MacKenzie, Iain and Porter, Robert (2017) *Drama Out of a Crisis? Poststructuralism and the Politics of Everyday Life.* **Political Studies Review, 15 (4). pp. 528-538. ISSN 1478-9299.**

Drama out of a Crisis? Poststructuralism and the Politics of Everyday Life

Iain MacKenzie (University of Kent) and Robert Porter (Ulster University)

Time and again we have been told that Poststructuralism is in crisis. Poststructuralism, we hear, is ontologically exhausted, epistemologically and normatively confused, and politically irrelevant to the contemporary economic and institutional conditions that have already domesticated, assimilated and recuperated it. While there is clearly merit and provocation in such critiques, for us, they underestimate the extent to which poststructuralist concepts can be transformed and made relevant to concerns we may have in our current political conjuncture.

In order to counter those who would simply dismiss and depoliticize poststructuralist thought as crisis-ridden or politically outmoded, we will suggest that poststructuralism is a drama that we can productively participate in, here and now. Further, we think this poststructuralist drama should be played out in the rough and tumble of everyday political life. There is, what we will call, a 'politics of everyday life' to be found in the poststructuralist archive, and the poststructuralist archive can be recast, revitalized, even transformed, when placed into the light and life of the everyday.

> I think I have in fact been situated in most of the squares on the political checkerboard, one after another and sometimes simultaneously: as anarchist, leftist, ostentatious or disguised Marxist, nihilist, explicit or secret anti-Marxist, technocrat in the service of Gaullism, new liberal and so on…None of these descriptions is important by itself; taken together, on the other hand, they mean something. And I must admit that I rather like what they mean. (Michel Foucault, 'Polemics, Politics and Problematizations').

> [O]pinion triumphs when the quality chosen ceases to be the condition of a group's constitution but is now only the image or "badge" of the constituted group…Then marketing appears as the concept itself….Ours is the age of communication, but every noble soul flees and crawls away whenever a little discussion, a colloquium, or simple conversation is suggested…The philosophy of communication is exhausted in the search for a universal liberal opinion as consensus, in which we find again the cynical perceptions and affections of the capitalist (Deleuze and Guattari, *What is Philosophy?*)

It might appear that 'poststructuralism', born at a time of political and

institutional crisis and upheaval (Dillet et al, 2013, pp. 1-19), is now itself in

conceptual crisis. While it was not that long ago that the texts of Foucault, Irigaray, Derrida, Cixous, Deleuze and others[1] created shock waves throughout the academy, whatever critical force they once had, has dissipated in a dual process of domestication and, following that, disavowal. Either poststructuralism has been domesticated, such that its key concepts have become banalities, or this very domestication gives sufficient weight to the idea that the insights of those old intellectual provocateurs can be side-stepped completely. We can see these dynamics clearly in the clichés and tropes that have been used to represent and frame the idea of poststructuralism, both positively and negatively. For critics seeking to bury poststructuralism we see the constant writing and rewriting of its obituary, nail after nail joyfully driven in by so many happy, and hubristic intellectual warriors who have attacked it on all sides. We have been told that poststructuralism is ontologically exhausted to the extent that it is implicated in variously mystical forms of vitalism that are literally 'out of this world' (Hallward, 2006; cf. Badiou, 2000). We have been told, by those with a more positive disposition to poststructuralism, that is needs to be epistemologically disciplined and codified as a method that can operate within a broadly naturalist social scientific framework (Bowman in Dillet et al, 2013, p. 465; Howarth, 2013). Since it's emergence within English-language debates within critical theory, we have been told that poststructuralism too easily forgoes normative regulation or restraint and mistakenly tries to place the 'moral' beyond the reach of reason (Habermas, 1987; cf. McCarthy, 1993). More recently, as the forces of domestication have taken hold, we have been told that poststructuralism is politically outmoded and surpassed on all sides by a contemporary neo-liberal

ideology that has already accounted for it and assimilated it in the to and fro of a thoroughly corrupted and commodified parliamentary exchange (Badiou, 2010; Žižek and Douzinas, 2010; Bosteels, 2011).[2] Whatever the merits of these various recuperative narratives (and there is some merit in the problems they sharply bring into focus) they remain, for us, problematic because they assume that the problems they identify are somehow lost on the poststructuralist thinkers they so readily implicate. The key problem is that they singularly fail to understand the extent to which poststructuralist philosophers always-already expressed an acute awareness of many of the recuperative traps that lay in wait for them as they tried to develop their thinking. So, whatever the merits of these specific recuperations (ontological, epistemological, moral or political), when taken together they add up to a more general claim about the *depoliticization* of poststructuralism that is worthy of some critical attention.

How, then, might we understand this more general depoliticization of poststructuralism? Drawing inspiration from the epigraphs above, we will present this general process as the result of treating poststructuralism as primarily an *oppositional* mode of thinking. To the extent that this treatment of poststructuralism is successful, the conditions are created for its commodification in the academic marketplace and, therefore, its depoliticization. On the contrary, and explicitly following Bernard Stiegler, we will argue that one of the defining characteristics of poststructuralism is its refusal of 'the thought by opposition' (Stiegler, in Dillet et al, p. 489) and, to

this extent, that it retains its capacity to resist commodification and, therefore, maintain its critical, political bite.

Let us try to tease out this claim a bit more. With more than the suggestion of a glint in his eye, Foucault refuses 'the thought by opposition' by refusing to be situated on the 'political checkerboard'. This imagery is highly suggestive, immediately bringing to mind the idea of the political as an already ordered container-space, governed by game-like rules and expressed through localised forms of strategic and tactical action (yet another generalized and clichéd image of poststructuralist ethics and politics). And yet this is refused. Being identified as this as opposed to that is less significant for Foucault than being identified *as this and then that*. As he says: 'None of these descriptions is important by itself; taken together, on the other hand, they mean something. And I must admit that I rather like what they mean'. James Williams has made the same point: 'poststructuralism is not against this and for that – once and for all. It is for the affirmation of an inexhaustible productive power of limits. It is for the resulting positive disruption of settled oppositions' (2005, p. 4). This is precisely where 'the thought by opposition' can give way to a different mode of thinking. With a nod to Deleuze's *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, we refer to this as a 'pluralist' mode of thinking motivated by a desire to create something different, rather than being content to oppose some already existing thing (Deleuze, 1986). Rather than simply or crudely privileging some notion of creation or transformation over opposition, however, it is, for us, more a question of showing how transformation is already immanent to opposition; it is a matter of shining a light on how the notion of opposition is both

conditioned by, and reflective of, particular kinds of transformative acts.[3] In this sense, rather than presume that poststructuralism once had but has now lost its disruptive power such that it is in crisis, it would be better to say that the history of poststructuralism is simultaneously a history of crises, both conceptual and political, and it is precisely its relation to these crises that give it pertinence and political bite. Although a full exploration of this idea is not possible in this discussion,[4] we can begin to show what is at stake by reflecting briefly on the idea of poststructuralism as a brand that is traded in a globalized academic marketplace.

The Poststructuralist Brand

That poststructuralism is branded as a form of oppositional thinking is indicated clearly whenever we read, and we read it time and again, that it stands against x, y and z (against 'reason', against any notion of an independent 'real', against the 'subject', against 'structuralism'…). The 'triumph' of this 'opinion', or clichéd image of poststructuralism, is reflected in its seemingly infinite exchangeability and reproducibility. This, for Deleuze and Guattari, is where 'marketing appears as the concept itself'. The circulation and exchange of this kind of 'opinion' is akin to branding, 'the badge', as they say above, or the kite-mark that aims to determine the 'quality' of the thing circulated and exchanged. The circulation, reproduction and exchangeability of the poststructuralist brand, whether we want to praise it or bury it as a form of oppositional thinking, needs to be understood primarily as a 'cynical' gesture, as reflecting 'the cynical perceptions and affections of the capitalist'. It is

cynical precisely because it transforms philosophy into a commodity, or a marketing tool.

Reading these lines from *What is Philosophy?* is a useful reminder that no-one knew better than Deleuze and Guattari themselves the recuperative dangers that lay in wait for them as their work got translated and developed across an increasingly globalized market of academic production and consumption. The temptation of some to turn Deleuze and Guattari's words back on them and implicate them in the culture industry of academic commentary that inevitably sprung up around their work should strike us as rather ironic, to say the least. Also, and obviously, those of us concerned to praise rather than bury poststructuralists like Deleuze and Guattari are also implicated here to the extent that we trade on the brand of oppositional thinking: where being against, being oppositional, somehow presupposes the emergence of the 'new', the quotidian roll out of which is actually nothing other than the development of yet another niche product in the academic marketplace. Mckenzie Wark saw this coming in relation to Deleuze in *A Hacker Manifesto* when he presciently said; 'there is an industry in the making, within the education business, around the name of Deleuze, from which he might need rescued' (Wark, 2004, p. 341). Though it would take us well beyond the confines of our argument here, we think it would be useful to sketch a map of the cultural and economic geography of receptions of poststructuralist ideas with a view to critically interrogating how the quotidian and everyday roll out of the brand actually works in various contexts or niche markets. The key thing, for us, is the particular way in which the 'new', 'oppositional' niche product

(poststructuralist brand) implies transformative acts that we need to hold critically to account.

Perhaps an example would help in this context. Think, for instance, of Deleuze's reception in Film Studies in the English-speaking world over the last twenty years or more. This niche market grew and traded on the idea that Deleuze's approach to film represented a new and oppositional form of thinking. *It was Film Studies Jim, but not how we knew it or used to desire it!* Deleuze was branded as the film theorist or philosopher who stood against 'structuralism' and 'semiotics', against the exhausted, repetitive, reductively obsessional, yet strangely dominant, psychoanalytical film theory of the 1970s and early 1980s. The political significance of Deleuze's reception in Anglophone Film Studies is precisely in the emergence or creation of the 'new' brand or niche market (the Deleuzian brand of 'film philosophy'), the transformative act or acts by which a 'new' kind of film theory and philosophy can suddenly come into vogue and orient itself in the contemporary education market. Wark is right! Deleuze needs rescuing from the film philosophy industry that grew up around him in the Anglophone world from the mid 1990s on. In *Cinema 2*, Deleuze, in melancholic and caustic tones very reminiscent of Adorno, insists that the contemporary experience of a cinema of mass consumption is one drowning in cliché and dripping in money, and that understanding these conditions is of the utmost political significance. 'Cinema is dying', says Deleuze rather melodramatically, 'from its quantitative mediocrity' (Deleuze, 1989, p. 164). The reason for this, Deleuze points out, is that film production as 'industrial art' finds itself in a conspiratorial,

unavoidable and deathly embrace with 'money' (Deleuze, 1989, p. 77). Now, what Deleuze says of the film industry in the late twentieth century is equally true of the education business that is twenty-first century Deleuzian film studies, a brand that trades on both the movie business and the transformation of philosophy into a commodity or marketing tool. Yes Wark saw it coming in *A Hacker Manifesto* but Deleuze was, in many respects, already there in *Cinema 2*. Just as the movie business must follow the money in a competitive market environment, and conspire with it, so too must philosophy, and the academy generally, follow the money in the education market. The conditions that allow for a particular reconnection of philosophy or 'high theory' to film studies are clearly political, economic and institutional. They are, in part, consumer led, reflecting changing market demands in higher education and the ever-accelerating marketization of education more broadly.[5] Thus, we can begin to bring into focus how the 'new' and 'oppositional' thing that is 'Deleuzian film philosophy' can be accounted for in and through the transformations in the contemporary market of higher education. Put crudely, philosophy becomes much more attractive in the current academic marketplace when it becomes a form of 'film philosophy' that is seen to connect to the 'creative industries' sector of the economy (Lovink and Rossiter, 2007).

The Poststructuralist Drama and Everyday Life

The gesture of refusing the 'thought by opposition' is not without provocation. Indeed, it might well be seen as the kind of peformative contradiction that we are so often told bedevils poststructuralist thinking generally: the classic statement of this problem is Habermas (1987). How can we oppose

poststructuralism to forms of oppositional thinking without falling into performative contradiction, and isn't it right to foreground the various ways poststructuralist thinkers have tactically and strategically opposed the things they criticized? These would indeed be fair questions if we were seeking crudely to oppose the concepts of opposition and transformation. But our aim, to repeat, is to understand how the very notion of opposition implies transformation, to think about the emerging and changing conditions that make opposition possible in the first instance. This is where poststructuralism (as a mode of critical inquiry rather than merely a brand) can come into its own in that it provides an integral account of its own transformative conditions of emergence and a real political sense of how concepts like 'opposition' can assume a life and a particular function in a given political situation. This is something that we have talked about before in the context of Deleuze and Guattari's method of dramatization. One of our key gestures in *Dramatizing the Political: Deleuze and Guattari* concerned the dramatic conditions in which concepts are actualized, where and when they begin to take on life and resonate in the political world (Mackenzie and Porter, 2011a). This work of ours is just one example of how the poststructuralist archive can be plundered. In fact, for us, the poststructuralist archive is not so much an archive as a vast dramatic script to be picked up and performed anew, in the here and now. Or, as we put it in the *Edinburgh Companion to Poststructuralism*, we see no reason why poststructuralism, for all that it has become a body of thought with a more-or-less settled series of practices associated with it, cannot be viewed as first and foremost an intellectual and institutional event (Dillet et al, 2013). While we are disciplined within the academy to think of a body of ideas or set of

practices such that we treat poststructuralism as an 'ism' – that is, as a canon of great thinkers and texts – it is important to retain the priority of its forceful emergence as an event, if its ideas and practices are to be dramatized anew, in the here and now. In short, it is only by considering the conditions of its emergence that one can give a properly poststructuralist account of poststructuralism and, thereby, repoliticize it as a series of interventions in the present (academy and beyond).

This may sound plausible, and we hope our earlier work goes some way to justifying this plausibility, but what could it mean in practical terms? While this, rather broad, question could take us off in any number of directions, our concern in recent writings has been to pose it in the context of a discussion of 'everyday life'. Our guiding intuition is this: poststructuralism should not be approached as a codified, oppositional form of thinking that can be consumed by the market but rather as a dramatic event that tends towards everyday life. This is a point that we have been content to more or less simply state in previous research (Mackenzie and Porter, 2011a; Mackenzie and Porter, 2011b; Mackenzie and Porter, 2015). In the remainder of this article, however, we would like to begin the process of teasing it out a bit more. The first thing worth emphasizing is that everyday life is a *concept*, or that it is *conceptually significant* for the student of politics. By this we mean that it is necessary for the student of politics to be worthy and be ready for the political challenge of what everyday life provokes, the political problems it brings into focus, and to be critical, if necessary, of the ready-made solutions that often accompany those problems it brings to life and dramatizes on a daily basis. Secondly,

while it is clearly useful to think of everyday life as a kind of problem for political thought, providing important conditions in which the conceptual negotiation of our political world takes place, it is also necessary to understand that it comes alive as something 'outside' political thought. For if everyday life is internal to political thought, it is also outside it, a non-philosophical reality into which political thought must extend if it is to retain any critical purchase and significance beyond its usually, rather constipated, disciplinary codification in the academy. Thus, thirdly, the poststructuralist drama, as we would call it, assumes new life to the extent that it remains an event worthy of the problems and provocations of everyday life and to the degree that it commits to extending into everyday life, time and again. There is nothing to be gained as a poststructuralist from the canonization of its ideas or the attendant academic desire to 'apply' these canonical thinkers and ideas. The unexamined everyday life is not worth living for the poststructuralist, and poststructuralist political philosophy must be continually directed towards the quotidian in order to avoid the irrelevant abstractions of a philosophical meta-language that is only ever happy to window dress the everyday, while remaining utterly indifferent to its provocation.[6]

Lipstick Traces, a Hipster's Moustache
A useful, concrete, indeed obvious, way to think about how everyday life provokes us politically or crystallises particular political problems is to direct ourselves to the quotidian rough and tumble of media representations. Now, to those students of politics who would worry that we are running the risk of reducing our analysis to the trivialities and triteness of the everyday, we say it

is not so much a reduction of political thought, but its extension, its opening up and pluralization (Porter, 2009; Shapiro, 2006). Further still, we would challenge political theorists, and students of politics more generally, to think about the political implications of turning our back on the everyday or hastily dismissing it as triviality, triteness and nothing else. There is a political significance to everyday life to which we need to be critically sensitive. Deleuze and Guattari were very fond of the idea of taking institutionalized and codified forms of thinking (philosophy, linguistics, aesthetics, political theory) out for a walk and into everyday life, of emphasizing the mediating significance of popular cultural forms in framing and developing thought (political and otherwise). One thinks of their notion of 'POP ANALYSIS' and their light-footed, but deadly serious, suggestion that *A Thousand Plateaus* should be read in the way that you would listen to a record (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p. 24). The record goes round and round, thought takes a circular form, and in its turn and turn can provoke new thoughts and sensations. 'We are writing this book as a rhizome…We have given it a circular form, but only for the laughs' (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p. 22). There is humour, mischief and political provocation in the picture painted by Deleuze and Guattari's words here. This connects to the humour, mischief and political provocation that we often find in everyday life itself. Consider, in this regard, the following first few lines of a rather funny, and seemingly trivial, story that ran in *The Guardian* technology section in January 2014. The headline reads; 'Instagram pictures reveal Belfast as UK's happiest city'. Here are the first few lines:

The happiest place in the UK? It's easy to find: all you have to do is analyze

the colours, facial expressions and other objects in tens of millions of location-tagged photos posted on Instagram. And it turns out that the happiest city is Belfast - and the happiest place there is a pub called the Parlour Bar in Elmwood Avenue.

The report continues:

The least happy place, meanwhile, turns out to be Salford, which comes below London and Bath in an analysis of 40 cities by Peter Warden, co-founder of the UK start-up Jetpac, which provides guides of places to visit around the world based on publicly posted pictures.

Warden analyzed 100m photos from Instagram's public system, as part of the company's attempt to build a recommendation system built purely on pictures which are "geotagged" - linked to a specific location. He got software to analyze the faces in the pictures, which first found the mouths of people in the pictures, and then decided - based on colour - whether they were wearing lipstick (which would indicate being "glammed up", and so likely to be having a good time) and whether they were smiling…

The software could also identify moustaches - and so could point to the places in cities likely to have the largest concentration of "hipsters" - although, Warden notes, they tend not to smile as much as others…(Arthur, 2014, accessed online).

Taking our inspiration from Deleuze and Guattari's remarks in *A Thousand Plateaus*, we would say that the mischief and humour here, while undoubtedly

a 'play for laughs', also connects to a circular, and circulating, mode of thought that has political significance. When Deleuze and Guattari joke that thought is assembled 'only for laughs', this needs to be read as a provocative slogan, and it needs to be taken seriously. This is equally true of the everyday. The seeming silliness, triviality and triteness of the everyday will always provoke the philosophically engaged and critical political theorist, at least as long as (s)he retains a sense of humour. In this respect, Deleuze and Guattari's 'POP ANALYSIS' finds a strong echo and resonance in the work of Baudrillard's mentor, Henri Lefebvre. Indeed, Deleuze and Guattari are explicit in *Anti-Oedipus* in their focus on Lefebvre's idea that contemporary capitalism incessantly generates circulating and 'floating images' of the political. They write:

> To pursue a remark of Henri Lefebvre's, these images do not initiate a making public of the private so much as a privatization of the public: the whole world unfolds right at home, without one's having to leave the TV screen. This gives private persons a very special role in the system: a role of *application*…in a code (Deleuze and Guattari, 1984, p. 251).

This helpfully takes us right back to our news report, back to the Instagram screens and the software codes implied by the image of Belfast as the UK's happiest city. In his own time, Lefebvre spoke famously of the emergence of 'The Bureaucratic Society of Controlled Consumption', where the subdivision, compartmentalization, organization and colonization of everyday life increasingly becomes subject to a cybernetic logic of *programming*. In the 1960s he was already talking about the

emergence of 'applied sciences' which not only take cognizance of the quotidian, but make it 'their special province', of 'daily life' as 'the screen on which our society projects its light and shadow' (Lefebvre, 2009, p. 219). The daily, banal and quotidian roll out of this 'cybernetic rationality', as Lefebvre calls it, may appear nothing more than a joke to some: triviality, triteness and nothing else. However, Lefebvre immediately trains our eye and puts us on our guard here to take it seriously, even though it might appear self-evidently ridiculous. Traces of lipstick, 'glammed up' colour, or a hipster's moustache: all these become part of a dataset that provides us with knowledge about particular places in the city, and the city in general. This 'knowledge' may be associative, fragmentary, insubstantial, but its truth, if you will, is expressed in and through the way it gestures toward what Lefebvre would insist is the broader political 'totality' in which it functions. This broader totality is, of course, 'The Bureaucratic Society of Controlled Consumption'. As Deleuze and Guattari point out, this has less to do with making a relatively private everyday experience public (say, for instance, the public display of our drinking and supposed merriment in the Parlour Bar in Belfast) but is more about privatizing our being in public as such, where we assume a role (a happy person, a hipsterish person, a sad person) in a system that is coded and programmed in advance, and where the company software of Jetpac is applied and charged with the task of determining the emotional tonalities of subjects in a given 'public' situation.

The resonances between Lefebvre's work on the bureaucratization of consumption in the 1960s and Deleuze's interest, in the 1990s, in 'control societies' are very strong indeed in this context. Both Lefebvre and Deleuze connect the problems of cybernetics and codes to emerging forms of consumption, linking these consumptive

experiences necessarily back to questions of political control. For both Lefebvre and Deleuze, it is important to understand how everyday life is coded by capitalism, how capitalism has colonized not only the everyday life of the citizenry, but also the everyday life of political institutions. Key here is the idea that business logic over-codes political logic. As Lefebvre puts it, modern business is not simply content 'with political influence', but tends 'to invade social experience and set itself up as a model of organization and administration for society in general' (Lefebvre, 2009, p. 220). The logic of business radiates out and becomes the model for administering and organizing public policy in general; for example, urban policy, housing policy, even education policy. Thirty years later, in 'Postscript on Societies of Control', Deleuze similarly speaks about business dominating education at every level, the triumph of vocationalism, and a diminished university sector more concerned with marketing than research (Deleuze, 1995). More than twenty years on from Deleuze's 'Postscript on Societies of Control' we can see that this tendency has continued to accelerate in our time (Rossiter, 2006; Bueno, 2017). Yet again, Deleuze's own research on 'control societies' implicates those who would wrongly dismiss his work as politically outmoded or recuperated by contemporary capitalism.

Conclusion

In order to counter those who would dismiss and depoliticize poststructuralist thought we have suggested that it is a drama that we can participate in, here and now. That we think this poststructuralist drama should be directed to the rough and tumble of everyday life is, we hope, obvious enough at this point. It is a way of thinking about poststructuralism that hopes to avoid sterile debate and the attending constipations of disciplinary coding. Further, and in practical terms, it is a way of showing how the

poststructuralist archive can be transformed and made contemporaneous with concerns we may have in the current political conjuncture, or, as we would prefer it, in the politics of everyday life. What do we mean by the 'politics of everyday life' here? Two key moments of our argument are worth replaying in light of this question.

First, we spoke about the idea of poststructuralism as a brand of oppositional thinking and called for more research – a broad economic and cultural geography - on receptions of poststructuralist ideas with a view to critically interrogating how the quotidian and everyday roll out of the brand actually works in various contexts or niche markets. Using the reception of Deleuze in Anglophone Film Studies as a brief case-study example, we gestured towards the transformations, or transforming conditions (economic, political, institutional) at play in the creation of the figure of the oppositional Deleuze (Deleuze against psychoanalysis, Deleuze against structuralism and semiotics…). The politics, then, plays through the everyday roll out of the brand in the transformed and transforming marketplace of academic production and consumption.

Second, and briefly using a case-study example of a news report on the 'UK's happiest city', we began to try to show how the everyday dramatizations of a political formation such as contemporary Belfast imply transformed and transforming conditions to which we must be critically sensitive. Here the seeming triviality, triteness and stupidity of the report begins to give way to a gnawing, troubling, sense that its implies a broader political totality where cybernetic rationality and software codes condition emerging forms of consumption, and where these consumptive experiences importantly connect back to problems of political control.[7] The politics

here being the coding of everyday life by capitalism and the emerging realization that the logic of business, and the administrative and organizational structures of the business firm, have become the model for public policy in the contemporary conjuncture. Business logic over-codes political logic, politics and supposedly 'public' institutions like universities become businesses at an ever-accelerating pace.

As we stated at the beginning of the article, one of the most well worn clichés about poststructuralism is that it is in crisis. From our perspective, it is important to retain the idea of poststructuralism as a dramatic event, as so many potential moments that are defined by the kind of free movement of thought and critical reflection which, when put to practical use, will always contain the possibility of political and institutional experimentation and social change (Dillet et al, 2013). While we think that the institutional recuperation of poststructuralism within the academy, and its attending depoliticization, is a story worth telling (as our brief discussion of Deleuzian film philosophy hopefully shows), it is not the whole story. There is no need to bury poststructuralism in the pseudo drama or spectacle of its supposed institutional crisis. Better to make a real drama out of the crisis by connecting poststructuralism back to the politics of everyday life.

References

Angermuller, J. (2015) *Why There is no Poststructuralism in France: The Making of an Intellectual Generation*. London: Bloomsbury.

Arthur, C. (2014) 'Instagram pictures reveal Belfast as UK's happiest city', *Guardian*, 13 January {accessed 10 September 2015}

Badiou, A. (2000) *Deleuze: the Clamor of Being*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Badiou, A. (2010) *The Communist Hypothesis*. London: Verso.

Bosteels, B. (2011) *The Actuality of Communism*. London: Verso.

Bowman, P. (2013) 'The Receptions of Poststructuralism' in B. Dillet et al (eds.) *The Edinburgh Companion to Poststructuralism*. Edinburgh: EUP, pp. 445-470.

Bueno, C. C. (2017) *The Attention Economy: Labour, Time and Power in Cognitive Capitalism.* London: Rowman and Littlefield International.

Deleuze, G. (1995) *Negotiations 1972-1990*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, G. (1989) *Cinema 2*. London: Athlone Press.

Deleuze, G. (1986) *Nietzsche and Philosophy*. London: Athlone Press.

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1994) *What is Philosophy?* London: Verso.

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1987) *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1977) *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. New York: Viking Press.

Dillet, B. Mackenzie, I. and Porter, R. (eds.) (2013) *The Edinburgh Companion to Poststructuralism*. Edinburgh: EUP.

Dosse, F. (1997) *History of Structuralism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Foucault, M. (1998) 'Polemics, Politics and Problematizations' in P. Rabinow (ed.) *Essential Works of Foucault*. New York: Viking Press.

Habermas, J. (1987) *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity.

Hallward, P. (2006) *Out of This World: Deleuze and the Philosophy of Creation*. London: Continuum.

Howarth, D. (2013) *Poststructuralism and After: Structure, Subjectivity and Power*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lefebvre, H. (2009) 'Everyday Life in the Modern World', in McDonough, T. (ed.) *The Situationists and the City*. London: Verso, pp. 218-221.

Lovink, G. and Rossiter, N. (eds.) (2007) *My Creativity Reader: A Critique of the Creative Industries*. Rotterdam: NAi.

MacKenzie, I. and Porter, R. (2011a) *Dramatizing the Political: Deleuze and Guattari*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

MacKenzie, I. and Porter, R. (2011b) 'Dramatization as Method in Political Theory', *Contemporary Political Theory*, 10, pp. 482-501.

MacKenzie, I. and Porter, R. (2015) 'The Drama of Schizoanalysis: On Deleuze and Guattari's Method' in I. Buchanan et al (eds.) *Deleuze and the Schizoanalysis of Literature*. London: Bloomsbury, pp. 43-60.

MacKenzie, I. and Porter, R. (2016) 'Evental approaches to the Study of Events', in T. Pernecky (ed.) *Approaches and Methods in Event Studies*. London: Routledge, pp. 25-35.

McCarthy, T. (1993) *Ideals and Illusions: on Reconstruction and Deconstruction in Contemporary Critical Theory*. Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press.

Porter, R. (2009) *Deleuze and Guattari: Aesthetics and Politics*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Rossiter, N. (2006) *Organized Networks*. Rotterdam: NAi.

Shapiro, M. J. (2006) *Deforming American Political Thought*. Lexington: University of Kentucky.

Stiegler, B. (2013) 'The Pharmacology of Poststructuralism' in B. Dillet et al (eds.) *The Edinburgh Companion to Poststructuralism*. Edinburgh: EUP, pp. 489-505.

Wark, M. (2004) *A Hacker Manifesto*. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Williams, J. (2005) *Understanding Poststructuralism*. Stocksfield: Acumen.

Žižek., S. and Douzinas, C. (eds.) (2010) *The Idea of Communism*. London: Verso.

---

[1] No discussion of poststructuralism can avoid the vexed question of how to define this term, especially in view of those thinkers most commonly associated with it seemingly rejecting this label. With Benoît Dillet, we have addressed these issues in the 'Introduction' to Dillet et al (2013). We will rely upon and develop this earlier discussion throughout this article.

[2] Of course, we speak in very general terms here, and figures such as Badiou and Hallward in particular take Deleuze and others poststructuralists seriously in very many important respects. Our point here is not that such important contemporary critical work on poststructuralism is simply dismissive and nothing else, but rather that its iterative effect tends, more broadly, to create the impression that poststructuralism is intellectually, culturally and politically passé.

[3] We have addressed the philosophical requirements of this claim elsewhere (MacKenzie and Porter 2011a and 2011b). In a symposium on poststructuralism within the academy, and political studies in particular, it is important to take a step back, or out of the realm of philosophical justification, in order to address the way in which poststructuralism as an intellectual intervention in ideas and institutions has both ceased to have this transformative power and how it might regain it.

[4] Useful texts to accompany such a general discussion of the relationship between poststructuralism and crises are Dosse (1997) and Angermuller (2015).

[5] See, for example, Angermuller (2015) for an interesting discussion regarding the relationship between the idea of poststructuralism as an academic brand and the need to reinvent liberal arts education in a 'post-national' American university system. The

account he provides leads easily to the idea that the branding of poststructuralism as an oppositional form is intimately connected to the shifts towards neo-liberal economic and institutional practices.

[6] We have addressed, in Deleuzian terms, the philosophical implications of this commitment to transcendental empiricism in other work, notably MacKenzie and Porter (2011a). Here we develop the idea of experience that resides within transcendental empiricism to a broader conception of everyday life.

[7] Obviously, this is not to deny the possibility of networked and other forms of political resistance in contemporary digital capitalism, nor is it to suggest that the poststructuralist archive cannot be plundered for such purposes. Indeed, this is something that we are currently grappling with in a forthcoming paper, 'Schizoanalysis: The Art of Sustainable Resistance'. Further, and for an explicit engagement with the Occupy movement, see MacKenzie and Porter (2016).