

International Workshop

**At the Crossroads of Thought –
Deleuze and/in Contemporary Philosophy**

BOOK OF ABSTRACTS

INVITED SPEAKERS

Daniel W. Smith

Emma Ingala

Henry Somers-Hall

Pablo Esteban Rodríguez

PARTICIPANTS

Alejandro Romero Pardo

Catarina Patrício

Diana Miheş

Filipe Ferreira

Izabela Loner

Julie Van der Wielen

Ralf Gisinger

Ricardo Mendoza-Canales

Rohitashwa Sarkar

Senda Sferco

Zach Taylor

Zhifeng Zhan

Daniel W. Smith

smith132@purdue.edu

Deleuze as a Pure Metaphysician: On Problems and Manifolds

My presentation will explore the nature of Deleuze's metaphysics, particularly with regard to his concepts of "problematics" and "manifolds." Deleuze once described himself as a "pure metaphysician." If metaphysics asks, "What is the nature of reality?", one could say that Deleuze has a one-word response: reality is a problem. Using Kant as a guiding thread, I would like to quickly trace out how Deleuze consequently develops a concept of problems by appealing to several mathematical domains, including group theory, calculus, and especially the theory of manifolds. Deleuze in particular stressed the importance of the latter: "I see philosophy as a logic of manifolds," Deleuze noted, telling an interviewer, "for the problem of thought, and even for the sciences, the notion of manifold, as introduced by Riemann, seems to me to be much more important than the notion of microphysics." Kant critiqued the Ideas of the Self, the World, and God as the three illusory terminal points of traditional metaphysics, and my overall aim is to explore how Deleuze attempts to create an a-personal, a-cosmic, and a-theistic metaphysics freed from the coordinates of Self, the World, and God.

BIO

Daniel W. Smith is Professor of Philosophy at Purdue University and is one of the world's leading commentators on Deleuze. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Chicago and works primarily in continental philosophy. He is the author of—among others— *Essays on Deleuze* (Edinburgh 2012), the co-editor of the *Cambridge Companion to Deleuze* (2012, with Henry Somers Hall), and, more recently, *Deleuze and Time* (Edinburgh UP, 2023, with Robert W. Luzecky). He has translated, from the French, books by Gilles Deleuze, Pierre Klossowski, Isabelle Stengers, Michel Serres, and Raymond Ruyer. He is the co-director of "The Deleuze Seminars" project (deleuze.cla.purdue.edu), which is translating Deleuze's seminar lectures and is supported by grants from the National Endowment of the Humanities.

Emma Ingala
eaingala@ucm.es

On Images and Imagining the Future

Deleuze had a deeply ambivalent relationship to images: on the one hand, he considered images to be clichés, dogmatic presuppositions, emissaries of identity and representation, and therefore a fundamental obstacle to a philosophy of difference; on the other hand, an iconophilia permeated his texts, and he quite often had recourse to images to help him think difference in itself. In this paper, I interrogate Deleuze's ambiguity regarding images and put it into dialogue with his conceptions of the future, of the possibility of a future that is not an indefinite reproduction of the present, and of the ways in which it is possible to make this future happen and so produce something different or new. The question will be whether imagination and images are necessary to generate that future or are rather an obstacle that should be avoided.

BIO

Emma Ingala is Associate Professor at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid (UCM), Spain. She specializes in post-structuralist thought, political anthropology, feminism, and psychoanalysis. Her recent publications include co-editing (with Gavin Rae) the volumes *Philosophy Across Borders* (Routledge, 2024), *Historical Traces and Future Pathways of Poststructuralism: Aesthetics, Ethics, Politics* (Routledge, 2021), *The Meanings of Violence: From Critical Theory to Biopolitics* (Routledge, 2019) and *Subjectivity and the Political: Contemporary Perspectives* (Routledge, 2018), book chapters published by Beauchesne (France), Bloomsbury, and Edinburgh University Press, and numerous articles published in journals including *Anales del Seminario de Historia de la Filosofía*, *Daimon*, *Ideas y Valores*, *Isegoría*, *Literature and Religion*, and *Psychoanalysis, Culture & Society*.

Henry Somers-Hall

henry.somers-hall@rhul.ac.uk

God, the Face, and the Transcendental Ideal: Traces of Kant in the Faciality Machine

In this paper, I want to explore one of the key influences of Kant on *A Thousand Plateaus*, namely Deleuze and Guattari's analysis of the abstract machine of faciality. I will argue that the abstract machine of faciality that Deleuze and Guattari hold to be responsible for making sedentary distributions possible has its origins in Kant's account of the transcendental ideal. Kant introduces the transcendental ideal to provide an account of why we have a concept of God. His answer in the *Critique of Pure Reason* is that the ideal of God as a completely determined being allows us to see the world as one where all determination is predicative. Deleuze and Guattari take up this model in their account of faciality, taking the face of Christ to present an account of how all determination comes to be seen as predicative. While for Kant, such an approach aims at making science possible by ensuring that the law of excluded middle holds, for Deleuze and Guattari, the transcendental ideal here serves to prevent our understanding of alternative forms of determination, such as those we would find in a nomadic distribution. Having talked about these parallels between these two philosophical accounts, I will conclude by talking about the countersignifying regime of signs, and its relationship with the machine of faciality.

BIO

Henry Somers-Hall is Professor of Philosophy at Royal Holloway, University of London, and an internationally renowned Deleuzian scholar. He completed his PhD at the University of Warwick. His research explores the intersections between German Idealism and French philosophy, showing how reading French thought through the lens of German Idealism reveals new continuities between its phenomenological and post-structuralist strands. He is the author of *Judgement and Sense in Modern French Philosophy* (Cambridge University Press, 2022), *Deleuze's Difference and Repetition: An Edinburgh Philosophical Guide* (2013), and *Hegel, Deleuze, and the Critique of Representation* (2012). He has also co-edited several volumes, including *The Deleuzian Mind* (Routledge, 2025, with Jeffrey A. Bell), *A Thousand Plateaus and Philosophy* (2018, with Jeffrey A. Bell and James Williams), and *The Cambridge Companion to Deleuze* (2012, with Daniel Smith).

Pablo Esteban Rodríguez

prodriguez@sociales.uba.ar

Trans-in-dividua-liz-ation:

On subjectification and technology in Deleuze (with Foucault and Simondon)

The conference will explore the term “dividual,” which Deleuze employs throughout his work as a philosophical and social critique of the notion of the individual. Among the many meanings of the dividual in Deleuze’s thought, the one tied to his well-known text *Postscript on the Societies of Control* directly connects Michel Foucault’s problematics of individualization and Gilbert Simondon’s concept of individuation. The wordplay we will engage in corresponds to different phases of the problem: 1) The dividual in Deleuze; 2) Individualization in Foucault; 3) Individuation and the transindividual in Simondon; 4) Trans-dividuation, a term used by Bernard Stiegler in *Automatic Society* to account for the transformations that the data-algorithms platforms framework brings to the relationship between technology and subjectivation in the age of artificial intelligence.

BIO

Pablo “Manolo” Rodríguez is an Associate Professor at the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Buenos Aires (UBA) and an Independent Researcher at the Argentine National Council of Research (CONICET). He holds a degree in Communication Sciences and a PhD in Social Sciences from the University of Buenos Aires, as well as a master’s degree from Université de Paris I-Panthéon Sorbonne. His published works include *Historia de la información* (2012) and *Las palabras en las cosas: Saber, poder y subjetivación entre algoritmos y biomoléculas* (2019). He has also co-edited *Amar a las máquinas: Cultura y técnica en Gilbert Simondon* (2015) and *La salud inalcanzable: Biopolítica molecular y medicalización de la vida cotidiana* (2017).

Alejandro Romero Pardo

alerom14@ucm.es

Deleuze: Time as Fractured Circularity

The reflection on time in Deleuze's philosophy is closely tied to the problem of the genesis of real experience. Within this framework, the notions of the virtual and the actual occupy a central place, as their interrelation provides a key to understanding the mechanisms by which experience is produced. This investigation aims to integrate these concepts with the distinction between Aion and Chronos—as formulated in *The Logic of Sense* (1969)—in order to offer an original reading that reconsiders not only Deleuze's conception of time, but also its fundamental ontological implications. To this end, we begin with an analysis of the relationship between events and their spatiotemporal actualization, each of which corresponds to a distinct temporal regime: Aion, associated with the incorporeal that subsists and determines individuals—the virtual—and Chronos, linked to present and measurable states of affairs—the actual. Our hypothesis is that, in Deleuze, time possesses a certain circular structure and fulfills a genetic function: experience arises through the reciprocal determination between the virtual and the actual, or between events and their actualizations. However, a perfectly closed or symmetrical circularity would lead to an eternal return of the Same; thus, there must be a rupture in the circle of time that ensures the actual always returns in a different way. This rupture arises from the fact that the relationship between the virtual and the actual is asymmetrical: the actual never directly leads to another actual. In this way, every genesis of real experience is traversed by difference, since the transition from the virtual to the actual requires a process of creation that does not follow the rules of identity or resemblance. This thesis is further supported by the study of the three syntheses of time in *Difference and Repetition*. The present—the first synthesis—requires the past—the second synthesis—in order to pass or be actualized, and this past is of a virtual nature. Consequently, what constitutes the future—the third synthesis—is always the new, insofar as the succession of presents is mediated by a process of genesis governed by chance and difference (by the necessary passage from the virtual to the actual). In conclusion, time is marked by a caesura; it is fractured in itself, divided into two opposing directions that bear no resemblance to each other. As such, chronological succession (Chronos) gives way to a time constituted by an eternally decentered circularity between the actual present and the virtual continuum of past-future (Aion).

BIO

Alejandro Romero Pardo is currently pursuing a PhD focused on Gilles Deleuze's interpretation of Nietzsche's doctrine of the eternal return, under the supervision of Emma Ingala. He holds a predoctoral FPI fellowship funded by the Community of Madrid (2023–2027) and is based in the Department of Logic and Theoretical Philosophy at the Complutense University of Madrid (UCM). He has published an article in *Logos. Anales del Seminario de Metafísica* entitled “Gilles Deleuze and the Truth of Truth: Thinking Forces,” and contributed with a book chapter on the same topic in a forthcoming volume published by Dykinson. In the upcoming fall, he will be visiting researcher at Purdue University (Indiana), working under the supervision of Daniel Smith.

Catarina Patrício

catarina.patricio@ulusofona.pt

Cartography of Anachronism

This paper proposes a transversal cartography of temporal and medial disruption by situating Gilles Deleuze's concept of the "crystal-image" at the intersection of Walter Benjamin's "dialectical image" and William Burroughs' cut-up technique, particularly as articulated in *The Electronic Revolution* (1970). While Deleuze's crystal-image crystallizes the coexistence of actual and virtual temporalities—where past and future fold into the present—Benjamin's dialectical image and principle of montage enact a temporal shock, arresting the continuum of history in the explosive instant of *Jetztzeit*. Burroughs, in turn, radicalizes this logic through the cut-up, a method that severs and recombines linguistic and media codes, exposing the parasitic "tapeworm" of discourse and enabling the leakage of unforeseen futures into the present. By bringing these approaches into dialogue, we argue that the crystal-image is not merely a cinematic or philosophical motif, but a media-philosophical operator that deterritorializes the linearity of historical narrative and the sovereignty of linguistic control. Montage and cut-up techniques function as critical interventions, fracturing the code of the "tapeword" (image-text), rendering visible the latent anachronisms that haunt both collective memory and technological mediation. The crystal-image thus emerges as a site of temporal and conceptual turbulence, where the present is perpetually cut, and the virtual is made to shimmer within the actual. This synthesis offers a model for understanding how contemporary media assemblages—digital, algorithmic, and viral—extend and complicate these analog strategies of resistance. Ultimately, this proposal contends that the Deleuzian crystal-image, in its affinity with Benjaminian and Burroughsian methodologies, provides a vital framework for rethinking the politics of time, discourses and image-text, in an era marked by the incessant recurrence of disaster and the perpetual invention of new lines of flight.

BIO

Catarina Patrício holds a Master's in Anthropology and a PhD in Communication, both from NOVA-FCSH. Her area of specialization is contemporary culture and new technologies. She is also a visual artist, graduated in Painting from the Faculty of Fine Arts at the University of Lisbon (1998-2003) and studied photography at FH Bielefeld. She has received grants and fellowships from the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT) and support for artistic creation by the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation. Since 2010, Catarina has been a professor in the Department of Cinema and Media Arts at ECATI - Universidade Lusófona, and she served as an invited professor at NOVA-FCSH in 2022-2023. An integrated researcher at CICANT, she regularly publishes essays and exhibits her artistic work.

Diana Miheș

diana.mihes@ubbcluj.ro

How Deleuzian Perspectives Reshape Corporeality and the Self: New Materialist Approaches

This paper explores how Gilles Deleuze's philosophy fundamentally reconfigures the narrative of the self against a coherent, stable entity and as a site of continuous becoming. In contrast to dominant cultural currents that need fixed identities and perfected selves—particularly as promoted by self-help literature and new positivist perspectives Deleuze offers a framework in which the self is not something to be discovered, optimized, or stabilized, but something that is always in the making. Drawing from Deleuze and Guattari's concept of becoming, the paper examines how identity emerges from the dynamic interplay of bodies, affects, and material conditions. This perspective is extended through the work of Rosi Braidotti and Elizabeth Grosz, who rearticulate Deleuze's becoming within the terrain of feminist materialism and embodied subjectivity. Together, their approaches challenge the internalized neoliberal imperative to treat the body as a machine for productivity and self-regulation. By unsettling the logic of self-mastery and self-possession that underpins both self-help culture and traditional humanist thought, this paper opens a path toward reclaiming the body as a space of resistance and creativity. This paper foregrounds the political and ethical power of thinking of identity as a multiplicity in motion. Against the immobilizing narratives of perfection and control, it argues for a renewed engagement with the body as a generative site of becoming.

BIO

Diana Miheș is a PhD candidate in philosophy at Babeș-Bolyai University and a lecturer in the Department of Educational Sciences. Her research explores the intersections of postmodern thought, identity construction, and the political dimensions of truth and activism in contemporary societies. She has presented at international conferences and published in journals such as *Studia UBB Philosophia* and *Revista de Filosofie Aplicată*. Her work blends academic inquiry with public engagement, often through workshops, civic education, and philosophy with children.

Filipe Ferreira

fapinheiroferreira@gmail.com

A First Step Towards an Ecology of the Brain

Deleuze's remarks on the brain are sparse and enigmatic. They appear more consistently in *The Time-Image*, and with Félix Guattari in the Conclusion of *What is Philosophy?* In this latter work, his last major project, also the final one of his prolific collaboration with Guattari, they introduce what they call the "Thought-brain" (*pensée-cerveau*), and speak of a "turning-point" in our relationship with the brain, literally, as to how the brain is "lived", "where the brain is 'subject', where it becomes 'subject'", and, in becoming-subject, "the brain thinks and not man" (contrary to the phenomenological stress on Being in the world as beyond the brain, where "man thinks, not the brain")—historically, this turning point would have occurred, for Deleuze, in the aftermath of WWII. I propose to problematize what such becoming of the brain consists of, in a first gesture, and in the second, the kind of "ecology" it may suggest, especially if we take this term in its ancient Greek inspiration to mean the articulation of a dwelling, the *logos* of *oikos*. That is, I would like to consider, generally conceived, the manner in which the brain's becoming-subject appears as the articulation of a place of dwelling, more specifically, as the articulation of "Earth" as this "place". For the purposes of this short presentation, I will only be able to deal with the first gesture, and very much initially: after all, what is it for the brain, of all things, to "become-subject"? In my view, this becoming refers to the constitution of what I understand to be a "cerebral unconscious", beyond the sensorimotor—the first step towards an ecology of the brain being precisely the one of conceiving in what way the brain may suppose an unconscious dimension, which Deleuze and Guattari also refer to as a "nonobjectifiable brain". It is followed by two further steps, at least, the Thought-brain being conceived politically, or "cosmopolitically" (Isabelle Stengers) as a "war-machine", and, finally, ecologically, as the articulation of "Earth". Thought-brain? However enigmatic, it might just be the conception casting new light on Deleuze's thought, his philosophy appearing as the tracing of lines cutting across the field of neuroscientific research (Deleuze is one of the rare philosophers to have a profound interest in the field), furnishing it with the concepts it lacks, that is, with its metaphysics (also following the role Bergson attributes to philosophy as complementing science with its "other half"). Perhaps this "metaphysics of the brain" is closest to what, in any case, seems to me to be Deleuze's most intimate demand for thinking in general, namely, that it may engender in itself the force to resist, to resist the present with its "states of affairs", and to do so creatively, affirmatively, joyfully, by way of the percepts, the affects, the functions, the concepts, it fabricates.

BIO

Filipe Ferreira holds a PhD in Philosophy from NOVA University Lisbon (2014), with a dissertation on Deleuze supervised by José Gil. Previously, he earned a Master's degree in Philosophy from The New School for Social Research (2008) and a Master's degree in Social and Political Theory from the University of Edinburgh (2002). Between 2022-2024, he was a postdoctoral researcher in the Graduate Program in Philosophy at PUC-São Paulo, where he conducted research in the areas of contemporary philosophy, philosophy of language, metapsychology, literary theory, and social theory.

Izabela Loner

izabelalonersantana@gmail.com

The Elusive Element: Lacan, Deleuze and the Structurality of Structure

In his text “How Do We Recognize Structuralism?”, Deleuze identifies a “degree zero” of structure, common to structuralist thinkers: an “empty square” responsible for the articulation and convergence of series. Unlike the purely transcendental value or function that this operator seemed to assume within structuralism, Deleuze attributes to it a paradoxical status: it organizes and determines the structure, but is not itself determined by it — inscribing, within the symbolic system it structures, an indeterminate value, an “elusive element”. Jacques Lacan is cited as adhering to this degree zero and likewise conceives it paradoxically: in the 1950s, the phallus (and the Name-of-the-Father) functioned as the signifier that closed and organized the chain of signifiers precisely by operating as both excess and lack. However, in the transition to the 1960s, by affirming that “there is no Other of the Other,” the psychoanalyst marked the impossibility of any signifier or purely transcendental point outside the field of signifiers. This shift led him to revise his affiliations with linguistic-anthropological structuralism, reformulating his conception of language — no longer identified with the symbolic, but also determined by the real. The present communication seeks to articulate, preserving their differences of register, the treatments that Lacan and Deleuze confer to this paradoxical operator in the second half of the 1960s. By reconstructing its regime of causality, its position in the structure, and its modes of determination, emphasizing its transcendental-limiting character, our objective will be to think the structurality of structure not from an external point of foundation, but from difference itself and from the inscription of the real, as each author proposed in their own way.

BIO

Izabela Loner is a Ph.D. student in Philosophy at the State University of Campinas (UNICAMP/Brazil) and is currently undertaking a research stay at the Complutense University of Madrid, supported by the São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP, process 24/17408-7). Her research focuses on the intersections between Philosophy and Psychoanalysis, with particular emphasis on Contemporary French Philosophy. In her current project, she examines the assumptions and implications of Jacques Lacan’s conception of language during the 1960s, situating it within the broader philosophical context of the period.

Julie Van der Wielen

julie.vdwh@gmail.com

From Bion's Basic Assumptions to Guattari and Deleuze's Group Phantasies

In *Anti-Oedipus*, Deleuze and Guattari distinguish between two kinds of group phantasy: the group phantasy of the gregarious masses, which invests the whole social field, including its repressive aspects; and another group phantasy, which is capable of generating a revolutionary counter-investment, when it is plugged into the social field. I propose to explain this distinction by tracing it back to its origin in Guattari's *Psychoanalysis and Transversality*, where he associates this to his distinction between two kinds of groups — the subjected group and the subject-group — while distinguishing his notion of group phantasy from Wilfred Bion's — a pioneer in the study of group dynamics, which he studies from a Kleinian perspective. I will discuss Bion's observations about different kinds of groups, and about the basic assumptions that correspond to them, and illustrate how, according to Guattari, phantasies can become a kind of currency, which circulates in the group in order to become the basis for a certain phantasm of the group. I will argue that, from the point of view of Guattari's distinction between subject-groups and subjugated groups, Bion only describes subjugated groups, which are aversive to change and alterity, and which neutralize their members' singularity and desire. I will argue that the group phantasy of the subjected group functions like a cybernetic machine, and that we should understand Guattari's second kind of group phantasy simply as a phantasy about belonging to a group — any group — which functions mechanically rather than cybernetically. I will show how this distinction is a mereological one: it concerns the relation between the part and the whole. I will conclude by indicating that we can see this conception of the group phantasm and of the subject-group as a response to Lacan, whom Guattari continuously criticizes for his conception of desire as the desire for the Other, and of the subject as representing a signifier for another signifier, because these conceptions lead to a complete disengagement from the social and the collective.

BIO

Julie Van der Wielen holds a BA, MA and MPhil from KU Leuven, a PhD from Universidad Diego Portales (Santiago, Chile) and Radboud Universiteit (Nijmegen, The Netherlands), and a teaching degree from Université Libre de Bruxelles. In her PhD dissertation, which was published as *Empirisme transcendantal et subjectivité* (2023, Hermann), she reconstructs Deleuze's notion of subjectivity on the basis of his early monographs on Hume, Kant, Nietzsche and Bergson, while confronting his readings of these authors with their own writings, and while articulating the concepts of the period of *Difference and Repetition* (singularities, habits, transcendental field, etc.) around the problem of the genesis and the status of subjectivity. Currently, she is employed as a lecturer and postdoctoral researcher at Universiteit Antwerpen, with a scholarship from the Fonds voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (FWO). Her current research project aims to show the philosophical contribution of the political militant, clinician, and author Félix Guattari, who is most famous for his collaboration with Deleuze.

Ralf Gisinger

ralf.gisinger@univie.ac.at

Eco-philosophical Interstices. Philosophy of Nature between and after Deleuze and Guattari

“[...] Guattari and I want to get back to our joint work and produce a sort of philosophy of Nature, now that any distinction between nature and artifice is becoming blurred.” (Deleuze 1995:155)

Deleuze states this in an interview in 1988 at a time, when Guattari has been starting to be engaged in what is called his “ecosophical project.” I argue that said blurring of the nature-artifice divide is not new to Deleuze but can and should be intensified with Guattari’s pluralized ecologies (*Les trois écologies*). I will trace back the problematization of nature-artifice in Deleuze and show how and in which way it is prevalent in his work and in the collaborations with Guattari. It makes sense to build Guattari’s project of a ‘generalized ecology’ (Guattari 2000: 52) on the two main elements formulated by Ernst Haeckel in the 19th century: ‘relations’ as well as ‘conditions of existence’; 1) to broaden and extend these criteria to all realms of the three ecologies, 2) to generalize the concept of relationality. Guattari’s ecology should be neither deep/subjectifying nor shallow/objectifying (Berressem 2009), but fundamentally materialist, transversal and political, operating relationally on a plane of immanence and consistency (Deleuze/Guattari 2004: 266). In the (geophilosophical) terminology of *What is Philosophy?* that refuses the subject-object distinction as the primordial foundation for thought (Deleuze/Guattari 1994) deterritorialized ecology. Following relationality in a transversal sense, we have contemporary approaches that focus on the aspects of non connectivity, cuts, disjunctions like what Tsing calls ‘disturbance-based ecologies’ (Tsing 2015: 5) or Neyrat’s ‘ecology of separation’ (Neyrat 2017) as opposed to romanticising concepts of nature. A ‘return to nature’, a preservation of ‘nature’ is always in danger of presuming as well as prolonging totalized, enclosed or harmonious concepts of nature. All these elements are already traceable in Deleuze AND Guattari, be it with the primacy of relationality while simultaneously starting from disjunctive syntheses, or immanent concepts of nature that build on non-totalizing production and heterogeneous agencements.

BIO

Ralf Gisinger is currently a lecturer at the Department of Philosophy (University of Vienna), teaching mainly courses on philosophy of nature and ecology and French philosophy (in political philosophy, critical theory and ethics). He has been a DOC-fellow of the Austrian Academy of Sciences and a research associate at University of Vienna from 2021-2024, working on a PhD on philosophy of nature and ecology with and after Deleuze/Guattari. In 2022/2023 he was a research fellow in Paris and Montreal and in 2024 awarded a grant of excellence by the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Among his publications, he has authored *Philosophien der Pluralisierung. Begegnungen des Politischen zwischen Gilles Deleuze und Jean-Luc Nancy* (Paderborn 2020) and “The Ecosophical Condition: Guattari’s Ecologies and *What is Philosophy?*,” in: *Deleuze and Guattari Studies*, 2025, in press.

Ricardo Mendoza-Canales

rcanales@letras.ulisboa.pt

Intervals of Absence: Deleuze, Derrida, and the Temporal Logic of Becoming

This paper explores the concept of absence through the intersecting temporal ontologies of Gilles Deleuze and Jacques Derrida, arguing that absence is not a mere negation or void, but a generative interval that shapes the very structure of becoming. Drawing on *Difference and Repetition*, I approach absence not as an exterior to presence but as an immanent spacing through which difference actualizes itself in time—a dynamic fold that operates at the heart of individuation. Central to this reading is Deleuze’s notion of the in-between time (*entre-temps*), where repetition is not the return of the same but the temporal rhythm of difference itself. This Deleuzian account resonates in unexpected ways with Derrida’s notion of *différance* and the trace: absence, here, is not simply deferred presence but the constitutive spacing and temporal delay that makes presence possible. By staging a dialogue between Deleuze’s ontology of becoming and Derrida’s spectral logic of deferral, the paper rethinks absence as a productive fissure—an interval in which time folds, sense emerges, and presence is both fractured and composed. This framework, I argue, has significant implications for understanding contemporary regimes of technics, affect, and power, which increasingly operate through modulations of presence and absence across perceptual and temporal registers.

BIO

Ricardo Mendoza-Canales is a research fellow at the Center of Philosophy of the University of Lisbon (CFUL). His specialization is in contemporary continental philosophy (19th-21st century), with a particular focus on phenomenology, philosophy of culture, and philosophy of technology. His research centers on the critical study of imagination and the imaginary as embodied, dynamic, historically situated, and technically mediated processes. Among his publications, he has authored *Husserl* (RBA, 2016) and is the editor of *Merleau-Ponty: Institution-Ontology-Politics* (Brill, in press) and *Individuating Simondon: Between Life and Technology* (Springer, forthcoming).

Rohitashwa Sarkar

sarkar60@purdue.edu

Undercutting Common-sense: Deleuze's Transformation of the Kantian Sublime

In this paper, I will show how Deleuze alters the concept of the sublime that we find in the third Critique by changing the role the sublime plays in the critical edifice: Deleuze transforms the sublime's role from that of being a bridge to that of being a ground. In the third Critique, the sublime is a "bridge" that facilitates the movement from individuals' sensible natures to their supersensible natures. In the experiences of both the mathematical and the dynamical sublime, individuals start out from the imagination's finitude but then realize that they have a higher supersensible destiny. Therefore, the sublime bridges the concepts of nature and the concepts of freedom, or theoretical reason and practical Reason. This is in keeping with Kant's description of the purpose of the third Critique: to complete the critical project by bridging nature and freedom. But in Deleuze's hands, the sublime is not a bridge between theoretical and practical Reason, but a heterogenous, differential ground that acts as a possibility for the theoretical and the practical. I will argue that this move has significant consequences: I will show that by turning the sublime into a prior differential ground for theoretical and practical Reason, Deleuze is able to take the sublime out of the grasp of common-sense. The bridge role keeps the sublime ensconced within common-sense in Kant, but as differential ground with heterogenous discord, the sublime is no longer within Kantian common-sense but prior to it as it's discordant genesis.

BIO

Rohitashwa Sarkar is a 2nd year Ph.D student at Purdue University's Department of Philosophy. There, he is working towards what will hopefully be a somewhat competent thesis on the role that infinity plays in Deleuze's philosophy of difference, under the supervision of Daniel W. Smith. His philosophical interests are in Deleuze, Kant, Hegel, mathematics, and he maintains more than a passing-interest in literature and cinema.

Senda Sferco

senda.sferco@gmail.com

Is There an Ontology of Desire? The Political Effects and Actuality of the Debate between Deleuze and Foucault

Following the publication of Foucault's *Histoire de la Sexualité I* in 1976, Deleuze wrote a critical letter which appears to have created distance between the two authors. The question of desire lies at the heart of a debate with ontological implications that demands philosophical and historical-critical consideration, according to Foucault. Indeed, in 1981, Foucault stated that desire is a fundamental part of the definition of Western subjectivity and that acknowledging ourselves as 'desiring subjects' enables us to explore our subjective experiences and potential actions. This is one of the inescapable marks that the logic of obedience in the 'philosophical-legal' discourse of modernity has left on the present day. While this observation opens up the possibility of a critical genealogical inquiry into our power relations, for Deleuze it presents an opportunity for a vital ontological possibility that must constantly be reaffirmed and 'fugued'. The reference to Nietzsche's legacy in both authors merits a reconstruction of the differences between them, as well as an examination of the influence of this untimely thinker on contemporary French thought. We will then examine and appreciate the nuances of both positions, as well as the extent to which they engage with the current dilemmas of subjectivity.

BIO

Senda Sferco holds a degree in Anthropology from the National University of Rosario (Argentina), a Diploma in Cultural and Artistic Studies from the Indonesian Institute of the Arts (STSI Denpasar), a PhD in Social Sciences from the National University of Quilmes (Argentina), and a PhD in Philosophy from Université Paris 8 (France). She currently works as a researcher for the National Scientific and Technical Research Council (CONICET), based at the Gino Germani Research Institute at the University of Buenos Aires (UBA), and teaches at both the undergraduate and graduate levels at the National University of the Litoral. Her research focuses on contemporary philosophical and political thought, particularly the problematization of temporality as it relates to the production of subjectivity and political action in the present. She is the author of *Foucault y kairós: los tiempos discontinuos de la acción política* (Buenos Aires: UNQ, 2015).

Zach Tailor

taylorzach5@gmail.com

Desubjectivation, (Non-)Relationality and Life in Deleuze and Agamben

The task of the coming philosophy, for Agamben, must be to decipher and reappraise the notion of life, or "...a life", as Deleuze invokes in the title of his ultimate reflections on immanence. The Deleuzian reworking of immanence that refers neither to an object nor belongs to a subject but instead is absolutely immanent to this immanence itself shows a level of congruence with Agamben's professed aims for the task of the coming philosophy. One of the most imperative among these tasks is undoubtedly to be found in both authors' respective processes of desubjectivation. Whilst, on the one hand, Agamben's pursuit of a post-subjectivist ontology conspicuously points towards a principle of non-relationality, a Deleuzian rejection, on the other hand, of relational ontology is far less evident. It is particularly important to consider the critical lens of desubjectivation in Deleuze and Agamben because a non-relational ontology firstly becomes conceivable through desubjectivation and, secondly, points to a position dramatically opposed to the previous ontological structures of Western philosophy. A comparative reading of the processes of desubjectivation in Deleuze and Agamben is, therefore, an apt starting point to bring the two thinkers into conceptual communication towards a non-relational ontology. The presentation will begin with this comparison before analysing several key concepts that underwrite desubjectivation; in Deleuze, absolute deterritorialization and a radical, rhizomatic in-between; in Agamben, the mediality of the gesture and his crucial stance on (im)potentiality. Finally, the presentation concludes by considering how Agamben's development of the concept of use (the use of bodies, the use of oneself etc.) provides a point of intersection between Deleuze's conception of immanence, supported by virtuality and singularity, and Agamben's forms-of-life, predicated on inoperativity and (im)potentiality. Not only does this intersection allow for a challenge and reappraisal of subjectivity, but also renders inoperative the relational ontology which underwrites the modern Western subjectivity on which human lives have, by and large, been supposed.

BIO

Zach Tailor is a doctoral candidate and FCT PhD grant holder at the University of Lisbon. He previously studied at the University of Glasgow, graduating in 2019 with a dissertation on the historical emergence of neoliberalism in Britain. In 2022, he obtained a Masters degree in political philosophy from NOVA University Lisbon having written his thesis on hegemonic neoliberalism and democracy. He also collaborated on the research project at IFILNOVA, "Present Democracy for Future Generations." His research interests include contemporary continental philosophy, political philosophy, philosophy of history, decolonial and feminist approaches and the history of ideas.

Zhifeng Zhan

zhifeng.zhan@kcl.ac.uk

***Puissance* between Ontology and Ethics: Tracing Deleuze's Interpretation of Nietzsche**

Deleuze's *Nietzsche et la philosophie* (1962) was regarded by contemporaneous French thinkers as the founding research of systematising Nietzsche in France. In this book, Deleuze endeavours to shape Nietzschean power (*puissance*) into the ontological genesis of actual forces while refusing to endow the former with a superior status, either essentially or logically. This symbiosis of forces and *puissance* leads to the interpretive tension between ontology and ethics, which is embodied in Deleuze's views on will to power, eternal return, genealogy, simulacrum and Nietzschean aphorism. In the 1970s, Deleuze started to step away from Nietzsche's philosophy and turned to the stylistic aspect of Nietzsche's thought, advocating radical openness towards the outside in order to confront political recodification. In this paper, I aim to outline Deleuze's strategic engagement with Nietzsche, and I argue that Deleuze, in the 1960s, endeavoured to systematise Nietzsche as an ontologist of difference in order to extend the boundary of philosophy. In comparison, from the 1960s to the 1970s, the French image of Nietzsche oscillated between philosopher and stylistic moralist (often deemed unqualified to be a philosopher in the traditional sense). As a master of scepticism, Nietzsche was incorporated into the pursuit of immanent autonomy of life based on self-knowledge and self-experimentation. Deleuze's interpretation of Nietzsche not only constituted the pillar of his own philosophy but also reflected the demands of contemporaneous intellectual culture.

BIO

Zhifeng Zhan is a PhD candidate in the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures at King's College London. He is writing an intellectual history of French Nietzscheanism in the post-war period and its interaction with vitalism and philosophy of biology. This paper is part of his forthcoming paper in *Deleuze and Guattari Studies*.