

Su-Anne Yeo
Goldsmiths, University of London

Discussion Questions for Deleuze and Guattari's "What is a Minor Literature?"

Deleuze and Guattari (1986) argue that literature, or cultural production, can be revolutionary if it is "deterritorialized." What do Deleuze and Guattari mean by "deterritorialization" and "reterritorialization"? What exactly does "deterritorialization" entail?

What meaning or significance should we attach to "deterritorialization" in an era of so-called globalization? Can we reconcile the revolutionary potential of "deterritorialization" with the neo-liberal conservatism of global capital? How do these processes articulate (or not)?

Deleuze and Guattari argue that in a "minor literature," "There isn't a subject; *there are only collective assemblages of enunciation*" (18, emphasis in original).

Are Deleuze and Guattari correct to disavow the importance of individual narration? What are the advantages and disadvantages of understanding translocal or interart forms of culture as "collective assemblages of enunciation"?

How might we adapt Deleuze and Guattari's concept of the "minor" to the process of cultural translation? Instead of "right/wrong" or "good/bad" translations, might we speak of "major/minor" translations? What would a "minor" translation look like?

Bibliographic reference:

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1986) *Kafka: Towards A Minor Literature*, translated by Dana Polan, Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.