TOWARD A CARTOGRAPHY OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE:
A DELEUZE-GUATTARIAN SCHIZOANALYSIS ON
THE MATTER AND FUNCTION OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE REGIMES

Paddy Farr

Independent Researcher,
Oregon, USA
pmfarr@email.arizona.edu

Abstract. The theory and praxis of domestic violence were developed by feminists firstly, to describe conditions of violence within the patriarchal family and, secondly, to prescribe a means for women's liberation. However, although the theory and praxis of domestic violence are conceptualized through a feminist lens, the anti-violence movement has served to strengthen the carceral state. Intersectional and queer theorists have criticized the role of anti-violence in the carceral system and expanded the theory and praxis of domestic violence. As a means to grasp the insights of intersectional and queer theorists on the critique of state violence, the following paper develops Deleuze and Guattari's schizoanalysis of the four regimes of violence. These regimes include ritualized violence and struggle, criminal violence, state violence, and war violence. Where ritualized, violence and struggle represent the foundational theory of domestic violence, criminal and state violence provide two sides of a bifurcated cooptation of feminist theory. In order to turn anti-violence against the state, war violence as linked to the war machine provides a schizoanalytic frame for anti-violence praxis.

Keywords: domestic violence, feminism, queer theory, schizoanalysis, assemblage theory

INTRODUCTION

The paradigmatic expression of domestic violence is "a pattern of abusive behaviour in any relationship that is used by one partner to gain or maintain power and control over another intimate partner" (Domestic Violence n.d.). This definition of domestic violence derives from radical feminist theory wherein power and control are

manifestations of the dialectic between men and women with patriarchy (Schechter 1982; Dobash and Dobash 1992; Lehrner and Allen 2009; Bailey 2010; Cohn 2010; Farr 2019). As primary authors of its current conceptualization, Lenore Walker and the Duluth group developed the theory of domestic violence to explain both the dynamics of abuse and the struggle for liberation from patriarchal conditions (Walker 1979; Cohn 2010; Farr 2019). However, the definition goes beyond a feminist dialect, and intersectional and queer theorists have expanded the conceptualization of domestic violence to include power and control as the manifestation of heteropatriarchy and white supremacy (Crenshaw 1991; Tomer and Busha 2000; Sokoloff 2005; Incite 2006; n.d.; Ahmed et al. 2015; Jindasurat et al. 2015; Farr 2019). In its expanded conceptualization, the concept of power and control centres violence between oppressors and the oppressed as a variable manifestation of heteropatriarchy and white supremacy within violent institutional, social, cultural and interpersonal relationships (Incite 2006; n.d.; Chen 2016; Farr 2019). In short, as stated by Lavina Tomer and Cathy Busha of the Wingspan Anti-Violence Project, "violence occurs when one person, one group, one country believes that she/he/it has the right to control the body, the land, the religion, the lives, the free will of another person, group, country, and so on" (Tomer & Busha, 2000, 1).

From its roots in radical feminism through its revisions within intersectional and queer theory, anti-violence praxis posits that "the personal is political" (Hanisch 1969; Farr 2019) and the goal of anti-violence activism is survivor empowerment (Schechter 1982; Dobash and Dobash 1992; Tomer and Busha 2000; Sokoloff 2005; Incite 2006; n.d.; Lehrner and Allen 2009; Bailey 2010; Cohn 2010; Chen et al. 2016). Taking shape within grassroots community organizations sheltering domestic violence survivors, the anti-violence movement was built on radical community organizing principles. And yet, while the anti-violence movement is rooted in feminist, queer and anti-racist activism, the movement against domestic violence is largely dominated by a movement for criminal

justice solutions to domestic violence (Farr 2019). Andrea Smith argues that "the co-optation of the anti-violence movement can be traced in part to when the anti-violence movement chose to argue that domestic violence was a 'crime'" (Smith, 2007, 49).

In the US, the struggle to establish legal rights protecting a person from domestic violence was incomplete until 1994 when US Congress passed the Violence against Women Act (VAWA 1994, 40002.a.8). This congressional act put domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking at the forefront of US policy for the first time, however, simultaneous to strengthening a person's rights protecting them from violence, the Violence against Women Act established these rights primarily through the establishment of criminal prosecutorial solutions (Farr 2019). Rather than focus on the dynamics of power and control between oppressor and oppressed, the Violence against Women Act states that "the term 'domestic violence' includes felony or misdemeanour crimes of violence" (VAWA 1994, 40002.a.8). Although feminists and anti-violence activists have generally lauded this development, intersectional theorists have pointed to how the criminal justice system unequally targets black, indigenous and communities of colour (Sokoloff 2005; Incite 2006; n.d.; Chen et al. 2016), and queer theorists have pointed to the exclusivity of protection for cis-gender women (Ahmed et al. 2015; Jindasurat et al. 2015; Farr 2016; 2019;). Hence, through the codification of criminal law, "the State, rather than being recognized for its complicity in gender violence, became the institution promising to protect women from domestic and sexual violence by providing a provisional 'sanctuary' of sorts from the now criminally defined 'other'" (Smith, 2007, 49).

While the anti-violence movement has focused on dismantling oppression, it has simultaneously helped to create a strengthened system of oppression (Incite 2006; n.d.; Smith 2007; Chen 2016; Farr 2019). This has resulted in an ironic state of affairs: from the split between a movement for liberation and a movement for carcerality, the anti-violence movement has created a crisis for survivors and activists alike wherein the personal-political

aspirations for social change have translated into a repressive state:

> Anti-violence advocates have regularly responded to these epidemic rates of domestic and sexual violence by partnering with police and district attorneys—both to try to find protection for survivors, and to empower the criminal legal system to intervene in gender violence by treating it as a crime. However, over the past four decades, this strategy has not only failed to significantly curb gender violence; it has reinforced the systemic roots of gender violence. In aligning themselves with a deadly and racist legal system, anti-violence advocates have sought safety from the most regular purveyors of insecurity and violence against marginalized people. The consequences of this now a deeply-entrenched alliance between anti-violence advocates and the criminal legal system have fallen most harmfully on the shoulders of Black, immigrant, women of colour, trans, queer, disabled and poor survivors (Bierria et al. 2017, 6).

In order to explain the mechanism in which this state of affairs manifests from a social movement, the following paper implements a Deleuze-Guattarian schizoanalysis of domestic violence. In this endeavour, the paper begins by describing domestic violence as an assemblage constructed through signification and materiality that is transformed as it is plugged into alternate abstract machines defining its matter and function. These abstract machines produce what Deleuze and Guattari describe as four types of violence: ritualized violence and struggle, war, criminal violence, and state violence. These four types of violence are attached to the abstract machines of the micromachine of the family institution, the nomadic war machine, and the mega-machine of the state apparatus. The paper moves on to describe how domestic violence, in particular, is transformed according to the machine under consideration. As the assemblage of domestic violence is run through each machine, domestic violence is transformed according to the matter and function of that machine. Finally, as a conclusion, the anti-violence movement is described as a potential war machine that holds the potential to create a global personal-political change. As a line of flight of pure deterritorialization, the anti-violence war machine becomes an insurrectionary force against violence as such.

ASSEMBLAGE TO ABSTRACT MACHINE

In "Thousand Plateaus", Deleuze and Guattari explain that the assemblage is constructed along two axes (Deleuze and Guattari 1980; Delanda 2006). Along the "first, horizontal, axis, an assemblage comprises two segments, one of content, the other of expression" (Deleuze and Guattari 1980, 88). Here, these segments of discourse and material constitute "on the one hand it is a machinic assemblage of bodies, of actions and passions, an intermingling of bodies reacting to one another [and] on the other hand it is a collective assemblage of enunciation, of acts and statements, of incorporeal transformations attributed to bodies" (Deleuze and Guattari 1980, 88). Breaking the dichotomy between structuralism and materialism, the first of the two segments constitute discourses and significations that produce the ways in which things are spoken of while the second of the two segments constitute the material world in which bodies interact. However, the processes which these discourses and materials are forced require a second "vertical axis, [wherein] the assemblage has both territorial sides, or reterritorialized sides" (Deleuze and Guattari 1980, 88). Here, the "cutting edge of deterritorialization" produces the process of change disrupts the first axis and the reterritorializations "stabilize it" and produce the territories over the line segments (Deleuze and Guattari 1980, 88).

Domestic violence has a correlate within Deleuze and Guattari's discussion of the two axes of the assemblage and the deterritorializing instances assemblages transform through. First, domestic violence as "a pattern of abusive behaviour in any relationship that is used by one partner to gain or maintain power and control over another intimate partner" (Domestic Violence n.d.) is an expression in that it is a definition and signification. From the definition and signification, there is attached discursive formations that extend in multiple directions toward feminist theory, queer theory, intersectionality and criminal legal theory. However, as a discursivity, domestic violence is about nothing more

than the collective assemblage of enunciation. Thus, second, domestic violence as "a pattern of abusive behaviour in any relationship that is used by one partner to gain or maintain power and control over another intimate partner" (Domestic Violence n.d.) is a content in that it regards acts on and against material bodies. And yet, nevertheless, whether particular acts on bodies are included within the extension depends upon the discursive formation that the definition is placed within: while within feminist, queer and intersectional discursive formation may include a set of events as domestic violence, within the discursive formation of criminal legal theory the same set of events may not meet the requirement for inclusion within the extension.

To explain how such breaks occur, Deleuze and Guattari posit that "the abstract machine is like the diagram of an assemblage" (Deleuze and Guattari 1980, 100) as "a display of the relations between forces which constitute power" (Deleuze 1986, 36). Deleuze asks, "What is a diagram?" (Deleuze 1986, 36). He replies that "it is a display of the relations between forces which constitute power" (Deleuze 1986, 36). Accordingly, the abstract machine has a cartographical matter and function for an assemblage, and thus, "the diagram or abstract machine is the map of relations between forces, a map of destiny, or intensity, which proceeds by primary non-localizable relations and at every moment passes through every point" (Deleuze 1986, 36). Deleuze and Guattari remark:

> Defined diagrammatically in this way, an abstract machine is neither an infrastructure that is determining in the last instance nor a transcendental Idea that is determining in the supreme instance. Rather, it plays a piloting role. The diagrammatic or abstract machine does not function to represent, even something real, but rather constructs a real that is yet to come, a new type of reality. Thus when it constitutes points of creation or potentiality it does not stand outside history but is instead always 'prior to' history. Everything escapes, everything creates—never alone, but through an abstract machine that produces continuums of intensity, effects conjunctions of deterritorialization, and extracts expressions and contents… [I]t is always a question of a conjunction of Matter and Function (Deleuze & Guattari 1980, 142).

Depending upon the matter and function of the diagram, domestic violence transforms into something new. In this sense, the Turing Machine is an abstract machine, an artificial hard-drive or operating system placed within a larger system. As such, where an assemblage is an intersection of line segments and territorialities, abstract machines diagram the pattern of the assemblage thereby coding, decoding and recoding the assemblage into new outputs. The abstract machine is the abstracted character of the line segments and territories that constitute an assemblage, and in this way, the abstract machine concerns both the matter and function of the assemblage within the various operating systems that the assemblage is plugged into. Where the assemblage "is in touch with the plane of consistency" as connection and double articulation (Deleuze & Guattari 1980, 71), the assemblage plugs into the abstract machine and the hard-drive becomes activated as a system for the program to run. This has an important role within the assemblage of domestic violence. Here, domestic violence is transformed depending upon the diagram that it is placed within. For instance, the diagram of domestic violence as drawn by the feminist movement has a significantly different matter and function to that of the diagram as drawn by the state.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND THE FOUR REGIMES

As an assemblage, domestic violence is conditioned through abstract machines in the conjunction of matter and function simultaneously. According to this presentation of the assemblage and the abstract machine, "the problem then becomes one of distinguishing between regimes of violence [of which] we can draw a distinction between struggle, war, crime and policing as so many regimes of violence" (Deleuze and Guattari 1980, 447). Each of these four regimes of violence diagram a particular form of violence as an abstract machine that transforms an assemblage, and as such, marks off the points at which violence is processed. All of these are

abstract machines in their own right and construct the cartography of an assemblage theory of violence. And each of these four types of violence is dependent upon the relation of power in question at their respective level of organization and describes the violence of different types of aggressors against different types of victims. These four types of violence are described in the following paragraphs.

Firstly, Deleuze and Guattari explain that "struggle would be like the regime of primitive violence (including primitive 'wars')" (Deleuze and Guattari 1980, 447), and as such describes violence at the level of the basic social organization of family, clan and community. As a form of violence exercised as the outcome of a particular power relation, "it is a blow-by-blow violence, which is not without its code, since the value of the blows is fixed according to the law of the series, as a function of the value of the last exchangeable blow, or of the last woman to conquer, etc." (Deleuze and Guattari 1980, 447). "Thus," explain Deleuze and Guattari, "there is a certain ritualization of violence" (Deleuze and Guattari 1980, 447). The violence involved at this level is significant of pre or para industrial arrangements of social hierarchies, and thus the arrangement at this level is horizontal rather than vertical in its ability to commit violence and oppression.

Secondly, Deleuze and Guattari discuss violence as war. War, unlike struggle, is a type of abstract machine in which the assemblage of moving parts within a particular society becomes focused on the destruction of assemblages, the deterritorialization of territorialities without reterritorialization. Deleuze and Guattari explain that "war, at least when linked to the war machine, is another regime, because it implies the mobilization and automatization of violence directed first and essentially against the State apparatus" (Deleuze and Guattari 1980, 447). Hence, according to the abstract violence of war, the war machine is, even if under the control of a state, a directed attack on the state through which states are dematerialized as such in a process of destruction. And thus, "the war machine is in this sense the invention of a primary nomadic

organization that turns against the State" (Deleuze and Guattari 1980, 447).

Thirdly, Deleuze and Guattari discuss the violence of crime. Deleuze and Guattari explain that "crime is something else, because it is a violence of illegality that consists in taking possession of something to which one has no 'right,' in capturing something one does not have a 'right' to capture" (Deleuze and Guattari 1980, 447). Hence, explain Deleuze and Guattari, "state policing or lawful violence is something else again [from struggle, war and criminal violence] because it consists in capturing while simultaneously constituting a right to capture" (Deleuze and Guattari 1980, 447).

Finally, Deleuze and Guattari discuss the most powerful of the abstract machines of violence: state violence. State violence is the exercise of law and it is this abstract machine which defines the state as such through violence. Hence, "the State has often been defined by a 'monopoly of violence,' but this definition leads back to another definition that describes the State as a 'state of Law' (*Rechtsstaat*)" (Deleuze and Guattari 1980, 448). The very existence of the state rests on this right to violence, this right to establishing and maintaining law and order through violence. Because of this right, Deleuze and Guattari explain that state violence "is an incorporated, structural violence distinct from every kind of direct violence" (Deleuze and Guattari 1980, 448).

Each of these represents a particular set of circumstances wherein the abstract machine defines the assemblage of domestic violence in its own particular way, and as it is plugged into different machines, the assemblage transforms. The diagram that domestic violence resides within outlines how it is defined and how the material is transformed. Thus, by analysing how domestic violence is constructed within the four regimes of violence, the theory of domestic violence is provided texture and critique that is otherwise confused. Where domestic violence crosses the boundary from ritualized violence and struggle to criminal and state violence, the problem faced by anti-violence activism is explained as a problem of assemblages transformed within alternate diagrams thereby

producing different regimes of violence. Through the conjunction of matter and function within the state, the ritualized violence of the family becomes a matter and function that can be enforced as a regime of criminal violence.

Domestic violence enforcement policies become a new regime of violence as the assemblage becomes a diagram of the state apparatus. From this analysis, the regime of state violence becomes the enforcement of heteropatriarchy and white supremacy wherein queer, trans, black indigenous, people of colour become matter and form for criminal prosecution. Below, these four regimes of violence demonstrate how the abstract machines decode and recode the assemblage of domestic violence according to a matter and function. Of particular importance are first the theories of domestic violence as established through radical feminism and expanded through intersectional and queer theory, and second, the intersectional and queer critique of the anti-violence movement as coopted by the state (Schechter 1982; Crenshaw 1991; Dobash and Dobash 1992; Tomer and Busha 2000; Sokoloff 2005; Incite 2006; n.d.; Lehrner and Allen 2009; Bailey 2010; Cohn 2010; Ahmed et al. 2015; Jindasurat et al. 2015; Farr 2019). These two directions of domestic violence theory establish the assemblages of domestic violence as they are presented within regimes of ritualized violence and struggle on the one hand, and state violence on the other.

REGIMES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

As should be expected, because domestic violence plays out within domestic space and the private sphere, first and foremost, domestic violence in its most basic form manifests within the regime of ritualized violence and struggle. As a manifestation of the regime of primitive ritualized violence, the definition of domestic violence as "a pattern of abusive behaviour in any relationship that is used by one partner to gain or maintain power and control over another intimate partner" (Domestic Violence n.d.) represents a formulation

for the dynamics within domestic space. The normative character of the ritualized violence and primitive domestic struggle is between men and women within the heteropatriarchal family, however, this is not necessarily the case. Following the normative character, radical feminists initially developed the theory of domestic violence as a concrete personal-political manifestation of women's oppression within domestic space (Schechter 1982; Dobash and Dobash 1992; Lehrner and Allen 2009; Bailey 2010; Cohn 2010; Farr 2019). From this theory, intersectional and queer theorists expanded the theory of domestic violence to include aspects of domestic oppression that are outside of the scope of the one-dimensional binary gender roles (Crenshaw 1991; Tomer and Busha 2000; Sokoloff 2005; Incite 2006; n.d.; Ahmed et al. 2015; Jindasurat et al. 2015; Farr 2019).

Together, from radical feminism, intersectionality and queer theory, the theory of domestic violence grew to describe how domestic violence takes shape within the frameworks established by domesticity. As such, the theory of domestic violence reoriented critique toward domesticity itself as a regime of violence. Because "a pattern of abusive behaviour in any relationship that is used by one partner to gain or maintain power and control over another intimate partner" (Domestic Violence n.d.), domesticity becomes the regime of violence that bolsters heteropatriarchy and white supremacy within the home. As such, domesticity is a power relation and a violent struggle, and the manifestation of power relations within ritualized violence and struggle is the fundamental organizing principle within the domestic and the family. Hence, where the violence of the family and domesticity becomes the maintenance of gender roles, sexual superiority-inferiority and hierarchical relations, domestic violence manifests within heteropatriarchal structures within the domestic space. The question facing the anti-violence movement is then: how can activists confront domestic violence in order to make interventions?

The anti-violence movement has sought to solve the problem of domestic violence largely through criminal justice reforms that

provide legal avenues for survivors of violence (Schechter 1982; Dobash and Dobash 1992; Lehrner and Allen 2009; Bailey 2010; Cohn 2010; Farr 2019). This direction of reform transforms domestic violence into the regime of criminal violence as defined by the state and policed through the regime of state violence. As such, the ritualized violence within and struggle over domesticity is conditioned through the state, for only under conditions marking an act illegal domestic violence does such an act become processed as criminal domestic violence. As a manifestation of the assemblage within the regimes of criminal and state violence, the federal law prohibiting domestic violence defines violence in terms of the felony.

> The term "domestic violence" includes felony or misdemeanour crimes of violence committed by a current or former spouse or intimate partner of the victim, by a person with whom the victim shares a child in common, by a person who is cohabitating with or has cohabitated with the victim as a spouse or intimate partner, by a person similarly situated to a spouse of the victim under the domestic or family violence laws of the jurisdiction receiving grant monies, or by any other person against an adult or youth victim who is protected from that person's acts under the domestic or family violence laws of the jurisdiction (Domestic Violence n.d.b; VAWA 1994, 40002.a.8).

Since April of 2018, the Office of Violence against Women has embraced this statutory definition over the earlier feminist-oriented definition, and while on its surface this appears as an attack on the Violence against Women Act by the Trump administration, this is the logical outcome of state cooptation (Farr 2019). The criminal justice strategy has a counterproductive effect wherein domestic violence becomes institutionalized and the anti-violence movement is coopted by statism (Incite 2006; n.d.; Smith 2007; Bierria et al. 2017). Hence, within the analysis of domestic violence as delineated through the Violence against Women Act, violence as such becomes an abstract machine which diagrams an assemblage on particular bodies under particular situations. Intersectional and queer theorists have criticized this strategy taking note of how domestic violence,

when applied through the lens of the criminal justice system, further harms survivors of domestic violence and oppressed communities (Crenshaw 1991; Tomer and Busha 2000; Incite 2006; n.d.; Ahmed et al. 2015; Jindasurat et al. 2015; Sokoloff 2005; Farr 2019; Farr 2016). As haecceity of the regimes of criminal and state violence, Deleuze and Guattari elaborate that "state overcoding is precisely this structural violence that defines the law, [and] 'police' violence" (Deleuze and Guattari 1980, 448).

In Deleuze-Guattarian terms, the policing of criminal domestic violence through the arrest and prosecution of domestic violence perpetrators establishes an apparatus of capture focused on processing criminals through the regime of state violence as a juridical assemblage (Deleuze and Guattari 1980, 80-81, 446-447). Deleuze and Guattari explain this strange occurrence of "lawful violence wherever violence contributes to the creation of that which it is used against, or as Marx says, wherever capture contributes to the creation of that which it captures" (Deleuze and Guattari 1980, 448). Hence, while the state apparatus determines the boundaries of criminal violence, state violence "is very different from criminal violence" (Deleuze and Guattari 1980, 448) because it is marked by a right to violence that supersedes all other forms of violence. Domestic violence is thus criminal violence, but only in so far as it is deemed as conflicting with the right of the state to violence. The state grows in opposition to the regime of ritualized violence and struggle, but the state simultaneously uses this struggle as a means for policing social ordering of the family, the community and the clan. As such, heteropatriarchy, private property, and community affiliations thereby maintain the social order through the regime of ritualized violence and struggle as policed through the state. And yet, when the regime ritualized violence and struggle illegitimate, ritualized violence and struggle is criminalized through the regime of state violence. Deleuze and Guattari delineate these points when they explain:

> In contradistinction to primitive violence, State or lawful violence always seems to presuppose itself, for it preexists its own use: the State can in this

way say that violence is 'primal,' that it is simply a natural phenomenon the responsibility for which does not lie with the State, which uses violence only against the violent, against "criminals"—against primitives, against nomads—in order that peace may reign" (Deleuze and Guattari 1980, 447-448).

TOWARD AN ANTI-VIOLENCE WAR MACHINE

As an expression of the feminist movement, Lenore Walker and the Duluth group authored the fundamental principles that resulted in the theory of domestic violence through firstly the dynamics of abuse and secondly the struggle for liberation from patriarchal conditions (Walker 1979; Cohn 2010; Farr 2019). Initially, this theory was extracted from a radical feminist analysis, but subsequently, the theory was translated into intersectional and queer theory. Within the radical feminist analysis of domestic violence, the primary consideration is the oppression of women by men in which the resolution of radical opposition requires the elimination of patriarchal relationships (Schechter 1982; Dobash and Dobash 1992; Lehrner and Allen 2009; Bailey 2010; Cohn 2010; Farr 2019). The feminist analysis of patriarchy is extended within intersectional critique to include an analysis of white power wherein a radical opposition requires the elimination of white supremacy, and within queer critique to include an analysis of heterosexism wherein a radical opposition requires the elimination of heteronormativity (Crenshaw 1991; Tomer and Busha 2000; Sokoloff 2005; Incite 2006; n.d.; Ahmed et al. 2015; Jindasurat et al. 2015; Farr 2019). Accordingly, within radical feminist, intersectional, and queer analyses, the elimination of domestic violence means a feminist revolution wherein heteropatriarchal and white power is eliminated. It is in this way, as a revolutionary and insurrectionary force, that the anti-violence movement should be grasped in both theory and praxis.

It is here that the entirety of the anti-violence movement develops a critical unification of theory and praxis, and yet, as

elaborated above, the regime of state violence of anti-violence activism has reterritorialized anti-violence as a means to carcerality and police violence. While turning toward the state apparatus provided the anti-violence movement with the power to punish perpetrators of domestic violence and make inroads toward the elimination of ritualized violence and struggle within domesticity, the result was not revolutionary but rather a cooptation that provides the regime of state violence a new direction of policing and prosecution. The question becomes, how can the anti-violence movement renew itself as a revolutionary force against the regime of state violence?

Deleuze and Guattari provide an answer in the regime of war violence. They state that the regime of war violence, when linked to the war machine, "implies the mobilization and autonomization of a violence directed first and essentially against the State apparatus," and thus "the war machine is in this sense the invention of a primary nomadic organization that turns against the State" (Deleuze and Guattari 1980, 448). The war machine grows independently of the state and on a regime separate from that of the state thus leading to such machinic outgrowths as the guerrilla war and insurrectionary moments. Deleuze and Guattari explain that war is not the object of the war machine but rather:

> To the extent that war (with or without the battle) aims for the annihilation or capitulation of enemy forces, the war machine does not necessarily have war as its object (for example, the raid can be seen as another object, rather than as a particular form of war). But more generally, we have seen that the war machine was the invention of the nomad, because it is in its essence the constitutive element of smooth space, the occupation of this space, displacement within this space, and the corresponding composition of people: this is its sole and veritable positive object (nomos). Make the desert, the steppe, grow; do not depopulate it, quite the contrary. If war necessarily results, it is because the war machine collides with States and cities, as forces (of striation) opposing its positive object: from then on, the war machine has as its enemy the State, the city, the state and urban phenomenon, and adopts as its objective their annihilation. It is at this point that the war machine becomes war: annihilate the forces of the State, destroy the State-form. The

> Attila, or Genghis Khan, adventure clearly illustrates this progression from the positive object to the negative object (Deleuze and Guattari 1980, 417).

It may appear ironic that the model for anti-violence is the war machine, and yet, like the anti-violence aspiration for the elimination of violence through revolutionary acts, at the level of the regime of war violence, the territorialities establishing power and control are wrecked and destroyed. As a war machine, when the anti-violence movement defines domestic violence as "a pattern of abusive behaviour in any relationship that is used by one partner to gain or maintain power and control over another intimate partner" (Domestic Violence n.d.), the movement explicitly directs its practice toward an attack on power and control. And because power and control develop along lines of both ritualized violence and struggle, and state violence, it is essential that any intervention into domestic violence targets the regimes of domestic violence manifesting within both domesticity and the state apparatus. As an anti-violence principle, the dynamic of power is the central target that holds together the symmetries of heteropatriarchy, white supremacy, and the state apparatus.

The war machine becomes the engine that propels a deterritorialization without reterritorialization of heteropatriarchal hierarchies, of racial inequality and colonization. Involved within this destruction are not necessarily bodies committing violence on other bodies, for unlike the ritualized violence and struggle and of state violence, the war machine does not attempt to hold together the symmetry of power that makes up a social group. Hence, the war machine of anti-violence activism deterritorializes all bonds which stand in opposition. And as such, where anti-violence becomes a war machine, it takes "shape against the apparatuses that appropriate the machine" thereby making war on heteropatriarchy, white supremacy and the state apparatus "their affair and their object" (Deleuze and Guattari 1980, 423). The war machine takes on a character of emancipation from the bonds holding the assemblage together. Where the war machine deterritorializes all

territories and takes an absolute line of flight which must remain in flux in order to thrive, the war machine holds within it the potential to also oppose violence and oppression as it is manifested through the state: "they bring connections to bear against the great conjunction of the apparatuses of capture or domination" (Deleuze and Guattari 1980, 423).

CONCLUSION

As "a site at which a discursive formation intersects with material processes" (Crary 1990, 30-31), the assemblages of violence can become rhizomatic of domination or liberation. The assemblage growing from the war machine provides both a framework for interpreting the dynamic conditions of survivorship as critical theory and the framework of praxis for insurrectionary action. Whereas ideological bases for social movements describe the discursive formation(s) that a particular movement encapsulates its ideas about itself, the assemblage describes what the output of a particular discursive formation is as it intersects with material processes. As argued through the previous sections, the manifestation of the assemblage depends on which abstract machine it has been plugged into and from which regime of violence it emerges.

The reorientation from power relations within domesticity toward power relations between the state and criminal is still the same assemblage of domestic violence, but as the assemblage is plugged into the regimes of criminal and state violence, it becomes hierarchical. And yet, domestic violence within each of the four regimes are manifestations of the same assemblage plugged into a different abstract machine. The power relations within this assemblage involve the same significations and bodies as those manifesting within the regime of ritualized violence and struggle, but the resulting violence manifests instead from the regime of state violence over the criminal. And as such, although criminal domestic

violence is still violence in that it is a crash of forces through the relations of power within domestic space, the violence committed through legal violence against criminals charges the relations of forces between state and criminal rather than intimate partners. The regime of state violence thus provides the direction of movement that the assemblages of domestic violence within the Violence against Women Act transition particular acts of violence into criminality.

In the regime of state violence, the state holds power over the movement of assemblages. For domestic violence, both the struggle of primitive violence, and criminal violence are conditioned through the Violence against Women Act and its associated measures which include the state's right to violence through policing, through the biopolitical, through policy, and legal procedure. Where the violence of primitive struggle, and criminal violence each function as independent operating systems through which the violence of domesticity and crime must pass, cutting across each of these regimes is the state as the arrangement of violence as such. Thus, in order to map the directions of deterritorialization and reterritorialization, to elaborate the cartography of violence, the state becomes the point at which the cartographer must begin within the current set of abstract machines.

If the anti-violence movement wishes to accomplish its goals then anti-violence advocates must become anti-violence insurrectionaries. As a war machine, anti-violence passes through the regime of war violence to begin "the long road toward hegemony" (Spivak 1999, 310). Organizers, advocates and survivors together become insurrectionaries and revolutionaries. Through the activation of multiplicities into a united movement against domination and oppression, the anti-violence movement becomes machinic. Through schizoanalytic insurrection, anti-violence activism deterritorializes and reterritorializes anti-violence neoliberalism. Through the seizing of agency as a force to destroy oppression, the anti-violence movement can end violence. As such, schizoanalysis provides a radical critique of society and a critical

foundation for the anti-violence movement thereby beginning an absolute line of flight toward anti-violence insurrection.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, Osman, Chai Jindasurat, Christopher Argyros, Ellen Brauza, Ursula Campos, Aaron Eckhardt, Patrick Farr, Nell Gaither, Lisa Gilmore, Jenna Lee, Essex Lordes, Lauren MacDade, Jane Merill, Lindsey Moore, Kristie Morris, Rick Musquiz, Brenda Pitmon, Cara Presley-Kimball, Des Rucker, Justin Shaw, Catherine Shugrue dos Santos, Yvonne Siferd, Lynne Sprague, Norio Umezu, Stacie Vecchietti, Taryn Walker, Rebecca Waggoner, Eva Wood. 2015. *Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, and HIV Affected Hate Violence in 2014*. New York, NY: National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs.

Bailey, Kimberly D. 2010. Lost in Translation: Domestic Violence, the Personal is Political, and the Criminal Justice System. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology* 100, no. 4: 1255-1300.

Bierria, Alisa, Mariame Kaba, Essence McDowell, Hyejin Shim, Stacy Suh [Eds.] 2017. #SurvivedAndPunished: Survivor Defense as Abolitionist Praxis. Chicago, Illinois: Love and Protect & Survived and Punished.

Chen, Ching-In, Jai Dulani, Leah Lakshmi Piepzna-Samarasinha. 2016. The Revolution Starts at Home: Confronting Intimate Violence Within Activist Communities. Chico, California: AK Press.

Cohn, Peter. 2010. [Film] *Power and Control: Domestic Violence in America*. Hillcrest Films LLC.

Crary, Jonathan. 1990. *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé Williams. 1991. Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review* 43, no. 6: 1241–1299.

DeLanda, Manuel. 1991. *War in the Age of Intelligent Machines*. New York, NY: Urzone Books.

DeLanda, Manuel. 2006. *A New Philosophy of Society: Assemblage Theory and Social Complexity*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari. 1980. *A Thousand Plateaus*. Trans. Brian Massumi. New York, NY: Continuum.

Deleuze, Gilles. 1986. *Foucault*. Trans. Sean Hand. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Dobash, R. Emerson, and Russell P. Dobash. 1992. *Women, Violence and Social Change*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Domestic Violence. (n.d.) Office of Violence Against Women. Retrieved 5-13-2015 from: http://www.justice.gov/ovw/domestic-violence

Farr, Paddy. 2019. Power and Control: Radical Feminism, State Cooptation and Intersectional Queer Theory in Domestic Violence Praxis. *Ethical Education* 16.

Farr, Paddy. 2016. *Queer Victims: Reports of Violence by LGBTQI Survivors Result in Violent Assaults by Police.* Arizona State University. Retrieved 11-2-2019 from: https://repository.asu.edu/attachments/172746/content/Farr_asu_0010 N_16187.pdf.

Hanisch, Carol. 1969. The Personal is Political. In Shulamith Firestone and Anne Koedt (Ed.), *Notes from the second year: Women's liberation.* New York, NY: Self Published by Shulamith Firestone and Anne Koedt. Retrieved from: http://www.carolhanisch.org/CHwritings/PersonalisPol.pdf.

Incite! Women, Gender Non-Conforming and Trans People of Color against Violence (n.d.). Dangerous Intersections. Incite! Women of Color against Violence Website, n.d. Retrieved on 10-9-2019 from: http://www.incite-national.org/page/dangerous-intersections.

Jindasurat, Chai, Osman Ahmed, Emily Waters Beverly Eugene, Cara Presley, Catherine De Shugrue Santos, Darlene Santos, Essex Lordes, Eva C. Wood, Erin Gargurevich-Gorman, Jenna Less, Jessica Punzo, Justin Shaw, Kristie Morris, Lauren MacDade, Leah Taraskiewicz, Lynne Sprague, Mieko Failey, Patrick Farr, Rick Musquiz, Susan Holt, Yvonne Siferd. 2015. *Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, and HIV Affected Intimate Partner Violence in 2014.* New York, NY: National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs.

Lehrner, Aamy and Nicole E. Allen. 2009. Still a Movement After All These Years?: Current Tensions in the Domestic Violence Movement. *Violence Against Women* 15, no. 6: 656-677.

Schechter, Susan. 1982. *Women and Male Violence: The Visions and Struggles of the Battered Women's Movement.* Boston, MA: South End Press.

Smith, Andrea Lee, Beth E. Richie, Julia Sudbury & Janelle White [Eds.]. 2006. *The Color of Violence: the Incite! Anthology.* Boston, MA: South End Press.

Smith, Andrea Lee. 2006. Heteropatriarchy and the Three Pillars of White Supremacy: Rethinking Women of Color Organizing. In Andrea Lee Smith, Beth E. Richie, Julia Sudbury & Janelle White (Eds.) *The Color of Violence: the Incite! Anthology.* South End Press.

Smith, Andrea Lee. 2007. Unmasking the State: Racial/Gender Terror and Hate Crimes. *Australian Feminist Law Journal* 26, no. 1: 47-57.

Sokoloff, Natalie J., and Dupont, Ida. 2005. Domestic Violence: Examining the Intersections of Race, Class, and Gender—an Introduction. In Natalie J. Sokoloff & Christina Pratt (Eds.) (2008) *Domestic Violence at the Margins Fourth Edition.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Spivak, Gayatri. 1999. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tomer, Lavina and Cathy Busha. 2000. *Domestic Violence in the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender Community: A Resource 2000.* Tucson, AZ: Wingspan Domestic Violence Project.

United States. 1996. *Violence Against Women Act of 1994.* [Washington, D.C.]: [U.S. Dept. of Justice, Violence Against Women Office]. Retrieved 4-14-2020 from: http://purl.access.gpo.gov/GPO/LPS7533.

Walker, Lenore E. 1979. *The Battered Woman.* New York, NY: Harper & Row