



## Dialogues

*Gilles Deleuze , Claire Parnet*

Download now

Read Online →

# Dialogues

*Gilles Deleuze , Claire Parnet*

## **Dialogues** Gilles Deleuze , Claire Parnet

Gilles Deleuze examines his philosophical pluralism in a series of discussions with Claire Parnet.

Conversational in tone, this is the most personable and accessible of all Deleuze's writings, in which he describes his own philosophical background, relationships and development, and some of the central themes of his work.

## **Dialogues Details**

Date : Published January 4th 1997 by Flammarion (first published January 1st 1977)

ISBN : 9782080813435

Author : Gilles Deleuze , Claire Parnet

Format : Paperback 187 pages

Genre : Philosophy, Theory, Nonfiction, Literature

 [Download Dialogues ...pdf](#)

 [Read Online Dialogues ...pdf](#)

**Download and Read Free Online Dialogues Gilles Deleuze , Claire Parnet**

---

# From Reader Review Dialogues for online ebook

## Peter says

Best introduction to Deleuze's work ever. I loved reading this book!

---

## Charles says

Although this is not necessarily the best place to start as an intro to Deleuze (I'd recommend Negotiations), this interchange between Deleuze and a former student provides insight into a lot of the concepts preoccupying him/them in the mid-1970s, as he and Guattari were in the process of preparing vol. II of Capitalism and Schizophrenia, A Thousand Plateaus.

---

## Meike says

Deleuze and Parnet's "Dialogues" is a fascinating collection of intriguing thoughts, ideas and questions coming together. The blurring of lines between the two partners in dialogue makes it an especially interesting conversation. At times Deleuze truly reads like poetry, the sentences flowing and floating, like lines meeting and crossing, weaving into each other like the threads of fabric. I found especially his notes on lines, geography of bodies, couplings, connections, the anorectic, and mechanisms of longing to be very insightful and beautifully described. The use of metaphor enables a particular visualization of Deleuze's philosophy which I thought was quite amazing. An excellent read that allows for the escaping of thoughts whilst focussing on the letters on the pages.

---

## Ami Iida says

I seldom have harvest in the book.

---

## Dhia Bouselmi ( ????????? ) says

????? ??????? ??????? ??????. ?? ??? ??? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ??????.

---

## Andrew Raphaël Osborne says

Watched L'Abécédaire de Gilles Deleuze, which (I am led to believe) is the video footage from which this series of dialogues stems from. Most odd and brilliant creature, this man. My initial impressions marked his apparent oddness, aloofness, and obscurity, but this blossomed into an awareness of his intense joy and

lucidity after I became more familiar with his work.

---

## Troy says

Finally! A totally readable Deleuze book. But even though this is the most readable Deleuze book I know (with the possible exception of *Pure Immanence*), it still took me a whole damn month to read 148 pages! 148 pages! In a month!

There's a little bit of all of *Capitalism and Schizophrenia: A Thousand Plateaus* in this book. But I want to talk about how this work effected me on a personal level, both because that is ultimately what Deleuze wants, and that also, to me, should be the end goal of philosophy: to change how we think, which should change how we understand and interact in the world, and maybe, just maybe, change the world.

But first you have to know that my interpretation of this is probably wrong, probably off-base, because I don't know as much as Deleuze, and a lot of time I'm not sure exactly what he's getting at, or sometimes even what he's saying, but that's ok, even according to Deleuze. I mean, he wants to get across his ideas, so he tries saying the same thing from tons of different angles, and unlike a lot of philosophers, uses a lot of examples, which includes various movies, lots of literature (not just Kafka and Proust, but H.P. Lovecraft and Carlos Castaneda(!)), B&D/S&M, tattoos, Dylan lyrics, and all kinds of other stuff.

Ultimately, Deleuze is writing about changing the models we use to understand the world. Like many philosophers of the last century, he wants to move away from a metaphysics that believes in intrinsic properties. For example, there is no true "you," or "Capitalism," or "red." All are collectives. That is, "you" are not the same as you were a few seconds ago, or even a decade ago. On one level, all your cells are completely different every ten years (your bone cells live the longest, 10 years). On another level, you have changed because of your loves: significant others, best friends, new passions, favorite books and music and art and movies, etc. have changed who you are.

So he wants us to think of everything not as a discrete object, but as collectives that are still unique, but made up of other parts (for example, you are made of cells and past loves and obsessions and your gender/race/nationality, etc) but are still you, but the "you-ness" is more like "noon."

From there, he wants us to re-think **desire**. Desire is what happens when those discrete bodies (which, again, aren't really bodies, but are themselves collections of all kinds of things from cells to passions to ideas to whatever) collide. So let's say you've just found, like I've have, a new favorite author (for me it's Thomas Bernhard). For me, there's a before-Bernhard and an after-Bernhard. I now think and see the world differently- with Bernhard-colored glasses. But it's not one directional; not simply Bernhard-texts effecting me. I look for others who are fans of Bernhard, push Bernhard on friends I feel will be receptive. So I, in my small way, am changing what Bernhard means, by helping to create a Bernhard-community (consciously or not), and giving that Bernhard-community (consciously or not) my spin on things. Deleuze always uses the example of the wasp and the orchid. The wasp and the orchid both have their bizarre shapes because they have mutated in tandem; they have mutually evolved in their interpenetration of each other.

So keep that desire thing, and the thing about everything being collections in mind.

Here's a quote:

"Great literature is written in a sort of foreign language."

Deleuze is one with me in this. What we should do, if we're so inclined (and sometime even if we're not), is associate ourselves with the minorities in our culture, whatever they might be. We do this to break away from the stagnating dominant narrative, and in order to blaze new trails. There are dangers in this, obviously. One danger in breaking away with the dominant order is that it can lead us to an entanglement with death, suicide, despair, etc. Let's call this drive a "line of flight."

So now, to politics.

Obviously, there are other forces at play than the "line of flight." There's a force that is about encoding. On one simple level, this makes you a citizen of wherever you're from. On one good side, this creates stability, on another bad side, it creates mindless zombies who parrot whatever crap is being spouted by Fox News (tellingly, I can't think of a left wing equivalent). There are other forces which are about flight. I don't really understand the difference between the various lines of flight, but the basic shtick is that we, as individuals (and as groups of individuals), should go off on these lines and try to create the life we want to live here and now. Those little gesture can be important. Not to ignore the big gestures, but the way we live our life reflects back. Nothing is truly unconnected, and we should remember that. We are responsible for our society moving towards a type of fascism or evil, and are equally responsible for our society moving towards something we believe in.

There's more than that, and that end part is definitely my spin on the (very great) last chapter, but, well... there you go.

Go kick some ass.

---

## **the gift says**

in this series of (edited) conversations there is an interesting defence/claim of essential 'empiricism', that seems to me to include the 'things themselves' of phenomenology. basically, this is that thought should start with immediate experience and not abstraction, thought should be basic, not theory, not framework, not grand totalizing concepts of the 'One' or the 'Subject'- but some recognition that these are construction or 'lines of flight'... great intro from deleuze himself...

---

## **vi macdonald says**

4.5

---

## **Vincent Scarpa says**

A slim text that took me about two months to "finish" reading, though I don't consider myself anywhere near done with the text or what it sets forth. I feel I could say so much, but instead will cite the passage that truly distills what Deleuze is after and which reads to me something like prayer:

"...to extract from the event that which is not exhausted by the happening, to release from becoming that which will not permit itself to be fixed in a term."

---

## **Noé Ajo caamaño says**

Como todos los libros de Deleuze, su lectura es difícil, pero fértil. No solo su capacidad crítica, o sus análisis (como el del psicoanálisis) son de una perspicacia y hondura dignas de ser comprendidas. Además, su forma de expresarse, su "ser un extranjero en la propia lengua" nos enfrenta a una forma novedosa, incluso veinte años tras su muerte, de conceptuar, de pensar, y por tanto de hacer filosofía. Como algunos libros de Nietzsche o Heidegger, el comentario es casi aquí una traición al espíritu, una letra asesina. Quien tenga el valor y la honestidad e interés suficientes, que se embarque en estos diálogos... quien no, otras cosas encontrará de su interés. Pero nadie busque aquí identificación, proclamas fáciles, ni caminos trazados.

---

## **Abdullah Ba?aran says**

Deleuze felsefesi için derleyici, toplayici bir kitap. Tabi bir giriş kitabı diyemem. İçine dalıp tekrar tekrar dönmeli bir söylesi-kitap.

---

## **Joost Van Der Weerd says**

The best way to enter inside the Deleuze work !

---

## **Cristina Chi?u says**

Caci in masura in care cineva devine, ceea ce el devine se transforma la fel de mult ca el insusi. Devenirile nu sunt niste fenomene de imitatie sau de asimilare, ci de dubla capturare, de evolutie neparalela, de nunti intre doua regnuri. Nuntile sunt intotdeauna contra naturii. O nunta este opusul unui cuplu.

Justitia si justetea sunt niste idei proaste. Acestor idei trebuie sa le opunem formula lui Godard: nu o imagine justa, adevarata, ci, doar o imagine. La fel ca intr-un film sau ca intr-un cantec e si in filozofie: nu idei adevarate, ci idei pur si simplu. Idei si atat: asta inseamna intalnirea, devenirea, furtul si nuntile, acel „intre doi” al singuratatilor.

In fiecare dintre noi exista un fel de asceza, intreptata, in parte, impotriva noua insine.

Atatea taceri si atatea sinucideri de scriitori se explica, probabil, tocmai prin astfel de nunti contra naturii, prin astfel de participari impotriva naturii. A-ti trada regnul, a-ti trada sexul, a-ti trada clasa, majoritatea—ce alt motiv pentru a scrie? Si a trada scrisul insusi.

cu atat mai mare va parea opera cu cat viata va fi mai jalnica.

Nu scriem decat din iubire, orice scriere este o scrisoare de dragoste: Real-literatura. N-ar trebui sa murim decat din iubire, si nu din moarte tragica. N-ar trebui sa scriem decat prin aceasta moarte, sau n-ar trebui sa renuntam la scris, sau sa continuam sa scriem, decat prin aceasta iubire, sau si una, si alta in acelasi timp. Nu

cunoastem carte de dragoste mai importanta decat Subteranele lui Kerouak. El nu se intreaba „Ce inseamna a scrie?” pentru ca are absoluta nevoie sa scrie, pentru ca se afla in imposibilitatea unei alte alegeri care constituie efectiv scrisul insusi, cu conditia ca, pentru el, scrisul sa fie deja o alta devenire, sau sa vina dintr-o alta devenire. Scrisul, mijloc pentru o viata mai mult decat personala, in loc ca viata sa fie un biet secret pentru un scris care nu s-ar avea ca scop decat pe sine insusi. Ah, nefericirea imaginarii si a simbolicului, realul fiind lasat intotdeauna pe altadata!

Relatiile exista la mijloc, si exista ca atare, au o existenta de sine statatoare. Aceasta exterioritate a relatiilor nu este un principiu, este un protest vital impotriva principiilor.

Necontenita tanguire universală pe marginea vietii: lipsa-de-fiinta care este viata...Degeaba spun unii „Hai sa dansam”, noi nu suntem, de fapt, fericiti.

Sa faci din corp o putere care sa nu poata fi reduca la organism, sa faci din gandire o putere care sa nu poata fi reduca la constiinta.

opusul unei morale a salvării: a-ti invata sufletul sa-si traiasca viata, nu s-o salveze.

Liniile de fuga iau intorsaturi atat de urate pentru ca sunt reale, si in insasi realitatea lor. (...) Kleist, Virginia Woolf, Fitzgerald (...) heccitate a unei morti care nu mai este aceea a unei persoane, ci o degajare a unui eveniment pur, la momentul propriului sau plan. Dar, tocmai, planul de imanenta, planul de consistenta nu ne poate aduce nimic altceva decat o moarte relativ demna si lipsita de amaraciune? Nu pentru asta era facut! Chiar daca orice creatie se incheie cu propria ei distrugere, care o macina inca de la inceput, chiar faca intreaga muzica nu este decat o cautare a tacerii, ele nu pot fi judecate dupa sfarsitul sau dupa presupusul lor tel, deoarece acesta le depaseste in toate. Atunci cand sfarsesc in moarte, asta se intampla in virtutea unui pericol care le este propriu, nu ca urmare a unei destinatii care le-ar fi sortita.

Critica si clinica: viata si fuga sunt acelasi lucru atunci cand au imbratisat linia de fuga care le transforma in piesele componente ale aceleasi masini de razboi. In aceste conditii, viata a incetat de mult sa mai fie personala, iar opera a incetat de mult sa mai fie literara sau textuala.

---

## GaiaP says

Come mai così poche recensioni? Benché tutte favorevolissime, non compongono lo zoccolo duro di deleuziani convinti che mi aspettavo di trovare qui. O forse sono io che esagero con le mie cinque stelle (che potrebbero tranquillamente salire a sei o sette, se solo fosse possibile)?

Massì, in fondo questo libro non mi ha cambiato la vita. Però per quanto mi riguarda ha cambiato, in modo tanto repentino quanto drastico, il mio modo di leggere e di rapportarmi alla letteratura. Penso soprattutto alla seconda conversazione, “Sulla superiorità della letteratura anglo-americana”: quando si legge un testo come questo, non si può fare a meno di maneggiarlo con estrema cautela, non sia mai che cada o urti qualcosa, perché potrebbe pure esplodere, distruggendo il proprio appartamento e magari anche quello dei vicini.

Lettura assolutamente dirompente, e al contempo direi abordabile: non è il Deleuze ancora trattenuto dal linguaggio accademico di “Differenza e Ripetizione”; non è il rizoma Deleuze-Guattari, con le sue ipertrofie concettuali, i suoi deliri schizoidi, i suoi gioiosi ritornelli ossessivi; e non è nemmeno (ma qui forse farei meglio ad abbassare la voce), ehm, non è nemmeno il Deleuze sdoganato da Negri (sshht, non aggiungo altro, prima che scenda su di me una fitta pioggia di sanpietrini). Qui abbiamo a che fare con una versione

del filosofo anti-filosofo francese in vena di entrare in dialogo diretto con i suoi lettori, è lo stesso geniale e inarrestabile flusso di concetti dell'Abécédaire (e sempre in coppia con Claire Parnet). In questo testo il nostro Gilles snocciola e concatena i suoi enunciati con la massima disinvoltura e con un tono assolutamente colloquiale, quasi da chiacchiera fra amici.

In breve, si tratta di un'ottima introduzione al Deleuze-pensiero.

Ecco un piccolo assaggio, tanto per rendere l'idea. Nella speranza che qualcuno, passando di qui per caso, lo legga e poi decida di dirigersi a passo spedito verso la più vicina libreria... :

- Che cos'è una conversazione -

"Un'intervista, un dialogo, una conversazione - spiegarsi è molto difficile. La maggior parte delle volte, quando uno mi fa una domanda, anche una domanda che mi tocca, m'accorgo di non avere propriamente nulla da dire. Le domande, come qualsiasi altra cosa, si costruiscono: e se non vi lasciano costruire le vostre domande, con elementi raccolti dovunque, con pezzi presi da qualsiasi parte, se ve le pongono, succede che non avete gran che da raccontare. [...] In genere le domande sono tese verso un futuro (o un passato). Il futuro delle donne, il futuro della rivoluzione, il futuro della filosofia, ecc. Ma nel frattempo, intanto che si continua a girare attorno a queste questioni, ci sono dei tipi di divenire che operano in silenzio, in modo pressoché impercettibile. Si pensa troppo in termini di storia, sia essa personale o universale. Mentre i tipi di divenire fanno parte della geografia, sono orientamenti, direzioni, entrate e uscite. Esiste un divenire-donna che non si confonde affatto con le donne, con il loro passato e il loro futuro e bisognerebbe proprio che le donne entrassero in questo divenire, per poter uscire dal loro passato e dal loro futuro, dalla loro storia. [...] Esiste un divenire-filosofia che non ha nulla a che vedere con la storia della filosofia, e che passa piuttosto attraverso coloro che la storia della filosofia non giunge a classificare."

Disponibile anche in italiano grazie alla traduzione pubblicata da Ombre Corte, con il titolo "Conversazioni".

---