J'aimais les femmes atroces dans les quartiers énormes
On naissait chaque jour quelques êtres nouveaux
Le fer était leur sang, la flamme leur cerveau
J'aimais j'aimais le peuple habile des machines
Le luxe et la beauté ne sont que son âme
Cette femme était si belle
Qu'elle me faisait peur.

— Guillaume Apollinaire, "1909," in *Aequos*

"Ouvire toute la nuit."

— Marcel Duchamp

In the searing concluding lines of his poem "1909," Guillaume Apollinaire evokes a hybrid feminine subject, equally seductive and repulsive to her masculine admirer. It is as though the poem's narrator had rushed into the arms of a woman and found himself in the mouth of a furnace. With fewer words, and a different kind of eloquence, Marcel Duchamp (and Rosé Sélay) envision the body of a woman as another kind of factory, "Ouvire toute la nuit," open (and producing) night and day. Femininity might wrap itself in "Le luxe et la beauté," as Apollinaire's machine-woman is "en robe d'ottoman violine/ et en tunique brodée d'or/ Décolletée en rond," or like Rosé Sélay dressed in a delirious "écume" of silly fur and outrageous hat. But the nature of these women, their inner core, is composed of iron and fire, spinning rotary discs: a pure site of production that is both "ouvert" and "Ouvire toute la nuit."

These suggestive literary fragments indicate a possible answer to the di-

* I would like to thank Benjamin H. D. Buchloh, for whose seminar "Duchamp and Dadaism" the first version of this essay was written, and Annette Michelson for her editorial suggestions, particularly with regard to Nietzsche's concept of the Eternal Return.
lemma posed by Robert Lebel when he asks the following question:

Thus once again the year 1920 was a time for great decisions since from the position of anti-artist he [Duchamp] had to pass to that of engineer. This mutation was to be so important that it required a change of identity. After having thought first of adopting a Jewish name he took the pseudonym "Rrose Sélavy" with which thenceforth he signed his works. Should we see in this female entity... the sign, evidently still ironic, of a passive acceptance of circumstances from now on?  

While Lebel's conjunction of Duchamp's new position as "engineer" (or perhaps anti-engineer) with his adoption of a female alias is invaluable, his easy elision of femininity with passivity is misleading. Far from serving as a "sign... of a passive acceptance of circumstances," I would argue that, like Apollinaire's woman who "était si belle/Qu'elle me faisait peur," Rrose Sélavy serves not to cancel but to extend the metaphors of industrial, visual, and sexual production that Duchamp's occultist machines were meant to introduce. In this light, it is easier to resolve the mystery of Duchamp's early vacillation between a Jewish and a feminine pseudonym: both of these identities—the Jew and the woman—are mobilized culturally as paranoid metaphors for a fearsome, runaway production. But while the irrational fear of "Jewish moneylenders" is restricted to the arena of capital, the identity of woman extends the metaphor of production into the realm of sexuality and the family—a place where Duchamp had already been and wanted to remain.

Andrews Huyssen's essay "The Vamp and the Machine: Fritz Lang's Metropolis" assists in clarifying the discursive field—to which I believe Rrose Sélavy belongs—by linking woman and industrial production in the 1920s. Huyssen's text centers on the character of Maria in Metropolis, a beautiful young woman who, at the beginning of the film, preaches an ethic of warmth, affection, and emotion to the workers while caring for and nurturing their children. Although her message is not explicitly revolutionary, the leaders of Metropolis seek to contain or subvert Maria's charismatic power by replacing her with a robotic...

double, what Huysssen calls the "machine-vamp." This double is sent back to the workers in the guise of an eroticized subversive: she performs a striptease for the men, leading to a frenzy of desire and violence that culminates in her being burned as a witch. Huysssen's description of the burning echoes the woman of Apollinaire's "1909":

This technical process in which woman is divided and fragmented into inner and outer nature is later mirrored in subsequent stages of the vamp's destruction: the outer features of the vamp burn away on the stake until only the mechanical insides are left and we again see the metallic robot of the earlier scenes.

Here again is the terrifying revelation that links woman and the machine. The spume of froth of her body, her dress, her beauty are revealed as nothing more than the masks of a robot: "Le fer était leur sang la flamme leur cerveau/plus que les masques d'un robot." The spunk and flounce of Raina Sélévay may be nothing more than the veneer—the bodily envelope—that simultaneously masks and reveals Marcel Duchamp the engin. This is the real subject of Huysssen's analysis of the film is his assertion that the "myth of the dualistic consciousness of the woman as either sexual virtue-mother or prostitute-vamp is projected.

Metropolis was conceived in 1924 and completed in 1927, and it is therefore directly contemporaneous to Duchamp's invention of Rose Sélavy. At the heart of the film is the assertion that the "myth of the dualistic consciousness of the woman as either sexual virtue-mother or prostitute-vamp is projected onto technology which appears as either neutral and obedient or as inherently threatening and out-of-control." In other words, Metropolis plots and explores the very threatening discursive connections: technology is feminized both in order to domesticate it (the virgin-mother) and to express its potential threat (the ravenous prostitute-vamp); but also, woman herself is envisioned as a dangerous machine, a factory "Ouvrier toute la nuit." The machine-woman of Metropolis therefore becomes a contradictory identity. She is both the metaphor for technical production and the contradiction of that identity. In Anti-Oedipus Deleuze and Guattari provide a means of collapsing this distinction. As they argue, the objet de réification that is that of the subject, the Eternal Return represents the individual's "multiple alterity"—the objective intensity that can forever only be glimpsed. As Klossowska puts it:

In adopting the necessity of the return as universal law at the outset, I de-actualize my present self to will myself in all the other selves, whose

---


4. Ibid., p. 73.


7. Ibid., p. 5.

8. Ibid., p. 21.


10. At this juncture it is important to note that the "iron and fire" underlying Apollinaire's one of sort of connection between what Deleuze and Guattari call desiring-machines and the machine.

entire series must be gone through so that, following the circular movement, I can again become *what I am at the moment in which I discover the law of the Eternal Return.*

Duchamp's multiplicity of identities in the face of his readymades, Large Glass, rotary discs, and other "machines"—R. Mutt, Rose Selavy, wanted criminal, and shaving-cram-laden faun—establishes such a Nietzschean "vicious circle" of subject effects. It is tempting to see this "rotation" through alternate personae as a strategy for representing what Klossowsky defines as a pure intensity. But to this I will have to return.

At the center of Deleuze and Guattari's attempt to establish a truly materialist psychoanalysis is their assertion that the production of desire cannot be divorced from social production, that the two processes are in fact one:

There is no such thing as the social production of reality on the one hand, and a desiring-production that is mere fantasy on the other... The Marx-Freud parallelism between the two remains utterly sterile and insignificant as long as it is expressed in terms that make them introjections or projections of each other without ceasing to be utterly alien to each other, as in the famous equation money = shit. The truth of the matter is that social production is purely and simply desiring-production itself under determinate conditions.

Following Deleuze and Guattari we can conclude that the adoption of Rose Selavy as an alter-ego, far from counteracting Duchamp's preoccupation with the machine, as Lebel implies, serves instead to broaden significantly the meaning of "engineering" within his work. For it is through the person of Rose Selavy—whose very name is a synonym for desire—that we may perceive the point of contact between desiring-production and social or economic production. Like the humming, spinning rotary discs, the body of Rose is also a machine: a "Cuisse enregistruse," perhaps. This and the multiplicity of linguistic fragments Duchamp/Selavy produced during the 1920s introduces a third dimension of the machine in which Deleuze and Guattari's dual desiring-machines and social machines are embedded. It is the *language-machine* and for his understanding of its mechanics Duchamp is indebted to the poet, novelist, and playwright Raymond Roussel. Apollinaire brought Duchamp to a performance of Roussel's *Impressions d'Afrique*—a novel adapted for the stage—in May 1912, and from that time Duchamp considered the poet a major influence. Roussel's narratives were generated from chains of associations and double entendres in which text was produced through a continuous process of recycling. As he explains in *How I Wrote Certain of My Books*:

I chose two almost identical words (reminiscent of metagrams). For example, *billard* and *pillard*. To these I added similar words capable of two different meanings, thus defining two almost identical phrases.

In the case of billard and pillard the two phrases I obtained were:

1. Les lettres du blanc sur les bandes du vieux billard...
2. Les lettres du blanc sur les bandes du vieux pillard...

15. Duchamp had stated, "It was fundamentally Roussel who was responsible for my glass. The Bride Stripped Bare by Her Bachelors. Even. From his Impressions d'Afrique I got the general approach, this play of his in which I saw with Apollinaire helped me greatly on one side of my expression. I saw at once I could use Roussel as an influence." See Marcel Duchamp, "The Great Trouble with Modern Art," vol. 15, no. 4-5 (1946). Reprinted in Sausset, Petron, Writings, p. 126.

Left: Marcel Duchamp. Wanted/$2,000 Reward. 1923.
Right: Marcel Duchamp. Rotary Demisphere (Precision Optics). 1925.
In the first, "lettres" was taken in the sense of lettering, "blanc" in the sense of a cube of chalk and "bandes" as cushions. In the second, "lettres" was taken in the sense of missives, "blanc" as in white man, and "bandes" as in hordes.

The two phrases found, it was a case of writing a story which could begin with the first and end with the second.

Now it was from the resolution of this problem that I derived my materials.16

Such a deployment of double meanings and near-metagrams was not Roussel's only technique for producing words out of words; he also devised a process of "pulverization" in which a readymade phrase was reduced to a similar-sounding string of fragments whose chance conjunctions became the basis for a narrative passage or tale.17

Both of Roussel's techniques are familiar to the readers of Duchamp. Whereas the poet creates an entire discursive circle—a story or novel written in flat, matter-of-fact prose—to double back onto nearly identical sentences like "Les lettres du blanc sur les bandes du vieux billard" and "Les lettres du blanc sur les bandes du vieux billard," Duchamp collapses the secondary identity of two phrases onto a terse literary precipitate like "Ouvroit toute la nuit," whose double, "Ouvroit toute la nuit," stands behind it like a ghost. Like Roussel, Duchamp also exults in pulverizing and reformulating language: Rrose Sélavy is produced from "Eros, C'est la vie," or "Lits et ratures" from "Littérature." In the Green Box Duchamp includes a note, Conditions of a language, which we may presume dates from the time directly following his encounter with Roussel, and which seems almost a rephrasing of the writer's system:18

The search for "prime words" ("divisible" only by themselves and by unity).

17. Roussel described this method in the following terms:

As the method developed I was led to take a random phrase from which I drew images by distorting it, a little as though it were a case of deriving them from the drawings of a rebus.


18. It is impossible to date notes from the Green Box specifically, but I will assume this one is part of the generative process of the Large Glass and was therefore written in the teens or early twenties of the modernism in 1935. Judging from his texts of the 1920s, Duchamp certainly seemed to be aware of or involved with it.

Take a Larousse dicit and copy all the so-called "abstract" words, i.e., those which have no concrete reference.

Compose a schematic sign designating each of these words. (This sign can be composed with the standard stops)

These signs must be thought of as the letters of a new alphabet.19

Like Roussel, Duchamp envisioned language as a cycle of destruction and signifiers from Larousse are transformed into the "letters of a new alphabet," based on the oscillation or pulverization of meaning: "This method is, in short, combinations."20 In his study of the poet's work, Michel Foucault described language, the eternal return of the same. It is worth quoting Foucault's lyrical description of a language that seeks to begin, it's the second form of words already spoken: it's everyday language ravaged by destruction and death. That's why it is essential that it refuse to original.

For we are not speaking of machines; we are speaking of monsters which have never dreamed of, crucified jellyfish, ad

The Monte Carlo Bond, a work by Marcel Duchamp and Rose Sélavy dating from 1924, opens out onto each of the three dimensions of the machine that I have described: the designing-machine, social production, and language, all of which, as Deleuze and Guattari might put it, share "identical natures and differing regimes." As Robert Lebel recounts, the bond was conceived as a joint stock company designed to raise 15,000 francs "divided into thirty bonds of 500 francs each redeemable by 'artificial drawings' and bearing the somewhat exorbitant interest of twenty percent." The purpose of this capital was to fund a system devised by Duchamp for winning at roulette. Such a conjunction of the activities of the "company" with the production of art is fundamental to the meaning of the Monte Carlo Bond: it is clear that Duchamp's martingale was as much intended to produce works of art as to generate cash profits. The very bond note itself—a lithograph including a portrait by Man Ray of Duchamp transformed through shaving cream into a chimerical figure, perhaps resembling a faun or devil—was a "masterpiece" of sorts. As The Little Review somewhat guilelessly reported in 1924–25, "If anyone is in the business of buying art curiosities as an investment, here is a chance to invest in a perfect masterpiece. Marcel's signature alone is worth more than the 500 francs asked for the share." Duchamp himself made the connection with painting explicit in a letter to Picabia in 1924:

The Martingale is without importance. They are all either completely good or completely bad. But with the right number even a bad Martingale can work and I think I've found the right number.

You see I haven't quit being a painter, now I'm sketching on chance.

The Monte Carlo Bond was a specific kind of machine: a painting-machine whose elaborate, monotonous activity—the repetitive spinning of roulette discs, inevitably reminiscent of the optical pulse of the rotary reliefs—was meant to generate a new kind of painting, "sketched on chance." Duchamp's accounts of his "work" at the roulette table emphasize not the glamour of his occupation in an alluring Mediterranean capital, but rather the killing monotony and sameness. To Picabia he writes, "It's delicious monotony without the least emotion"; and to Jacques Doucet:

I'm beginning to play and the slowness of progress is more or less a test of patience. I'm praying about even or else am marking time in a disturbing way for the aforementioned patience. But still, doing that or something else... I'm neither richer nor a millionaire and will never be either one or the other.

Again we are indebted to Lebel for amplifying this last line of Duchamp's letter.

22. [The Monte Carlo Bond], The Little Review 10 (Fall/Winter, 1924–25), reprinted in Sanoüillet and Peterson, Writings, p. 185.
25. Lebel, Marcel Duchamp, p. 50. Written on the bond note is the following statement: "Remboursables au pair en trois ans par tirages artificiels a partir du ler Mars 1925."
to Doucet with an apparently trivial but absolutely fundamental piece of evidence: "He considers his martingale infallible in this respect but he also admits that if one perseveres long enough one can hope to win an amount equal to the wages of a clerk who works in his office as many hours as the gambler does in the casino."28

What kind of machine, then, is the Monte Carlo Bond? On one dimension, it invents an entire discursive structure—bonds, thousands of spins of the roulette wheel—in order to double back to its starting point, to get nowhere. As Foucault argues with regard to Rousseau's language-machines, which pulverize language, the Monte Carlo Bond is a language-machine that pulverizes the language of everyday life, Duchamp's bond issue is premised on the premise that the language of everyday life is an illusion, and he resists the process of representation itself. As Klossowski had put it in relation to Nietzsche: "How can meaning be constituted within the intensity? Precisely in returning upon itself... by repeating and imitating itself, it would become a sign."29

Duchamp's bond issue is a painting-machine, but its significance cannot be reduced to this status. For the Monte Carlo Bond projects a field in which desiring-production and social production come into play, in which—adopting the terminology of Deleuze and Guattari—the meaning of Oedipus within capitalism is both expressed and contested. As a natural consequence of their thesis that "social production is purely and simply desiring-production itself under determinate conditions,"30 Deleuze and Guattari have undertaken to define the relationship between them and to periodize it historically. At the heart of Anti-Oedipus is the belief that social institutions—social repression—arise to counteract the primal fear of what the authors term "decoded" or deterritorialized flows of desire. Each of the three social models they describe—the "Primitive Territorial Machine," the "Barbarian Despot Machine," and the "Civilized Capitalist Machine"—establishes techniques for coding or controlling desire, and within each one there plays a different structural role. It is only in capitalism, characterized as it is by a general decoding of flows through the adoption of money and the unfettering of economic production from extraeconomic restrictions like myth, that the incest prohibition establishes itself within individual subjects and families in the form of Oedipus.

Within each of their three machines, Deleuze and Guattari structure the social field by establishing two orthogonal axes of relationship. The Primitive Territorial Machine arises from a vertical axis of filiation (the family, or stock) and a horizontal extension of alliance (marriage through a system of debts). In the primitive socius, incest with the mother is prohibited to insure the extension of the family through reproduction, to maintain the axis of filiation, and incest with the sister is prohibited to insure the establishment of a system of alliances through marriages outside of the clan based on blocks of inter-familial debt. Before the incest prohibition there were no subjects known as "mother" or

transcription of the landscape: "The finished work, seen as a whole, gave an impression of uncommonly intense colouring and remained strictly true to the original."31 As Foucault argues of Rousset, such machines present an allegory of the identity of language: "In their wealth of poverty words always refer away from and lead back to themselves."32 And so, Marcel, Louise, and Rose seem to imply, do paintings. The Monte Carlo Bond establishes a flow of desire—of infinite spins of a disc and settings of a ball—that departs from and returns to the same position: the process of representation itself. As Klossowski had put it in relation to Nietzsche: "How can meaning be constituted within the intensity? Precisely in returning upon itself... by repeating and imitating itself, it would become a sign."33

30. Ibid., p. 148.
33. Deleuze and Guattari, Anti-Oedipus, p. 29.
“sister,” but only pure “intensities” of desire between one desiring-machine and another. Incest brings these unified, delineated subjects into being but sets them beyond reach as sexual objects. The Barbarian Despotism Church establishes the social field along the same axes, but the meaning of these relationships is radically transformed. Filiation becomes “direct” filiation to the despot or the deity that he represents, while alliance—what was accomplished through discrete blocks of debt in the Primitive Territorial Machine—becomes an infinite tribute, what Deleuze and Guattari call a “debt of existence.” In this corpus everything—including incest—is collapsed onto the body of the imperial leader, which is itself transformed into a despotisme representation: the detached object as both phallus and signifier. The despot is Oedipus and Oedipus is the despot, and as a result the world is overdetermined through his transformation into a signifier and the consequent invention of writing. The signifier arises as a deterritorialized sign through the body of the leader: “Incest has ceased being the displaced representation of desire to become the repressing representation itself.”

It is the argument of Anti-Oedipus that Freud’s Oedipus complex is not immanent in the unconscious of individual human subjects. Rather, an introjected Oedipus arises only at a particular historical moment and for a particular purpose: as a figure of repression within the deterritorialized flux of capitalism. Of the three social machines Deleuze and Guattari describe, capitalism comes closest to occupying what they theorize as the limit of the social: a complete decoding of desire in its transposition to an infinitely polymorphous cash economy. If capitalism is the relative limit of every socius, schizophrenia—the utter decoding of desire—is the absolute limit:

Capitalism is indeed the limit of all societies, insofar as it brings about the decoding of the flows that other social formations coded and overcoded. But it is the relative limit of every society; it affects relative breaks, because it substitutes for the codes an extremely rigorous axiomatic that maintains the energies of the flows in a bound state on the body of capital as a socius that is deterritorialized, but also a socius that is even more pitiably than any other. Schizophrenia, on the contrary, is indeed the absolute limit that causes the flows to travel in a free state on a desocialized body without organs. Hence one can say that schizophrenia is the exterior limit of capitalism itself or the conclusion of its deepest tendency, but that capitalism only functions on condition that it inhibit this tendency, or that it push back or displace this limit by substituting for it its own immanent relative limits, which it continually reproduces on a widened scale.

Schizophrenia is both capitalism’s ultimate expression and its limit; its dream and its nightmare. Oedipus arises in the space between capitalism and schizophrenia; it enforces the boundary and “maintains the energy of the flows in a bound state.” In terms of Nietzsche’s “vicious circle” of the Eternal Return, Oedipus provides the mechanism for re-willing the set from its periodic dissolution into pure intensity (or schizophrenia).

According to Deleuze and Guattari, capitalism is constituted when the axes of filiation and alliance become entirely economic. Filiative or industrial capital arises when money begins to generate money; this vertical axis is transacted by the commercial capital of alliance that binds the socius together through consumer purchasing—the investment by the wage earner of his meager resources into the system. Deleuze and Guattari argue that these two forms of capital, though scarcely ever distinguished, are completely incommensurable:

Let us return to the dualism of money, to the two boards, the two inscriptions, the one going into the account of the wage earner, the other into the balance sheet of the enterprise. Measuring the two orders of magnitude in terms of the same analytical unit is a pure fiction, a cosmic swindle, as if one were to measure intergalactic or intra-atomic distances in meters and centimeters.

It is the conjunction of these two dissimilar flows of money through the regulatory structures that Deleuze and Guattari call axiomatics that gives form to the capitalist field. In this social machine, characterized by the freeing of flows of money and their axiomatic conjunction, the structure of the family no longer gives form to relationships of production: “Capital has taken upon itself the relations of alliance and filiation. There ensues a privatization of the family according to which the family ceases to give its social form to economic reproduction.” Divested of its former role, the family comes to serve a new function: as the laboratory of Oedipalization. In capitalism, “Oedipal desires are the bait, the disfigured image by means of which repression channels desire in the trap,” and Oedipus is distributed everywhere, inhabits everyone. Oedipalization makes the subject believe that all of his or her desires can be reduced to “Mommy and Daddy”; and this allows—or forces—him or her to repress the character of his or her real desire: the unconscious as a purely productive factory of desiring-machines and the capitalist socius as a humming machine of decoded flows. The social repression that once was imposed by myth or the law of the despot is now developed within the psychic economy of the individual.

Deleuze and Guattari’s theory of decoded flows of filiation and alliance, reterritorialized by Oedipus’s distorted representation of desire, brings us back again to the Monte Carlo Bond. Duchamp’s bond issue sketches out the field of
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capitalism as described in *Anti-Oedipus* only to collapse it back onto itself, to approach the absolute limit of schizophrenia. The *Monte Carlo Bond* establishes axes both of filiation and of alliance. What better image for filiative capital— for the generation of money from money— than gambling, the spinning disc of the roulette wheel? But Duchamp's bond also embodies a second manifestation of this generative principle: it, like other stocks and bonds, yields dividends—high ones, figured at twenty percent. The bond elides the two faces of filiative capital: its unpredictable relationship to chance and the mask of propriety—of legitimate investment—that serves to suppress any recognition of capital's always already speculative nature. But where does the capital of alliance lie in the *Monte Carlo Bond*, which at first appears as a pure demonstration of filiative production? The worker is nearly invisible in this "corporation" because he lies at its very center. Rose Selavy may be the chairman of the board, but Marcel is the one who labors; and his labor is "monotonous" and distinctly unproductive. As Lebel states:

Duchamp] considers his martingale infallible in this respect but he also admits that if one perseveres long enough one can hope to win an amount equal to the wages of a clerk who works in his office as many hours as the gambler does in the casino.90

Like the wage laborers described by Deleuze and Guattari, who bind the social machine together through the continual reinvestment of their meager capital, Duchamp-the-worker—the gambler as clerk—would put his winnings back into the "company": "I would like so much to pay my dividends."90

In the *Monte Carlo Bond* the axes of filiation and alliance that structure the capitalist field fall back onto themselves in a monotonous, repetitive rehearsal of desire which is always in motion but never loses its point of departure: Duchamp breaks even. As Thierry de Duve argues in his article "Marcel Duchamp, or The Phynancier of Modern Life," the representative of filiative capital (the financier) and of alliance capital (the worker) are collapsed upon the person of the artist (or one of his aliases):

At the beginning of the story Marcel Duchamp is R. Mutt, but this we won't know until the end. R. Mutt is like the little nobody who proclaims himself an artist in taking out his membership in the Society; he divides himself into a stockholder and an artisan, Richard and Mutt. Richard is like Arenberg, both of them "big" stockholders in the Society (both founding members) and both collectors (Richard is president of the hanging committee and future founder of the Société Anonyme). Mutt is like Mott, artisan-painter or small indus--

trialist. As artisan Mutt suffers from his person's being divided into an exploited worker and a merchant who pockets a surplus value. As industrialist Mutt doesn't suffer, he exploits his workers. Mutt envies Mott and fears for his trade.41

As de Duve demonstrates, Duchamp's experience as capitalist is radically divided and contradictory. He occupies several subject effects representing both financier and laborer, or as Deleuze and Guattari might put it, the "subject itself is not at the center, which is occupied by the machine, but on the periphery, with no fixed identity, forever decentered, defined by the states through which it passes."42

There is a multiplicity of characters embedded in the *Monte Carlo Bond*—to be more precise, it is a family business. Rose Selavy is the mother, and chairman of the board. She is a mother who is a man. Marcel Duchamp is the father. In his portrait on the bond note by Man Ray, he, like Rose, is masquerading— as a hypermasculine devil or jock. But his mask is made of shaving cream, echoing Selavy's "Complete Line of Whiskers and Kicks."43 He may be about to lose his whiskers, and he might be in for some kicks from Mother. Marcel's face is obscured by the frothy stuff, as though his identity were being erased. And Oedipus—the child—is there too; just as Deleuze and Guattari argue, Oedipus is everywhere. The entire background of the bond is covered with a text printed in green italics: "moustiques domestiques demi-stock." While the primary meaning of "moustique" is mosquito, it may also be an idiomatic term for a child or brat. "Stock" additionally contains the double meaning of family and goods. Distributed throughout the field of the bond is a "democratic brat, a "half-share"—the product of a bond issue. In a fragment of 1922, Duchamp makes an analogous conjunction—an equivalent play on words—between "insectes" and "insect." "Rose Selavy troué qu'un insecticide doit couche au sein de la tue; les punaises sont de rigoire."44 Oedipus, the "insecticide" (and linguistic ghost of insecticide) is killing insects (children, as well as parents?) and yet also producing such progeny: "les punaises sont de rigoire."

Assuredly, the flowing desires of capital are displaced onto the production of the Oedipal family in the *Monte Carlo Bond*, joined most explicitly in the single word *demise*: the child who is a share. But this delicious, dissolving

---

91. Marcel Duchamp, Letter of Jacques Douce, January 16, 1925, reprinted in *Sanouillet and Peterson, Writings*, p. 188.
43. Rose Selavy's calling card included two "professional" affiliations or areas of expertise. Above her name, the card read, "Precision Oedum," and below, "Complete Line of Whiskers and Kicks." See *Sanouillet and Peterson, Writings*, p. 105.
44. Marcel Duchamp, text first published in *Littérature* (nouvelle série, no. 5, Paris, October 1, 1922), reprinted in *Sanouillet and Peterson, Writings*, p. 105.
family (which anyway collapses back onto just one man) is not the kind of efficient laboratory of repression that Deleuze and Guattari identify. Duchamp reinvents the Capitalist Machine as though it were one of Rousseau’s language-machines: the *Monte Carlo Bond* leads onto a long journey filled with spins of the wheel, filiative and wage-earning capital, the production of children; and yet its destination is identical to its starting point. Or perhaps not quite. For in the *Monte Carlo Bond* Duchamp begins with capitalism, the relative limit of social machines, and ends with schizophrenia—what Annette Michelson called “autism considered as a language system”⁴⁵—as the absolute limit of any socius. In his bond, Duchamp has sought to represent two kinds of pure intensity: that defined by Nietzsche as the “vicious circle,” the cycle of alternate identities that must be passed through in order to will the self out of its lavalike formlessness, and secondly, the equally deterritorialized flows of money, which likewise eternally return to the same—to the point of breaking even. With his wry choice of the roulette wheel as the “vicious circle” par excellence, Duchamp inscribes one spinning disc within another: the cycle of identity meshes with the cycle of capital. It is through the figure of Oedipus, *the monistique domestique demistock*, that these two “wheels of chance” come to communicate.⁴⁶

---

46. It should not be forgotten that these two “disks” constitute, moreover, a third figure: the “painting machine.”