Small happiness

aesthetic strategies for witting consumers

Hugo Liu
Media Laboratory & Comparative Media Studies
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
hugo@media.mit.edu

Most people see the pursuit of happiness as the ultimate goal of their lives. When asked what it is that makes them happy, people tend to give two kinds of answers. The first kind of thing that people associate with producing happiness is the fulfillment of the various rites of passage that make up our society's grand narrative of the *good life*—such as having a good career, good home, successful children, deep friendships, true love, and a prosperous family. The drive to pursue these events is imprinted deeply into each one of us from an early age—by our parents, by our cultural environment, and by our species' evolution. As such, their pursuit transcends choice to become somewhat of a moral imperative—remuneration to parents for their sacrifice, and the duty to make the most of the gift of existing. In addition to cultural pressure to fulfill these life events, the process of their attainment is itself arduous and wrought of pain and unhappiness. But we strive for these mythic attainments nonetheless.

When asked what it is that makes them happy, people also give a second kind of answer. The second kind of thing that people associate with producing happiness are the small victories in life—good music, good conversation, good food, sentimental objects, movie-going, playing games. While not epic in scope like the fulfillment of career, home, or children, life's little pleasures nourish our spirits with a steadier diet of satisfactions. Without the respite and rejuvenation that they afford, it would be difficult to sustain the journey for epic happiness, a process which is not usually pleasurable in and of itself.

But due to the unprecedented affordances of this, the postmodern age, the role of small pleasures in our lives is gaining in importance. They are no longer mere petty amusements or distractions or anything to be scoffed at—these small pursuits are increasingly at the center of our lives, to which we dedicate a great deal of emotional energy and disposable income. Many have even decided to stake their life's happiness on the sum total of small pursuits—having a double-dipped chocolate fudge ice cream, beating a video game, trying out a fancy bar of soap—rather than on the traditional epic pursuits. Is this madness or is this revolution? How could small material enjoyments add up to profound happiness, when happiness is supposed to transcend all superficial pleasures?

There is power in the small

Small pleasures are usually regarded in a trivial light. True, collecting shiny little objects does delight us, going to concerts does amuse us, and pastimes—well, they do pass the time. But living in postmodern times, small pleasures play a greater role—inch by inch, they propel our aesthetic self-actualization. When people claim to find happiness in the sum of small things—the real source of their joy is that, as practitioners of the small, they have learned how to tap into their truest desires, they have revealed their true tastes and point of view. When people claim to find happiness in small pleasures, it is self-actualization that is the happy occasion.

Small pleasures are low-cost. The experience of small pleasures is readily available—crystallized into the cornucopia of goods and services offered in our cultural economy. Consider the very modest delight of buying and using a bar of soap. Bars of soap take many forms, there are many brands, and they are all quite affordable. Because enjoying a bar of soap requires so little financial, emotional, and time investment, it invites experimentation. What brand of soap speaks to me? What is more luxurious—a thick lather, or an inviting scent? When we dabble in these details, are we not actually engaged in the discovery of oneself and one's tastes? In contrast, life's bigger decisions —of job, of relationships— are not nearly as nimble to experiment with. We could hardly switch jobs or lovers on a whim.

The small is fun to do, but also good for you. Good for you because each little choice allows you to discover your tastes, probe yourself along zillions of dimensions of meaning. Bit by bit, and at an imperceptible pace, you can "become who you are," as Nietzsche wrote. In fact, the whole secret of *becoming* rests in the idea that we cannot genuinely transform overnight; rather, true transformation is unconscious, and can only be realized through a myriad series of changes, which are themselves inconsequential. Finding out who you are and what you like is necessarily a process of trial and error—the more you try, the quicker you progress. As Albert Camus wrote into one of his notebooks, "To know oneself, one should assert oneself. Psychology is action, not thinking about oneself. We continue to shape our personality all our life. If we knew ourselves perfectly, we should die."[i]

The small is not only powerful because it is inexpensive, it is also powerful because it affords granularity. Modern Man's vocabulary for describing himself was quite limited. In 18th and 19th century Europe, people were predominantly identified by their church membership, profession, and social class. The early sociologist Georg Simmel recognized this limitation of the society and times that he inhabited, leading him to woefully posit that each person's individuality could not be adequately and judiciously represented by the two or three broad labels that constituted his social identity. Instead, Simmel realized a person's individuality manifests through

each of his possessions, relationships, and demeanors. Simmel likened these fragments to shards of glass capable of reflecting a part of one's individuality back unto him.[ii] The more shards of glass that are considered, the more complete the resulting portrait of oneself. In this respect, Simmel might have approved of today's postmodern consumerism, as acts of consumption behave like shards of glass that capture more detail about our individuality.

The range of goods and services available to the postmodern consumer is both broad and deep—not only do cosmopolitan cities cook up a gamut of world cuisines but each cuisine is further served by restaurants offering competing interpretations and styles. The breadth of offerings affords a greater scope of one's tastes to be captured. The depth of offerings means that every nuance of our style can be captured. Understanding this through an analogy with portraiture, actualizing oneself through broad social categories versus through a breadth of consumer offerings is like sketching a portrait with a magic marker versus with a fine-tipped pen. Having great depth in offerings can be likened to rendering the portrait in color versus monotone.

The larger and more heterogynous the vocabulary for describing a person's tastes, the more nuanced the final description. That small pleasures are low-cost and fun makes them the ideal realm for taste experimentation and aesthetic becoming.

Aesthetic fuels for happiness can be burned or saved

One of the greatest challenges to staying happy is that humans have a vicious talent for taking things for granted. In psychologist Daniel Gilbert's book, *Stumbling on Happiness*, he explains that people are bad at forecasting their happiness level—for example, you think that buying a car will make you happy forever, but that initial giddy quickly fades and you re-acclimate to misery. He showed this by exhibiting that people from all social classes and throughout history have varying living conditions yet the same amount of happiness.[iii]

It should be acknowledged that epic life achievements such as marriage, children, and career are more profound, fulfilling and rewarding than momentary pleasures. In fact, these events can produce a constant stream of happiness over time, notably because they evolve themselves and because we can continue to savor the pride of these attainments with loved ones for years and years. But, since there are relatively few of these epic life achievements, taking any of them for granted bears great consequences for one's happiness. Consider the dire implications of losing taste for one's career or marriage. In contrast, consider the implications of taking small pleasures for granted. It is true that small things can be taken for granted far more easily because they required relatively little investment. But the great news lies in the wide spectrum of small things that we surround ourselves with. Since the collector of small pleasures will have collected more interests than he could possibly consume on a day-to-day basis, he can stand to take an interest or

two for granted without jeopardizing his steady diet of small pleasures.

Speaking of diet, in taste-for-food we have a prime example of a source of happiness that, if properly managed, cannot be exhausted and cannot be imperiled by takings-for-granted. A single person likely enjoys many kinds of food—different flavors, meat or vegetable, different ethnic cuisines, and of various preparations. Consider one who, having discovered Indian food for the first time and having fallen in love with its intoxicating flavors, begins to eat a lot of it, and soon tires of its taste. Had it been profession or marriage that he grew tired of, his happiness could be jeopardized. But seeing that it's only food, the gentleman can simply refrain from Indian food for a while, instead enjoying the other cuisines that still please his palate. Then, after sufficient time has passed, the tastebuds—which are quite elastic—can forget its conception of Indian food and the quality of ordinariness that it had come to take on. Assuming that the gentleman had not burned his bridges by over-abusing curry to the point of traumatizing himself, he can, once again appreciate the sensuousness of that cuisine.

"Dark horses" or "benchwarmers," are small pleasures that are unused and kept in reserve. Continuing the example of food, a "dark horse" could be a great neighborhood restaurant that one resists going to, in spite of hearing great things about its food, and its convenient nearby location. But why practice such self-denial? The rationale for resisting these treasures is that their currency could be most valuable in an emergency situation. Faced with a serious bout of boredom or restlessness with one's existing dining choices, a "dark horse" could then be strategically spent to uplift one's mood with great effect. The "dark horse" strategy also explains why some people stash away a special bottle of wine or a box of cigars for a special occasion, such as a reunion with a long lost friend.

A "dark horse" restaurant is like a fuel that one saves up when spirits are already high, and that one burns only at the crucial moment of need. But these aesthetic fuels have a regenerative quality about them, which that make them peculiar compared to typical fuels like fire logs, or petroleum. Just as the gentleman who grew sick of Indian food eventually rehabilitated his cravings, any aesthetic fuel such as Indian food can be burned, but can also regenerate and be burned again and again.

We can articulate this principle as the *aesthetic regeneration hypothesis*. By having more food interests than we could regularly consume, we can resist getting sick of any one food by switching between foods frequently enough so as to allow heavily taxed foods to regenerate their aesthetic potential. The basis of this hypothesis is that when we take something for granted, it is our minds and our senses that seem to memorize the taste of a thing. The ability to quickly recognize a familiar thing is part of the human adaptive faculty. This is the same faculty that is useful for learning to ride a bicycle for the first time.

By habituating the act of balancing ourselves on a bicycle, we no longer have to think about it or focus directly upon it. Motor coordination gets delegated to unconscious processes in the cerebellum. Like learning to ride a bicycle, eating curry at the same Indian restaurant over and over again will engage habituation. But whereas it is considered a good thing to be over-familiar with keeping balance on a bicycle, over-familiarity is the root cause of taking something for granted, and is thus an enemy of the aesthetic. In the case of food, music, poetry, and other sensuous acts, we should not want to know what the act will feel like before engaging in it; we should not want to recognize the taste of curry too quickly, because recognition can pre-empt sensuous experience.

Sensuous acts are dulled once they are memorized by the body. Luckily, the body and mind does forgive and forget, to an extent. Over a sufficient period of disuse, over-familiar experiences can rehabilitate their aesthetic potential, and will recover some of the sensuousness of the virgin experience.[iv]

The wealth of small pleasures that we collect and partake of in everyday life provides a steady stream of nourishment for the spirit. Each small pleasure is an aesthetic fuel that uplifts us when burned. If we are strategic, we would invest in a cache of "dark horse" pleasures that can redeem us during crises of mood or spirit. Aesthetic fuels are unlike traditional fuels because they have elasticity and can regenerate their capacity to delight us, time after time.

A grove of trees, a rainforest, as aesthetic ecosystems

The field of all small pleasures that could be had is vast and heterogynous. This is not an accident. Small pleasures are commoditized into economic supply because demand either exists or is anticipated to exist. If there are ten offerings of nearly the same pain reliever, differing only in the slightest of ways such as in brand or packaging, it is because goods and services fulfill more than basic needs, they also fulfill aesthetic needs like style and identity. By accounting for all the goods and services that exist in our economy, we can begin to appreciate the scope of subjectivities and styles that actually exist in the world, and that are held by someone, somewhere.

The field of goods and services that constitutes our *aesthetic economy* is governed by different kinds of diversity. The same language that scientists have developed to describe biological diversity can also be applied to the field of aesthetic goods. With its vernacular, we can cultivate a system-based understanding of aesthetic economy. Ecologists identify biodiversity at three phenomenal scales—genetic diversity, species diversity, and ecosystem diversity. Genetic diversity is the degree of variability within a species; this is the sort of variation that is subtle and not always apparent. In the realm of goods and services, we might regard each kind of good as a species. For example, BATH-SOAP could be regarded a species category whose

genetic diversity consists of brand, quality, material, shape, packaging, color, and price variations. Within species BATH-SOAP, a BAR-OF-BATH-SOAP and LIQUID-BATH-SOAP may be different enough to warrant designating them as two subspecies, but similar enough in function to remain the same species.

If genetic diversity accounts for depth of offerings—how goods can vary its aesthetic attributes while retaining functional identity and genre—then *species diversity* should account for breadth of offerings—how goods can differ in function and genre. BATH-SOAP and HAND-SOAP could be functionally distinct enough so as to be regarded as two different species. Yet they have enough commonality to warrant grouping them within a common genus, say, BODY-SOAP. We might further imagine that genus BODY-SOAP, along with genus SHAVING-PARAPHERNALIA, genus BODY-DEODORIZERS, and others might inhabit the common taxonomic family, PERSONAL-HYGIENE-DEVICES. Whereas genetic diversity is a most obvious carrier of aesthetic variation—brands and packaging being often thought of as stylizations—species diversity is also connected to aesthetics. Knowing that one man possesses a great range of shaving products while another man does not possess any shaving products is a telling clue to unraveling a person's life style, personality, and appearance.

Finally, a third type of biodiversity is *ecosystem diversity*. It is variability at the highest level of organization. Rather than emphasizing static differences in goods, it instead emphasizes dynamic differences in what different goods are grouped together or how they relate to one another. A society's economy of aesthetic goods constitutes an aesthetic ecosystem. But perhaps a more intriguing suggestion is that each person's tastes can also be regarded as an aesthetic ecosystem. While it is manufacturers of goods and services who control genetic and species diversity, each person can control the diversity of her own aesthetic ecosystem.

How one cultivates the ecosystem of her tastes has everything to do with her happiness. For one, the robustness of an aesthetic ecosystem is a function of its diversity. Think of a grove of tall trees planted all at the same time. The grove may be marveled for its orderliness and grooming. However, should a fire sweep through the grove, it is likely that all of the trees in that majestic grove would perish because if one tree was susceptibly dry, it is likely that they all are. A grove of identical trees, while majestic, is not robust to drastic changes. Likewise, lack of diversity in an individual's tastes and consumptive patterns can invite catastrophe. Consider a person whose favorite color is blue; as an extreme expression of taste, all of the clothes and furnishings that she owns are blue; she only ever listens to 'blue' music, and reads books of a 'blue' mood. She prides herself on her ability to match. But one day, she wakes up with a peculiar panic in her heart-- the color blue suddenly evokes claustrophobia and nausea. She feels the urge to discard all of possessions and to wipe her slate clean, but she finds that she cannot simply repurchase all of her possessions in a different color, for even

then the products themselves would remind her of her tainted possessions, to which she had become accustomed. For her, blue was the organizing principle of her aesthetic ecosystem, which resembled a grove of neatly manicured trees. But her sudden rejection of her favorite color swept like a fire, ravaging her entire ecosystem, and forcing her to start anew to rebuild her possessions and tastes, without the security or comfort of long-treasured favorites to fall back on. Her *aesthetic strategy* was extreme and founded in a single factor; thus the high spirits that her tastes afforded her was not robust.

With respect to diversity, the opposite of a grove of identical trees may very well be a rainforest—one of nature's most diverse and robust ecosystems. Rainforests house countless species and subspecies, all at different stages of their life cycles, and all implicated into a lush web of crisscross interactions. The species of rainforests have predators and prey, and form complex food webs. Species support one another in parasitic and symbiotic relationships. The rainforest is also a superstructure than houses further microcosms. In the canopy layer rising hundreds of feet above ground are the tallest of trees vying for sunlight and challenging one another to reach new heights. Down below in the understory layer is a nursery for young trees and shrubs. On the forest floor, dead trees and plants decay, providing fertile nutrients for new life.

If one desires to be build a robust happiness out of the small, perhaps he should model his own aesthetic ecosystem after nature's rainforests. He should explore and cultivate different enough interests so that any malaise that afflicts a subset of one's interests will not doom the whole ecosystem. He should emulate the partition strategy of canopies, understories, and forest floors. The most mature and longstanding of one's interests soar like the majestic trees in the hundred-foot canopies. These are the staple pleasures that can always be relied upon and continue to grow better with age. At the same time, some of these could eventually fall, so it is necessary to steadily cultivate new interests in the understory layer. Here is a nursery of fledging interests that with use and with age, might one day become staples.

Finally, the forest floor of an aesthetic ecosystem consists of fallen interests that one has perhaps grown out of, as will surely happen for one who is constantly engaged in *aesthetic becoming*. But rather than laying those to waste, an economical person would seek to salvage the savoir-faire of fallen interests, finding creative ways to reuse and leverage these nutrients into new passions.

The aesthetic as virtual and abundant

The forest floor allegory touches upon a greater theme in aesthetics and creativity—that it serves oneself well to get the most out of any pursuit by recycling, reusing, and multi-purposing. A fallen tree marks an interest being laid to rest, but nary to waste, rather the decaying tree assumes a new role as provider of nourishment for the

nursing of other interests. Nature is economical, and so is the new breed of postmodern aesthetics.

Indian food, a bar of soap, movie-going, a white t-shirt—interests, goods, and services themselves are not "the aesthetic," and do not even *contain* the aesthetic, as Immanuel Kant once insisted.[v] Instead, the aesthetic is the product of an *unconscious imagining*; it is a quality and quantity that we intuitively project unto a thing, and a satisfaction that we naturally get out of a thing. But key is the idea that the individuality of each our tastes will lead us to draw different aesthetic conclusions about the same things—as the folk saying goes, "different strokes for different folks."

Sometimes, the aesthetic is a unique projection—that is to say, only one person, thing or event can trigger that aesthetic. For example, one's "true love" or one's offspring are likely to be bestowed unique aesthetics. However, in the realm of small pleasures, the aesthetic is more often a projection unto *a set of things.* Consider sartorial fashion and the various aesthetics that it is known for—classic elegance, avant-garde, minimalism, boho chic, and so forth. Each fashion aesthetic cannot be fully demonstrated in a single item of clothing, but rather, necessarily corresponds to a set of clothing items whose members share the aesthetic as their thematic quality. If it is the case that the aesthetic is a projection unto a set of things, we might be curious to know if two aesthetics can overlap.

Indeed they can. For instance, consider a young man whose taste for clothing has long been casual—he owning an inordinately many duplicate sets of white t-shirts, blue jeans, and tennis shoes. Consider that after the elapse of several years' time, that young man had since enjoyed a renaissance, becoming a diehard fashion devotee, though still on a shoestring budget. Having disavowed his once casual aesthetic as a faux-pas, he nonetheless does not discard his former wardrobe, for he has a strategy to re-appropriate those items into his new aesthetics. His white t-shirts, when paired with well-cut trousers, and Italian loafers, afford an avant-garde minimalist aesthetic. He adds distress to his blue jeans with a cheese grater, and now sports those as part of his boho chic look. And his tennis shoes—when paired with a polo shirt and white shorts—they complete his resort chic look for tennis outings.

By practicing re-appropriation, the fashion devotee has derived more pleasure and satisfaction from his possessions than he would have otherwise. But even if he had not disavowed his former casual aesthetic, the white t-shirt, blue jeans, and tennis shoes could still participate in the other aesthetics. In that case, we might call his strategy *multi-purposing*. And finally, a startling implication of these findings—if the aesthetic is the fuel of enjoyment and satisfaction, if the aesthetic is a projection, and if interests, goods, and services can be multi-purposed to support multiple aesthetics, then *aesthetics and enjoyment are not bounded by material reality, they are only bounded by a practitioner's creativity and imagination.*

The image of aesthetics as an abundance harkens to Gilles Deleuze's philosophy of the postmodern, in which virtual thematic units — such as the aesthetic— are emphasized over actualities.

In Deleuzian parlance, thematic units are called "multiplicities." The unit, *multiplicity*[vi], is ascribed significance and uniqueness by focusing on its emergent identity, which transcends the sum of its members.[vii] Although a theme is primarily a quality, thus having only virtuality, Deleuze argues that even what we call reality is only made substantial by the explosion of virtualities that populate it. When Deleuze's principle of multiplicity is appreciated as an aesthetical principle, it bears revelatory consequences. If multiplicities are the atomic units of the aesthetic—each being substantive, unique, and greater than the sum of its members, then the total creative potential of an aesthetic ecosystem far exceeds the number of species within it. In fact, for an ecosystem of sufficient size, the combinatorial possibilities are practically endless, limited only by our imagination's ability to appreciate the aesthetic of each multiplicity. Here, Deleuze's idealization of aesthetics as having abundantly multiple characters inverts Plato's doctrine that the aesthetic has always a single character. In the famous dialog, *Phaedo,* Plato recounted Socrates' teaching thusly—"if there be anything beautiful other than absolute beauty should there be such, that it can be beautiful only in as far as it partakes of absolute beauty"[viii]

The principle of multiplicity is fully complementary with the principle of economy, which can be summarized in the pithy witticism, "kill two birds with one stone." To pose aesthetics in economic terms, it is the goal of an individual who practices the principle of economy to cultivate his aesthetic ecosystem so as to produce the most aesthetic delight per unit of effort invested. If the substances of aesthetic delight are the multiplicities which emerge atop the field of aesthetic goods, then it is most economical to cultivate interests that can be parlayed into multiple aesthetic themes; it also pays to cultivate one's ability to recognize new multiplicities in the existing ecosystem—each affording a new aesthetic interpretation of existing interests.

Focusing on the creative potential of multiplicities is a quintessential poststructuralist insight into aesthetics. The Enlightenment framework would rather have prescribed that interests belong to static sets such as taxonomies and genres, but under that framework, creative potential would be stifled since interests could only afford a fixed canon of interpretations. In contrast, multiplicity states that meaning is never fixed in an interest; an interest is inherently just a cultural material, capable of receiving a multitude of meanings, of satisfying a person in countless unforeseen ways.

The emergence of happiness

The English utilitarian philosopher, Jeremy Bentham, who was a key influence on John Stuart Mill, created a mathematics called the *felicic calculus*[ix] to quantify happiness as a function of factors such as

intensity, duration, certainty, proximity, fecundity, and purity. To insist that happiness can be pinned down to a formula is an extreme position. Happiness is primarily a word and a social concept. That is its primary reality, and from that, we try to see what in our own lives and hopes and dreams manifests our intuition of that word.

The conception of happiness as the fruit of epic life events—like finding a great love, or settling down with a family and kids—has been instilled in us from an early age. Even the morals of childhood fairytales repeat the idea—"and so they lived happily ever after." Later in life we are immersed in romantic narratives from films and novels, which breed the same conception of happiness as the attainment of romantic ends. Even tragic plotlines, like *Romeo and Juliet*'s add to our conception of happiness—that ending was tragic because a great romantic happiness was star-crossed—it wanted to be but was not to be. In light of our epic conceptions of happiness, how can small pleasures expect to measure up?

In his treatise, *Utilitarianism,* John Stuart Mill famously distinguished happiness as being more than mere *contentment*—the state that Mill relegated physical pleasures to. Namely, happiness exceeds wanton hedonism by being moral and intellectual. "Better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied,"[x] Mill wrote. Rites of passage such as career, marriage, and children clearly fit these criteria for happiness. Now we are interested in how small pleasures could also meet these criteria. Can the sum total of the small pleasures in one's life—the incidental interests we pursue and aesthetic goods we consume— transcend the superficial to become a substantial basis for happiness?

It can. Just as epic events satisfy our intellect and morality by engaging the myth of a fruitful human life, so too can an enthusiasm for small pleasures engage the myth of self-actualized individualism by seducing us into the discovery, pursuit, and refinement of ourselves. Is not empowering one's own authentic individuality a deeply moral and noble quest? It is not deeply intellectual to experiment with one's identity and aesthetic becoming?

Happiness can emerge from life's small pleasures, if only, as aesthetic practitioners, we cultivate a responsible ecosystem of interests and possessions, and invest in our own creativity and identity. Beyond being moral and intellectual, we believe in our heart of hearts that true happiness endures and surpasses all tests of time—a criterion that sometimes proves too challenging for those who stake happiness on but a handful of epic life events. Felicitously, robustness is the strong suit of the small when the small is practiced as a wise ecosystem. Finally, true happiness becomes substantial when it not only endures, but in fact, creates and flourishes. True love ripens like a fine wine, and children make their parents prouder by each year. Yet so too can small happiness flourish and multiply if one believes in the unlimited creative potential of aesthetic multiplicities. With the wisdom of a well-

trained imagination, each passing day we will even recognize new beauties in that which is already before us.

Through the lens of multiplicities, we could see that Socrates actually quite enjoyed the aesthetic of dissatisfaction as it reinforced his self-image of one who seeks perfection. And what of 'a fool satisfied'? If his satisfaction be true and ever-lasting, is this fool not a sage?

---

[i] Albert Camus: 1963, "May, 1937" in *Notebooks*, *1935-1942*, New York: Knopf.
[ii] Georg Simmel: 1971, D.N. Levine (Ed.): *On Individuality and Social Forms: Selected Writings,* University of Chicago Press.
[iii] Daniel Gilbert: 2006, *Stumbling on Happiness*, Knopf.
[iv] There are some exceptions to the rule-of-thumb that virgin experiences are more sensuous than over-familiar experiences. Notably, certain esoteric experiences such as the connoisseurship of wines, spirits, and cigars, to name but a few, can become more sensuous with use. Experiences such as these can be heightened after one becomes familiar with the expected range of sensations and has acquired the proper sensuous vocabulary for interpreting those experiences.
[v] Immanuel Kant, who, in his *Critique of Aesthetic Judgment* (1790), insisted that the aesthetic was *a priori* intrinsic to certain objects and their form
[vi] Deleuze and Guattari did not endorse the usage of the term "multiplicities" in singular nominal form, as their philosophical project in *A Thousand Plateaus* sought the overturning of dialectics and the hegemony of One over Many that the Platonists began.
[vii] Deleuze & Guattari: 1987, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, University of Minnesota press
[viii] Plato: 360BCE, *Phaedo* (trans. Benjamin Jowett).
[ix] Jeremy Bentham, 1789/1970, *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*, Clarendon Press.
[x] John Stuart Mill: 1863/1979, chap. 2, *Utilitarianism,* Indianapolis, Indiana, USA: Hackett Publishing Company.