

# **An Unconscious Subject of Deleuze and Guattari<sup>1</sup>**

**Inna Semetsky**

**Centre for Comparative Literature  
and Cultural Studies,  
Monash University  
Wednesday 17 September 2003**

Inna Semetsky tutors in Philosophy and Bioethics at Monash. She completed her doctoral thesis *Continuities, Discontinuities, Interactions: Gilles Deleuze and the Deweyan Legacy* at Columbia University in 2002.

---

<sup>1</sup>This paper is a much abbreviated version of the article entitled “The complexity of individuation” and forthcoming in the *Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies* (Kluwer Publish.).

The philosophical thought of Gilles Deleuze is characterized by his attention to the problem of the Outside. The states of things are, for Deleuze, what he called multiplicities, that is, relational rather than substantial entities. The analysis of multiple relations as a task of philosophy ultimately leads to the creation, invention and construction of novel concepts therefore making a philosopher think the unthinkable. The realm of as yet unthinkable is what constitutes the Outside. This peculiar concept is presented by Deleuze as the dynamic field of forces in action leading to deterritorialization, that is, approaching and traversing its own spatio-temporal boundaries. In psychological terms, such a limit-experience is equivalent, for Deleuze, to *becoming-other* in the process of individuation. “The other in me” (Deleuze 1988a: 98) is ultimately implicated because of the twisted and folded relationship between a rational thought and a non-thought. The latter is unconscious: as inherent in one’s relation to oneself, it belongs not to a preexistent *Ego*, but to “the fractured I of a dissolved Cogito” (Deleuze 1994a: 194).

These fractured pieces of a dissolved Cogito are to be put together. Subjectivity, however, does not presuppose identity but is produced in a process of individuation, which is always already collective or “populated” (Deleuze 1987: 9). As a multiplicity, subjectivity too is a relation! The process of individuation is artistic and creative and may include moments of the metaphorical death of the subject, an event that is to be considered as a condition of possibility of becoming other than the present self. Deleuze introduces his notion of *rhizomatics* as a process of drawing multiple connective lines between conflicting experiences thereby constituting what he calls the plane of immanent consistency. The plane of immanence “does not immediately take effects with concepts” (Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 41): it is pre-rational and a-conceptual, ultimately enabling “the conquest of the unconscious” (Deleuze 1988b: 29) during its own constructive process.

Thinking through affects and percepts brings an element of non-thought into a thought, justifying a seemingly contradictory ability of the aforementioned thinking the unthinkable.

Respectively, one may become able to “to show ...the possibility of the impossible” (Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 60), and “to ‘see borders,’ that is, to show the imperceptible” (Deleuze 1995: 45). The paradoxical thinking of this sort constitutes

“the supreme act of philosophy: not so much to think *the* plane of immanence as to show that it is there, unthought in every plane, and to think it in this way as the outside and inside of thought, as the non-external outside and the non-internal inside – that which cannot be thought and yet must be thought” (Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 59-60).

The dynamic subject’s complex rules of formation are defined by the intensive capacity “to affect and be affected” (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: xvi). The production of subjectivity is based on the autonomy<sup>i</sup> of affect (see Massumi 1996) as if it were a real being. The forceful, as if physical, intensity of an encounter with an affect marks the passage between the experiential states of the body, which is defined by Deleuze, borrowing from Spinoza, as both physical and mental. Accordingly, the body’s power is being changed. Deleuze specifies the body’s power as a capacity to multiply and intensify connections. Conflicting real-life experiences are characterized by their difference; philosophical thinking, then, is conceptualized as the quasi-empirical, practical, mapping of such a difference. By constituting the very content of the movable and moving (*nomadic*, as Deleuze says) concepts, the affective dimension is complemented by percepts: “Percepts aren’t perceptions, they’re packets of sensations and relations that live on independently of whoever experiences them. Affects aren’t feelings, they are becomings that spill over beyond whoever lives through them (thereby becoming someone else)” (Deleuze 1995: 137). The Deleuzian subject, in a process of becoming-other, is open to an interference of those dynamic affective forces.

From the psychological standpoint thinking in affects may be considered tending towards Jungian analytical or depth psychology, which is irreducible to a single master-signified but is based on multiple (sic!) archetypes as symbols of transformation. As such, archetypal psychology agrees in principle with Deleuze and Guattari's anti-Oedipal perspective and their transformational pragmatics described as becoming-other. Jung, defying Freud's reducing the unconscious to just its personal dimension, commented that Freud "was blind toward the paradox and ambiguity of the contents of the unconscious, and did not know that everything which arises out of the unconscious has ... an inside and an outside" (Jung 1963: 153) – quite in accord with the critical thinking of Deleuze.

The power to be affected, which together with the corresponding power to affect constitutes the body's organizational structure, is completely filled, according to Deleuze, by passive and active affections. This means that, even in the absence of actions, passions are present: the passions of mind and body that may manifest in aleatory encounters and diverse assemblages of experiences. The affects, which "traverse [one's universe] like arrows or...like the beam of light that draws a hidden universe out of the shadow" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 66) are immanent, and immanence is understood by Deleuze as being immanent to nothing else than itself.

The Deleuzian level of analysis is "not a question of intellectual understanding ... but of intensity, resonance, musical harmony" (Deleuze 1995: 86). It is guided by the "logic of affects" (Guattari 1995: 9) and as such is different from a rational consensus or solely intellectual reasoning. Its rationale is pragmatic and the thinking it produces, over the background of affects – Jung would've said, feeling-tones – is experimental and experiential. The Deleuzian Outside does not mean rejection of interiority; just the opposite, the outside and the inside, or the deep

layer of the internal world permeated by archetypal forces, exist in a dynamic and differential relationship to each other: “The outside is not a fixed limit but a moving matter animated by ... movements, folds and foldings that together make up an inside: they are not something other than the outside but precisely the inside *of* the outside” (Deleuze 1988a: 97). As we said earlier, Jung too has stressed the significance of the “outside,” non-personal, dimension of the unconscious.

For Jung, affects are aroused by complexes; a complex – also called a splinter psyche by Jung – implies an assemblage of archetypal patterns of behavior and emotions. Complexes, derived from the common archetypal core as well as actual experiences, act similar to Deleuzian pure affects: they are autonomous and “behave like independent beings” (Jung CW 8, 253). Archetype as a theoretical entity is nonetheless not just an idea or concept disguised “under the cloak of rational motivations” (Jung CW 8, 276) solely. It is seen by Jung as a skeletal unknowable pattern, filled in with imagery and motifs that are “mediated to us by the unconscious” (CW 8, 417), the variable contents of which form different archetypal images. Subjective will become subsumed by desire, which reciprocally is itself “subject ... to the interference ... of the autonomy and numinosity of archetypal processes” (Jung 1963: 353).

If philosophy exists in an “essential and positive relation to non-philosophy” (Deleuze 1995: 140), then rational thought alone would not suffice. New means of philosophical expression rather than merely a language of propositions become imperative. Citing Proust “who said that ‘masterpieces are written in a kind of foreign language’” (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 98), Deleuze and Guattari emphasize the potential of such, as if foreign, language to be truly creative. Its mode of expression may be any regime of signs, such as poetry or images, writing or film, music or painting. A new language of expression must be created: a language within

language, which may take either linguistic or extra-linguistic forms, or hybrids like legible images, exemplified in what Deleuze called a performative, or modulating, aspect of language.

Language, as any other philosophical concept, is an intensive multiplicity, that is, language as a system possessing a certain structure. Deleuze would have agreed with Lacan that unconscious too is structured like a language, but he reconceptualizes language to posit it as an *assemblage*, or a system of signs, in which expression and content reciprocally presuppose each other. Acknowledging Lacan's critique of Jung because of the general hostility of structuralism towards "the methods of the imaginary" (Deleuze 1968 in Stivale 1998: 269), Deleuze – like Jung – nonetheless presents structures as "unconscious, [and] necessarily overlaid by their products or effects" (Deleuze 1968 in Stivale 1998: 270).

The subtle language of the unconscious, in the process of individuation, is to be perceived. Deleuze wants to achieve the means so as to be able "to show the imperceptible" (Deleuze 1995: 45) as we mentioned earlier, that is, become capable of bridging the eternal gap, haunting us since antiquity, between the sensible and the intelligible. The task of what Deleuze and Guattari specified as *transversal communication* is "to bring [the] assemblage of the unconscious to the light of the day, to select the whispering voices, to gather ...secret idioms from which I extract something I call my Self (*Moi*)" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 84). Deleuze affirms that language, in its multiple forms, is the only thing that can properly be said to have structure, "be it an esoteric or even a nonverbal language" (Deleuze 1968 in Stivale 1998: 259), such as pictorial, imaginary, or the language of dreams. For Deleuze, anything can possess a structure insofar as this "thing" maintains a *silent discourse*, such as the language of signs. Signs and symbols indeed constitute the psychological language (see Hillman 1972) by means of

which Jungian archetypes express themselves at the level of human cognitions, emotions, and actions.

For Deleuze, when a distinction between the planes of content and expression becomes blurred, a new property emerges: a highly expressive, even “passionate” (Deleuze 1995: 31) language, in which an utterance, affected by a play of forces, becomes an enunciation. The relationship between the two planes is not of binary opposition but is derived from “an intensive and affective logic of the included middle” (Bosteels 1998: 151), which defines them “by their mutual solidarity, and neither of them can be identified otherwise” (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 45). The Self, defined by Jung as a collective noun, expresses itself via enunciation, which is always already, as Deleuze says, collective, that is plurivocal. We said earlier that to Deleuze subjectivity is collective or populated. Nonetheless, at the ontological level it indicates the univocity of Being, that is, the highest possible affirmation of its dynamical structure. In an almost alchemical vocabulary, Deleuze and Guattari describe this new, as if limit, level as

“a transformation of substances and a dissolution of forms, a passage to the limit or flight from contours in favor of fluid forces, flows, air, light, and matter, such that a body or a word does not end at a precise point. We witness the incorporeal power of that intense matter, the material power of that language. A matter more immediate, more fluid, and more ardent than bodies of words. In continuous variation the relevant distinction is no longer between a form of expression and a form of content but between two inseparable planes in reciprocal presupposition” (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 109).

The incorporeal transformation, described above, empowers subjectivity with the ability to express itself freely and passionately. Individuation, for Deleuze, “has little to do with any subject. It’s to do, rather, with an electric or magnetic field, an individuation taking place through intensities, ...it’s to do with individuated fields, not persons or identities” (Deleuze 1995: 98). Subjectivity of this sort becomes manifest by one’s becoming capable of expressing oneself so as

“to bring something to life, to free life from where it's trapped, to trace lines of flight. The language for doing so [is] something unstable, always heterogeneous, in which style carves differences of potential between which ... a spark can flash and break out of language itself, to make us see and think what was lying in the shadow around the words, things we were hardly aware existed” (Deleuze 1995: 141).

As a marker of such an *in-between*, mediatory, mode of language Deleuze uses his brilliant metaphor of stuttering. We remember that the problem of the Outside is of paramount importance for Deleuze. He asserts the reality of its ontological status and contends that it is on the basis of the reality of the Outside that all existence is produced. The expressive instances of the Outside are equally real: the new form of content manifests itself when being expressed via (metaphorical) stuttering, as though the Outside itself has its own style as a means to communicate, to bring into existence that something, of which we were as yet hardly aware. Intensity is such that it “brings together ... the stutter, the tremolo, or the vibrato and imparts upon words the resonance of the affect under consideration” (Deleuze 1994b: 24).

Stuttering is always creative because the subtle variations of the refrain tend to destabilize language. Deleuze says that it is precisely a “creative stuttering [which] makes language a rhizome” (Deleuze 1994b: 27). The language’s structure is dynamic: it defies a rigid formal syntax but is based instead on “a grammar of disequilibrium” (Deleuze 1994b: 27). By having produced a state of a-signifying rupture, it is stuttering that allows difference to intervene and be repeated thereby ensuring that “the transfer from the form of the expression to the form of the content has been completed” (Deleuze 1994b: 26). The process of individuation may be described by a transfer function the outcome of which is the emergence of new content. The transfer takes place at the limit, by cutting through a vanishing line, a concept derived by Deleuze from art, projective geometry and Poincare's mathematics. Stuttering does appear as a disjunction, in its mode of in-between-ness. It is, however, a paradoxical element: a disjunction,



it nevertheless functions as a conjunction by transforming itself into a positive synthesis leading to the expression of new meanings.

The process of subject-formation, or individuation, depends on the dynamics of unfolding. “Being as fold” (Deleuze 1988a: 110) is more than a simple projection of the interior. Its meaning cannot be reduced to terms of local, even if nuanced, representation, but “is an internalization of the outside. It is not a reproduction of the Same, but a repetition of the Different. It is not the emanation of an ‘I’ but something that places in immanence the always other” (Deleuze 1988a: 98). The complex conceptualization of the repetition of the different might seem to be a contradiction in terms if not for the epistemic role of the unconscious that exists over and above – indeed, *outside* – the intentional, phenomenological consciousness or the ego-consciousness of psychoanalysis. Philosophy, for Deleuze, needs an intense non-philosophical understanding. This happens when thought enters “an echo chamber, a feedback loop” (Deleuze 1995: 139) that filters it, and filters it again and again in a process of subtle reflexive am-pli-fications (*le pli* in French means the fold). During each of the iterations something different is being repeated, until a rational thought forms an assemblage with a non-thought that “guides the creation of concepts” (Deleuze 1995: 148).

The folding of thought in the process of individuation brings forth an element of novelty and presents “life as a work of art” (Deleuze 1995: 94). There is no return to the subject, to the old self, but invention and creation of new possibilities of life by means of going beyond the play of forces. The world is folded and, as such,

“we can endure it, so that everything doesn’t confront us at once. ... ‘Children are born with twenty-two folds. These have to be unfolded. Then a man’s life is complete’<sup>2</sup>. ... It’s

---

<sup>2</sup> Deleuze’s quotation on the twenty-two folds is from *The Space Within*, by Henri Michaux, in *The New Directions Series*, printed in France by Henri Marchand & Company. Michaux’s book was first published by Gallimard in Paris in 1944 under the title “L’Espace du Dedans” and then appeared in English as Selected Writings: the space within (translated, with an introduction by Richard Ellmann).

not enough for force to be exerted on other forces or to suffer the effects of other forces, it has to be exerted upon itself too. ... There's no subject, but a production of subjectivity: subjectivity has to be produced, when its time arrives. ... The time comes once we've worked through knowledge and power; it's that work that forces us to frame a new question, it couldn't have been framed before" (Deleuze 1995: 112-114).

The auto-referential exertion of force upon itself not only leads to a production of subjectivity but also ensures its emergence at the new, higher, level. What is *implicated* in a fold is not only *explicated* but also, in a process of becoming-other, involves *complication*, that is, a new level of organization in a complex system. At this level there is neither a room for the old set of beliefs and values, nor eternal ones are stored there. Deleuzian critical thought

"always speaks of values that are to come. ... [T]he artist and philosopher do not conjure things out of thin air, even if their conceptions and productions appear as utterly fantastical. Their compositions are only possible because they are able to connect, to tap into the virtual and immanent processes of machinic becoming (there are no points on the map, only lines), even if such a connection and tapping into are the most difficult things to lay hold of and demonstrate. ... One can only seek to show the power, the affectivity, the ... alienated character of thought. One ... is drawn to the land of the always near-future, ... readings the signs, ... and decoding the secrets of intelligent alien life within and without us" (Ansell Pearson 1997: 4).

The aforementioned tapping into the virtual means a possibility for it becoming-actual. The presence of transversal connective link characterizes Deleuze's method of transcendental empiricism. This philosophical method is empirical by virtue of the object of inquiry regarded as real, albeit sub-representative, experience. Yet, it is transcendental because the very foundations for the empirical principles are left *outside* the common faculties of perception. Deleuze purports to *show* the yet imperceptible by laying down a (visible) map of (invisible) territory or, in other words, creating a mediatory space between discursive and non-discursive formations. The very "interstice ... between seeing and speaking" (Deleuze 1988a: 87) is the place where thinking occurs.

The transversal, as if intuitive, connection makes Deleuze's method "patterned after Bergson's intuition" (Boundas 1996: 87). Intuition enables the reading of signs and symbols that might appear, e.g., during Jungian method of active imagination in analysis, which may be considered to be a kind of nomadic thinking. As "the presentation of unconscious, [and] not the representation of consciousness" (Deleuze 1994a: 192), intuition leads to laying out the plane of immanence aiming "to bring into being that which does not yet exist" (Deleuze 1994a: 147). An artist and philosopher – as well as an analyst, interpreting internalized archetypal images as contents immanent in the collective unconscious, or objective psyche, postulated by Jung – become capable of traversing a "fundamental distinction between subrepresentative, unconscious and aconceptual ideas/intensities and the conscious conceptual representation of common sense" (Bogue 1989: 59). Because "symbols act as *transformers*, their function being to convert libido from a 'lower' into a 'higher' form" (Jung CW 5, 344), their apprehension contributes to the individuation of the self – in accord with Deleuze's considering transformation, or change in nature, to be a precondition for subject-formation.

A play of affects may reach "a point of excess and unloosening" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 134). At this crucial turning point there are two options: a subject must "either annihilate itself in a black hole or change planes. Destratify, open up to a new function, a *diagrammatic* function" (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 134), such a diagram, or a map, functioning as a transversal. The critical philosophical framework is too narrow: Deleuze posits philosophy as an enterprise both critical and *clinical* (Deleuze 1997) indeed tending towards the level of analysis as deep as analytical psychology. Jung's depth psychology merges with Deleuze and Guattari's rhizomatic, or cartographic, method of drawing lines of connection. Hillman contends: "in Jung's language, psychotherapy achieves its ultimate goal in the wholeness of the conjunction"

(Hillman 1972: 293). As for Deleuze, he, by focusing on the intensive dynamics of individuation, intends to describe the very process of such a complex, disjunctive-conjunctive, synthesis.

Destratification as a praxis of thought involves perpetual dislocations, that is, folding and unfolding, so as to construct a map of the original, *outside*, territory: in other words, to integrate the unconscious into consciousness. For Deleuze, to map means to form a relation between the discursive and the non-discursive. In a semiotic sense, a diagram is a sign whose symbolic function is to establish a mediatory space between the visible and the articulable, between the sensible and the intelligible, and between a form of content and a form of expression. A diagram, at the level of (even if non-verbal) language, and a fold – as constituting the archetypal field at the ontological level – perform the same function of creative synthesis, which is positive yet disjunctive. Both play the role of a differential, a breakthrough, and an operational closure within a system open at large: this closure may be appearing, e.g., in the analytic practice in the guise of awakening or catharsis.

Such a breakthrough establishes what Deleuze calls a line of flight; this line sure enough “upsets being” (Deleuze 1995: 44), yet along this very line “things come to pass and becomings evolve” (1995: 45). A line of flight or becoming, as Deleuze says underlying its mediatory quality, “has only a middle. The middle is not an average; it is fast motion, it is the absolute speed of movement. A becoming is neither one nor two; ...it is the in-between, the border or line of flight or descent running perpendicular to both” (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 293). One is not consciously passing through the line of flight; just the opposite, Deleuze insists that “something [is] passing through you” (Deleuze 1995: 141). Becoming-other is established via “diversity, multiplicity [and] the destruction of identity” (Deleuze 1995: 44). Individuation presupposes breaking out of old habits and into new territories: archetypes as symbols of transformation and

“system[s] of readiness for action” (Jung CW 9.199) are postulated by Jung to serve as a deep ground for habits. Deleuze (1987) describes a conversation between Jung and Freud where Jung points out to Freud the importance of multiple elements constituting a particular context as they appear in the unconscious. Individuation, as always already becoming-other, is bound to collective assemblages: people do not become “without a fascination for the pack, for multiplicity” (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 240), for the entangled lines of flight.

Deleuze stresses the importance of the conjunction “and” as a movable borderline. He even intensifies “and” as though stuttering: “and...and...and” (Deleuze 1995: 44). Multiplicity is created by difference and repetition; each “and” every time acts as a distributed marker of a new breakthrough, “a new threshold, a new direction of the zigzagging line, a new course for the border” (1995: 45), because of the play of archetypal forces during the process of individuation. The transfer to the ultimate archetype of the Self was called by Jung the transcendent function and was described as the process arising from the middle (sic!) of ego-position by virtue of the

“existence of the mediatory product [which] actually strengthens the ego. ... The ego...[gives way for] a mediatory symbol [to]come through ... The symbol presents a way of moving from ‘either-or’ to ‘and’ by going beyond the limitations of logical discourse or commonsense... The experience of ‘and-ness’ is central to psychological change” (Samuels 1986/1994: 59).

A mediatory, in-between, symbol, or a diagram, constitutes the core of Deleuze and Guattari’s cartographic approach. Cartography, as a method of mapping, permits the reconceptualization of the unconscious. The unconscious is enactive, itself plurality or multiplicity that does not belong to the scope of traditional psychoanalytic thought. It cannot be reduced to psychoanalytic drives or instincts as well as “playing around all the time with mummy and daddy” (Deleuze 1995: 144). Over and above the personal unconscious, it always deals with some collective frame and is “a productive machine, ...at once social and desiring”

(Deleuze 1995: 144). Unconscious formations are to be brought into play because an individual is a desiring, rather than solely rational, being: the “family drama depends ...on the unconscious social investments” (Deleuze 1995: 20), which may manifest themselves during, as Deleuze says, *delire*, such as perhaps dream interpretation in Jungian analysis.

Such conceptualization of the unconscious indeed makes it *the collective unconscious*, in Jungian definition, and includes the dimension of depth. For Deleuze, an unconscious of thought is profound because unknown. In this respect, archetypal structures of the field of collective unconscious – in other words, traces of collective memory that include Deleuze’s *deterritorialized* traits of content and expression as this field’s subtle and almost imperceptible “language” – seem conceptually analogous to “the objects of an aleatory outside [that] impress themselves in the form of ‘ideas’ upon the body, which infolds the effects of those objects in the forms of thoughts” (Wolfe 1998: 120.1).

Deleuze’s pragmatic (see Semetsky 2003) and future-oriented epistemology is oriented towards the creation of concepts “for unknown lands” (Deleuze 1995: 103), as well as meanings and values “that are yet to come” (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 5). Similarly, Jung’s synthetic method implies the emergence of new meanings as carrying the utmost significance thereby reflecting the future-oriented path to knowledge. According to Jung, archetypes do hold “some sort of foreknowledge” (Samuels 1986/1994: 33). Jung emphasized the prospective function of the unconscious or what Deleuze, following Bergson, called the memory of the future. The synthetic, and not solely analytic, approach indeed amplifies traditional psychoanalysis, which was considered reductive by Jung and Deleuze alike because of its sole orientation to the past marked by Oedipal conflict.

*Typos*, as the composite of the “archetype”, means imprint, stamp or pattern. Archetypes as dynamic patterns of the process-structure of the psyche are unconscious and exist, according to Jung, only *in potentia*; they are beckoned forth by circumstances and, despite their *a priori* status, they are, as part of experiential field, categories of possible functioning only. For Deleuze, the objects that take the form of *ideas* may exist, or rather subsist, in the preconscious, out of awareness, state of virtual potentialities or tendencies. The realm of the virtual is reminiscent of, but not limited to, the Jungian archetype of the Shadow (or, at the level of language, as Deleuze put it, the shadow around the words). Still, it can be actualized, or brought into consciousness as a thought-form, that is, *reterritorialized* during the process of individuation or, in Deleuzian words, becoming-other. While not all virtualities may become actualized in the present, they are nevertheless real conforming Jung’s pointing out the objective character of the collective psyche. Those activated archetypal forces “seized *in actu*, liberated from substances that function as their support and vehicle, do seem better candidates for a diagrammatic mapping out of becoming” (Boundas 1994: 105).

The process of actualization of objects/events subsisting in the virtual field depends on information being active and producing a difference. Deleuze’s concept of difference is not only an index of diverse and conflicting experiences in the phenomenal world. For Deleuze, difference “is the noumenon closest to phenomenon” (Deleuze 1994a: 222), that is, by virtue of its own ontological status it is difference that can *make a difference* in the world of human experiences. In-formation, when differentiated, leads to trans-formation:

“In order for the virtual to become the actual, it must *create* its own terms of actualization. The *difference* between the virtual and the actual is what requires that the process of actualization be a *creation*. ... The actualization of the virtual ... presents a dynamic multiplicity in which the process of differentiation creates the original arrangement or coherence of actual being: This is the multiplicity of organization” (Hardt 1993: 18).

The collective unconscious, inhabited by virtual archetypes, indeed appears in this interpretation to assume the quality of the Deleuzian “Outside, more distant than any exterior, [which] is ‘twisted’, ‘folded’, and ‘doubled’ by an Inside that is deeper than any interior, and alone creates the possibility of the derived relation between the interior and exterior” (Deleuze 1988a: 110). The unconscious as *collective* entails the insufficiency for subjectivity to be interpreted just in terms of a single identity of an intentional speaking subject. The unconscious, as yet a-  
conceptual part of the plane of immanence is always productive and constructive, making “self” and “subjectivity” transient and unstable notions. According to Deleuze, the conscious and rational “intentionality of being is surpassed by the fold of Being, Being as fold” (1988a: 110). In this respect, the unconscious perceptions are implicated as minute-, or micro-perceptions (Deleuze 1993); as such, they become part of the cartographic microanalysis of establishing “an unconscious psychic mechanism that engenders the perceived in consciousness” (Deleuze 1993: 95).

The twenty-two, implicated in subjectivity folds that, as Deleuze has reminded us, need to be unfolded in a course of one’s life, correspond to the number of archetypes encountered during one’s archetypal journey (Nichols 1980), that is, during the very process of individuation. The unfolding of archetypal dynamics is strongly non-linear. It is not the infamously stratified royal road but the smooth space of the less travelled detours and zigzagging, “rough and uncommonly devious footpaths” (Jung CW 8, 210), the lines of flight of fools (see Semetsky 2001), vagabonds, and nomads. Coincidentally, Jung uses the same metaphor of a rhizome as Deleuze:

“The life of a man is a dubious experiment. ...Individually, it is so fleeting ...Life has always seemed to me like a plant that lives on its rhizome. Its true life is invisible, hidden



in the rhizome. The part that appears above ground lasts only a single summer. Then it withers away – an ephemeral apparition. ... Yet I have never lost a sense of something that lives and endures underneath the eternal flux. What we see is the blossom, which passes. The rhizome remains” (Jung 1963: 4).

This true, vitalistic and enduring, albeit invisible, life is “*a life*” defined by Deleuze as a transcendental field (Deleuze 2001), the many encounters with which bring forth events and signs that, from the Jungian perspective, constitute the archetypal symbolism of the field of collective unconscious. Archetypal images are laid out on the “plane of immanent consistence” (Deleuze and Guattari 1983: 88) thereby mapping out an individual psyche and “suggest[ing] ‘highs’ or periods of depression” (1983: 70) at the emotional, what Deleuze called molecular, level. The plane of immanence, in a process of mapping the transcendental field, needs to be constructed and

“its layout resorts to measures that are not very respectable, rational, or reasonable. These measures belong to the order of dreams, of pathological processes, esoteric experiences, drunkenness, and excess. We head for the horizon, on the plane of immanence, and we return with bloodshot eyes, yet they are the eyes of the mind” (Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 41).

The order of dreams, as in Jungian analysis, makes it possible to integrate the unconscious into the conscious mind. For Deleuze and Jung alike, a method of analytical inquiry originates in the middle of real, often conflicting and baffling, human experiences. As an immanent process, individuation may be mapped via the transcendental field. Each person has “[his/her] geography, ...cartography, ...diagram. What’s interesting ...in a person, are the lines that make them up, or they make up, or take, or create. A ‘map’, or ...a ‘diagram’ is a set of various intersecting lines” (Deleuze 1995: 33). The cartographic method of mapping multiple rhizomatic lines enables a construction of the planes, as Deleuze says, representing a possible

future development of the actual “territory” as such. Cartography becomes a means of modelling archetypal human behaviors, feelings, and thoughts.

Such “topological and specifically cartographic” (Bosteels 1998: 146) being cannot but express itself by means of spatial, topological metaphors as a locus of situations and events. Subjective voice is more than personal: by being embedded in an indirect discourse it becomes collective, or “plurivocal” (Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 188). Furthermore, since free indirect discourse is considered by Deleuze to be “an essential component of the perception image ...[and]...of thought and art in general” (Marks 1998: 155), it might as well be the non-discursive, that is, extra-linguistic, formation of the field of collective unconscious expressed through the archetypal, that is, objective according to Jung, language of signs, symbols, and images. In this respect, an intentional speaking subject is a false notion for both Deleuze and Jung: “it is not the personal human being who is making the statement, but the archetype speaking through him” (Jung 1963: 352).

Deleuze stresses the a-personal nature of this specific expressive language by describing it as the fourth person singular, that is, collective yet univocal. The process of constructing the Self, as the ultimate Jungian archetype of wholeness, engenders itself through multiple rhizomatic connections mapping both “the psychic and the social” (Bosteels 1998: 150). In analysis, a process of internalizing experience, which at the unconscious level is always already folded, is referred to by Jung as interjection, versus projection, and is part and parcel of Deleuze’s method of transcendental empiricism and traversing the Outside. While the Outside itself maintains “its ontological priority” (Boundas 1994: 114), cartography as a mode of diagrammatic “thinking” creates a visual notation for the archetypal ideas as a space of possibilities, something yet to come. The cartographic map serves as a pragmatic tool to “read,

find, [and] retrieve the structures” (Deleuze 1968 in Stivale 1998: 270; Deleuze’s italics) of the Jungian collective unconscious. In psychological terms, a diagram represents a self-referential, albeit indirect, projection of that what is being, or will have been, interjected. Individuation cannot proceed without a means to express itself, and now and then, we repeat, a spark can flash so as to make us see things “we were hardly aware existed” (Deleuze 1995: 141), but that were nonetheless secretively hiding somewhere in the assemblages of the unconscious.

### References

Ansell-Pearson, Keith (1997). “Deleuze Outside/Outside Deleuze.” In Deleuze and Philosophy: The Difference Engineer. Keith Ansell-Pearson, Ed, London: Routledge, 1-22.

Bogue, Ronald (1989). Deleuze and Guattari. London and New York: Routledge.

Bosteels, Bruno (1998). “From Text to Territory, *Felix Guattari’s Cartographies of the Unconscious*”. In Deleuze and Guattari: New Mappings in Politics, Philosophy, and Culture. Eleanor Kaufman and Kevin J. Heller, Eds. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 145-174.

Boundas, Constantin V. (1994). “Deleuze: Serialization and Subject-Formation”. In Gilles Deleuze and the Theater of Philosophy, Constantin V. Boundas and Dorothea Olkowski, Eds., London: Routledge, 99-116.

Boundas, Constantin V. (1996). “Deleuze-Bergson: The Ontology of the Virtual”. In Deleuze: A Critical Reader, Paul Patton, Ed., Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 81-106.

Deleuze, Gilles (with Claire Parnet) (1987). Dialogues, trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. New York: Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, Gilles (1988a). Foucault, trans. Sean Hand. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, Gilles (1988b). Spinoza: Practical Philosophy, trans. R. Hurly. San Francisco: City Lights Books.

Deleuze, Gilles (1993). The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque, trans. Tom Conley. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, Gilles (1994a). Difference and Repetition, trans. Paul Patton. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Deleuze, Gilles (1994b). "He stuttered". In Gilles Deleuze and the Theater of Philosophy, Constantin V. Boundas & D. Olkowski, Eds. London: Routledge, 23-33.
- Deleuze, Gilles (1995). Negotiations 1972-1990, trans. Martin Joughin. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles (1997). Essays Critical and Clinical, trans. Daniel W. Smith and M. Greco. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles (2001). Pure Immanence: Essays on A Life, trans. Anne Boyman. New York: Zone Books.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari (1983). On the Line, trans. John Johnston. New York: Semiotext(e).
- Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari (1987). A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia, trans. Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari (1994). What is Philosophy?, trans. Hugh Tomlinson and G. Burchell. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Guattari, Felix (1995). Chaosmosis: an ethico-aesthetic paradigm, trans. Paul Bains and J. Pefanis. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Jung, Carl Gustav (1953-1979). Collected Works, trans. R. Hull, H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler, and Wm. McGuire, Eds., Princeton University Press.
- Jung, Carl Gustav (1963). Memories, Dreams, Reflections, trans. R. & C. Winston. A. Jaffe, Ed., New York: Pantheon Books.
- Hardt, Michael (1993). Gilles Deleuze: An Apprenticeship in Philosophy. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hillman, James (1972). The Myth of Analysis: Three Essays in Archetypal Psychology. New York: Harper Colophon Books/Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Massumi, Brian (1996). "The Autonomy of Affect", in Deleuze: A Critical Reader, Paul Patton, Ed., Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 217-239.
- Marks, John (1998). Gilles Deleuze: Vitalism and Multiplicity. London: Pluto Press.
- Samuels, Andrew (1986/1994). Jung and the Post-Jungians. London: Routledge.
- Semetsky, Inna (2001), "The Adventures of a Postmodern Fool, or the Semiotics of Learning", in Trickster and Ambivalence: The Dance of Differentiation, ed. by C. W. Spinks. Madison, WI: Atwood Publishing, 57-70.

Semetsky, Inna (2003). "The Problematics of Human Subjectivity: Gilles Deleuze and the Deweyan Legacy", *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, Vol. 22, 211-225.

Wolfe, Cary (1998). Critical Environments: Postmodern Theory and the Pragmatics of the "Outside", *Theory Out of Bounds*, Vol.13. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

---