GILLES DELEUZE AND THE POWERS OF ART

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty of

the Department of Philosophy

Villanova University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements of the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Philosophy

by

Joshua Alan Ramey

July, 2006

Under the Direction of

John Carvalho

For Janet, who showed me signs.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to thank the members of my committee.

The elegance and sophistication of my director, John Carvalho, has been the charm of my years in graduate school. Without his humor, his pragmatism, and our shared passion for music, I would never have glimpsed the end of this road. I cannot express how grateful I am for his attention, compassion, and profound dedication to helping me find my own voice. His graduate seminars on topics ranging from Socrates to psychoanalysis, Aristotle to Deleuze, contemporary music to critical theory after 9/11 were the beacons of my intellectual voyage at Villanova. Dr. Carvalho's appreciation for the arts of healing and the healing of art, his bureaucratic savvy, and his profound understanding of both ancient and modern paradigms in philosophy drew me into a life-long quest.

Dr. Walter Brogan's hospitality and collegial demeanor was responsible for my attraction to Villanova in the first place. His enthusiasm for my work and his deeply insightful seminars on Nietzsche and ancient philosophy are resources on which I have continuously drawn. I cannot thank him enough for the way he helped me form a bridge between earlier and present phases of my own thought, and for how he has made me feel a part of the continental philosophy community.

My downtown meetings with Dr. Julie Klein at Café Lutece were tasty ways of continuing the work of her inspiring Spinoza seminar. Dr. Klein's sophisticated approach to late medieval and early modern thought encouraged my own research in many, many ways. This project could not have materialized without her support and her confidence in my abilities.

John Milbank's incisive appraisals of the hermetic traditions in Western thought has been a source of constant inspiration to me, ever since I first came across his work in print. I have been deeply challenged by the boldness of his vision, and I am very grateful for his willingness to be part of this committee, and for his support of my research.

For years before any of these phrases began to take shape, before the paragraphs and chapters emerged, when even the ideas themselves were barely more than flashes of energy and surges of life, a density of friendships formed (and still form) a life which I am happy to say will never be fully my own possession. My brother, Philip Ramey, has always been and always will be my greatest intellectual sparring partner, and the one with whom I have most deeply shared the pain and ecstasy of why thought matters.

My best friends, most astute colleagues, most intimidating mentors, and the most venomously angelic minds I know are those of my collaborators Paul Haidle, Clark Roth, and Aron Dunlap. My ambition for this thesis, from the start, was that it in some way form a footnote to our odyssey.

The philosophical companionship of Brian Carpenter, Lucio Privatello, Edward Kazarian, Giorgio Agamben, Rocco Gangle, Creston Davis, Jessica Elkyam, Adriel Trott, Ray Brassier, and James Wetzel has constantly reminded me of the collective nature of this seemingly individual work.

The artists and sages of the sweet city of Philadelphia, a town that has supported me in ways too subtle and too powerful to say, have included Rick, Barbara, and Francis Alton, Anne de Quillettes, Elizabeth Haidle, Loren Johnson, Aaron Straight, Jesse Ketteridge, James Sugg, Victor Fiorillo, Lee Etzold, Dito van Reigersberg, David Brick, Maggie Sift, Hilary Dick, Lorin Lyle, Bill Reil, Jeb Kreager, Jim Sutcliffe, Mike Kiley,

Nicole Canuso, Matt Saunders, Christie Lee, Olase Freeman, Jillian Bird, Nora Johnson, Leslie Delauter, Bob Ennis, Jack Norris, Emily and Ivy Ramey, Elizabeth Doering, Jeb Lewis, Mike Hood, Lou Fuiano, and the untamed alley cats of South Camac Street.

Without the generosity and constant attention of my parents, John Calvin and Michelle Joy Ramey, I would not have had the strength to finish this project.

My companion and in every way my match, Emmanuelle Delpech-Ramey gave me the space, the time, and the experience required to bring this work to fruition. May it only be one branch on our vine of life, work, and love.

July 15, 2006
Nerac

Abstract

"Gilles Deleuze and the Powers of Art" is a preliminary investigation into how certain key notions of French philosopher and aesthetician Gilles Deleuze (1925-1995) may be defined more richly they have been so far. Against either overly idealist or overly reductivist accounts of the simulacral, singularity, difference, immanence, univocity, signification, and life in terms of which Deleuze is usually understood, the thesis attempts to emphasize the performative, pragmatic, and transformative dimensions of these terms against their presumably ontological referents. By reading Deleuze as a reader of art, and by rendering his notion of art in terms of a peculiar power to generate *worlds*, this dissertation argues that artistic inspiration for a "constructivism" in philosophy links Deleuze to a Renaissance tradition of neoplatonic speculation that saw poetic and magical acts as being co-incipient and co-terminus. This thesis is argued for through a reading of Deleuze on the powers of certain modern art forms and on the way in which the practices of certain artists model a form of *thought* that is immediately the genesis of new forms of life. Deleuze's philosophizing on behalf of such a life is defended in the face of recent criticisms by Slavoj Zizek and Alain Badiou, as well as earlier critics such as Rene Girard. The importance of connecting Deleuze's notion of creation to earlier Renaissance and magical notions of *poiesis* becomes clearer against the backdrop of current debates about which materialism is necessary to overcome the anti-materialism of capitalism in contemporary life. While Deleuze's philosophy is proposed as offering new futures for our times, it is also taken as a proposal for further work—work beyond Deleuze's own—in the elaboration of a complex notion of materiality that would exceed the modern (and postmodern) opposition of the magical to the real. This project is outlined but not comprehensively accomplished here.

List of Abbreviations

Works by Gilles Deleuze (with Felix Guattari*)

(AO) *Anti-Oedipus**
(ATP) *A Thousand Plateaus**
(ES) *Empiricism and Subjectivity*
(C1) *Cinema I: The Movement-Image*
(C2) *Cinema II: The Time-Image*
(CC) *Essays Critical and Clinical*
(D) *Dialogues*
(DI) *Desert Islands and Other Texts (1953-1974)*
(DR) *Difference and Repetition*
(FB) *Francis Bacon and the Logic of Sensation*
(LS) *The Logic of Sense*
(F) *The Fold*
(NP) *Nietzsche and Philosophy*
(PI) *Pure Immanence: A Life*
(PS) *Proust and Signs*
(WIP) *What is Philosophy?**

Works by Giordano Bruno

(CPU) *Cause, Principle, and Unity*
(HF) *Heroic Frenzies*

Work by Alain Badiou

(TR) *Theoretical Writings*

Work by Jose Gil

(MB) *Metamorphoses of the Body*

Work by Jacques Derrida

(WD) *Writing and Difference*

Work by Bruno Latour

(M) *We Have Never Been Modern*

Work by Slavoj Zizek

(OwB) *Organs Without Bodies*

Introduction: The Aesthetic Paradigm

At least since Plato, philosophy has maintained an ambivalent relationship with the arts. Plato's Socrates claims, however, that his critiques of poetry and artistic device are not peculiar to him, but issue from an ancient war between philosophy and poetry, a perpetual antagonism between *logos* and *poiesis*. Socrates makes several different complaints against poetry in Plato's dialogues, but his criticisms can be crystallized in the complaint that poetry is essentially *indifferent to truth*. Truth for Socrates is always an endeavor to present the way things most deeply and truly *are*, beyond all appearances. Insofar as what makes art compelling is its appearances *per se* and not the presentation of an ideal essence existing beyond all appearance, for Socrates art fails to present the Forms (*eidei*) of reality: those essences only ever partially realized in the appearances of a changing world. What captivates our attention in art, for Socrates, is precisely what distracts us from the truth.

Socrates' discourse can be in some sense defined as anti-poetry. His method of questioning himself and others about the nature of things—his famous search for definitions of justice, courage, moderation, etc.—is diametrically opposed to that of the rhetor or the rhapsode, who entrusts her truth to the persuasive force of the images of reality she is able to conjure through her art. The philosopher, on the other hand, is ready to submit her image of reality to constant cross-examination. At stake in this battle are the merits of two different forms of discourse: one which perpetually seeks truth beyond appearance, image, and imagination, and another which proposes a truth of (or within) appearances, themselves.

In ontological terms, because for Socrates the fundamental elements of reality are given only in the ideal forms, the poet or rhetor can present only abstract shards of true being. Poetry presents only the more or less incomplete ways in which the empirical flux of time, space, and historical circumstance is more or less participating in the ideal reality of the Forms. Poetry is thus "twice removed" from reality: as an imitation of actually existent people, places, and things, what poetry presents is already a mere copy of an ideal Form. The "lie" of poetry, for Socrates, is that it attempts to pass off one or several combinations of these shards or shadows of the ideas as a true description of reality. For Socrates, we are persuaded of art's truth based only on the power of those shadows over our sensibility and imagination (aspects of mind that are locked into the illusions of the empirical flux) and not by any purchase art might have on what is most truly real.

In his early and important study of the work of Marcel Proust, French aesthetician and philosopher Gilles Deleuze claims, contrary to Socrates, that artistic style has the power to access the most fundamental elements of experience. In Deleuze's view, artistic style renders the essence of things in a way that not only has a legitimate purchase on reality, but in fact embodies a method and a structure that can be paradigmatic for philosophy itself. Deleuze describes the power of art to present essence in the following way:

> As the quality of a world, essence is never to be confused with an object but on the contrary brings together two quite different objects, concerning which we in fact perceive that they have this quality in the revealing medium. At the same time that essence is incarnated in a substance, the ultimate quality constituting it is therefore expressed as the *quality common* to two different objects, kneaded in this luminous substance, plunged into this refracting medium. It is in this that style consists . . . style is essentially metaphor. But metaphor is essentially metamorphosis and indicates how the two objects exchange their determinations, exchange even the names that designate them, in the new medium that

> confers the common quality upon them . . . This is because style, in order to spiritualize essence, reproduces the unstable opposition, the original complication, the struggle and exchange of the primordial elements that constitute essence itself. (PS 48)

Art's power, for Deleuze, is that it is able to establish a relationship between at least two different objects such that, in a way that would be otherwise impossible, artistic style expresses qualities common to disparate things—a set of essences divided among, or "complicated" in objects that only style can reveal. Deleuze's claim is not so much that the essence of art is metaphor, but that the essence of metaphor (this is that) is transformation or metamorphosis (one becomes another). If metaphor reveals a "struggle and exchange" of qualities beneath the level of identifiable objects (quantities and qualities), art as metaphor "spiritualizes" that struggle in the peculiar "refracting medium" of an artistic style. This new medium both *confers* an essence on disparate objects and *reveals* that primitive struggle or "unstable opposition" in which the essence consists. Essence for Deleuze, therefore, is not an immutable Platonic ideal form, but is rather a dynamic interrelationship among objects. Essence is therefore never simply given, either to empirical or mathematical intuition. It is rather refracted or *evoked* in a style that radically transforms that which is apparently given.

Deleuze's thesis, in part, is that art is able to combine and change elements that appear to be otherwise mutually exclusive and untransformable. However, if art only *metaphorically* enables objects to exchange determinations, and only reveals essence as an "effect" of its operations, does this mean that the essences art invokes are "unreal" or are somehow less real than, say, what causes a chemical reaction or a tectonic plate shift? Is the power of art ultimately the power of illusion, or is the metamorphosis of things in art as real as the mitosis of cells?

Style matters, or brings its own substance into being, because for Deleuze the essence of a thing is not given until it is *repeated*. Only as *repeated* do constitutive elements appear. And when appearing in repetition, in *series*, elements appear not so much as what they are as what they may *become*. Deleuze's philosophy is thus a platonism of essences *in becoming*, where the idea of a thing is not given in advance of an event which transforms that idea in a differentiating repetition. In short, for Deleuze, becoming is both ontologically and logically prior to being, and what for Plato were immutable forms of experience are for Deleuze historically emergent dynamics or elemental powers in a constant state of redefinition.

Because the truth of art is the truth of a world whose substance is found through experimentation, transmutation, and metamorphosis, art gives us an entrée to the dynamics of things as they are in *becoming*. For Deleuze, the worlds presented by a work of art are not independent from mind in the sense that, say, natural kinds might be thought to be. But neither are the worlds of art merely subjective perspectives which artists or audiences take up at will. Never taken up at random, yet never a mere product of fate, the work of art embodies the paradox of a forced choice, an experiment with destiny. This is why, for Deleuze, artistic creation offers a deep if somewhat paradoxical thought of the real, or of what he calls a "strange complicity between mind and matter."

In this thesis, "Gilles Deleuze and the Powers of Art," I explicate Deleuze's diverse philosophical enterprise in terms of his attempt to use this artistic model or aesthetic paradigm for the construction of a conceptual pluralism in philosophy. Across Deleuze's *oeuvre*, I trace how art illuminates the possibility of a new kind of thought, a

thought not of the identities proper to being but the transformations possible for a world in becoming.[1]

Platonism Reversed

Seeing this possibility for thought hinges on properly appreciating Deleuze's notion that being is inherently *expressive*, and that this sense of expression or creativity *not only* cuts across or "deconstructs" dualisms between subject and object, essence and accident, form and content (which it does), *but also* implies a creative role for mind in relationship to reality, a relationship whereby knowledge of what is most real is available only in an event of transformation. On my reading, Deleuze's metaphysics of becoming is the *result* of an analysis of how superpersonal (and subindividual) events *can be construed as creative acts*, and how the singular nature of things becomes available in certain extraordinary signs and figures that clue us in not to the nature of a substance, but to the nature of *expression*. Deleuze is thinking in a space where willed action and natural causation cannot be distinguished any longer, where the Kantian antinomy between natural causation and subjective freedom does not apply. Whether finally nature or culture "is" expressive, whether being "is" expressive, is simply the wrong place to start. The much more subtle and vital question, for Deleuze, is under what conditions of real experience experimentation makes possible more joy, love, and life than would be otherwise available.

In other words, Deleuze's ideas are ultimately subject to a pragmatic or practical test of whether or not they actually *play a role* in the experiences which give rise to them.

The *evaluation* of knowledge in Deleuze is at one with its enacted *performance*. Despite the revival, at least since the German Romantics, of interest in occult or hermetic forms of knowing—a revival that carried on through psychoanalytical interest in alchemy, structuralist interest in gifts and potlatch, all the way up to Barthes and Baudrillard's "occultisms" of the sign—neither modern nor postmodern epistemologies have gone as far as Deleuze toward articulating the conditions under which truly transformative knowledge actually occurs.

Therefore the critiques of Deleuze recently levied by Alain Badiou and Slavoj Zizek are most pressing, since they claim that Deleuze's philosophy fails a practical test: it does not recommend or inspire, these critics argue, the *kind* of changes that are most necessary for life as we know it under the pressures of late capitalist ideology. It is by connecting Deleuze's vision with that of certain Renaissance thinkers, philosophers who were investigating the possibility of a magical rapport between mind and its concerns, that I propose his thought has its most genuinely creative connections with the problems of contemporary life, since it is precisely the concern of the philosophy of magical activity to give an account of the real conditions necessary for the ritual generation of those effects we most need and desire for life.

Connecting Deleuze to the Renaissance helps clarify a persistent difficulty: how to explain Deleuze's idea that the experience of certain forms of art transforms the world. Deleuze insists that certain forms of art (which are allied with certain forms of philosophy and science) render the true (if hidden) dynamics of the world. In a way, Deleuze's philosophy could be called *occult*, but only in the true sense of this word, which means not obscure but *hidden*.[2] It is not a matter of intuiting the invisible (as it

might have been for, say a thinker like Merleau-Ponty), but of seeing the visibility of the *imperceptible*. This is an uncomfortable proposition for most post-Kantian thinkers, who have denied the kind of "intuition" of the "nature" of things that Deleuze seems to be working with. In fact, the biggest complaint of Deleuze's contemporaries seems to be about his "vitalism," his claim to speak in the name of life (even if that life is understood as inorganic, unrepresentable set of intensive features that cannot be reduced to observable mechanisms and behaviors). The bold claim of Deleuze's philosophy is that life is artful, and that only when we begin to understand the structure of art do we glimpse the forms of the power of life.

However, this investigation cannot be undertaken as pure reflection or interpretation: access to how things transform, devolve and resolve themselves, is available only under the conditions of *experimentation*. The vital truth of life is found only when certain regimes of signs are *invented*. As Vico might have put it, the true is the made. Or as Deleuze himself puts it, there is an intellectual path beyond the contrast of reflective insight and active enactment. As he puts it early on in his career, "it's possible that the actual idea of interpretation goes beyond the dialectical opposition between 'knowing' and 'transforming' the world" (DI 129). In what follows I show how it is to art that Deleuze looks for the model of a form of interpretation which would be at once both critique and creation.

Creative Encounters

Because he envisions nature as much as art as an open or incomplete set of multiplicities (and not as a set of static objectivities), Deleuze sees in the generative and

transformative power of certain art forms not only the origin of artistic experience, but of experience, generally. Certain dimensions of certain forms of art (literature, cinema, painting, and music especially) give us a true sense of how worlds are constituted, but again, this is not a truth available to "common sense," which is always interested in clarifying that which is productive as *indiscernible*, that which is at the porous borders of a multiplicity, a becoming. To see these borders and limits, to see lines which are neither contours nor outlines, but vectors, forces, and machines requires the intuition of an anorganic and "intensive" process of creation that is tertiary to both "nature" and "culture."

Deleuze's project is realist in the sense that he affirms that through certain practices mind has actual contact with the genetic and constitutive processes of being. Such a realism, however, is not one that comes by way of a reflection upon what is "given" in experience. For Deleuze, insight comes by way of a *forced provocation*, a being forced to think, the most authentic result of which is a great work of art (although experimental science also has its own version of this Acteon's quest where, like Acteon falling to the Diana he seeks, hunter becomes the hunted).[3]

What Deleuze thinks we invent in genuine concepts are uncanny, paradoxical, and complicated parameters of the real. But again, rather than simply asserting a new dogma of *complicatio*, asserting that the world of co-existent contraries is the new foundation of judgment, what Deleuze's concepts embody is not the identity but the *difference* complication makes, and the *creative process* under which complication is *encountered*. What are the intense conditions under which we contact the genetic features of life? What can force us to think, beyond our habits, our memories, and our stupidities, which

have been so often enshrined in philosophical concepts? For Deleuze, these two questions, one addressing the real conditions of genesis and one addressing the genesis of thought itself, are one and the same burning issue.

For Deleuze, the philosopher, like the artist or the scientist, must first be moved into an extraordinary perspective in order to begin to think. But this perspective is not something one can take up and put down at will. Perspective for Deleuze is a monadological vector into which we become absorbed. This vector is measured not present moments, but *instants* shorter than countable time and longer than thinkable time. transitional or liminal spaces: becomings, rather than beings.

In the same way that art enables us to see things we would not otherwise see, philosophy at its most authentic is an experience of *vision*. Paradoxically, however, Deleuze thinks that artists are *constrained* to create, they are forced to create because of a traumatic encounter they have with the world. Again, paradoxically, the encounter that provokes art is not the encounter with the world of medium-sized physical objects, the world of habits, memories, and egos. The world of thought is replete with the primordial elements from which the common or public world is made. Genuine thought always involves an encounter with a reality that remains *problematic* with respect to all the ways in which we have "solved" the problems life poses, through the establishment of routine, the force of habit, the consolidation of memory, through the repression of guilt, and the construction of a personal identity.

For Deleuze, creating a world and knowing a world occur in the same fell swoop. There is always this double implication of epistemology and ontology, a discursive action that bespeaks both what there is and how we know what there is at the same time. This is

the paradox of expressivism in philosophy, that the concepts generated in philosophy do not reflect on objects or problems that pre-exist those concepts. The primary goal is not to solve problems but to discover them; to discover new and more interesting and more engaging problems than we thought before existed. That Deleuze sees this as an "immanent" process while Vico and others before (and since) him relate creativity to a certain transcendence may not be the crucial difference. The crucial difference may be between those who would have us bound to a paradigm of knowing that proceeds via cannons of recognizability which confirm the intuitions of common sense, and those who are prepared, and indeed are seeking, the transformation of that very sense deemed important because common.

Challenging Immanence

Deleuze's philosophy is always an ethics in the sense that Spinoza's metaphysical and epistemological treatise is entitled *Ethics*. That is because on this view politics, as much as painting or sculpture, would be subject to a test of creativity—great leaders or great societies would have to be measured in the way we measure art. Does this society enlarge our perspective? Does it give us an entrée to a health and a humor we have not yet experienced beyond our melancholy decadence and tragic negativity? Or does it merely attempt to consolidate what we already recognize as being desirable?

This is what I take to be the situation in which most readers are right now (re)discovering Deleuze: in critical dialogue with the contemporary post-Marxist projects of Slavoj Zizek and Alain Badiou. Deleuze's thought is being questioned in the name of what is circulating as a "return to the universal" in political philosophy, philosophical

theology, and ethics. The gambit of the new universalists is to re-invent and re-marshal the power of axiomatic or non-localizable premises, since—the story usually goes—all particular or local claims (to equality, enfranchisement, recognition, let alone to trustworthiness or to truth) do no more than consolidate the interests of one group or community in a continuing and total, globalized war of all against all (what Baudrillard has recently called "the fourth world war"). In other words, the new universalists are suspicious that the immanent consolidation of difference in any given group or locality constitutes a gain (or is realized) only for the hidden but dominating project of an abstract totality that remains unperturbed. Usually this totality is labeled "global capitalism" but it is also sometimes labeled "modernity" or "liberalism," as well.

Trying to make good on a Marxist/Pauline vision of solidarity, the universalists reject any ontological scheme which figures life as an unregulated flow of immanent differences (in powers, potentials, affectivity, etc.) and figures human groups as more or less territorialized assemblages of these differences. This "viral" notion is rejected in favor of thinking difference as either a kind of undead substratum of the real (Zizek's Lacanian Hegelianism), or a minimal subtraction from the given (Badiou's modernist Platonism). For these views, Deleuzianism is part of an obviously failed postmodern project of thinking from the point of view of abstract particularities.

For Badiou and Zizek, Deleuze's attempt to make singularities, impersonal affects, achronological temporality, and intensive spaces the true objects of thought plays directly into the hands of today's microfascisms of global domination by the powers of international technocracy, since those powers more and more manipulate us on this level. What we need to do, the universalists insist, is reclaim the "indivisible remainder" of the

mathematically singular, undead, or resurrected life, a life that persists by cutting into or subtracting from or transcending the flow of affective life in the name of a greater if more uncanny and less predictable life.

Above all Deleuze's opponents seem to be unconvinced that an immanent and pragmatic approach to problems is the way to go, since the technocratic capitalists investing the lives of our desire are nothing if not great pragmatists. What I will argue here, however, is that Deleuze's ability to identify the nature of microfascism (the mechanisms by which we come to desire our own enslavement to the Other) is at one with a powerful way of articulating how to combat fascism: we can combat it on its own terms. This is what artists do: the proximity of artistry to fascism that the universalists seem to think calls for a retreat is for Deleuze the only means of advance.[4]

Deleuze (and his co-author Felix Guattari) were sometimes suspected of asking us to simply embrace chaos or social disorder—a world of "no more limits"—as if somehow the "nomadic" formations of biker gangs, hippie communes, neo-pagan religions, and other "minor" formations that were taking shape in the 1960's and 70's were somehow the *telos* or goal of this kind of thinking. Even though Deleuze and Guattari wanted to encourage experimental forms of social life, what their thinking means to achieve is not experimentation or experimentalism as the *end* or the goal of philosophy, but rather as a *beginning* that thought can assist in generating. It will have different effects in different times and places relative to the different ossifications with which life is faced.

What Deleuze is always trying to achieve is an opening for results (scientific, artistic, perhaps even magical[5]) other than those that are conceived by the "givens" of a transcendental schema of space, time, and the categories *or* the "givens" of a primordial

life-world/*urdoxa* that would give a natural semiosis or pre-abstractive grammar of meaning. This is partly why those familiar with the thinkers from which Deleuze should be most carefully distinguished—Kant, Hegel, Husserl, Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, Heidegger and Badiou—continually fall against the rock of Deleuze's "vitalism." The general complaint of Kantians, phenomenologist, Heideggerians, and Hegelians is that it seems as if Deleuze presupposes the very (intense, singular, repetitive, auto-differential) vitality of the world that philosophy must prove and not presuppose.

The reason this critique ultimately fails, I argue, is because philosophy is not a purely descriptive science, for Deleuze. It is not an act of reflection, but of *institution*. Deleuze's concepts do not describe things as they are, or as they should be, but *as they can be under certain conditions*. His concepts therefore attempt to be real definitions of things and activities that are actually there for us *only under certain (virtual) conditions*: the conditions of *intensity* and *singularity* that only multiplicities (and not "organizations" or "organisms") harbor.

This is why Deleuze's controversial notion of life is centered on an inorganic, intensive set of forces and not on an organized, extensive set of properties and attributes. In *A Thousand Plateaus*, he describes this set of forces as a plane of immanence or "Body Without Organs," a region or regime of affects and flows of information that *would* be present *if* and *when* organized bodies—personal, collective, animal, mechanical—break open or "deterritorialize," opening their flows of energy and elements onto a "line of flight" (*ligne de fuite*). In the achievements of immanence, this flow simultaneously connects the parts of one assemblage with the parts of other assemblages in ways that would not be available apart from certain movements of restructuration or

"deterritorialization." There are different techniques or "plan(e)s" for adjusting or re-arranging or "re-territorializing" what are given initially as parts of an organism. Some of these techniques are more dangerous than others, some are more healthy than others. But for Deleuze the techniques themselves cannot be judged other than in terms of criteria immanent to their continuous re-creation or repetition, which is ultimately beholden to the matter of expression to which they belong.

Toward a Haptic Form of Thought

This is why Deleuze's ambition for philosophy was that it become "haptic"—that it pass beyond the distinction between reflective concepts and reflected objects in the way that Francis Bacon's paintings contain diagrams that take painting beyond the distinction between the optic and the manual, the hand and the eye. Bacon began all of his paintings with an aleatory or chaotic splash or *trait* around which he then forced or constrained himself to paint. This mark, chaotic and yet not random, when incorporated (if not "incarnated") in the painting as a whole then becomes a diagram for what can appear in a painting constructed around that "error" or wandering or ambulatory trace of life.

When the composition is completed, it culminates in a "pictorial fact" that has nothing to do with the "factual accuracy" or verisimilitude of a painting *nor* with the "formal fact" of an abstraction. It is rather a new kind of empirical regime not of given but of "brute" fact—the fact of what *this* color and *these* lines were compelled to do given the imposition of a starting point that comes to the painting from beyond or before the conscious will. Here not a given representation of the world but an assembled Figure emerges. This figure is neither illustrative nor abstract, but an autonomous living form

that would not have been there in any other way, under any other conditions. Deleuze explains it this way:

> For the diagram was only a possibility of fact, whereas the painting exists by making present a very particular fact, which we will call *the pictorial fact* . . .what we will call a "fact" is first of all the fact that several forms may be included in one and the same Figure, indissolubly, caught up in a kind of serpentine, like so many necessary accidents continually mounting on top of one another . . . But the fact itself, this pictorial fact that has come from the hand, is the formation of a third eye, a haptic eye, a haptic vision of the eye, this new clarity. It is as if the duality of the tactile and the optical were surpassed visually in this haptic function born of the diagram. (FB 128-129)

Just as the diagram (the trait) is not the "fact" Bacon paints, but what allows him to paint a pictorial fact, the "creation" of a philosophical concept is not an end in itself. Its creativity is the end, or rather the beginning, of its adventure. This "third eye" or diagram, hovering between the object of thought and the clichés of our categories, emerges between the chaos we entertain and the constraints selecting that chaos itself. Certain film makers make us experience this world other than as we normally do and yet as Deleuze puts it, their aim is not to help us escape but to once again believe in *this* world.

In some cases film makers can even restore our *faith* in this world, or rather in the elements, however fragmented, from which new worlds can be made of this one. That is the peculiar "magic" of cinema, a magic to which Deleuze's concepts also aspire: not the ability to present what is not there (the power is not that of illusion), but the power to present the elements that make appearances singular. This is what the early Deleuze meant by a "dramatization" of ideas: every idea as a little play, a little drama, a little mask, a little proportion or degree whose dimensions and sufficient reasons can be found only in the experiment which they provoke. To have done with judgment, and to begin

again with life, is the power of art that so seduced Deleuze. For Deleuze, these powers are essentially three:

1. Not to offer solutions to pre-existing "human" problems, but to pose new, transhuman problems.
2. Not to represent a coherent world, but to creatively repeat worldly complications.
3. Not to ask us to think in terms of identities, resemblances, the recognizable and the analogical, but to force us to think in terms of the different, the strange, the unrecognizable, and the univocal.

It is these three powers that we will investigate in this thesis, "Gilles Deleuze and the Powers of Art."

I. Critique as Creation: The Contours of Transcendental Empiricism

> The conditions of a true critique and a true creation are the same. (DR 139)

At the core of Deleuze's enterprise is his notion of a free-floating image or *simulacrum* which, because it cannot be comprehended in terms of derivation from an original, forces a new kind of modern thought. Insofar as modernity has attempted to rigorously distinguish reality from illusion, it has constantly searched for either empirical or transcendental foundations upon which to build a non-illusory edifice of knowledge. This quest for secure foundations is interrupted, for Deleuze, by the presence of simulacra which defy all subordination to notions of original and derivative, figure and ground, model and copy, transcendentally possible and empirically actual.

Because certain modern art forms deal extensively in simulacra, and compose new worlds from them, these experimental forms and the knowledge they embody model for philosophy a new method: not the deduction of the real from the possible, but the encounter with the *singular* in its extraordinary genesis. In response to such encounters, philosophy for Deleuze should seek to construct a multiplicity of concepts that attest to the inherently multiple dynamics of experience. These dynamics are not in any sense pre-given in *a priori* categories, but emerge at the limits of sensation, memory, and thought itself. This "constructivism" in philosophy is a project whose model is art. Constructivism's concepts however, are no mere products of taste or effects of will, but are rather creations in some sense forced by the extraordinary events that befall us.

In the Clinic of Simulacra

For Deleuze, philosophy is first and foremost *critique*.[6] Never an encyclopedic encompassing of the particular in the general, philosophy is always a specific intervention in a particular context. Its hallmark is the interruption of the same, the common, and the ordinary in the name of the different, the novel, and the vital. Yet true critique, for Deleuze, results not merely in a set of qualifications or negations, but in a positive *affirmation* of life.[7]

In an early interview, Deleuze aligns his philosophical vision, at once affirmative and critical, with those of Nietzsche and Spinoza. Deleuze writes,

> Spinoza or Nietzsche are philosophers whose critical and destructive powers are without equal, but this power always springs from affirmation, from joy, from a cult of affirmation and joy, from the exigency of life against those who would mutilate and mortify life. For me, that is philosophy itself. (DI 144)

By "cult" Deleuze means something like a passion or a mandate for joy, for life. A will not so much "to power" but for the power of life in the face of mortifications, in the face of ascetic or life-hating tendencies.[8] But how, in affirming life, do we also critique? And what *life* does Deleuze have in mind here—is it natural life, psychological life, or spiritual life? And what could it possibly mean to criticize, or even to destroy, by making an affirmation?

Deleuze thinks of critical affirmation as involving the selection of something in the world that is not what the world has made it seem to be.[9] What is affirmed in life is always something in the times that *resists* the times, what Nietzsche called the *untimely.*[10] The subject of affirmation is not, for all that, something which "transcends" the times. It is something that cannot exist without the times but that does not properly belong to it.

Critical affirmation is the process of discovering this untimely or uncanny dimension. What critical affirmation finds in life is not another world, but a singular *difference* in and of this world. To philosophize, for Deleuze, is to find the strange in the familiar, the different in the same.[11]

Deleuze models this kind of philosophy on a combination of artistic and medicinal paradigms. We are all too familiar with our symptoms—our pettiness, our greed, our shortsighted ambitions, our weak lusts, our cancers, our rotting joints, our impotence. We don't depend on doctors to endlessly "redescribe" our symptoms. We depend on them for cures. The cure consists in knowing how to interact with whatever is causing the symptom, how to affect the pathology, the disorder, the disease. In any etiology that matters, *what* a disease is, is defined by *how it can be cured*. In this way, as Deleuze puts it, the doctor is a "legislator": in giving the rules for healing a disease, she determines the nature of the disease and the nature of that which it affects. Doctors search for a *singularity* beneath the monotony of symptoms.

For Deleuze, as for Nietzsche and Spinoza before him, knowing the essence of the world is knowing, event by event, mode by mode, case by case, the symptoms of how the world is doing.[12] The twist for Deleuze, however, is that in his view *what* we know, as we interpret the signs and symptoms of life, is always immediately *transformed* by that act of knowing. Insofar as philosophy takes this route, it cannot be systematic or even axiomatic, but must be aphoristic, poetic, and creative. As he puts it in one of his last essays, a reflection on the "enquiring" and "inventing" empiricism of David Hume,

> Interpretation establishes the "meaning" of a phenomenon, which is always fragmentary and incomplete; evaluation determines the hierarchical "value" of meanings and totalizes the fragments without diminishing or eliminating their plurality. Indeed aphorism is both the art

> of interpreting and what must be interpreted; poetry, both the art of evaluating and what must be evaluated. The interpreter is the physiologist or doctor, the one who sees phenomena as symptoms and speaks through aphorisms. The evaluator is the artist who considers and creates "perspectives" and speaks through poetry. The philosopher of the future is both artist and doctor—in one word, legislator. (PI 66)

This brings us to the other aspect of critique, and in fact the more important one for distinguishing Deleuze from his precursors and contemporaries: the role of art. Deleuze sees the ability to select and affirm as something great artists do best. Deleuze reiterates throughout his *oeuvre* that philosophy must be connected to art, and must even take art's affirmation-structure as thought's primary model and mode. Art's key structural feature, for Deleuze, is that it relates to the world not as if it were something unified, pre-given, stable, and coherent in and of itself, but as if its essence inhered in a series of signs that beyond clichéd or formulaic coherence, can extract sthe singular from the clichéd, the different from the same, the extraordinary from our fixations on identifiable forms, personal identities, and represented societies.[13]

This power of art is exemplified, for Deleuze, in the literature of Joyce, Proust, Melville, and Kafka, in the painting of Warhol, Bacon, and Klee, in the theatre of Artaud, the music of Stockhausen, and in the cinema of the Italian Neo-Realists and French New Wave.[14] In the work of these creators and in many other artists, as well, Deleuze finds not constituted individuals but sub-personal and pre-individual affects permutating, combining, and resonating despite the fact that these affective events are seemingly unrelated or even opposed to one another, from the point of view of common sense. In art, for Deleuze, the disparate becomes strangely unified or uncannily resonant, despite, or rather *because* of that very disparity. Through processes of extracting difference, through "forcing" resonances between times and places and affective states, the artist

gives us a sense of the world that defies the categories in terms of which we generally imagine what is possible and impossible for us to do and be and become.

The artist transcends the givens of experience, but not through knowledge of the "transcendental" principles of experience. Rather, art succeeds only when it takes experience not as the final but as only the initial conditions of an experiment, an invention, a re-creation of those conditions. Deleuze contrasts this sense of the world deriving from art with that sense which derives from politics. He writes,

> In very general terms, we claim that there are two ways to appeal to "necessary destructions:" that of the poet, who speaks in the name of a creative power, capable of overturning all orders and representations in order to affirm Difference in the state of permanent revolution which characterizes eternal return; and that of the politician, who is above all concerned to deny that which "differs," so as to conserve or prolong an established historical order, or to establish a historical order which already calls forth in the world the forms of its representation. The two may coincide in particularly agitated moments, but they are never the same. (DR 53)

Both the poet and the politician know the necessity of destroying what is in the name of what may be. But the politician does this in the name of what has already been, and what can be predicted to be, based on the *representable form* of what has already been. The artist, on the other hand, creates not a representation of what may be, but a *simulacrum* of what *appears* to be.

The notion of simulacra plays a major role in Deleuze's thought. A simulacrum is not a copy of a model, but a copy of a copy. It is a repetition, but not of an object or paradigm, but of an *image* of that object or paradigm. What is crucial for Deleuze are the conditions under which a simulacrum can be made to appear. The emergence of simulacra has for its condition the breakdown of "major" or "recognizable" identities. Because of *where* it appears, as well as its lack of origins or reference to an original, a

simulacra disrupts our categories of model and copy, truth and consequence, event and effect.

Simulacra do this because they appear at places where at least two series of identities and generalities (constituted by our memories, habits, and official histories) blur into or open onto one another. Where at least two distinct orders enter into an "occult" communication, simulacra emerge. Paradoxically, while the emergence of simulacra indicate a breakdown in ordinary experience, for Deleuze emergent simulacra point to the real conditions of experience, conditions which are ordinarily occluded by our sense of what is possible, a sense which derives from those habitual regularities simulacra disrupt.

In *Difference and Repetition*, Deleuze defines the power of the simulacral in this way:

> the simulacrum is the instance which includes a difference within itself, such that (at least) two divergent series on which it plays, all resemblance abolished so that one can no longer point to the existence of an original and a copy. It is in this direction that we must look for the conditions, not of possible experience, but of real experience (selection, repetition, etc.). It is here that we find the lived reality of a sub-representative domain. If it is true that representation has identity as its element and similarity as its unit of measure, then pure presence such as it appears in the simulacrum has the 'disparate' as its unit of measure—in other words, always a difference of difference as its immediate element. (DR 69)

By definition, simulacra make it impossible (or at least problematic) to say what is originary, what is derived; what is cause, what is effect; what is deeply meaningful and what is merely superficial ornament. But for Deleuze simulacra do this not merely in the name of the destruction of represented identity, but in the name of re-creating the actual resources occluded by the categories of representation, categories which read difference as divergence from a pre-given or dialectically renewed sameness.

For Deleuze this was the achievement of Pop Art, and of Andy Warhol, whose serial works extract singularities from our habits of consumption and destruction (DR 294). What Warhol's art achieves cannot be described in terms of representation. His art breaks down our illusion that images—even the most stereotyped images—*represent* things, rather than repeat things. If images represent things, then art imitates the world, and the truth of art becomes subject to evaluation in terms of how well it imitates what is already in the world.[15] Bur for Deleuze, we do not depend on art to reveal to us what is already there, but to extract a singularity, a difference, a *simulacrum* from the intersecting series of what *appears* to be there.

By generating simulacra, art *illuminates* the times. Art does this not by transcending the appearances, but by undermining our illusions about the origin and meaning of "the way the world is." This is what Francis Bacon called "putting some Sahara" into the clichés of painting, inserting a desert space into habits of sensation across which a nearly-imperceptible force can flash. By repeating stereotyped images (of Marilyn, Mao and Christ, car wrecks, riots and pistols), Warhol's work forces us to look beyond what is figured toward percepts visible only through the decentering of the "identity" of those formulaic events and stock characters.

This is how Deleuze describes art's power, at the conclusion of *Difference and Repetition*. Art, he writes,

> . . . does not imitate, above all because it repeats; it repeats all the repetitions, by virtue of an internal power (an imitation is a copy, but art is simulation, it reverses copies into simulacra). Even the most mechanical, the most banal, the most habitual and the most stereotyped repetition finds a place in the work of art, it is always displaced in relation to other repetitions, and it is subject to the condition that a difference may be extracted from it for these other repetitions. For there is no other aesthetic problem than that of the insertion of art into everyday life. The more our

> daily life appears standardized, stereotyped, and subject to an accelerated reproduction of objects of consumption, the more art must be injected into it in order to extract from it that little difference which plays simultaneously between other levels of repetition, and even in order to make the two extremes resonate—namely the habitual series of consumption and the instinctual series of destruction and death . . . [art] aesthetically reproduces the illusions and mystifications which make up the real essence of this civilization. (DR 293)

As Deleuze conceives it, somewhat as a doctor or a shaman sees the body exhibiting certain signs—of life, of death, of sickness, of health, of power, of weakness, of sadness, of joy—the artist sees the world in terms of *symptoms*, as well. This is how Warhol saw advertisements, or as the French New Wave or Orson Welles saw the clichés of Hollywood. But Warhol never rejects graphic design principles any more than Welles or Goddard rejects the formulas of cinema. Art stays with, refashions, *deals with* the symptoms—the illusions and mystifications—which give rise to art itself. This paradox means that in creating, the artist is also analyzing. The studio is also a clinic. In an early essay Deleuze puts it this way:

> The artist is a symptomologist . . . the world can be treated as a symptom and searched for signs of disease, signs of life, signs of a cure, signs of health . . . Nietzsche thought of the philosopher as the physician of civilization. Henry Miller was an extraordinary diagnostician. The artist in general must treat the world like a symptom, and build his work not like a therapeutic, but in every case like a clinic. The artist is not outside the symptoms, but makes a work of art from them, which sometimes serves to precipitate them, and sometimes to transform them. (DI 140)

At the same time that the artist puts the world in the clinic, she puts herself there, as well. This is why Deleuze claims that artistic style sometimes *precipitates* and sometimes *transforms* the symptoms (DI 140). The artist's own life is always at stake in the world she is creating. We might say that for Deleuze, art is an attempt to read the world's vital signs. The greatest artists *take the whole world* as a symptom of life's

creative effort. "Shakespeare's characters say, 'how *goes* it with the world?'," Deleuze writes in that same early essay (DI 140). In a Deleuzian aesthetics, Iago, Hamlet, Lear, and Lady Macbeth are more than mere characters. They are vectors of energy. They display the possible flows or what he later calls "lines of flight" (*lignes de fuite*, flow-lines) that constitute our social and psychic territories.[16]

But the idea that art is an attempt to "understand" the world is somewhat problematic, since this formula presumes precisely what Deleuze insists art does not: that there is some pre-given truth or unity art stands underneath or supports—some truth existing in the structure of our own minds if not in an absolute Mind, in terms of which the world should be understood, to which it should be adequated, and by which it should be measured.[17] For Deleuze, what art teaches is that the essences constituting the world whose signs we read and whose symptoms we trace are not available apart from the space or *spatium* (depthless continuum) constituted by the art's affirmational *work*.[18] Apart from a work of creative repetition, there is no "original" world. As Giambattista Vico might have put it, the true is always already *the made*.[19]

In the philosophical tradition of aesthetics which includes Nietzsche's early work, *The Birth of Tragedy*, the tragic vision of life has often been theorized as the source of art itself, since it reflects the inherent limits of the cosmic and social order. But for Deleuze even the vision of a tragic world is, *as a creation*, a joyful affirmation. As he puts it in an early interview, "there can be no tragic work because there is a necessary joy in creation; art is necessarily a liberation that explodes everything, first and foremost the tragic. No, there is no unhappy creation, it is always a *vis comica*" (DI 134).[20] For Deleuze art offers through its *vis comica*, a way to *health*—to that "great health" of which Nietzsche often

dreamt. This health does not ask us (or the world, or the earth, or our bodies) to conform to an "original" (in the sense of aboriginal or primordial) ideal of sanity or wholeness.[21] Thus the artist, for Deleuze as for Nietzsche, does not treat symptoms in terms of a given totality or whole or world (such as "the body") of which those symptoms would be partial manifestations, but takes symptoms as indicating the presence of *worlds unto themselves*.

Assembled Worlds, Modern Nomads

The worlds espied in artistic creation are, for Deleuze, like Leibniz's monads: ontological atoms around which subjects and objects form, and through which pass the predicates or "manners" of various events.[22] Monads are not fully formed subjects, persons, or identities, but singular points around which identities coalesce. For Leibniz, the best possible world, the one God created, is a world that pre-exists its expression in monads and was selected by God for its maximal harmony or "compossibility" with itself (DR 47-48).

As with Leibniz' monads, the worlds of modern art, for Deleuze, are expressed in relationships of "compossibility" (maximum convergence and divergence simultaneously). The monads of modern art, however, are not subject to any prior schema of coherence, whether in the mind of God or in transcendental schemas. As he puts it in his late work on Leibniz, for Deleuze the singularities of the modern world must be described not in a monadology but in a "nomadology," a logic not subject to representational forms of identity and difference (F 137). The work of Deleuze's philosophy is dedicated to the construction of concepts adequate to these inherently

multivalent and polysemic logics, logics not of substance and accident, but of *events* and of the sense of various worlds that converge and diverge through those events, in a world that can no longer be considered as having a recognizable center or representable order.

Later in his career Deleuze will call these worlds "assemblages." As Deleuze defines it in *A Thousand Plateaus*, an assemblage is a configuration or form of life that differentiates itself from other configurations by re-configuring decoded fragments of other configurations (ATP 503). Creating an assemblage thus always involves a de-creation or a "counter-actualization" of a given set of forces and signs. As *multiplicities* (neither given unities nor derived diversities) assemblages by definition express old content in new forms, or new content in anachronistic forms. Assemblages mix and combine parameters from other assemblages in order to put themselves into unforeseen relationships and unpredictable trajectories relative to other assemblages.[23] "War machines" that form along the border between the weapons of state powers and the desires of nomadic people exemplify the notion of assemblage (ATP 351). Experimental music is an assemblage at the limit between noise and traditional forms of composition.[24] Francis Bacon's paintings, for Deleuze, create figures that cannot be explained in terms of figuration or narrative, but are nevertheless "diagrams" that capture chaos at the same time that they allow chaos to invade painting and transform it.[25]

One of the key features of assemblages is that, as nomadic sets of singularities, they often appear as "nonsense" relative to the "sense" of the milieus or systems of significance with which they make their break or within which they find their "line of flight" (*ligne de fuite*).[26] Joyce's *Finnegan's Wake* and Lewis Carroll's *Alice* stories—with their words that each contain a world of sense despite their surface

nonsense—are two of Deleuze's prime literary examples. Part of what Deleuze admires in these literary art forms (and their parallels in cinema, theatre, music, and painting) is that they "permit several stories to be told at once" (LS 260). The assemblage (of words, of actions, of notes, of images), is based on a fundamental principle of *divergence* of elements from one another, a distance between elements that an artistic style both measures and redoubles in its style. Style establishes an occult form of communication between otherwise "incompossible" sets of affects and events. The nomadic world implied by the coexistence or "alogical compatibility" of different series sets a major new task for thought. As Deleuze puts it,

> . . . it is not at all a question of different points of view on one story supposedly the same, for points of view would still be submitted to a rule of convergence. It is rather a question of different and divergent stories, as if an absolutely distinct landscape corresponded to each point of view. There is indeed a unity of divergent series insofar as they are divergent, but it is always a chaos perpetually thrown off center which becomes one only in the Great Work. This unformed chaos, the great letter of *Finnegan's Wake*, is not just any chaos: it is the power of affirmation, the power to affirm all the heterogeneous series—it "complicates" within itself all the series (hence the interest of Joyce in Bruno as the theoretician of the *complicatio*). (LS 260)

The kind of art that tells several stories at once matters so much for Deleuze because for him, as for Giordano Bruno before him, there truly is no world apart from a co-existence of contraries, a *complicatio* of singular events.[27] For Deleuze no *a priori* category can pre-determine, and no act of recollection can adequately grasp the uncanny character of a singular event. The world of artistic creation, however, does capture the sense of events. It is able to do so, however, because the world of an artistic style is neither transcendentally given nor ideally recalled, but discovered through an actively *affirmed* multiplicity. Art brings together strings or chains of singularities, but as these

series are constructed in art, singular differences are not synthesized but are rather *further differentiated from one another* than they would be otherwise.

For Deleuze, this process of artistic "complication," producing "forced resonances" and relationships of "aesthetic analogy," is art's peculiar affirmative power—its power to find life where we least expect it.[28] What art shows is that, rather than as mediated in "infinite concepts" of experience, the sense lurking in events must be understood in terms of a field larger than any *a priori* condition can encompass, and pass in the blink of an eye, in a time smaller than that in which consciousness can react. The logic of reality is at one with the eventful emergence of new relations. Philosophy must model itself on art because knowledge of these relations cannot be derived from a pregiven whole or a gradual recollection of parts for the sake of a whole to come, but is always *constructed* in a vision of how uncentered monads or "nomads" invent new relations and measure new distances from one another.

Beyond Representation

This is where Deleuze's idea that art can be paradigmatic for philosophy must be made clear, because it might seem as if Deleuze invites philosophy to follow art into a world of delirious illusion.[29] For Deleuze the forced resonances or "special effects" of modern art—nonsense, the absurd, the surreal, pop pastiche, montage, and so on—only appear as illusory and insubstantial when they are judged in terms of the common sense world of representationalism from which they differ. Representationalism has dominated aesthetics since Kant. Since Kant, Deleuze argues, aesthetics has suffered from a

"wrenching duality" in which the theory of sensation is divorced from the theory of pleasing or beautiful form. Deleuze writes,

> Aesthetics suffers from a wrenching duality. On the one hand, it designates the theory of sensibility as the form of possible experience; on the other hand, it designates the theory of art as the reflection of real experience; in this case the work of art should really appear as experimentation. (LS 260)

The problem, however, is that art does not appear to modern aesthetics (or philosophy) as experimentation, but as a *reflection* of experience. As Deleuze critic John Rajchman well notes, Heidegger believed that art met its death at the hands of modern aesthetics, and had to retreat from sensation in order to rediscover its authenticity.[30] For Deleuze, this same result is the Kantian tradition of aesthetics. In this tradition, which has dominated the field, the possibilities of art have been thought to be pre-determined by what "objectivities" can be represented in the sensible. In other words, the responses elicited by art must refer to a real (i.e. possible) object of experience, in the Kantian sense of possibility conforming to *a priori* categories of what can count as phenomenal (and not as mere illusion).

This Kantian sense of possibility is the basis for the category of taste—a *sensus communis* of the appropriate, the fitting, the pleasing form. Even the sublime, in Kant, is still defined as the limit of representational possibility. As Deleuze candidly points out, however, the alternative to Kant's aesthetics does not seem all that promising. If we reject the criteria of what is representationally possible for sensations to become in art, what remains seems to be only a cacophony of impressions, a "contradictory flux" or a "rhapsody of sensations" as the basis for aesthetic judgment (DR 56).[31]

For Deleuze, however, if Kant managed to salvage the objectivity of knowledge by making the conditions of the objects of possible experience the same as the conditions of possible experience, he did so at the cost of denying to mind access to the *genesis* of the forms of experience, per se.[32] For Kant the forms or categories hold because they cannot be denied without contradiction. But for Deleuze, certain modern art forms have an intuition not of logically possible experience, but of the *limits* of possible experience, as such, which is simultaneously the limit of our collective sense of what is pleasing, appropriate, or beautiful.

Experimental art, for Deleuze, collapses the two sides of the duality between the theory of sensation and the theory of form. *Under conditions of experimentation*, such as those outlined above in certain modern art forms, we apprehend directly *in* the sensible what "can only be sensed, the very being *of* the sensible" (DR 57). As an experiment at the limits of the sensible, art no longer passively reflects but rather actively reveals the structure and limits of the sensible, per se. Art is therefore an exercise in empiricism, with the added twist that what art "knows" is not a clear and distinct idea corresponding to the limits of quantities and qualities, but rather a paradoxically distinct and yet obscure idea of the real *intensities* manifest at the limit of quantities and qualities and relations.

Transcendental Empiricism

For Deleuze, art offers a special form of knowledge, that of a "transcendental" or "superior" empiricism—an empiricism not of qualities or quantities in sensation, but of the irreducible *differences* that form the real limits of the representable world. Because

representational categories—the same, the identical, the analogous, the similar—present difference in terms of sameness, for Deleuze representational thought and art cannot capture the dynamics of a difference insubordinate to any concept. However, there are certain art forms, those Deleuze usually calls "modern," that are capable of putting into play differences *in themselves*. As Deleuze puts it in *Difference and Repetition*,

> Difference must be shown differing. We know that modern art tends to realize these conditions: in this sense it becomes a veritable *theatre* of metamorphoses and permutations. A theatre where nothing is fixed, a labyrinth without a thread (Ariadne has hung herself). The work of art leaves the domain of representation in order to become "experience," transcendental empiricism or science of the sensible. (DR 56)

Deleuze defines transcendental empiricism by a deceptively simple phrase: relations are external to their terms. What does it mean to say that artists are transcendental empiricists? For empiricism, all knowledge begins in sense experience. But it is a mistake, Deleuze argues, to claim that empiricism takes experience as *constitutive* of knowledge.[33] Artists seem to know intuitively what Hume explained philosophically: discrete perceptions do not carry the rules of how those perceptions can be associated. The principles of association are not derived from things, but from the mind.[34] The principles of association do not constitute perceptions; rather they constitute the human mind. It is the human mind that has the "univocal" and "constitutive" role, and it is the mind that is constantly invented by the ever-renewed possibility of new relations—renewed by desires or what Hume called "passions."

However, the sense that mind donates is never unified in a majestic self or superior I (whether of transcendental or phenomenological variety). The mind is fragmented and partial. "Mind" is, as it were, only a vector of the set of relations in which it partakes.[35] For Deleuze this fragmented (as opposed to transcendentally unified)

character of mind is, if the limit, also the condition of *real* experimentation with relations (as opposed to the conditions of possible experience of future objects). Relations are not determined by things (contra Kant). Relations are determined by themselves, external to things.[36] As John Rajchman explains it, for Deleuze we have an intuition of this in certain forms of *intense* experience, experience of *intensive spaces* that cannot be defined by extrinsic parameters (distances or other metric properties). Rajchman put is this way in his excellent primer, *The Deleuze Connections*.

> For in departing from the idea of well-constituted objects-with-properties and the kinds of distance and relations they presuppose, one departs from the idea of extension (a space of divisible *partes ex partes*). Deleuze then discovers a kind of amorphous or unformed space, shown through "anexact" diagrams of pregeometric figures, in which Husserl saw the origins of geometry. Deleuze thinks Husserl should have extended his phenomenology to such spaces, rather than making them part of the genesis of good geometric figures. For what the modern work shows is that we have very different bodily or kinesthetic relations with "intensive" than we do with "extensive" spatiality. We move in space in ways that cannot be mapped by any "extension"; we "fill it out" according to informal diagrams that do not completely organize it, such that the space and our movements in and through it become inseparable from one another . . . .[37]

Modern art is an exercise in transcendental empiricism insofar as it maps not the *merely* empirical coordinates of space and time, but the *transcendentally* empirical forms of intensive space, a space populated not be quantifiable distances but by singular points mapped only by informal or affective diagrams. Here, a form emerges which is "transcendental" to the extent that it is neither merely the possibilities of our bodies nor the potentials of a space, but a singularity altering the coordinates of both.

This intensive world of singularities is broached not only in modern art but in paradoxical experiences of sensation, experiences Plato called those of "qualitative contrariety." Here, the significance of sense impressions cannot be clarified on the basis

of sensibility alone.[38] Contact is made with a presence that, while existing only in the sensible, is not composed of any sensible quality, and is rather that intensive or singular point that in any case organizes or deploys sensation, as such. Deleuze describes it in the following passage of *Difference and Repetition*, this way.

> Qualitative contrariety [in perception, but also in perception of events as much as colors or sounds] is only the reflection of the intense, a reflection which betrays it by explicating it in extensity [i.e. in historical narratives as much as in represented qualities]. It is intensity or difference in intensity which betrays it [the contrary, the difference] by explicating it in extensity. It is intensity or difference in intensity which constitutes the peculiar limit of sensibility. As such, it has the paradoxical character of the limit: it is the imperceptible, that which cannot be sensed because it is always covered by a quality which alienates or contradicts it, always distributed within an extensity which inverts or cancels it. In another sense, it is that which can only be sensed or that which defines the transcendent exercise of sensibility, because it gives to be sensed, thereby awakening memory and forcing thought. (DR 237)

Plato took encounters with the imperceptible in perception to occasion *recollection*. To explain a contingent, time-bound event, an eternal archetype of that event (a Form) is invoked as being that in terms of which identity and difference can be established, that on the basis of which qualitative contrariety can be explained. For Deleuze, however, art demonstrates a form of recollection which one-ups Plato. While ascertaining a singular form, art remains within time and contingency rather than prescinding to an eternally self-same model.

The paradox is that while remaining with contingency, art does not make its knowledge arbitrary for making it constructed. The knowledge proper to art is thus a kind of baroque "produced eternity." However, the vaunted "eternal value" of art is an intuition of the ways in which temporally dynamic and historically-emergent forces can crystallize in a given milieu or be expressed by the contours of an intensive space. Art's

knowledge is therefore never an induction nor a deduction or the real, but a kind of "abductive" genealogy which *produces* intuitions specific to the passion giving rise to that creation: the "obsession" or "fixation" giving rise to art.[39]

What is made visible in modern art, as Foucault might have put it, are the conditions of visibility, as such.[40] However, it is the *non-resemblance* between visibility and what is rendered visible, between condition and conditioned, between the intensive and the merely qualitative, that forms the basis of modern art's *knowledge* or illumination of "possibility in the aesthetic sense."[41] The techniques of modern art extract the singularities or differences which order (without resembling) affects and sensations. The key point, here, is that modern art does not merely experiment with color and sound, but with the categories and forms of habitual experience. The peculiar "thinking" done by a film auteur or a literary author takes place at a level of pre-individual singularities and impersonal affects. At this level, alone, for Deleuze, does empiricism—the science of relations—become transcendental. As he puts it in *Difference and Repetition*,

> Empiricism truly becomes transcendental, and aesthetics an apodictic discipline, only when we apprehend directly in the sensible that which can only be sensed, the very being *of* the sensible: difference, potential difference and difference in intensity as the reason behind qualitative diversity. It is in difference that movement is produced as an "effect," that phenomena flash their meaning like signs. The intense world of differences, in which we find the reason behind qualities and the being of the sensible, is precisely the object of a superior empiricism. (DR 57)

This brings me to a culminating formula for how I will read Deleuze in what follows: *aesthetics is first philosophy insofar as art is already transcendental empiricism*. The task for philosophy is not to reflect on but to *join with* the rigorous experimentation, which is also a rigorous *enquiry* in Hume's sense, that is already taking place in art.

The paradox for philosophy, and why the aesthetic paradigm needs so much justification, is that art knows something that cannot be explained apart from art, whereas in some sense philosophy abstracts from and "logicizes" what art presents.[42] Should philosophy really model itself on a practice that in principle defies explanation?[43]

In what follows I will try to argue that the answer to this is yes, but it is necessary to see the creative character of philosophical intervention, and the educational function of art. For Deleuze, if philosophy intervenes in knowledge for the sake of genuine learning, art intervenes in experience for the sake of that same learning. Art and philosophy are not the same activity; one discipline produces affects, the other concepts. But insofar as both disciplines invite us into transformative possibilities that are available only under the rigorous conditions of creation, artists think in affects as much as philosophers paint or sing in concepts. This paradigm does not reduce philosophy to stylism or textuality any more than it would reduce art to didacticism. Rather, under this aegis both art and philosophy (and in some cases scientific practice) are endless attempts to create in response to the extraordinary events that befall us. In this, Deleuze writes, consists the whole of an intellectual ethics: "not to be unworthy of what happens to us" (LS 149).

The Creation of Concepts

For Deleuze, the events of our lives come from a place the composer Samuel Butler called "EREWHON," everywhere and nowhere, "the nowhere of origins, and 'now-here,' the here and now turned upside down, displaced, disguised " (DI 141). To say that philosophy as much as art works in EREWHON is to say that philosophers are working to create a coherence which is not *given*, at least not as we habitually,

categorically, memorially or even "intersubjectively communicate"[44] such coherence (DR 7)[45]. Philosophy, for Deleuze, has to begin from a place of great interruptions. It must think or "counter-actualize" the sense of great events—but not necessarily "big" events, since we must always be alert to "imperceptible" forces. Philosophers, Deleuze argues, must be at the scene of life like a good detective, with the incisiveness of a Sherlock's eye. As Deleuze puts it in an interview "On Nietzsche and the Image of Thought,"

> You have to present concepts in philosophy as though you were writing a good detective novel: they must have a zone of presence, resolve a local situation, be in contact with the "dramas," and bring a certain cruelty with them. They must exhibit a certain coherence but get if from somewhere else. (DI 141)

Deleuze compares concept creation to Artaud's theatre of cruelty. What was cruel in Artaud's vision was not something mean or vicious, but was rather the way in which cries, groans, props, masks, disguises, and even nonsense words continually interrupted the expectations of the theatre goers. Artaud wanted a theatre that presented not forms but *fires* through which spectator and actor alike could see signals of a life yet to come.[46] A "cruel" or experimental thought does not attempt to develop concepts that would gather or enclose experience. Nor does genuine philosophy, for Deleuze, posit a ground of sufficient reason or deduce a transcendental schema from which the conditions of possible experience can be derived. Rather, for Deleuze, genuine thought creates concepts that are vehicles for transformations.

Knowledge, for Deleuze, is never an end in itself. It is always a practical rule of experimentation. This is why philosophy, for Deleuze, is neither contemplation nor reflection nor communication (WIP 6). As he puts it, in his late work *What is*

Philosophy, "anyone (a scientist, an artist, a laborer) can reflect on what he or she already does—it is a bad joke to call them philosophers when they do so" (WIP 17).[47]

What Deleuze calls for, instead of reflection or even dialogue, is a *multiplication* of concepts, a "massive expenditure" of concepts (DI 141). As he puts it in *What Is Philosophy?*,

> The idea of a Western democratic conversation between friends has never produced a single concept . . . you will know nothing through concepts unless you have first created them—that is, constructed them in an intuition specific to them: a field, a plane, and a ground that must not be confused with them but that shelters their seeds and the personae who cultivate them. (WIP 7).

What does this mean? First, it means that concept creation is not a species of relativism. For Deleuze, not just any concept can adequate the differential forces acting on our lives, and the perspectives into which we are drawn by those forces cannot be described *ad hoc*. We cannot "pick and choose" out concepts. Deleuze's notion of conceptual creation is in fact a strange kind of *realism*,[48] insofar as Deleuze seeks to analyze concepts in terms of the singular events (i.e. the experiences, but not necessarily "human" experiences) that force us to conceive regions of *consistency*—fields, planes, and grounds (what he will call "territories" in another text) that cannot be mapped extensively, but are rather traversed *intensively*. It is these intensive spaces which our most interesting concepts surround, and which belong to a philosopher as her neighborhood of singular points—her site-specific "conceptual persona" (WIP 61-63).[49]

Much ado has been made of Deleuze's notion of creating concepts, and many have accused him of a casual pragmatism and bland relativism—all Deleuze really advocates, the critics say, is a set of advertising slogans for whatever has power over our confused desires.[50] The way to avoid this critique is to place the accent in the phrase

"creation of concepts" on *creation*, not simply on proliferation.[51] What matters most to Deleuze in thought is the response we make to a *singularity* which is itself the condition of authentic creation. Singularities are never mere particularities. They are in fact the only "universals," but not in the communicative, contemplative, or reflective sense in which universals have been usually conceived. Universals, for Deleuze, are not self-identical ipseities, but singularities which continually disguise themselves. The singular is not an identity but a differential force that must be followed, tracked, and traced. Proximity to a singularity is what creates a concept, and because we must keep recreating concepts in response to the movement of the singular, the intense, the different, concept creation is an endless *pedagogy*, a continuous learning. As Deleuze puts it, in *What is Philosophy?,*

> The post-Kantians concentrated on a universal *encyclopedia* of the concept that attributed concept creation to a pure subjectivity rather than taking on the more modest task of a *pedagogy* of the concept, which would have to analyze the conditions of creation as factors of always singular moments. If the three ages of the concept are the encyclopedia, pedagogy, and commercial professional training, only the second can safeguard us from falling from the heights of the first into the disaster of the third—an absolute disaster for thought whatever its benefits might be, of course, from the viewpoint of universal capitalism. (WIP 12)

Deleuze's notion of concept creation would be distinct from the debased pragmatism of a "commercial professional training," which would attribute the merit of, say, a "company philosophy" to its ability to create a consistent perspective in terms of which consumers can recognize what they (already think they) want. It would also be distinct from the post-Kantian idea that concepts are functions of the ongoing effort of pure or transcendental subjectivity to reinforce its identity, to *synthesize* experience.[52]

Concept creation is neither the sheerly mundane pragmatics of telling stories about what works (or what sells), nor the lofty attempt to include, collect, or synthesize (even transcendentally) the varieties of experience. Rather, for Deleuze all concepts worthy of the name are *forced creations* that bear witness to certain events, struggles, intense delights and unexpected breakdowns: singular moments in experience. These moments are always those which *resist* integration into a system of smooth exchange (cultural or natural), and indeed into any system of speculative synthesis.[53] We think, as he puts it in his early work on Proust, only when we are *forced* to think.[54]

This is part of the sense in which concept creation is *transcendental*: the encounters that force us to think are "necessary conditions," not merely an instance of sensing or remembering. They are *events* which call sensibility or thought into being. Singular events provoke sensation while being imperceptible, forcing thought while being intrinsically "unthinkable." In some sense Deleuze presumes to stand Kant's doctrine of the faculties on its head: objects of possible experience do not come to the fore when the faculties operate properly. Rather, certain kinds of intense experience force our faculties to operate in spite of themselves, in spite of their inertia, habit, or common sense. Confronting the singular forces faculties to function in strange, nomadic, even monstrous ways, but always in the name of a life beyond what we imagine.

Concept creation is also *empiricist* in that different concepts are expected to be differently formed and developed relative to the different intensities and fields that give rise to them.[55] This is why Deleuze claims, following Bergson, that "the first principle of philosophy is that Universals explain nothing but must themselves be explained" (WIP 7). Thought is never the set of competing explanations of the same event, but already a

different way of *experiencing* or "selectively affirming" what is singular and what is ordinary about an event. The "explanatory power" of a concept consists not only of the solutions it creates, but of the prior extraction of a "plane of immanence" that a philosopher *sees* before conceptualizing and the establishment of an uncanny double or "conceptual persona" that non-subjectively "thinks" the concept.

This prior selection of *what it is important to conceptualize* must be accounted for when determining the value of a concept as a "solution" to a problem. In *What is Philosophy*, Deleuze writes,

> We cannot say in advance whether a problem is well posed, whether a solution fits, is really the case, or whether a persona is viable. This is because the criteria for each philosophical activity is found only in the other two, which is why philosophy develops in paradox. Philosophy does not consist in knowing and is not inspired by truth. Rather, it is categories like Interesting, Remarkable, or Important that determine success or failure. Now, this cannot be known before being constructed. (WIP 83)

Although this may seem like a kind of relativism, Deleuze is a deeply realist philosopher, since any plurality of concepts refers, for him, not to different languages or cultures or human "practices" but to different powerful dynamics: to real if occult differential and repetitive forces selected in a field or "plan(e) of immanence" in which problems arise.[56] The ontological basis of thought, therefore, lies not in any conception of a representable given, but in the forced selection of a "problematic element," and an act of creativity that constructs and reconstructs through the seismic forces of events.[57]

Despite the fact that authentic natural science can also be an experience of being forced to think, for Deleuze it is the work of great artists that most clearly attests to what it is to be forced to think, and to create in response to the events of life.[58] Put briefly, this is because artists tend to work much more closely to *chaos* than do most scientists.[59]

Science, as Deleuze put is, is determined to establish the set of possible solutions to problems, and is determined to represent these solutions in recognizable patterns and predictable orders. The goal of science is not to produce paradox but to explain it. Philosophy, however, is paradoxical by nature. Deleuze writes,

> If philosophy is paradoxical by nature, this is not because it sides with the least plausible opinion or because it maintains contradictory opinions, but rather because it uses sentences of a standard language to express something that does not belong to the order of opinion or even of the proposition. The concept is indeed a solution, but the problem to which it corresponds lies in its intensional conditions of consistency, not as in science, in the conditions of reference of extensional propositions. (WIP 81)

Although there are certainly conceptions of scientific activity and scientific imagination that do not conform to Deleuze's characterization, at least as traditionally understood science does not claim the discovery of singularities (what Deleuze calls here "intensional conditions") as the *result* of its work. Philosophical concepts, on the other hand, preserve the inherently *problematic* singularity of experience. Its achievements are not so much solutions but *problems*, or provocations.

This is what makes the paradoxical objects of art a model for concepts. Proust's involuntary memories, Kafka's condemned innocents, Melville's White Whale, Bacon's vortices around which bodies decompose, Warhol's displaced Brillo Boxes, Joyce's nonsense words, the portmanteau words of Lewis Carroll—these uncanny things, these excessive features, these smiles without cats harbor the unconscious fixations or "dark precursors" that imperceptibly motivate events. Art renders visible or sonorous these otherwise imperceptible movers. Out of them, it makes strange new worlds.

Modern art thus proceeds as if it were possible to find the actual genetic elements of everyday life by transmuting those elements—by, as it were, putting a Campbell's

soup can in an art gallery. Only then do we see *that red* on the label *as red*. Only then do the elements constrained to advertise a product advertise, even for a moment, nothing but themselves. It is procedures such as this one used by Warhol, as well as the creative processes of film makers, composers, and painters that inspired Deleuze to call his own work an effort of conceptual *creation*.

II. Minding Art: Platonism Overturned

Because art involves the drive to make new worlds out of the events of our lives, and not the drive to include the meaning of events in a total representation of the world, art offers a model for philosophy different from that of science (at least as traditionally conceived).[60] Art models not a representation but a *repetition* of the singular elements that array themselves at the borders of various worlds. This repetition is, for Deleuze, what philosophy should emulate. Philosophy, if it would be authentic, should not attempt to make a *representation* of the world. Rather, it must like art dramatically *repeat* those elements in experience from which new worlds can be made. To put this in a "Platonic" idiom, for Deleuze this is how we make contact with what is most real in the world, even if this reality is inherently elusive, since simulacral. Devoted to difference and repetition—rather than identity and representation—thought, for Deleuze, is an *ambulatory* affair.[61] An enquiry. Because in some sense to follow this path this means to delve into the chaos of the world, our minds naturally resist the risk it takes to go where artists go, down the rabbit hole, through the looking glass, across the tracks, out to the deep grey sea.[62] And yet we must follow, argues Deleuze, unless we wish to remain attached to the tragedy and melodrama of our habitual conscious limitations and a profound stupidity [*betisement*] which, he will argue is more dangerous to thought than any kind of *error*.

The Image of Thought

> Thought is primarily trespass and violence, the enemy, and nothing presupposes philosophy: everything begins with misophy. Do not count on thought to ensure the relative necessity of what it thinks. Rather, count upon the contingency of an encounter with that which forces thought to rise up and educate the absolute necessity of an act of thought or a passion to think. The conditions of a true critique and a true creation are one and the same: the destruction of the image of thought which presupposes itself and the genesis of the act of thinking in thought itself. (DR 139)

In *Difference and Repetition*, Deleuze argues that there has been, throughout the history of philosophy in the West, an implicit "Image of Thought" that secretly pre-determines what can count as genuine philosophy.[63] At the center of this image is what Deleuze calls the figure of a "good will to thought:" an implicit presumption that in any genuine act of thought, it is the *good* which connects thought to truth. Deleuze defines this "good" will as the will to perpetually re-establish identity, order, continuity, and stability. Under the auspices of this Image, thinking consists in a will to order the mind against madness or idiocy and to order the world, against natural or demonic chaos, at any price. The Image of Thought and its presuppositions are all ultimately geared to protect human identity, natural order, and divine provenance from the potential of differential and repetitive forces—forces that cannot be represented in terms of identity, continuity, stability, and order—and the strange becomings to which they might attest. Fixated on the categories of *representation*, the Image of Thought blinds the mind to the sub-representational differences and trans-temporal repetitions of which the world is actually composed.

The Image is centered on the figure of a *cogitatio natura universalis* that Descartes supposed was given in humanity. For Deleuze, the persuasive force of Descartes' identification of thought with subjective being, *cogito ergo sum*, depends on the implicit presupposition that it is in the nature of thought itself, in its innate being, to seek the truth with a good nature and a good will. This good will exercises "common sense," the harmonious and spontaneous distribution of what is sensical and nonsensical. The good will, Descartes presupposes, uses its "good sense" to eliminate the confusion or error that arises when we misapply our powers—when we use our imagination where we should use our memory, or where we use memory where we should use reason, or reason where we should use our sensibility, and so on. To think with "good sense" is to eliminate the errors that arise from the competition of faculties or from their confusion in madness. However, Deleuze points out, the cogency of an idea of naturally donated "good sense" depends not on an explicit philosophical formulation, but on the implicit idea that "everyone knows" what it means to think.

Everything in the Image of Thought appears twice: once outside of philosophy in the "natural state" of our good sense, and once more within philosophy as the a set of presuppositions about how essences are reasonably determined (DR 167). For Deleuze the problem with this situation is that the postulates of good and common sense implicitly and explicitly legislate that the *object* of thought be something inherently *recognizable*, even if that object is no one particular empirical object but an "object in general" (so that philosophical reasoning can *render* the invisible Soul, the impassible God, the totalized World). For Deleuze, it is the Image of Thought which prevents philosophy from ever truly breaking with opinion, with the *doxa*, insofar as philosophy continues to fashion its

"metaphysical" ideas of things in terms of ordinary objects. Even if the essence of things amounts to an "invisible" mathematical ipseity, in the image of thought the invisible is always fashioned in the image of the (apparently) visible, such that the uncanny difference and repetition at the heart of nature and culture is perpetually occluded.

Deleuze argues that even in the great "critical" philosophies of Kant and Hegel, the Image of Thought still dominates, to the detriment of the breakthroughs these thinkers might otherwise have made. To begin with the latter, Deleuze's complaint against Hegel[64] is that because Hegel insists that only *contradiction* signifies a movement of the Absolute (i.e., of thought) the "differences" from which we might potentially learn the nature of Spirit in the *Phenomenology* are, in essence, *too large*. As Deleuze puts it, "even though it is said of opposition or of finite determination, this Hegelian infinite remains the infinitely large of theology, of the *Ens quo nihil majus*" (DR 45). For Hegel, since all sensible difference dissolves into indeterminate particularity (this red can only be defined as not every other red), only a concept in its totality or "absolute" reality (the sublation of all reds) has the infinite power of a distinctive difference. Whatever makes no conceptual difference, or difference in thought, makes no difference at all. For Deleuze, however, the true level of difference, and the truth of differences, lies beneath what can be determined as a contrariety; beneath a difference that can be *thought*. For Deleuze, the perpetual crisis of the Understanding, in Hegel, with its constant experience of negativity, is merely a dim shadow-play, an after-effect of the subterranean positive and differential forces of which "contradictions" are only an after-effect, the illusion of a consciousness that still imposes a *model* of difference onto difference itself (in this case the model of logical mediation or the overcoming of contradiction).

Even though Kant defined his critique in terms of a search for true and false problems, as a pedagogy of the "transcendental illusions" which must be overcome for skepticism to be refuted, for Deleuze Kant's pedagogy is not a true adventure of mind. "Kant still defines the truth of a problem in terms of the possibility of its finding a solution," Deleuze writes, "this time it is a question of the transcendental form of possibility, in accordance with a legitimate use of the faculties as this is determined in each case by this or that organization of common sense (to which the problem corresponds)" (DR 161). In other words, Kant's critique only teaches us how to *correctly return* to the objects of common sense, and the "transcendental turn" only abstracts from actual objects to possible ones in order to guarantee the possibility of objects whose legitimacy common sense (or Newtonian physics) already recognizes as valid. As Deleuze puts it,

> . . . Far from overturning the form of common sense, Kant merely multiplied it . . . knowledge, morality, reflection, and faith are supposed to correspond to natural interests of reason, and are never themselves called into question; only the use of faculties is declared legitimate or not in relation to one or another of these interests. (DR 137)

The real "Copernican Revolution," Deleuze thinks, would be to critique the faculties not in terms of their accord in objects of possible experience, but in terms of how faculties are *generated* by certain *intense* experiences. This would be a quest of thought for *encounters* which break with the *form* of the problems posed by common sense or "ordinary" empirical experience. We will son see what Deleuze means exactly by such experiences, as they play a crucial role in his thought.

Beyond the postulates of the Image of Thought lies a great risk, a confrontation of philosophy with allies other than those of good and common sense in the quest of truth.

Allies who at first appear, somewhat as the "allies" did to Carlos Castaneda in his quest to become a sorcerer, as powerful enemies.[65] A thought beyond the image of thought would, Deleuze writes,

> . . . find its difference or its true beginning, not in an agreement with the *pre-philosophical* Image but in a rigorous struggle against this Image, which it would denounce as *non-philosophical*. As a result, it would discover its authentic repetition in a thought without Image, even at the cost of the greatest destructions and demoralizations, and a philosophical obstinacy with no ally but paradox, one which would have to renounce both the form of representation and the element of common sense. (DR 132)

For authentic thought to begin, Deleuze argues, we must become demoralized with the possibilities open to us through the forms of representation and common sense. We must develop a taste for paradox, or for what paradox reveals without transparency. And yet this obscurity is not going to be a lapse into a vague relativism and empty sophistry. If certain art models authentic thought because such art breaks with representation and the cannons of recognition and good and common sense which undergird it, for Deleuze this is not simply in the name of irreality or irrationality. Rather, it is because the philosophy he seeks to construct would attest as much as art does to a reality that is too complex for the Image of Thought to handle, too small and too large to be represented or recognized. Deleuze calls for the destruction of the image of thought in the name of a richer if more dangerous reality: the world beneath representation, the world of repetition.[66]

The Theatre of Repetition

> We must believe in a sense of life renewed by the theatre, a sense of life in which man fearlessly makes himself master of what does not yet exist, and brings it into being. And everything that has not been born can still be brought to life if we are not satisfied to remain mere recording organisms. (Antonin Artaud, *The Theatre and its Double*, 13)

In *Difference and Repetition*, Deleuze argues that nature does not truly repeat itself, at least not as "nature" is understood to be the subject of observational science and the incarnation of physical laws (DR 3). What is constructed in a laboratory is merely a situation which *resembles* nature in its "free" state, and the results of experiment represent generalities about factors that are equivalent only from the point of view of general laws. Not only do experiments leave out a number of variables in any given situation, they select elements to which phenomena are in some sense *reduced*. As Deleuze puts it, "experimentation is thus a matter of substituting one order of generality for another: an order of equality for an order of resemblance," (DR 3).

While Deleuze has no complaint against the results of experimental science, he wants to make it clear that the order science reproduces is not, strictly speaking, a *repetition*. A bird in flight and a bee in flight, a diving whale and a diving penguin, the camouflage of a spider and that of a chameleon—these flights, dives, and masks may *resemble* one another, and there may be elements involved that are equivalent. But what would it mean to say that two flights *repeat* one another, or that two dives, two maskings, let alone two home runs, basketball shots, car races, murders, thefts, or performances of "All Blues" are *repetitions* of one another?

For Deleuze it does not suffice to say that these events *resemble* one another (DR 1). To say that two things resemble one another, even to an extreme degree, is not to say that they *repeat*. As long as we are considering particularities, we are thinking in terms of a general law that governs what can be substituted or *changed* within the act while the action or event or thing "remains the same." In fact, what can be repeated in any case would have to be something that passed below or above the particularities involved (muscles articulated, neurons fired, time, place, weather conditions, etc.). The paradox here is that for an event to repeat itself exactly, there has to be something absolutely *irreplaceable* in it, and this would have to be something other than a particularity or set of particularities about which we might generalize. A repetition would have to be something *singular*. As Deleuze puts it, "repetition as a conduct and a point of view concerns non-exchangeable and non-substitutable singularities" (DR 1).

Deleuze arrives at this claim in the following way. Since laws generalize about resemblances, and about which particularities can change for resemblances to continue to count as equivalences, repetition is not a matter of resemblance, and it does not follow laws. "If repetition is possible," Deleuze writes, "it is due to miracle rather than to law" (DR 2). What repeats, Deleuze insists, is always something singular, irreplaceable, irreducibly *different* from other things. If the whale and the penguin repeat the same dive, or even if the penguin repeats his own dive 1+n number of times, this is because, paradoxically, there is something about *diving* that is irreplaceable, something that has no equivalent.

This is why Kant was right, Deleuze notes, to insist that we look in vain to the order of nature for that on which we might model the authentic repetition for which

moral life seems to call.[67] Kant was right, Deleuze argues, to think that the moral law is something that comes from beyond all phenomena (all contingency and particularity) to demand something of us beyond our natural habits (DR 4). The limitation of Kant's view, for Deleuze, is that it does not offer the possibility of establishing moral habits as an authentic form of *repetition*. This is because the habits of the Kantian Man of Duty are a form of generality. Even though the Man of Duty legislates for himself, deciding each time what is right to be done, he does this in situations which *resemble* one another or through a law that reads situations as analogous to one another. In the end the moral law ends up looking very much like generalities of natural science, because the perfection of intention (the moral will) takes place as a subsumption of particulars to a general rule, (even if that rule originates in the regulative ideals of pure practical reason).

For Deleuze, we cannot look to morality any more than to science for the rule of genuine repetition (DR 5). Neither moral nor natural law can capture the *haecceity* (this-ness) of repetition. Science and morality can see a repetition only as a form of particularity in relation to general rules or forms. To discover the essence of repetition, for Deleuze, we must discover an order that operates without generality, a coherence that holds without resemblance, and this coherence must subsist beyond all recognition. Where are such haecceities, such an order and coherence found? For Deleuze they are found in art. "The repetition of a work of art is like a singularity without a concept," Deleuze writes (DR 1). We must look to art, Deleuze suggests, because it is art that does what morality and science cannot: it repeats the unrepeatable, and never establishes a regime of generality or a "concept" in terms of which we must envision the unrepeatable, the singular, the different. Deleuze writes,

> If repetition exists, it expresses at once a singularity opposed to the general, a universality opposed to the particular, a distinctive opposed to the ordinary, an instantaneity opposed to variation, and an eternity opposed to permanence. In every respect, repetition is a transgression. It puts law into question, it denounces its nominal or general character in favor of a more profound and more artistic reality. (DR 2-3)

What art expresses is something morality and science cannot. In fact art, for Deleuze, is something of a *transgression* against the laws governing morality and science. And by way of this transgression art indicates a coherence beyond generality, resemblance, and recognition.

For Deleuze it was Kierkegaard and Nietzsche who, despite their profound differences, both critiqued the ethico-scientific worldview by claiming it had concealed the true nature of things—a universe of singularities this believer and this atheist both argued was, in some sense, supremely artful. Kierkegaard argued this by showing that the principles of faith (the unpredictability of divine mandate) were beyond the generalities of the moral law, and called for a "theological suspension of the ethical" in the name of the singular and the "impossible" invasion of eternity into time. Nietzsche's "geological" suspension of morality shows, among other things, an animality in human nature, an "interior of the earth" (DR 6) which serves its own "perverse ends" no matter how law-governed it seems to be. For Deleuze, Kierkegaardian irony and Nietzschean humor both point to a "theatre of repetition" where, in a new and uncanny morality, humanity attempts to become equal to the inhuman events that befall it, and to will something in nature and create something in culture that is unrepeatable, even if this creation is unbearably painful, powerful, or sublime. Deleuze opposes their work to that "theatre of representation" in which modern thought hitherto took refuge. Deleuze writes,

> The theatre of repetition is opposed to the theatre of representation, just as movement is opposed to the concept and to representation which refers it back to the concept. In the theatre of repetition, we experience pure forces, dynamic lines in space which act without intermediary upon the spirit, and link it directly with nature and history, with a language which speaks before words, with gestures that develop before organized bodies, with masks before faces, with specters and phantoms before characters—the whole apparatus of repetition as a "terrible power." (DR 10)[68]

Both Nietzsche and Kierkegaard bring forces into philosophy which pass above or below conceptualization, populating their texts with animals, pseudonyms, fables and myths that performatively repeat powers that cannot be represented.

Repetition is always linked, for Deleuze, to a power to hide or conceal. While present, that which repeats is always *disguised*. As Deleuze puts it, "repetition is truly that which disguises itself in constituting itself, that which constitutes itself only by disguising itself . . . there is therefore nothing repeated which may be isolated or abstracted from the repetition in which it was formed, but in which it is also hidden " (DR 17). What, then, is the true power of repetition? If repetition is not something we can recognize in nature or espy in ourselves, in our habits or in our memories which *seem* to come to us "over and over" or in the moral consistency we attempt to develop, where does repetition actually occur?

To use an example Deleuze will use in his work on music, repetition is hidden as rhythm is hidden in cadence. When a drummer plays a beat, a repeating series of phrases, the redundance of the cadence hides the singularity of the rhythmic character which plays the cadence. This hidden or disguised singularity of accents or imperceptible inflections are what Deleuze calls *intensive*, as opposed to extensive or measurable values. Rather than being that which identifies different cadences as "the same" these

values create *inequalities* or micrological incommensurabilities between different, if apparently redundant, bars of a groove.

The inequality between the beats is not something negative or missing from the cadence. It is something supremely *positive*, if silent, which orients the sound. These intensive values cannot be heard, but can only "be" as masked sound. What Deleuze means when he argues that the "unequal is the most positive element" (DR 21) is that there could be no compelling, listenable, recognizable cadence—no genuine repetition, and thus no groove or swing of the otherwise monotonous refrain, without a compulsive, silent, unrepresentable *rhythm* which masks itself in the cadence as an irregularity or a *difference* peculiar to that cadence: a set of "rhythmic events that are more profound than the reproduction of ordinary homogeneous elements" (DR 21).

Thus the repetition that interests Deleuze always takes place in tandem with and as a function of imperceptible differences. The power of repetition, and its "theatre," is the stage established by the power of *differences in themselves* (rather than divergences from "the same. " Philosophy, for Deleuze, has historically attempted to *represent* difference in a *concept* of difference. But representation requires analogy, opposition, and negation—categories that subordinate difference to divergence from the same or the similar. Thus the true positivity of difference in itself is always missed. A real difference, for Deleuze, is never something in *opposition* to something else (red not blue), is not the negation of something by something else (not-just, not-man, not-God), and is not something that can be understood by analogy (two things unlike in some respect but the same in others). All of these notions of difference subordinate difference to a divergence from what is the same, and miss difference in and of itself.

Difference-in-Itself

Despite the fact that he creates a concept of difference that is not mere otherness or diversity, difference in Aristotle is still subordinated to conceptual identity, and is therefore not what Deleuze is getting at by the phrase "difference in itself."[69] Deleuze argues that difference in Aristotle is a "synthetic and attributive predicate," subordinate to *continuity* within genera and even within being itself (DR 31). Socrates and Plato are both rational animals. What makes this man Socrates and not Plato is something that can be recognized but not defined. Difference does not have its own concept, but is said equivocally: "Socrates is different from Plato" is an equivocal statement, since both Plato and Socrates differ differently from one another.

Difference of species (within genera) are not defined by a difference of the genera *in* itself (say "in" the genera of mammals), but by a difference *contained* within genera, as the genera of mammals contains all its "different" species. Collected differences, as it were, establish an identity. In lieu of a notion of differences *between* genera, "large" differences between species stand for the most important or most significant difference knowable. Thus an observable contrast stands in for a concept of imperceptible difference in itself. Difference actually divides and distributes essence in uncanny (indefinable) ways, but a "middling" contrast silently governs the image of difference, per se. Even the difference *between* genera (of say, mammals and reptiles) is thought in terms of the sameness of the Being they share, ineffable as this "analogy" may be (DR 33).

For Deleuze, this ineffable sameness of being in analogy is the secret enemy of a true concept of difference.[70] Deleuze's reason for this has less to do with the notion of analogy per se than with how it manifests, under the auspices of the Image of Thought, a drive to unify generic difference and specific difference in a single coherent, "organic," representable Whole of being. For Deleuze even Leibniz and Hegel, who each attempted in his own way to introduce infinity into this representable Whole, do so by allowing a particular difference (the microscopic differential, in Leibniz' case, and the macrological contradiction, in the case of Hegel) to stand in for difference in itself. Thus difference, as represented, as conceptualized, as *identified*, is once again missed *as difference*.

This is disastrous, Deleuze thinks, because each time a particular species difference is identified, (say rational, as opposed to irrational animal), we relate being to this difference without being able to say what it is that *individualizes* this being. For Deleuze the "Aristotelian" judgments we make, analogically attributing predicates to subjects or accidents to essences, always "retains in the particular only that which conforms to the general (matter and form), and seeks the principle of individuation in this or that element of the fully constituted individuals" (DR 38). The identity of the essence is what is substantial; difference is always that which is accidental, contingent, and arbitrary. But if difference individuates or produces individuality, as Aristotle seemed to think it did (since, as he says, we look to the "specific difference" for the form), individuality should not be understood in terms of the analogical distribution of being to various existents, since that always predetermines difference and, ironically, identity.

By contrast, for Deleuze, if we conceive of Being not as analogically but as *univocally* distributed, we approach difference in itself, and a more fluid notion of identity. Deleuze writes,

> When we say that univocal being is related immediately and essentially to individuating factors, we certainly do not mean by the latter individuals constituted in experience, but that which acts in them as a transcendental principle: as a plastic, anarchic and nomadic principle, contemporaneous with the process of individuation, no less capable of dissolving and destroying individuals than of constituting them temporarily; intrinsic modalities of being, passing from one "individual" to another, circulating and communicating matters and forms. (DR 38)

The point here is that, for Deleuze, to truly think difference as individuating, as a power to individuate requires a break with the common-sense impulse to seek individuation in representable relationships between genera and species, matter and form, potentiality and actuality. These conceptions make difference itself *indifferent*, inessential, external to things, a derivation from the same. But for Deleuze, difference *is* what individuates. This is so because for Deleuze it is Being which *is* Difference, and this difference is said differently (or equivocally) of each individual (DR 39). For Deleuze Being is not a genera *not* because all the categories share in it, but because being is substantially Difference, and each particular difference "is not" in a sense that has no contrary, that is not a negation, but a paradoxically positive non-being (DR 39). Identity, for Deleuze, is thus always *simulacral*, but never in the sense that a simulacra is a degraded copy. If Being is Difference, Socrates can be said to resemble his portrait, but only because of the differential and repetitive power of a simulacra to which both the portrait and the man attest. Thus there is something strangely "eternal" about difference, something like the intransitivity (but not the impassibility) of Platonic ideas. Deleuze argues, in fact, that it

was Plato who came closest to a notion of difference in itself, prior to Aristotle's attempt to represent difference in terms of the accidental or inessential.

Overturning Platonism

> The task of modern philosophy has been defined: to overturn Platonism. That this overturning should conserve many Platonic characteristics is not only inevitable but desirable. (DR 59)

As Deleuze reads it, Plato's dialectic is not, like Aristotle's, an attempt to determine the species of different genera, but to select lineages: "suitors of the Good" that the Socratic philosopher determines *worthy* of an Idea. When determining, for example, who counts as a sophist as opposed to a philosopher, or what counts as an acquisitive art as opposed to a productive art, or what counts as a winged as opposed to non-winged animal, Plato does not explain how the difference between any two terms could be represented or "mediated" in yet another opposition. Plato's divisions "lack sufficient reason," as Aristotle correctly saw (DR 59). For the later Plato, there is a distinct Idea for each thing, even for mud or hair. But ideas differ from one another, according to the *Sophist*, not due to "material" contingency, but as an effect of the idea of the Other. The difference the form of the Other makes is, to say the least, *occult*, and perhaps even incoherent, as Aristotle argued.

But the capricious or "incoherent" form of division or differentiation, which "jumps from one singularity to another," (DR 59), is precisely what is so important for Deleuze about the Platonic method. Socrates' capriciousness demonstrates that, in a

certain way, Plato does not subordinate difference to a representable divergence, or to what will amount in later philosophy as subordination of difference to the powers of the One, the Analogous, the Similar, or the Negative—all the ways in which difference is no longer thought "in itself," but always in relation to something else (DR 59).

As Deleuze puts it, in Plato "the Idea is not yet the concept of an object which submits the world to the requirements of representation, but rather of a brute presence which can be invoked in the world only in function of that which is not 'representable' in things" (DR 59). Thus in Platonic dialectics the relation between an Idea (of, say, the philosopher) and a possible participant or *icone* of that Idea (Gorgias, Charmides, or Socrates) is in some sense *occult*. It cannot be represented. However, it is a singularity which can be recognized through recollection. Recollection is precisely the prerogative of those who, illumined by the invisible light of the Good, perceive ideas in things, even if ideas or forms are not only beyond perception and representation but beyond concepts (since insofar as conceptual representation admits of explanation even if only analogically, in terms of other concepts and forms are ineffably self-same) (DR 59).

Faced with a host of "suitors" or "claimants" to the right to define and thus to participate in some Idea ("I am just," "I am beautiful," "I am your leader," "I am wise"), Socrates "tests" to see if the claim holds. But this test is always an enigma, a problem posed to the claimant: do you know the *nature* of the question to which you are giving an answer, the *essence* of the problem to which you are giving a solution? False claimants contradict themselves, in the end, because they do not fully understand the ideal nature of the problem they claim they can solve. If truth is not a matter of opinion, the best opinion will not matter; if ruling is not a matter of coercion, the most noble form of coercion will

not count as ruling, and so on. The "ideal" status of the Forms, Deleuze argues, corresponds to their inherently or eternally "problematic" nature, even if Plato ultimately writes as if philosophical inquiry can at least in principle return us to a state in which what is problematic in embodied existence will one day no longer be so (DR 62).

But beneath this "metaphysical comfort," Deleuze argues, lies the actual practice of platonic division: an ordeal, a trial. For Deleuze this is why Plato's dialectic is always tinged with irony: "irony consists in treating things and beings as so many responses to hidden questions, so many cases for problems yet to be resolved" (DR 63). Even if the philosopher has assurance of the ultimately unproblematic nature of the Ideas to which s/he belongs by right, the intuition of a Platonic idea is never a means of identifying things in the world but a way of *problematizing* them, a manner of calling into question what we take things to be.

For Deleuze this is the case in Plato not because ideas come in the form of "the negative," of a self-contradiction internal to things awaiting their resolution in infinitely "reflexive" concepts, but because, as Deleuze puts it, for Plato there is a kind of non-being or questionable-being (?-being, as Deleuze writes it in *Difference and Repetition*) which is nevertheless not a negation but a *positively problematic determination* (DR 63). This is the source of the irony of the philosopher's discourse: her questions lead only to other questions, her problems point not to solutions (which are always more than abundant) but to an inherently indecisive or *problematic* participation of things in ideas. The always incomplete sense of participation is not, however, a tragic incumbent to knowledge. Rather, problematic Ideas constitute the possibility of *learning*, per se. Deleuze writes,

> Neither the problem nor the question is a subjective determination marking a moment of insufficiency in knowledge. Problematic structure is part of objects themselves, allowing them to be grasped as signs, just as the questioning or problematizing instance is a part of knowledge allowing its positivity and its specificity to be grasped in an act of *learning*. More profoundly still, Being (what Plato calls the Idea) "corresponds" to the essence of the problem or the question as such. (DR 64)

For Deleuze, Plato constantly tried to "tame" the problematic nature of Being by describing Ideas as models from which *icones* or images of these ideas can or cannot be derived, relative to the receptivity of the participant (DR 127). This is the point at which Deleuze believes we must overturn the Platonic vision. Rather than suppose that Ideas are problematic due to the contingency of the model-copy relationship, Deleuze asserts that ideas are *essentially* and *necessarily* problematic due to relationships of *non-resemblance* between simulacra. When Nietzsche declared that it was the task of modern philosophy to "overturn platonism," this does not mean, for Deleuze, to jettison the entire platonic structure, but precisely to deny, from *within* the platonic vision, the priority of model over copy, and the need for a guarantee of the "return" of copies to originals. This denial amounts to the affirmation of simulacral *becomings* as the problematic element, or as the set of infinitely differentiating "Platonic ideas on the surface."

Overturned platonism accepts the idea that there *is* an invisible, occult quality in things, something in things that is more than our perceptions, memories, and cognitive acts can grasp. But it resists the notion that this excessive nature in things is somehow the shard of a lost transcendent stability, angels fallen from the heaven of ideas. For Deleuze, to overturn platonism is to take what is unperceivable in perception, what is immemorial in memory, and what is unthinkable in thought as inherently positive determinations of a learning act which is also a cosmic *becoming*. This is a world not of

beings but of becomings: of events, actions, and affects rather than of substances, properties, and causes. A world of pure transitions and modes whose only substance is a life whose essence is continuous experimentation.[71]

To overturn platonism—which is, Deleuze insists, to at once produce a work of art—is to release the play of simulacra, in their "eternal recurrence," in their being impossibly what they are: appearances without an appearing thing, accidents without essences, images without realities. To say that being is difference is to say that being is neither an original source nor a participating copy, but a simulacra. To reverse platonism is to attribute the eternal status of Ideal Forms to the dynamics of a simulacral time, a time "out of joint."

Simulacra Affirmed

Simulacra exist only as *becomings*—as a becoming-other of one series with respect to another, populated by "dark precursors" or "objects = x" which invisibly traverse series, appearing (differently) in each of them as a kind of forced motion. This is the sense in which the "modern" art that fascinates Deleuze is critical: it breaks down our ordinary notion of identity, of time, of place, and substitutes for it (in a violent act, in a decision, in fetish, in fixation) "impossible" connections, conjunctions, proximities, and locales. Certain forms of art, especially those that develop complicated series of images or words or events that are connected in ways different from ordinary continuities in space, time, and consciousness, thus model for Deleuze that "critical affirmation" which is the goal of thought.

What is this affirmation? Is it simply the self-assertion of various perspectives? Yes, but only in the sense that perspectives are not the prerogative of a knowing, conscious subject. For Deleuze, perspectives *involve* selves; selves do not choose perspectives (DR 56). What we have in an art like Joyce's or Francis Bacon's or Lewis Carroll's is a self or a world that exists or insists only in and as it is torn asunder by the various points of view which compose it, or *complicate* it. This is a serial art form, an art that forces (through strange connections, nonsense, mantric rhythms, haptic colorations) apparently unconnected or disparate lives, events, times, places, objects, words, colors and sounds to resonate with "one clamor of being" (DR 304). In this kind of art, Deleuze writes,

> each term of a series [of lives, of events, of animals, of words, of bodies, etc.] being already a difference, must be put into a variable relation with other terms, thereby constituting other series devoid of center and convergence . . . Difference must be shown *differing*. We know that modern art tends to realize these conditions: in this sense it becomes a veritable theatre of metamorphoses and permutations. (DR 56)

What would this mean for philosophy? In Plato, a chaos of simulacra confronts the philosopher, a host of differences from which must be selected those that are in conformity with the Idea. But what would thought be like if we overturned this situation? What if rather than seeking to subordinate difference we sought to multiply collaborations and connections between and within the disparate, the irreducibly different? Put abstractly, this would be to seek the conditions of real experience, not of possible experience. Put somewhat more concretely, it would be to take the experimentation of modern art forms as redefining the limits of the sensible, per se. This would bring together the two sides of aesthetics long sundered. Deleuze writes,

> Everything changes once we determine the conditions of real experience, which are not larger than the conditioned and which differ in kind from the categories: the two senses of the aesthetic become one, to the point where the being of the sensible reveals itself in the work of art, while at the same time the work of art appears as experimentation. (DR 68)

To pass beyond representation, we have to pass through Platonism once more. Why? For Deleuze it was Plato who first conceived of philosophy as an encounter with problems raised in sensation that cannot be solved by comparison with other sensations, or with memories or imaginary objects. At *Republic* 523b-524d, Socrates shows Glaucon that there are two kinds of sensory experiences: those which provoke thought (or "summon" it, as Reeve translates the word) and those which do not. At first Glaucon thinks Socrates is referring to objects seen in the distance, or in *trompe l'oeil* paintings. But Socrates has something else in mind: when we hold up three adjacent fingers, it is *the same sense* that reports to us that one finger is, at the same time, both larger and smaller than another. The report of the senses with respect to largeness and smallness is "contradictory." It says that a finger is both large and small simultaneously. The understanding must intervene to separate out the large from the small.

In this way Glaucon learns that certain sense experiences lead us to realize the necessity of ideal forms of Largeness in itself or Smallness in itself. Through mathematical training the philosopher will learn to conceive of such qualities in an abstract way—she will learn to conceive the one without simultaneously thinking of the many, i.e., "2" ("the dyad") without simultaneously relating it to "1" (the monad) or to "3" (the triad), and so on. The provocation to begin to undertake such training lies in a very peculiar encounter with an apparently contradictory set of signs issuing from sense experience itself. Plato's text implies that an *apprenticeship* in these experiences is

propaedutic to knowledge: a heterogeneity or *difference* internal to sensation itself provokes the genesis of thought.

This kind of difference is what Deleuze means by an *intensive* difference—a feature of sensibility that cannot be described by any pair of opposing terms, whether quantity or quality, matter or form. According to Deleuze, Plato tries to limit the "summoning" power of the intensive to the accidental condition of our soul in the material world. Plato offers the philosopher a kind of "metaphysical comfort" in the doctrine that the forms re-learned by the soul in this life have their origin in a Unity and Goodness beyond being to which the soul ultimately belongs and to which it is destined to return, despite its temporary situation of confrontation with unruly matter.

But even though Plato's ideas of a difference, apprenticeship, and heterogeneity proper to the sensible world is ultimately subordinate to this "mythical form of resemblance and identity" (DR 66), it remains Plato, for Deleuze, who is "the exception" in the history of philosophy (at least until Nietzsche) to those who subordinate the *problems* posed by sensibility to the a priori conditions of knowledge. Deleuze writes,

> For [Plato] learning is truly the transcendental movement of the soul, irreducible as much to knowledge as to non-knowledge. It is from "learning," not from knowledge, that the transcendental conditions of thought must be drawn. That is why Plato determines the conditions in the form of *reminiscence*, not innateness. In this manner, time is introduced into thought—not in the form of the empirical time of the thinker subject to factual conditions, and for whom it takes time to think, but in the form of an in-principle condition or time of pure thought (time takes thought). Reminiscence then finds its proper object, its *memorandum*, in the specific material of apprenticeship—in other words, in questions and problems as such, in the urgency of problems independently of their solutions, in the realm of the Idea. (DR 166)

What so inspires Deleuze here is that Plato's theory of ideas is rooted in a theory of education. Ordinary objects—statues, olives, beaches, hands, and stars—simply call

for recognition. We know what these things are because we have seen them before. Even when perception is not immediately transparent, the memory or the intellect can recall what an object is and apply it to the confusion (DR 139). None of this is yet "learning," in the Platonic sense of reminiscence. Only when contradictory perceptions cannot be sorted out by reference to other perceptions (even past or paradigmatic perceptions) are we confronted with an intensity or a "difference" which defies the power of the senses to recognize discrete perceptions (DR 140). It is thus difference that *forces* genuine learning, or genuine thought.

As Deleuze reads it in Plato, the intensity forcing thought is not a quality or quantity, but an imperceptible difference within qualities. The hard is not hard without also being soft (relative to something). The loud is not loud without also being quiet. The just is not just without being unjust, the beautiful without being ugly, and so on (DR 141). In order to "recognize" things as being what they are, Socrates teaches that we must resort to resources beyond sensation, beyond memory, beyond even thought itself. Where would we find such things, such reference points? In the recollection of the forms of Hardness, Loudness, Justice, Beauty, Courage, Moderation, and so on.

In Plato, recollection is a journey of the soul from a place it knows, through a place full of unknowns, and back to that place it knows. But this Platonic myth, for Deleuze, confuses the being of the past with a past being, the being of the sensible with sensible being (what we are looking for in sensation is *like* a sensible quality), and the form of thought with the form of the good (when we think of hardness in itself or justice in itself, it has a self-identity derived from that Good whose perfect impassibility is imparted to all the ideas). Reversing platonism, for Deleuze, means to free the being of

the sensible, the form of thought, and the nature of time itself from all resemblance with sensible objects, self-identical forms, and all images of time that take the present moment as its paradigm. It is to capture those simulacral instants that force us to *learn*.

Because Plato does not yet subordinate difference to representation, we get a very clear image of the *simulacral* nature of difference, of what for Deleuze is the insubordination of difference to either the model or the copy. "The simulacral" is not, properly speaking, an ontological category. Or if it is, it is so only paradoxically. For simulacra make the being/non-being distinction problematic, somewhat in the way that anti-matter makes problematic the distinction between what is material and what is immaterial. A simulacrum is a non-being which does not distinguish itself from being. In a way, the uncannily present simulacrum play for Deleuze the role that the ineffably present One played in Neo-Platonism. But whereas it is the role of the One to mediate difference and thus to relate it to a higher unity, the role of a simulacrum is to further differentiate the *merely* diverse, to make distinct and singular an ordinary diversity. Rather than say "there are simulacra," we should say that "the many simulacrum produce the effect of being." Above all when simulacral forces are united (if not unified) in the work of art. As Deleuze puts it,

> When the modern work of art develops its permutating series and its circular structures, it indicates to philosophy a path leading to the abandonment of representation. It is not enough to multiply perspectives in order to establish perspectivism. To every perspective or point of view there must correspond an autonomous work with its own self-sufficient sense: what matters is the divergence of series, the decentering of circles, "monstrosity" . . . it is in this direction that we must look for the conditions, not of possible experience, but of real experience (selection, repetition, etc.) It is here that we find the lived reality of a sub-representative domain . . . always a difference of difference as its immediate element. (DR 69)

The work of Marcel Proust serves as such a major cipher for Deleuze's philosophical enterprise precisely for its development of perspectives that are not products of a synthetic overview, but rather constitute self-sufficient worlds of signs. Proust's apprenticeship to these signs thus models that form of learning which difference and repetition require: encounter with the lived reality of a sub-representative domain that can be known only as it is recreated, or repeated, in the signs of art. To Deleuze's work on Proust we now turn.

III. Learning Signs: Recollection Without Recognition

In the preface to the English edition of *Difference and Repetition*, written in 1994, Deleuze asserts that the project of that book had already begun in Deleuze's earlier monograph on the work of Marcel Proust, *Proust and Signs*.[72] There Deleuze had first espied, in Proust's *Search for Lost Time*, a new conception of what it means to *learn*, a conception that breaks decisively with an "Image of Thought" that would make learning a matter of confirming and conforming to the dictates of common sense. For Deleuze, Proust's *recherches* break with the strictures of the Image of Thought in a way that is instructive for philosophy. Deleuze's epistemology, in a sense, began with his reflection on Proust: "a liberation of thought from those images which imprison it: this is what I had already sought in Proust" (DR xvii).

In the classical image of thought, a thinker's "good will" leads her to truth: there is a presupposed natural alliance between the goodwill of the thinker and truth itself, between common sense or good sense and the representable identity of the things we wish to know. But in the *recherches* of Marcel Proust, truth cannot be sought with the good will. It is rather that which *befalls* us, as a kind of blow. As Deleuze puts in *Proust and Signs*, "philosophy, with all its method and goodwill, is nothing compared to the secret pressures of the work of art" (PS 98). For Deleuze, it is only the secret pressures of the world that force us to think, to learn, and to create. Thus it is to artists like Proust that we must look for a paradigm of what philosophy might become beyond its attachment to elements common sense can recognize, its presumption of a "friendship with concepts" by means of which it pre-ordains a natural affiliation of mind for truth.

As Deleuze reads it in Proust, the truth is not that which befriends us. Rather, is that which disguises and betrays itself. And the true thinker is not the friend of the representable concept, but the jealous lover of the elusive, imperceptible *idea*. It is the indications of s*igns*, and not the elucidation of the proposition, which is the home, or better the "territory" of genuine thought and creation. As Deleuze puts it, "Creation, like the genesis of the act of thinking, always starts from signs. The work of art is born from signs as much as it generates them; the creator is like the jealous man, interpreter of the god, who scrutinizes the signs in which the truth betrays itself" (PS).[73]

In this chapter, reading Deleuze reading Proust will make clearer the paradigmatic status of art for a thought that would break with the strictures of representation and, more importantly, with the cannon of *recognition*: the unspoken dictate that thought recognize itself in its object. Proust gives Deleuze a model of philosophy as a perpetual *confrontation* with uncanny signs, and of conceptual creation as an art of *learning* those signs. Ultimately the essences or ideas we learn, for Deleuze, are not the subjects of consciously constructed knowledge but are rather the forces of unconscious provocations.

Apprenticed to Signs: Marcel Proust and the Art of Learning

> We learn nothing from those who say, "do as I do." Our only teachers are those who tell us to "do with me," and are able to emit signs to be developed in heterogeneity rather than propose gestures for us to reproduce. (DR 23)

Deleuze argues, in *Difference and Repetition*, that *learning* is not a matter of adequating an action to a representation (say, the act of swimming and the movements of a teacher's arms). Rather, on Deleuze's account learning is a matter of connecting signs (e.g. waves in water) with a possible response (what our body can and cannot do in waves) (DR 23). We do not so much *imitate* the possible actions represented by our teacher as *repeat* her real response to actual waves. As Deleuze puts it,

> The movement of the swimmer does not resemble that of the wave, in particular, the movements of the swimming instructor which we reproduce on the sand bear no relation to the movements of the wave, which we learn to deal with only by grasping the former in practice as signs . . . . When a body combines some of its own distinctive points with those of a wave, it espouses the principle of a repetition which is no longer that of the Same but involves the Other—involves difference, from one wave and one gesture to another, and carries that difference through the repetitive space thereby constituted. To learn is indeed to constitute this space of an encounter with signs, in which distinctive points renew themselves in each other, and repetition takes shape while disguising itself. (DR 23)

The distinctive points which emerge in the space of the teacher's movements are not imitated by but *repeated in* the (different) body of the student. Thus, swimming is not a transcendent idea from which action is deduced, but an immanent idea which *insists* in our attempt to swim. Swimming is thus not a static being represented by the teacher to

the student, but a dynamic form of *becoming* that is transmitted and modulated across the body of the teacher *through* the body of the student.

The key point in Deleuze's account, here, is that it is only in the singularity constituted by the *real* encounter with *actual* waves that the "essence" or "idea" of swimming subsists. For Deleuze there is no "representable form" of the idea of swimming (at least not one from which anything could be learned). There is only an *event* in which the distinctive points of a body combine with those of a wave. The teacher does not represent but rather *transmits* a singular relation between her body and the waves, a relation that must be repeated differently in the body of the student.

This transmission cannot happen through conscious imitation, because the relation between the wave and the body is, each time, a unique singularity. The nature or essence of the idea is never a stable, representable "solution" to the problem of what to do in water. Rather, the idea of swimming, as an *event*, poses a problem or introduces the "problematic field" in which we learn. As Deleuze explains this subtle but crucial point,

> To learn to swim is to conjugate the distinctive points of our bodies with the singular points of the objective Idea in order to form a problematic field. This conjugation determines for us a threshold of consciousness at which our real acts are adjusted to our perceptions of the real relations, thereby providing a solution to the problem. Moreover, problematic Ideas are precisely the ultimate elements of nature and the subliminal objects of little perceptions. As a result, "learning" always takes place in and through the unconscious, thereby establishing the bond of a profound complicity between nature and mind. (DR 165)

For Deleuze the fact that we can learn, at all, points to a complicity between nature and mind. However, this complicity is not the one Kant determined as the set of possible actions within the phenomenal world deduced from the categories of our understanding. For Deleuze it is rather the *body* that unconsciously but continuously

creates *real* relations between action and perception, always on the basis of an encounter not with stable objectivities consciously apprehended ("the possible") but with "problematic ideas" which appear, *apart from their enactment*, only as subliminal or unconscious elements (as purely "virtual" elements). Learning happens when a new mode of existence comes into being, a form of becoming that "actualizes" the virtual, creating a new assemblage or multiplicity of life.

What Deleuze means when he claims that ideas are inherently problematic is that a multiplicity-in-becoming, the actualization of the virtual, always poses a problem: the idea of swimming inherently poses the problem of what it is to swim. The specificity of the idea of swimming, its *ipseity*, cannot be known apart from acts of learning, or from *experiment*.[74] The status of an idea as "virtual" is therefore always *incomplete* or *in excess of itself*, its essence located *in a process of becoming rather than in a state of being*. Ideas are and remain problematic not because actual acts of swimming lack a governing notion to unify them, but because the virtual does not exist apart from things themselves—it is not a transcendental condition of possibility, but of *reality* that evolves and changes through acts of learning. Deleuze describes it this way.

> Neither the problem nor the question is a subjective determination marking a moment of insufficiency of knowledge. Problematic structure is part of objects themselves, allowing them to be grasped as signs, just as the questioning or problematizing instance is a part of knowledge allowing its objectivity and its specificity to be grasped in the act of *learning*. (DR 64)

Another way of putting this would be that it is the *act* of learning, the *event* of its actualization (and the virtualization of its idea) that is logically prior to the actual instance or the virtual idea. While there are no a priori rules governing how actualization can occur in that act, because ideas are always already a part of the structure of objects, there

are nevertheless material regimes of signs in terms of which ideas objectively emerge. This constitutes a specificity, a determinate *multiplicity* peculiar to any act of learning.

Deleuze's most thorough account of learning comes in his early monograph, *Proust and Signs*. For Deleuze, when certain sensory experiences provoke Marcel Proust to reminisce, what is recalled in the Search is never simply another past experience. Rather, the Search finds an object (such as the city of Combray) which "is" only in recollection—only its distribution across two series: one of a present, lived experience and one of an unlivable encounter, a sensation given substance only in the style of Proust's artistic work.

Deleuze calls Proust a "Platonist" because Proust seems to affirm the existence of objectivities that are something like Platonic forms. For Deleuze the worlds Proust learns are inherently *problematic ideas*, fraught with an ambiguity that is not due to any deficiency on Proust's part, but which is proper to the obscure nature of those worlds, themselves. Far from occluding knowledge, however, this obscurity is what causes the life of different times and places to exist in signs. The worlds Proust explores are problematic in a positive sense: they do not exist as eternal ipseities but subsist or "insist" in signs. For example, Proust's idea of the city of Combray is neither in the taste of the Madeline in the present nor in the past which that taste evokes, but in a pure passage of time, always already past and always yet to come, a time *which never actually passes* outside of the literary creation, and which is virtually present in the signs repeated in that act of creation.

Proust's idea of Combray is neither a copy of an original nor itself an eternally self-same identity. It is a simulacra, a mobile difference-in-itself. The identity of

Combray is nothing but a difference which traverses two series, that of a past which is immemorial outside of the *Recherche* itself and that of a present experience which forces sensation (taste or sight or hearing) to confront an uncanny sign (DR 122). In this sense Deleuze reads Proust as a kind of strange, or "problematic" Platonist, engaging in a kind of Platonic recollection without the knowledge acquired being an effect of recognition.

For Deleuze, Proust's worlds are constituted by a kind of obverse of the platonic Idea. For Proust it is not we who recall the essence of things from the mythical past (in which we dwelt fully with the ideas themselves), but in some sense the reverse: Proust's problematic worlds are like hieroglyphs that demand interpretation, and the varieties and vagaries of his experience correspond to various successful or failed interpretations of those inherently problematic ideas. Ideas, in Proust, are forces that call us or give us our *vocation*.

But learning signs, for Deleuze, is not a derivation of our subjectivity, even in a transcendental or critical realist sense of there not being anything to know apart from our meaning-making behavior. For Deleuze signs are not conventional; they are expressive of things themselves, even if what they express is obscure. For Deleuze signs are always both *distinct* and *obscure*. Signs have this double status as part of a cosmic process of *expression*: something very much like Spinoza's *natura naturans*—a continuous generativity that is no less sign than thing, no more nature than culture, no less free than determined.[75] Because art models expression better than science and philosophy as traditionally conceived, Deleuze turns to artists like Proust for a model of genuine learning.

For Deleuze, the expressivism of the world is the true subject of the *recherches* of Proust. Thus Proust's method is not a simple reproduction of the past, or mere reverie, but the recapitulation, indeed the *anamnesis*, of a *form* of time, or of becoming. Why is this recapitulation so important to knowledge? Why must we in some sense remain with the platonic model of reminiscence, even if in order to recall what we can no longer recognize? Proust's answer, to put it cryptically, is because *our time is not our own*. The first time we experience anything, it is in a sense blind, mute, uncreated, void. But as soon as it is repeated (paradigmatically in art), *time itself*, in all its multiplicity, comes into focus, not as a whole but as a set of singularities. Art is thus a way of recollecting not the past, but of what in the past can be realized only via the style of an artist who can deliver, as if for the first time, what a experience unwittingly harbored.

This is why, for Deleuze, repetition is closer to the essence of art than any notion of representation. The singular elements inhabiting a great artists' style have neither analog nor allegory in any other world than the world of that style. If artists are able to "recall" the truth of a given world (the countryside of Provence, the seas of the 19th century, the aisles of 20th century supermarkets), this is not because the artist has created a world analogous to the actual world. It is, rather, the *unrecognizability* of the singularities haunting "actual" experience that provokes the necessity of artistic repetition, and appeals to us in art. This is why, Deleuze says, our only response to great art is to make more of it, just as the only true response to love is more love. If art or love have essences, that is only because essences magnify singular Differences as the only truly living things, harbingers of present yet ever-disguised powers.

For Deleuze, Proust teaches that the essence of a particular world, and the nature of its relationship to other worlds, is not a self-identical object of contemplation. It is an essence which only *is* when invoked or *evoked* in the signs recreated in a style.[76] As Deleuze puts it,

> The Search is presented as the exploration of different worlds of signs that are organized in circles and intersect at certain points, for the signs are specific and constitute the substance of one world or another. (PS 4)

Deleuze calls Proust's art, like Plato's education, an "apprenticeship." What Proust is apprenticed to are potentials in things that only stand out as potentials, or as signs, under the objective conditions of that apprenticeship. Proust's apprenticeship is particular to him, but it is not exactly "relative" to his capacities. Just as carpenters are peculiarly sensitive to wood, and to the signs emitted by wood, and just as good doctors are peculiarly sensitive to or "called by" the symptoms of disease, so Proust is peculiarly sensitive to certain kinds of signs (PS 4).

Yet signs are not constituted as such through subjective acts, and are not simply relative to subjective dispositions. This is why Deleuze argues that signs populate *worlds* (or what he will later call *regimes*), and does not hesitate to claim that the initiate or apprentice more or less *participates* in various worlds. As Deleuze reads Proust, it is ultimately these strangely "objective" worlds whose signs determine the nature and possibility of the search, even though that search can be carried out only in the extraordinary achievement of Proust's peculiar style.

In a somewhat Kantian fashion Deleuze understands the sign as the *limit* of both our faculties and of various "worlds" (of love, of urban life, of a countryside, of art, of politics, etc.). As Deleuze puts it, "instead of an indifferent perception, a sensibility that

apprehends and receives signs, the sign is the limit of this sensibility, its vocation, its extreme exercise" (PS 99). To reverse Kant, the schema according to which the understanding functions, for Deleuze, is not what is most common, sensible, and rational, but what is most uncanny. On Deleuze's view of mind, the shortest line is not a transcendental reassurance: "the shortest schema is the drama (dream or nightmare) of the straight line" (DI 99).

In opposition to Kant's taste for common sense and popular notions (which Kant awards "civil rights" in his critique), for Deleuze what thought consists in is not the harmonious functioning of our faculties but their autonomous and divergent exercise. As he sees it operative in Proust, for Deleuze authentic thought always involves a "disjunct use" and "involuntary exercise" of our faculties, the potentials of which Plato was more aware of than was Kant.[77] It is on this basis that Deleuze relates and yet differentiates between Proust and Plato. The "objectivity" of different worlds (the salon, the city, the work of art), with their different kinds of signs does indicate a set of essences proper to different worlds, in Proust. Deleuze's "Proustian" sense of essence, however, is not a self-identical substance, but an *extraordinary viewpoint*.

What Deleuze admires in Proust's work is that the viewpoints inspired by involuntary memories are not so much perspectives on time, but the times (and signs) belonging to a perspective. The signs of art reveal to us the different kinds of time we are living. These are times "out-of-joint." They are the times not of history, or of physical causation, or of cosmic rotation, but produced or reproduced times of strange connections and uncannily discerned relations. Proust's art presents a time that cannot be experienced directly but only in *repetition*. Thus Deleuze can claim that in Proust, time itself is the

true subject of the search, a time belonging neither to subjects nor objects, but to the autonomy of artistic creation itself, the autonomy of style itself (PS 115).

If Platonic essences have always already been present even if they are occluded here-and-now, Proustian essences are never pre-given, and are not found apart from a creative act. In Proust the duplicity of sensation, the confusion in experience which provokes the need for recollection, is not already oriented, as it seems usually to be for Plato, toward an ideal mean or measure that will divide truth from apparent truth, illusion from reality. Proustian recollection is oriented rather by a creative act: a repetition that will only indicate essence or identify itself when that essence has been *re*-produced. In a second time, in another place. As Deleuze puts it," the Search is oriented toward the future, not to the past" (PS 4). For Deleuze, Proust is searching for a future that is available only on the basis of a repetition which will release something from the past that never exactly belonged to it—something that was improper or *unheimlich* there, something that can live only in a repetition it provokes in the artist: a *style*.

From Logos to Hieroglyph

> It is style which substitutes for experience the manner in which we speak about it or the formula that expresses it, which substitutes for the individual in the world the viewpoint toward the world, and which transforms reminiscence into realized creation. (PS 111)

Deleuze imputes a *hieroglyphic* style to Proust. If Socratic *logos* is the discourse which attempts to dialectically work toward a substance of things that is in some sense eternally pre-given, and that mind has only to recollect, Proust's version of recollection

evokes not a pregiven substance but the heterogeneity of sensation, itself: difference in itself, repetition for itself. In Proust's work, essence is not beyond sensation, but is rather that which in sensation differs and repeats, or that which signals what it is only *as another sensation* (or that which in memory cannot be remembered except as something forced or provoked by *another* memory, an "involuntary" memory). Proust's modern or "hieroglyphic" discourse signs the presence of essences, but these cannot be recognized in terms of ideal identities, and the mind "adequate" to essence does not come before but *after* the advent of the sign. In *The Search for Lost Time*, all that was given to Proust has become shards or traces, and the signs to which essence *will have* referred await their recreation in his work.

What makes Proust's work so important for Deleuze is the way in which it displaces the problem of "the whole" of experience, moving it away from a problem of recalling that which was given and towards that which remains to be created. As Deleuze articulates this point,

> . . . the entire problem of objectivity, like that of unity, is displaced in what we must call a "modern" fashion, essential to modern literature. Order has collapsed, as much in the states of the world that were supposed to reproduce it as in the essences or Ideas that were supposed to inspire it. The world has become crumbs and chaos. Precisely because reminiscence proceeds from subjective associations to an originating viewpoint, objectivity can no longer exist except in the work of art; it not longer exists in signification as stable essence, but solely in the signifying formal structure of the work, in its style. It is no longer a matter of saying: to create is to remember—but rather, to remember is to create, is *to reach that point where the associative chain breaks, leaps over the constituted individual, is transferred to the birth of an individuating world*. (PS 111)

An artist like Proust models authentic thought because Proust has experienced *where*, *how*, and *to whom* and *in what degree* experience breaks up, loses its normalcy, its regularity, its predictability. And this not because Proust is a more self-involved ego or

more sensitive subject, but because in his style Proust experiences the Self as a viewpoint external to him, as something that is always the subject of experimentation, a vector various worlds.

To generalize, rather than seeking a narrative that will reunite what is broken in experience, part of what makes art paradigmatic for thought is that the artist is able to develop a "point of view" that does not summarize or encompass experience, but comes alongside experience in a way that forces resonances and connections that would not resound or be visible otherwise than as art. That is why it can be said that art "recalls" us to experience or that the artist "reminisces" about experience, without for all that making experience recognizable to our *sensus communis*. As Deleuze puts it,

> . . . there is no Platonic reminiscence here [in Proust], precisely because there is no sympathy as a reuniting into a whole; rather the messenger is itself an incongruous part that does not correspond to its message nor to the recipient of that message . . . one would look in vain in Proust for platitudes about the work of art as organic totality in which each part predetermines the whole and in which the whole determines the part (a dialectic conception of the work of art)" (PS 114). [78]

Proust does not proceed, as Socrates does, along the lines of a dialectic—he does not set out, on the basis of any intuition of Forms, to divide legitimate from illegitimate signs, reality from illusion, sophistry from wisdom. Rather, Proust is arrested by certain signs (Vinteuil's little phrase, the ankle boot, the madeleine) that force him to simultaneously invent and (re)interpret. It is in this activity, for Deleuze, that mind consists, for it exemplifies the mandate of transcendental empiricism that the conditions of experience be no larger than that which they condition—that experience itself, in its intensive and singular *becoming*, provokes its own categories and its own evaluation.

Proust is learning an essence when forced to create, but essence is not what Socrates would count as well defined in *logos*, in a true speaking.[79] Socrates mocks the Sophists by claiming that their form of questioning is that of children and the senile. Sophists are childish by thinking that essence can be determined and definition found by answering *which one* is beautiful; by giving an example. For Deleuze the Sophists have an insight Socrates refuses to see. Deleuze writes,

> The Sophist Hippias was not a child who was content to answer the question "which one?" when asked the question "what is?" He thought that the question "which one?" was the best kind of question, the one most suitable for determining essence. For it does not refer, as Socrates believed, to discrete examples, but to the continuity of concrete objects taken in their becoming, to the becoming-beautiful of all the objects citable or cited as examples. Asking which one is beautiful, which one is just, and not what beauty is, what justice is, was therefore the result of a worked-out method, implying an original conception of essence and a whole sophistic art which was opposed to the dialectic. An empirical and pluralist art. (NP 76)

It is interesting to note that Deleuze's critique of Plato is not of his metaphysical vision per se—not of the idea of their being essences at all, which many would take to be Nietzsche's critique. Deleuze insists that it is the form of the question itself (or the mode of critique) which sets in motion Plato's metaphysical distinctions between essence and appearance, being and becoming. Deleuze insists that these oppositions depend "primarily upon a mode of questioning, a form of question" (NP 76). For Deleuze what distinguishes the "empirical and pluralist art" that would be, paradoxically, the true platonism (recollection without recognition, determination of "problematic" essences) is therefore not any kind of axiomatic metaphysical supposition, but rather a certain form of question, a certain style of critique. It is an art form, a Nietzschean art of "measuring rivals and selecting claimants" (DR 59).

Thus it is through platonism *and* against it that Deleuze believes we should fulfill Nietzsche's dream of overturning platonism. To determine essences (which are not "beings" in the platonic sense of self-identical points of reference but rather are strange continuities in the world of becoming) philosophers must be, like modern artists, creators. Socrates is unable to do this because the form of the question upon which he insists is not *active*. It is fundamentally *passive*, as if lying in wait. That is why Socrates is a *reactive* thinker, in Nietzsche's sense, even if he was the thinker, Nietzsche admits, who took the reactionary stance to its highest possible level.

Deleuze (with the later Nietzsche) affirms Plato's radicality, that Plato was a thinker of forces as much as Nietzsche: "Plato offers us an image of thought under the sign of encounters and violences," Deleuze writes.[80] For Deleuze Proust is better than Socrates, and a better Platonist, because Proust does not attempt to *anticipate* the encounters that provoke him. Socrates, for Deleuze, still imagines that his intelligence—and his *daimon*—come prior to experience, prior to the encounters which might provoke recollection. "The Socratic demon, irony, consists in anticipating the encounters," Deleuze writes (PS 101). The point here is that when Socrates says "no" to an answer, this is because he has already organized the situation (the question) in an intellectual way—the responses to the "what is . . ." questions that Socrates asks himself and others are already ironized by the impossibility of answering that specific question in that specific way.[81]

Under a hieroglyphic aegis such as Proust's, essences "force us to think; they develop in the meaning in order to be necessarily conceived" (PS 102). Essences do not have a static, immutable character: they develop or unfold themselves, in a "baroque"

manner.[82] The strange nature of essences is found or discovered only when we are forced to respond to and indeed to recreate the *difference* to which they attest in *becoming*. As Deleuze puts it, in *Difference and Repetition*,

> . . . essence is precisely the accident, the event, the sense; not simply the contrary of what is ordinarily called the essence, but the contrary of the contrary: multiplicity is no more appearance than essence, no more multiple than one. (DR 191)

The form of knowledge called for by the multiple character of being is one that Proust's art models well. There, a series of concrete objects undergo a transformation in the *recherche*, even as those objects provoke a style of recollection that transforms them. The essence of the objects of the *recherche* insist only in the performance of that style—as Proust says of the musicians, they did not so much play Vinteuil's "little phrase" as perform the rites necessary for its invocation. Here the contrast should be clear with the Socratic method of determining essence through elenchic procedure, whose goal is the establishment of an ideal essence *beyond* all exemplification, beyond "which one." On the contrary, for Proust it is only the "counting" of each sensation, or of the intensive encounter to which it attests, that renders a distinct essence, even while that essence maintains an obscurity proper to its continual transformability and mutability.

"One must be endowed for signs," Deleuze writes (PS 101).[83] But Socrates (at least the Socrates Deleuze knew) is only partly endowed for signs. He only partly gives himself over to the hieroglyph. The logos is kept in readiness. But for Deleuze, as for Nietzsche, this poisons the intelligence. For Socrates, "the intelligence always comes after; it is good when it comes after; it is good only when it comes after" (PS 101). The afterthought of Socrates is always art. But an artistic Socrates, for Deleuze, would be the

truer Platonist. Because it is primarily through art that essences are evoked in their purest difference, in their most authentic ability to express.

Socrates is right to say, listen not to me but to something else, something that is not reducible to communication. His error is to say that we should listen to a tale of metaphysical homecoming, of immutable and immemorial recapitulation. If truth lies in those encounters which interrupt the functioning of recognition, in encounter with the Different, Proust's recollection of lost time is a recollection without recognition. Proust is thus a Socrates who "can rightly say: I am Love more than the friend, I am the lover; I am art more than philosophy; I am constraint and violence, rather than goodwill" (PS 101).

Problematic Essences, Unconscious Ideas

> The fact remains that the revelation of essence (beyond the object, beyond the subject himself) belongs only to the realm of art. If it is to occur, it will occur there. This is why art is the finality of the world, and the apprentice's unconscious destination. (PS 50).

Style evokes the singularity of a world, of the essence of a world. As Proust himself put it, "thanks to art instead of seeing a single world, our own, we see it multiply, and as many original artists as there are, so many worlds will we have at our disposal, more different from each other than those that circle in the void . . ." (PS 42). However, art does not clue us in to some primordial or originary givenness of the world. Rather, art

draws out a quality, a disparity, a difference proper to a world that is created out of a style, and that insists in that style, alone.

But the truth of a world, if singular, is not a premise from which other truths can be derived. It is not a template for designing other worlds. It is not even a paradigm for other works of art. It is a Difference. What to do in response to a difference, to something extraordinary? What do we do with our favorite songs? We repeat them. "Play it again, Sam." The extraordinary difference elicited by art calls for its repetition. This is why difference and repetition cannot be opposed. "Difference and repetition are only apparently in opposition. There is no great artist who does not make us say, "the same and yet different" (PS 49).

The reason, perhaps even the "sufficient reason" why essences are what they are, for Deleuze, is that properly speaking, essences are of the order of the unconscious, of "unconscious themes and involuntary archetypes" (PS 47). That is why art always involves partiality, or "partial objects," in order to display and evoke essence. The unity of essence is not a whole. It can be evoked only by a multiplicity of partial objects. As Deleuze puts it,

> The essential point is that the parts of the search remain partitioned, fragmented, *without anything lacking*: eternally partial parts, open boxes and sealed vessels, swept on by time without forming a whole or presupposing one, without lacking anything in this quartering, and denouncing in advance every organic unity we might seek to introduce into it. (PS 161)

Deleuze argues that when Proust compares his work to a gown or a cathedral, it is not in order to insist on his own special form of unity and unification, his own special form of logos. It is on the contrary to "emphasize his right to incompletion, to seams and patches" (PS 161). The artist asserts his right *against* the metaphysical and organicist

temptation. She finds the power of her work in her ability not to unite what is sundered from itself, but in her ability to evoke a resonance and a world of signs that resonates only because the essence which the resonance evokes comes into being *alongside* the elements we might mistakenly think are "unified" or "gathered" in the work. As Deleuze puts it,

> this seems a good definition of essence: an individuating viewpoint superior to the individuals themselves, breaking with their chains of associations; essence appears *alongside* these chains, incarnated in closed fragments, *adjacent* to what it overwhelms, *contiguous* to what it reveals. Even the Church, a viewpoint superior to the landscape, has the effect of partitioning this landscape and rises up itself, at the turn of the road, like the ultimate partitioned fragment adjacent to the series that is defined by it. (PS 162)

If "knowledge" refers to the generality of concepts or to the stability of a rule that can help us find solutions (measuring techniques, approximation of particulars to a general standard, etc.), learning Differences does not exactly result in what we have traditionally thought of as knowledge. Rather, it results in something stranger and more profound, something Deleuze is not embarrassed to call a "profound complicity between nature and mind" (DR 165) that persists at an unconscious level.

Freud defined the unconscious as a set of fragments of experience, the ruins of our personal histories. Deleuze was convinced that Carl Jung was right to believe that the unconscious not only recorded that which consciousness rejects or represses, but also *poses problems* for desire. The unconscious is not merely those drives consciousness cannot accept, but an autonomous regime of desire (DR 317). However, while Jung considered these unconscious desires to be those of universal archetypes having perpetual identities, Deleuze sees the questions posed by the unconscious not as the overshadowing

of individual by the enormity of types, but as the differential and repetitive power of Ideas themselves, of which the individual as much as the collective is only an echo.

This is why Deleuze has a "Leibnizian" conception of the unconscious, which he explains in *Difference and Repetition*. He thinks of the "partial objects" of the unconscious, which appear as the uncanny images of our dreams (better, the sets of relations the images of our dreams propose to us as symptoms), as inherently positive or problem-posing. They are the *petits perceptions* of Leibniz, on the basis of which we act or react prior to conscious awareness, like a dog that winces before being struck. This is contrary to the Freudian idea of the unconscious as a garbage dump or an inverted world where we try to compensate for certain lacks or gaps in our experience. The Freudian unconscious is a threat, it is an animal to be tamed and controlled. *Wo es war, soll ich werden*—there where id was, ego shall come to be—was Freuds formula for analysis.

For Deleuze the unconscious is not reactive but *expressive*. It is composed of singular points that territorialize or order ordinary points, and extend themselves as far as another remarkable point (again analogous to Leibnizian space). Ideas are singularities or events that determine the borders and limits of the *sense* of a thing. We intuit or grasp the sense of something (a word, a phrase of music, a political movement) not so much by analyzing its truth or falsity as by being confronted or arrested by the "ideal events" that distinguish its idea. These ideal events or singularities prior to fully formed subjects, objects, histories and organisms, are *virtual multiplicities*.

Virtual as opposed to actual, not to real. The possible is always contrasted with the real, but for Deleuze the virtual is much more real than the possible. It is as real as the actual, surrounding the actual like a halo or a holographic double. That is why it is

not at all *indeterminate* even though it is *unrepresentable* in concepts. It "is real without being actual, ideal without being abstract" (DI 101). The virtual has a *neighborhood* or a distinctive *variation*. Considered as pure virtualities, ideas for Deleuze are distinct differentials not yet clearly differentiated in the actual parts which will incarnate their singularities. Ideas are virtually differen*c*iated, but not yet actually differen*t*iated. Ideas are thus "distinct-obscure," transcending things by being a (virtual) part of them or a side of them, a side that does not resemble the other (the actual). Yet the idea is immanent to things as the becoming or sense things more or less actualize in their "historicity" (all those factors making up a "state of affairs" or a set of interlocked efficient causes).[84]

It is because of an obscurity proper to Ideas that they are of the order of the unconscious, of what is closed in on itself or reserved. "In this same sense," Deleuze writes, "the Idea is Dionysian: that zone of obscure distinction which it preserves within itself, that undifferentiation which is no less perfectly determined—this is its drunkenness" (DI 101). However, the slurred speech of the Idea is not a deep mystery, but an unconscious riddle. Not the unconscious as a graveyard or garbage dump, but the unconscious as life's provocateur. As Deleuze puts it, "in truth, the structure of the unconscious is not conflictual, oppositional, or contradictory, but questioning and problematizing" (DR 112). An unconscious idea poses a problem, it questions us.

The paradox of the unconscious is that it is a machine which has "chosen" what has "befallen" us. It is connected to what psychoanalysis called the *death drive*: not the desire for death, but the compulsion to repeat something to which we are erotically attached to, in order to force that attachment to exceed itself toward other attachments.

This, for Deleuze, is what Nietzsche called the will to power's affirmation of itself, the paradox of an affirmation of chance.

Life involves a certain affirmation of chance, as Proust's art involved a certain "involuntary" moment, because we cannot consciously choose our problems, our ideas, any more than the Greek gods could escape *Ananke*, necessity (DR 199). As Deleuze puts it,

> The imperatives and questions with which we are infused do not emanate from the I: it is not even there to hear them. The imperatives are those of being, while every question is ontological and distributes "that which is" among problems . . . from the outset, however, what are these fiery imperatives, these questions which are the beginning of the world? The fact is that everything has its beginning in a question, but one cannot say that the question itself begins. Might the question, along with the imperative which it expresses, have no other origin than *repetition*? (DR 199-200)

What would the logic of such repetition look like? The repetition of the past in the "eternal" present of art gives Proust entrée to the imperatives dominating his life. But this process, though at its purest in art, also takes place in the emergence of thought itself. To understand the genesis of thought from the point of view of those unconscious imperatives that give rise to it requires a new logic. Deleuze's *The Logic of Sense* attempts such a thought, to which we now turn.

IV. Surfacing Bodies: The Adventures of Sense

In a certain way, it was the quest of Plato's philosophy to identify the source of sense. To whom does sense belong? Plato answers that it belongs to no one in particular because it belongs to the Forms specifically and universally. This was a move against the pre-Socratics who had attempted to claim it belonged to no one because it belonged to the earth and the elements. The Enlightenment claimed that sense belonged to the coherence of the rational individual, and Romanticism located sense in the dialectical dynamics of the person (LS 138-139). In every case there is no answer to the question, "who is speaking?" that is without irony.

If the Romantic ironist finally assumes the instability of sense by internalizing it (making Nature internal to Spirit), for Deleuze this assumption is riddled by bad consciousness insofar as some version of unity is still the goal. The romantic may have experienced the death of God, but she has not yet survived the death of Man. What modern literature and modern art only *begin* to realize is that it is impossible to judge which is more ironic, the fractured presence of nature in humanity or the human shadow cast over the sub- and super-human void.[85]

To complete the move begun by modern art requires the abandonment of the presupposition that events are reducible either to the ideas in which they are supposed to participate or to the forces which they express. This, for Deleuze, was the achievement of the Stoic school. "The autonomy of the surface, independent of, and against depth and height; the discovery of incorporeal events, meanings, or effects, which are irreducible to "deep" bodies and to "lofty" Ideas—these are the important Stoic discoveries against the pre-Socratics and Plato," Deleuze writes (LS 132).

For Deleuze, the Stoics proposed a humorous or healthy philosophy, working with "a new demarcation: between things and propositions themselves. It is the frontier drawn between the thing such as it is, denoted by the proposition, and the expressed, "which does not exist outside of the proposition," and yet which has enough autonomy to become the subject of art, humor, and experimentation (LS 132). In this neo-Stoic space, which for Deleuze is a new *surface* of thought, a new wisdom speaks not in the name of identities or natures, but in a voice Deleuze calls the "fourth person singular" (LS 141). It is the voice of an "objectality" that cuts across the distinction between subject and object in the name of as yet unimagined becomings. It is a voice speaking not in syllogisms but in riddles, in paradox, and even in jest.

Double Time: The Sense of Events

> Catholics scrutinize signs. Calvinists put no trust in them, because they believe only in the election of souls. But what if we were neither visible signs nor invisible souls but simply the same as ourselves (neither the visible children of our works nor predestined) and thus spread-eagled in the simulacrum's distance from itself? This being the case, signs and men's destiny would no longer have any common ground . . . On this forsaken soil (or perhaps rich soil, owing to that abandonment) we could give heed to the words of Hölderlin: "*Zeichen sind wir, deutungslos*," and perhaps, further still, to all those great and fleeting simulacra that made the gods scintillate in the rising sun, or like great silver arcs in the dead of night. (Michel Foucault, "The Prose of Acteon," 132)

As we have already seen, Deleuze's conception of a "transcendental" empiricism does not simply affirm that all ideas derive from sensory experience. Rather, Deleuze's empiricist claim is that, as Spinoza might have put it, there are as many things unknown in the mind as in the body. There are as many ideas yet to be explored as there are times,

places, and events yet to be lived. Deleuze's "superior" or "transcendental" empiricism is thus the search for encounters with that which forces us to think and to act in unforeseeably new ways. It is an apprenticeship in the signs of an uncanny life.

As Deleuze's commentator and translator Dan Smith has shown, for Deleuze, as for Spinoza, the test of an idea is always a practical test.[86] Ideas like Justice are not "infinite," "absolute," or "pure" because impossible to be realized in the phenomenal world.[87] Rather, the idea of justice or beauty or love is infinite because we do not yet know how and in what ways we might become just, how we may yet love, what we may find beautiful—we do not yet know, as Spinoza put it, what our bodies can do. For Deleuze as for Spinoza, there are as many unknown regions of the mind (and its ideas) as there are secret powers in the body.[88]

What calls up the potentials of the body are the *events* that befall it. Something happens: a tsunami, a volcanic eruption, a genocide, a nuclear holocaust, an equation is solved, milk is pasteurized, the DNA code is cracked, the Buddha is enlightened, Christ is resurrected, lightening strikes, Sting records "Every Breath You Take" in the middle of the night, Kurt Cobain commits suicide, Captain Ahab is destroyed by Moby Dick, two cats make fighting love in an alley, an unusual couple marries. What is the sense of any of these events? Obviously the sense of events is different for those nearer to them or farther from them, and different again for the different contours of the different bodies directly or indirectly involved. But to say that there are different senses of different events for different bodies is not to solve the problem but only to pose it.

In *The Logic of Sense*, Deleuze approaches the problem of determining how bodies and events relate through a logic that is neither purely abstract nor completely

concrete, but an inherently problematic mixture of sense and nonsense. Deleuze begins this book, which he calls a "logical and psychological novel," by noting that the Stoics divided the sense of interlocked corporeal causes, a totally determined Destiny shared by all bodies, from the sense of incorporeal effects, which continually float or "insist" in bodies without ever being reducible to them (LS 6).

For the Stoics there is only a single, univocal causal stream or causal "language," but it is divided into substantives and adjectives (bodies-causes), on the one hand, and verbs and adverbs on the other (events-effects). On the Stoic view, the event is a pure "result" or pure verb. When we say "a tree is becoming green," we are not, for the Stoics, designating a quality to a substance. The "greening" that sunlight, proper soil conditions, and water produce in the tree is not a new property of the tree but a new attribute, a new event that the tree is undergoing. In saying, "the tree becomes green," we are not identifying a being, but attributing to the tree a *way* of being or a form of *becoming*.

This sense of this becoming, housed in the intransitive verb, is paradoxical. The sense of "I am growing," is that at the same time I am larger than I was and smaller than I become. Of course, I only grow in one direction. But the sense of " to grow" is not reducible to the good sense of something in successive moments going from small to large. The proposition also includes the possible sense that in the present I am *at once* larger than I was but also smaller than I am (LS 2). This duplicity violates our sense of what the "present" means.

Lewis Carroll's *Alice* stories dramatize the play of sense and nonsense, for Deleuze, because Alice is constantly torn between two directions: "Which way? Which

way?", Alice says. Her adventures through the looking glass and down the rabbit hole are adventures in what Deleuze calls the "paradoxes of pure becoming," where sense is not restricted to one direction, but is "nomadically" distributed in an open space, and in a time which continually evades the present—a time constantly divided into a past that never stops arriving and a future that never comes—which is why sometimes, as on the Red Queen's chessboard, Alice has to run very fast to stay in place.

In order to explain the paradoxical sense of "pure" becoming, Deleuze invokes two different times: Chronos and Aion. Chronos is the oriented time that distributes past and future into two opposing directions. It is the time of the marketplace, the time of agriculture, the time of the body's movements, and the time of historical linearity. It is the thick or "lived" present of phenomenology. In Chronos we always go from the past to the future, from what was to what will be, in successive presents (LS 162-163). Characteristic of Chrono-logical time is that it is always conceived of as a movement from what is more or less obscure and undifferentiated to that which is more and more differentiated or clarified—the time of what Kant might have called "progress" in universal history, but more simply what is conceived of as the "march of civilization." Chrono-logical time is the time of predictability, calculability, measurability, the elimination of multiple directions in favor of one or several directions possible for limited and bounded material configurations (a house being built, a young girl going through puberty, a nation struggling for independence, a song being played on the radio).

But within Chronos another kind of time is passing, or "subsisting." This is what Deleuze calls the time of Aion. Aion is unlike Chronos in that it cannot be limited to the succession of presents. Aion's characteristic, as Deleuze puts it, is to *elude* the present

(LS 77). Aion infinitely subdivides itself into both past and future at once, so it can be identified with neither (LS 164). Yet, Deleuze argues, Aion *insists* in an instant that perpetually *divides* the present from itself. Aion is not the "passing" of the present as we live it, but an instant that marks the present as present without itself passing. As Deleuze puts it,

> Plato rightly said that the instant is *atopon*, without place. It is the paradoxical instance or the aleatory point, the nonsense of the surface and the quasi-cause. It is the pure movement of abstraction whose role is, primarily, to divide and subdivide every present in both directions at once, into past-future, upon the line of Aion. (LS 166)

The proposition "Alice becomes larger," denotes an event taking place in time. But from the point of view of Chronos, the point of view of the actual growth of Alice in the present, the proposition is missing half of its sense, namely that *intransitive* sense of "growing" as heading in two directions simultaneously: Alice smaller than she becomes as well as larger than she is now. If there were only a chrono-logical time, there would be no coherent sense of grow-*ing*, but only an abysmal, measureless present, where the past and future would be locked into the "now." Only the measureless *instant* of Aion makes possible the abstraction necessary for there to be a true sense of *becoming*, or a malleable sense of *events* separate from the concatenation of bodies.

Deleuze claims that language is possible due to this special sense of abstract instants that constantly elude the present. As he puts it,

> The straight line [of Aion] traces the frontier between bodies and language, states of affairs and propositions. Language, or the system of propositions, would not exist without this frontier which renders it possible. (LS 167)

Events happen to bodies, but the sense of events takes place in *language*, in a system of propositions whose existence is not "caused" by the interactions of bodies, but by a third

element—an element that the event causes to exist but that only subsists or "persists" in language. This element is sense. As Deleuze puts it,

> Sense and event are the same thing—except that now [in Aion's instant] sense is related to propositions. It is related to propositions as that which is expressible or expressed by them, which is entirely different from what they signify, manifest, or denote. It is also entirely different from their sonorous qualities, even though the independence of sonorous qualities from things and bodies may be exclusively guaranteed by the entire organization of the sense-event. (LS 167)

What Aion makes possible is an experience and an experimentation that is not actual, but *counter*-actual: "the present of pure operation, not of incorporation" (LS 168). If our personal identity is the character or persona we are inhabiting in accordance with the requirements of the continuous present—the role we are playing that relates us to other players and other roles through bodily causes—there is also, for Deleuze, the identity, or rather the *difference* of an actor or dancer or *mime* who is able to identify with or "counter-actualize" the present in a way that can change or *pervert* its sense. This *mimeur* animates that which it mimes just as the sense-event is not the cause but the "quasi-cause" of the proposition. Just as sense always "others" itself in the proposition (or doubles itself in its own nonsense), "the sage can 'identify' with the quasi-cause, although the quasi-cause itself is missing from its own identity" (LS 168). The "wisdom" of the actor-dancer is not an escape from the character she plays, but is rather her ability to redouble the role, or, as Deleuze puts it to "duplicate the lining [*redoubler la doublure*]" of sense, to selectively activate a nonsense that frees sense from its restriction to Chronos and the demands of ordinary time.

What we have to learn from Alice is how to grasp ourselves as events, events with multiple senses constituted by populations of singular forces that define themselves not in

opposition to others, but through unexpected relations of *intensive distance* between them, not in the present of Chronos but in the instant of Aion. Deleuze thus sees in Alice's adventures the contours of a new ethics. He writes,

> The problem is . . . one of knowing how the individual would be able to transcend his form and his syntactical link with a world, in order to attain to the universal communication of events, that is, to the affirmation of a disjunctive synthesis beyond logical contradictions, and even beyond alogical compatibilities. It would be necessary for the individual to grasp herself as an event; and that she grasp the event actualized within her as another individual grafted onto her. In this case, she would not understand, want, or represent this event without also understanding and wanting all other events as individuals, and without representing all other individuals as events. Each individual would be like a mirror for the condensation of singularities and each world a distance in the mirror. This is the ultimate sense of counter-actualization. (LS 178)

To grasp the events of our lives as collective yet anonymous sets of singularities would be to move beyond the fixation of the individual on an identifiable sense of self. For Deleuze, unless our fixation on identity or our ego is overcome, we cannot fully actualize the potential of the events that befall us.

Platonic Ideas on the Surface

This aesthetic-ethics of an actor/dancer, this integrity of a mask, a certain non-identity formed on the surface, challenges the Platonic paradigm of participation as authenticity, the imposition of a noble form on a chaotic depth. Within the platonic dualism of Ideal Forms and participants which more or less reflect or embody those Forms, Deleuze discerns a hidden distinction that silently controls and secretly directs the major distinction between invisible model and visible copy (LS 256). This is the distinction between that which, due to an ineffable quality perceivable only by the true philosopher, potentially receives or reflects the idea, and those things that, due to an

equally ineffable quality, is perceived by the true philosopher not to be a worthy "suitor" of the Idea.

This distinction is not so much among different discrete objects or persons, but *within* suitors as a distinction between that which is able to receive the imprint or power of the Idea, and that which is too unruly or inchoate for it. Unworthy suitors can never be true images [*icones*] of the forms, but only idolatrous imposters. Only an ineffable connection with the Good enables certain participants to do more than mimic or parrot Beauty, Justice, Courage and Unity. Without an internal resemblance to or resonance with the Forms themselves, there is no true but only simulacral participation in the Forms.

Idolatrous simulacra lurk in the depths of things as the unlimited sense of becoming lurks in the good sense of propositions.[89] Simulacra harbor a power truth cannot oppose, because simulacra in and of themselves are not opposed to the truth.[90] The "falsehood" of a simulacrum is not that of direct opposition, but of oblique or "perverse" identification, like the identification of Warhol's Brillo boxes with Brillo boxes in supermarkets. Warhol's boxes are not "false appearances" of the real, but are rather appearances which cannot be judged as either true or false renderings. As Deleuze puts it, "the simulacrum is an image without resemblance" (LS 257).

Simulacra inhibit our ability to make the distinction between model and copy. That is why, according to Deleuze, it is much more important to Plato to be able to distinguish some ineffable characteristic of a thing that makes it a proper suitor (a potential icon) of the Idea than it is to distinguish the Ideal Model from its various participants. Socrates' reaction to the rhapsode is what it is—scorn and disgust—because

the rhapsode's power cannot be specified in terms of the truth his words represent. The rhapsode's knowledge is only a knowledge of the movement of language itself, the murmuring or stammering prior to language. For Socrates language should have power due only to its presentation of the *natures* to which any logos should ultimately refer. The power of the rhapsode is in his master of *effects*, of linguistic effects that are not ascertainable in terms of what is being talked about—the subject matter, the *to ti on*.

This realm of effects—of simulacra, of pure becomings—exist in Aion-time and nomadic space. This is the proper realm of sense and its effects prior (ontologically, not temporally) to inherence in propositions. Although sense does not exist outside of propositions, it remains "superior" to them, the subject, once again, of a "superior" empiricism. It requires a new topology to understand the logic of sense (beyond signification, denotation, or manifestation). Deleuze calls it the logic of a "metaphysical surface" or "transcendental field" of sense. Deleuze defines it this way:

> Metaphysical surface (*transcendental field*) is the name that will be given to the frontier established, on one hand, between bodies taken together as a whole and inside the limits which envelop them, and on the other, propositions in general. This frontier implies, as we shall see, certain properties of sound in relation to the surface, making possible thereby a distinct distribution of language and bodies, or of the corporeal depth and the sonorous *continuum*. In all these respects, the surface is the transcendental field itself, and the locus of sense and expression. Sense is that which is formed and deployed at the surface. (LS 125)

If Plato placed the origin of sense in the "heights" of the Forms, his task was to explain the presence of the Forms even at the lowest levels of existence. Socrates famously wondered whether there would not be a Form of hair or of mud. With his "overturning" of Platonism, where the intensive and the singular in the empirical play the role that the Forms played in Plato, for Deleuze the problem is not participation, but the

genesis of an effect that is not reducible to the medium in which it is nevertheless constrained. This would be an account of the genesis of sense beyond its inherence in the medium of the proposition, but yet not outside of language.

Rather than locate this sense at the "depths" of things (where it partly escapes or resists illumination by Platonic Ideas), Deleuze reconceives Platonic ideas by describing them not as Forms descended from the heights of the immutable and eternal, but as simulacra arising from the depths of *physis* to create a surface that is nevertheless no longer reducible to the forces which produced it. These "Platonic ideas on the surface" constitute the surface of sense. This surface of sense is Deleuze's way of thinking through Spinoza's claim that the order of ideas and the order of things is the same. The same, but only differentiated as bodies repeat themselves (their difference) at the surface, at the "frontier" between events and propositions.

Because sense is neither purely ideal nor fully concrete, sense is double, and involves all the disguises of doubling. This duplicity makes sense reducible neither to physical causes nor to ideas. Sense is not a smile without a Cheshire cat, as it is "down" in the "depths" of the rabbit hole. It is rather the "transcendental" possibility of there being a sense to *both* a cat with a smile and a smile without a cat, a name of a song and what the name of the song is called, and an entrance to another world indistinguishable from the empty space between the synapses of our brain. As Deleuze puts it,

> The fact is that the doubling up [of sense] does not at all signify an evanescent and disembodied resemblance, an image without flesh—like a smile without a cat. It is rather defined by the production of surfaces, their multiplication and consolidation. This doubling is the continuity of reverse and right sides, the art of establishing this continuity in a way which permits sense, at the surface, to be distributed to both sides at once, as the expressed which subsists in propositions and as the event which occurs in states of bodies. (LS 125)

In Deleuze's analysis, sense is a "pure effect" of the conjunction of bodies and propositions, but at the same time sense is paradoxically a "quasi-cause" of what happens on both levels (bodies and propositions). It is a cause in the sense that a surface tension is a cause without having existence independently of the depth to which it belongs. As Deleuze puts it, sense is a pure surface effect effective without being separate from other effects, "since a surface energy, without even being *of* the surface, is due *to* every surface formation, and from it a fictitious surface tension arises as a force exerting itself on the plane of surface" (LS 124). Surface effects are a function of certain forces without being reducible to those forces. Surface tensions, though in a sense heuristic fictions, are nevertheless totally real, in the same way that the boiling point of water only exists as a fiction, as a fictitious "personality" attributed to a chain of causes.[91]

The productions of sense, which depend on delicate mixtures of bodily causes, can and does fail. Surfaces that are not plastic enough, not flexible enough, or are expected to bear more than they can, fall apart. Words then become alienated from things. At an extreme, this is the nightmare of schizophrenia, in which the body and language are at war. Deleuze writes,

> When this production collapses, or when the surface is rent by explosions and by snags, bodies fall back again into their depth; everything falls back again into the anonymous pulsation wherein words are no longer anything but affections of the body—everything falls back into the primary order which grumbles beneath the secondary organization of sense. (LS 125)

Mania and depression signify the breakdown of the surface, our falling into one side or the other. "Which way, which way?" asks Alice. How do we come to inhabit the surfaces, the metaphysical surfaces, on which our bodies themselves can experience the event as more than a state of affairs? How is it that our *body* can distinguish speaking

and eating? What are the dynamics that make our bodies susceptible of the adventure of sense, of being the avatars and not merely the victims of events? How do sounds become separated from bodily affects, from groans and cries? How can we come to live by our words, and ultimately to live by our art?

The Art of Surfaces: Desexualization and the *via phantasmata*

In *The Logic of Sense* Deleuze points out that psycho-analysis from Freud to Kline and Lacan linked the development of language to the emergence of sexually organized bodies. Accordingly, Deleuze ties the emergence of language and even of thought itself to the *desexualization* of sexually-organized energies. In traditional terms, this is the terrain of sublimation: the processes by which bodies are conformed to socially viable patterns; and by which our drives to consume and our fears of being consumed come to be regulated. The energies persist, but they exceed the body's primary functions of eating, excretion, motility, and sound-making toward abstract or virtual activity—toward language and thought and art.

For Deleuze and for psycho-analysis, all of this begins in sexuality. On the Freudian view, sexuality itself is not something "natural" to the body, but something that comes to be *between* bodies and *between* parts of bodies. The accomplishment of growing up or "normalizing" which psychoanalysis explains in terms of sublimation is thus a matter of connecting disparate parts, organizing what is fundamentally open-ended or "polymorphously perverse." Particularly at stake here is the transition from purely destructive activities to activities which, while connecting with the environment and with

others, and even taking from others, do not destroy but enjoy. Such is the transition from suction to sucking in the oral zone, or from urination to insemination in the genital zone.

Melanie Klein proposed that at its earliest moments the infant experiences itself as composed of fragmented objects (LS 187). Each child, she proposes, is originally a paranoid schizophrenic (LS 187). What she means by this, according to Deleuze, is that the child experiences the world initially as a void in which aliment and excrement circulate without fixable reference point—the mouth, breast, anus, penis from which things come and into which they go are only so many voids, given that the child does not yet distinguish between her body and the body of the mother. This existence-in-void makes all the "objects" of this early stage partial or "simulacral"— images without fixable reference or identifiable source.

Klein hypothesized that the child experiences partial objects as threats, as poisons or toxins that threaten more than nourish, fragments of the mother's body that rend and tear the body from the inside more than restore its tissues and fibers. What comes out of the mother fragments her; what I take into myself fragments me. Mother and child share a Passion of direct bodily communication that is the endless Fracture of parts, bits, and crumbs.

For Klein, if the child cannot move beyond the trauma of this "system of introjection and projection," she remains locked into cannibalistic and anally-fixated behaviors. Schizophrenia is a regression or reversion to this position. Klein proposed that the way beyond the sufferings of this deep bodily identification (I and the Mother are Vortex and Void) is the simultaneous discovery and production of an object that is whole in and of itself. The image of this object becomes a source of consolation and inspiration,

a point around which the child can orient the adventures of the body, a surface which can tie together the disparate organs. The name psychoanalysis in its sublime chauvinism has given this image is "phallus." Like a platonic form, the phallus is the ideal sexual organ which all other organs (from penises to vaginas and every orifice in between) more or less participate in to have substance, essence, reality, stability, coherence, truth.

Just as Hercules has to pacify the earth, so Oedipus has to pacify his body and the bodies of his parents. But in the very act of having intentions, of developing an Idea such as Oedipus did, lies the secret of thought itself and its liberating power. Oedipus makes a phantasm, a work of art. Or at least, that is what the capabilities which ruined Oedipus might amount to if we can pass from the problem of restoring our parents to something else: "From the question 'Shall I marry Albertine?' to the problem of the work of art yet to be made—this is the path of enacting the speculative coupling, beginning with the sexual pair, and retracing the path of divine creation " (LS 220). The paradox is that immanent to the very dynamic of the Oedipal triangle and its castration complex are the forces that create works of art.

Art, or the literary-speculative work involves a leap from the sexualized surface on which everything happens to the desexualized surface where everything insists. Art is paradigmatic for Deleuze in that it succeeds in making something *other* of castration or our complexes, something other than universal neurosis. For Deleuze it is art that extracts a *question* from our lives, a question which exceeds all "tragic" insight into the impossibility of narcissistic desire. The great Work leads us from "the cause of symptoms to the quasi-cause of the *oeuvre* . . . the positive, highly affirmative character of desexualization consists in the *replacement of psychic regression by speculative*

investment" (LS 238). It is Oedipus' phantasmatic energy itself, the desire to think, and to create, that can be doubled by and in art; it is art that enables us to use the energy otherwise than to restore the family (which is always to destroy it, to absorb it, and to avenge ourselves upon it.) The mystery is how do we make the leap? How does a space or a surface appear tertiary to the rumbling devouring depths of our bodies (and the image of the wounded mother) and the absent Idea of good and complete objects (figured in the removed and complete father)? How is it that this dualism of sense (to eat/to speak) is traversed by a nonsense we enjoy for its own sake, and not for what it can do for our wounded narcissism?

Again, it is art that best poses the question. As Deleuze puts it, "from the perspective of Freud's genius, it is not the complex with provides us information about Oedipus and Hamlet, but rather Oedipus and Hamlet who provide us with information about the complex" (LS 237). And the information Deleuze attempts to analyze in the *Logic of Sense* is the way in which the absurd or obverse side of "meaning" is not at all a random or arbitrary affair. It is linked specifically to the relationship between sexualized body parts or orifices and to the way in which all "desexualized" thought also signifies a sexual meaning at the same time. This is the "perverse" character of sense, but it is also the logic of becoming who we are, as a self-engendering species. The *Alice* stories diagram the splendid neutrality of the verb. Alice literally enters into a realm we experience only as thought, as a phantasm.

Generating a work of art is an issue of producing phantasms. Phantasms are, in short, false wholes. The Phallus is the master of all phantasms, what Lacan called the "transcendental signified"—it is that which makes signification possible by

simultaneously being impossible to signify directly (no penis is ever *the* phallus) and insinuating itself everywhere (all language has a perverse core of sexual reference). The Oedipal drama is the phantasm par excellence. Despite the fact that incest, castration, etc. really do happen, the *imagined* event, the phantasm, is not ever wholly derivative from these bodily "states of affairs." The phantasm has an autonomy as pure "result," signified by the neutrality of the sense of Oedipus's adventures—by the fact that his adventures are one for all, all for one.

Deleuze argues that "to Oedipalize," like "to live," "to see," "to be castrated," are events that remain superior to both the bodies which incarnate them and the propositional language that expresses events as having taken place at various chronological points. Psychoanalysis has power because it deals directly with phantasms as realities (even though Freud often wrote as if empirical causes were more important in developmental life). It succeeds where it enables us to re-imagine or "counter-actualize" not what happens to us but *how we have imagined*, or how we have made sense of what has happened. Far from weakening its diagnoses, the "mythological" terms or "archetypes" in terms of which it enables us to approach our lives give us the only power we have to change what is real for us, *given that the ultimate form of experience is not a transcendental possibility but a virtual phantasm*.

Deleuze's philosophical project tries to analyze the ontology psychoanalysis implies. What is the nature of the reality, he wonders, in which we can only change ourselves through a medium that is irreducible to either physio-logical or ideo-logical forms? What kind of world does the logic of psychoanalytic symptomology refer to?

Deleuze's answer is that it is a world that is constructed not according to the logic of propositions any more than it is reducible to the effects of corporeal causation. It is a world operating according to the logic of sense, where sense is understood as "representing the extra-propositional aspect of all possible positions, or the aggregate of ontological problems and questions which correspond to language" (LS 215). This world or regime of sense, superior to bodies while being the result of bodily affections, irreducible to propositions while never existing apart from them, is more concrete than any one body living, dying, eating, or speaking, and paradoxically more ideal than any proposition expressing these actions.

If sense, "inhering" in propositions, is "closer" to language than to bodies, this is only as true as is the fact that it is not our body taken simply as organism or physical system that undergoes destiny, but rather a particularized or singularized body, a body cut or wounded in a specific way that is the "objective correlative" of sense. It is our body *as* more or less sexualized, *as* more or less "normalized" or "integrated." This is why the phantasm as a "surface phenomenon" comes to be only with a later phase of development, the phase represented by Oedipus's attempt to create a narrative or an image-surface that can coordinate, restore, and re-connect the absent father and the wounded mother as effects or results of his own "good intentions." This gesture is equivalent to the "adsorption" of his phallus into the life of signs which will compensate for the impossibility of having the mother and/or being the father.

It is the *way* we become able to surface and re-surface our bodies, or through our bodies, that interests Deleuze, because for him this is what finally amounts to "thought." Thought for Deleuze is not a process of reflection, but of re-creation, or of "counter-

actualization." It is an active engagement not so much with "the material world" understood in a brutely concrete sense, nor an engagement with "the history of ideas" or "worldviews," but an attempt to make and remake sense.

Thought is phantasmatic because only the phantasm gives us the power and capacity to move beyond "what happens" without escaping into the heights of mania or falling into the depths of depression. Oedipus had attempted to create a surface, but insofar as this surface is directly or "literally" the restoration of *either* his own personal body (the concrete Thing) *or* the restoration of the kingdom (the Idea of the family), the result can only be a tragic failure. In order to achieve a humorous or healthy result, the phantasmatic energy initially used up in Oedipus' "good intentions" has to be transmuted. What is initially only the drive-energy of a narcisstic libido has to become "desexualized" energy, energy available for symbolic activity. Deleuze talks about this in terms of the development of a second screen, beyond that of the body, onto which phantasms may become projected. This is the surface proper to thought and the site of cuts which do not destroy but create—cuts like those made on a film or a canvas or on audio tape in a studio.

This new or second screen emerges *ex nihilo*. The body itself, even the sexualized body, cannot serve as the basis of thought, despite the fact that sexuality will be the source of the energy of thought. "There is thus a leap," Deleuze writes (LS 218). The beginning of thought remains "external" to thought—the beginning is "truly in the void" (LS 218). To think is thus to play, but to play precisely with what is most serious: our fate. What the thinker as much as the artist knows is how to do this without playing for "literal" stakes. Deleuze writes,

> For only thought finds it possible *to affirm all chance and to make chance* into an object of affirmation. If one tries to play this game other than in thought, nothing happens; and if one tries to produce a result other than the work of art, nothing is produced. This game is reserved then for thought and art. In it there is nothing but victories for those who know how to play, that is, how to affirm and ramify chance, instead of dividing it *in order to* dominate it, *nor in order to* wager, *in order to* win. This game, which can only exist in thought and which has no other result than the work of art, is also that which thought and art are real and disturbing reality, morality and the economy of the world. (LS 60)

There is an entire ethics implied here—Oedipus literally wants to restore the kingdom and lead it. He wants to wager, win, and dominate. So do our egos, which is why "morality" has to pass beyond the terms in which it is traditionally conceived. This comes to the heart of the problem: how is it that Oedipus' narcissistic wound can come to be a source of creativity and not of destruction? Insofar as we literally try to repair the mother or avenge ourselves on the father—to substantiate our egos—we destroy the world. We seem "forced" into this program by the castration complex itself. If we want to heal ourselves, we have to return to the sword that cut us. But for Deleuze, "we are castrated" is already an interpretation of "we are wounded": what if the not-whole character of the self is not the sign of impotence but of potential? What if its wound is the aperture by which cosmic forces come into play and are unleashed? What if our sense of non-identity could be a provocation to *create* rather than an excuse to take revenge?

Becoming-Hercules: Toward an Ethics of Humor

For Deleuze, the whole of ethics consists, in away, of a refusal of revenge. Ethics for Deleuze is a becoming-worthy of the peculiar adventures that befall us. Nietzsche

once called this *amor fati* (LS 149). For Deleuze this is an ethics of humor, not of irony. For Deleuze, humor always involves active selection as opposed to passive reflection. Deleuze calls this selection a studied "perversion" as opposed to Platonic conversion or pre-Socratic subversion (LS 133). It is the becoming-Herculean of philosophy, as opposed to becoming-Apollo above or becoming-Dionysus below. As Deleuze puts it, "[Hercules] always descends or ascends to the surface in every conceivable manner. He brings back the hell-hound and the celestial hound, the serpent of hell and the serpent of the heavens. It is no longer a question of Dionysius down below or Apollo up above, but of Hercules on the surface, in his dual battle against both depth and height: reorientation of the entire thought and a new geography" (LS 132).

This idea of a new geography or cartography of sense is something Deleuze sees in Lewis Carroll's brand of nonsense, which plays superficially with the paradoxes of language and sense. Even though this kind of nonsense seems "superficial" compared to the deeper, seemingly more profound "absurd" of Camus or even the cries and groans of Artaud, Carroll's nonsense is a more important guide to a humorous and healthy *thought*. In Camus' existentialism, for Deleuze, there is never enough sense—sense has been banished to the heights of an absent God (as opposed to being lost in the depths of a diseased body, as it is in Artaud).

Film *auteurs* such as Goddard and Fellini gave us a new sense of the surface, and a new humor in a world where the link between body and mind seems ravaged by war and traumatized by destruction. How does the film *auteur* restore the broken link between humanity and world? Not by acting but by *seeing*. The images of the avant-garde are not images of movement (of action, of emotions, even of memories). They are

images that have broken with the sensory-motor link, the link between perception and action. Not originals, not representations: simulacra. Images that reveal to us the nature of the time we are living even though we can no longer react to the bizarre, uncanny, and overwhelmingly disorienting nature of that time.

The *auteur* is a "spiritual automaton," whose inability to act directly on his situation—his need to act indirectly, through images, paradoxically makes him able to restore our faith in the world. How? Because the images of the world he or she extracts from the situation—purely optical and sonorous images—give us a glorious or astral body, a *subtle* body, to replace (if not to recover) the bodies broken by the horrors of war and the degradations of globalization. As Deleuze puts it,

> Our belief can have no other object than 'the flesh,' we need very special reasons to make us believe in the body ('the Angels do not know, for all true knowledge is obscure . . .'). We must believe in the body, but as in the germ of life, the seed which splits open the paving-stones, which has been preserved and lives on in the holy shroud or the mummy's bandages, and which bears witness to life, in this world as it is. We need an ethic or a faith, which makes fools laugh; it is not a need to believe in something else, but a need to believe in this world, of which fools are a part. (C2 173)

Filmmakers like Resnais, Welles, Goddard, and Fellini enable us to pose a new question of "meaning," in the old existentialist sense. If existentialism asked us to seek in the affirmations of human volition what was lost in the rejection of divine benevolence, then for Deleuze (as for Foucault and Nietzsche) this only substituted for the lost God a Man as limiting to life and expression as ever was the old divine Being. To think in terms of this "man" is still the attempt to discern or receive a meaning that is *given* apart from its *production*—whether this meaning is discerned beyond Man's betrayal of the gods or beyond the gods apparent indifference to humanity makes no

difference; in both cases we turn away from the real game, what Nietzsche called the "ideal game," which is played out by events that engender meaning, below God and above Man, on a surface of pre-individual singularities and radically impersonal events.

For Deleuze, the act of turning our attention to this surface—the achievement of certain art forms—is more liberating and empowering than any attempt to plumb the depths of the human personality or to scale the heights of contemplating the divine attributes. Deleuze reserves some of his most passionate writing for this point.

> And how could we not feel that our freedom and strength reside, not in the divine universality nor in the human personality, but in these singularities which are more us than we ourselves are, more divine than the gods, as they animate concretely poem and aphorism, permanent revolution and partial action? What is bureaucratic in these fantastic machines which are peoples and poems? It suffices that we dissipate ourselves a little, that we be able to be at the surface, that we stretch our skin like a drum, in order that the "great politics" begin. An empty square for neither man nor God; singularities which are neither general nor individual, neither personal nor universal. All of this is traversed by circulations, echoes, events which produce more sense, more freedom, and more strength than man has ever dreamed of, or God ever conceived. Today's task is to make the empty square circulate and to make pre-individual and nonpersonal singularities speak—in short, to produce sense. (LS 72-73)

In the next chapter, "Writing Power," we will examine how Deleuze, along with his collaborator Felix Guattari, analyzes the possibilities for the production of sense in the context of capitalism. If capitalism co-opts the power of creativity and the logic of surfaces, what power might art have to produce singularities that would escape the machinations of marketeering? What aesthetic gesture could possibly thwart the re-territorializing powers of capital? This is the question that will occupy us next.

V. Writing Power: Desire and the Signs of Life

Much of radical philosophy in 20th century France (from Blanchot, Klossowski and Bataille, to Foucault, Deleuze, and Derrida) starts with the notion that in modernity the formalities of *writing*, or the structures and strictures of representation, generally, are in a conflictual relationship with the *forces* words and images harbor. According to the analysis of these thinkers (despite their variations) in modernity this conflict cannot be directly acknowledged, since its pretensions to epistemological certainty or metaphysical totalization (whether as positivism or as dialectical materialism) prevent the table upon which words and things are represented from being itself a matter of scrutiny. In the so-called "postmodern" thought associated with these French names, the conflicts of representation *per se* are foregrounded and critiqued.

For Jacques Derrida, for example, the representational model breaks down due to an "auto-deconstruction" of signs. Events of "deconstruction" point backward (in space) or forward (in time) to an order of connection between words and things that, if always already interrupted by the binary paradigms constituting signifiers and making signs meaningful, nevertheless persists as simultaneously the "tain" of the mirror of *signifiance* and the promise of a significance always *a venir*, yet to come. For Derrida, the liberation of a life dead within signs is an after-effect of meaning's divergence from itself, of its own insupportable rage for order.

Although Deleuze is in agreement with Derrida that signification has a constantly deferred and supplemental character, he does not see the partial or fragmented characters that make up subversive or "minor" discourses as shards of a mirror or vestiges of the master tongue. In fact the master tongue (institutional, bureaucratic, legalistic) is for

Deleuze but the parrot of a more profound writing power, a power proper to the ancient shamans and priest-kings manifest in modern times in the anguished and tortured psyches of schizophrenics, in the play of children, and in the exploits of experimental art forms.

This positive (if obscure) writing power comes to the fore, for Deleuze and his collaborator Felix Guattari, as an effect of capitalism's powerful grip over a level of our psyches much deeper than the conscious ego. Although overtly an attack on fascism in every variety—including fascism's manifestation as the regimented forms of interpretation entrenched in the mainstream psychoanalysis charged with curing us of our neurosis and purging us of our schizoid tendencies—Deleuze and Guattari's *Anti-Oedipus* is also a positive project, co-extensive with that begun in *The Logic of Sense*. This positive project is an attempt to explicate the logic of a primitive (in the French sense of *primitif*, original, chthonic, fundamental) form of signification which is powerful and effective without yet being despotic As we began to see in our reading of the *Logic of Sense*, this entails the supposition of a *positive unconscious*, an unconscious at work in regimes of signs that, though not yet significant in the sense of being tied to a master signifier or centralized set of meanings nevertheless has a primitive and aboriginal power of expression.

The Positive Unconscious

> The unconscious poses no problems of meaning. Solely problems of use. The question posed by desire is not "What does it mean," but rather "*How does it work*?" (AO 109).

According to the "ethics" Deleuze constructs in *The Logic of Sense*, the problem of health is a question of how to create livable surfaces. Not exactly the surface of the "lived" body, nor the purely mental surface of abstract ideas, but a metaphysical surface of sense. The creation of sense is a movement of "desexualization" that goes from the connective relationships in the body to conjunctive series built up not through bodily connections but through "mental" syntheses of coexistence (LS 225). Individuation passes from a genital organization to an organization of surfaces that places the genital series in the service of a guiding *image* that the sexual energies are meant to ramify or realize. Here the Oedipal drama commences wherein the child attempts to restore the image of the wounded mother and to retrieve the image of the absent father (which is finally a way of attaining or achieving a *phallus*). But the adolescent affair, which issues in the "choice of an external object" continually recalls the original adventures of the primary order, whose traumatic emergence energizes the creation of the Oedipal surface or "stage."

The significance of this process, for Deleuze, is not so much the development of the Oedipal phantasm *per se*, nor the achievement of the repetition of the family unit. For Deleuze, Oedipus represents only what he calls a "negative" and "limitative" of the disjunctive power (the desexualization process that enables the transmutation of inchoate

drive into explicit desire) (LS 229). With psychoanalyst Felix Guattari, Deleuze will even claim that Oedipus is not the resolution of desire, but "an exploded triangle from which the flows of desire escape in the direction of other territories" (AI 96). What matters to Deleuze is not Oedipal consolidation, with its tragic narrative of misrecognition, but the epic or even comic possibilities that *also* emerge at the "Oedipal stage." This is the potential of thought to positively and affirmatively use the disjunction not just to restore the family trinity but to create other unforeseen relationships, connections, and surfaces of pleasure.[92]

Deleuze and Guattari argue that such an "experimentation" of desire is possible because the phantasmatic energies used up in the consolidation of Oedipus are cosmic or better *a*cosmic forces that always already exceed the familial triangle. The forces of desire that are at first recognized in terms of mommy-daddy-me do not originate in that triune enclosure, but come from and return to a cosmic *outside* of the triangle. To join with these cosmic and world-historical forces, forces of desire which overflow Oedipal codification, is the "perversion" Deleuze first conceived in the *Logic of Sense.*

In *Anti-Oedipus*, Deleuze and Guattari give a deeper and more profoundly materialist twist to perversion, arguing that, in the face of a capitalism that constantly co-opts our representable desires, we must embrace a bit more the *schizophrenia* lurking behind our everyday neuroses. "A schizophrenic out for a walk is a better model of than a neurotic lying on the couch," Deleuze and Guattari write (AO 2). Why schizophrenia, schizoanalysis, rather than neurosis and psychoanalysis? Deleuze and Guattari justify their move in the following passage of *Anti-Oedipus.* They write,

> . . . there is much optimism in thinking psychoanalysis makes possible a veritable solution to Oedipus: Oedipus is like God; the father is like God;

> the problem is not resolved until we do away with both the problem and the solution. It is not the purpose of schizoanalysis to resolve Oedipus, it does not intend to resolve it better than Oedipal psychoanalysis does. Its aim is to de-Oedipalize the unconscious in order to reach the real problems. Schizoanalysis proposes to reach those regions of the orphan unconscious—indeed "beyond all law"—where the problem of Oedipus can no longer even be raised. (AI 82)

For Deleuze and Guattari, the "schizoid" form of organization, though more volatile and uncanny than that of the neurotic, is closer to the real essence of the unconscious. The unconscious, they argue, is populated not by precursors and ruins of the Oedipal romance, the drama of restoring the mother and displacing the despotic father, but the cosmic play of autonomous or "orphaned" realms of sense and nonsense. The unconscious, for Deleuze and Guattari, is made of signs, but the signs are not organized "like a language," but like a jargon or an idiom missing the "master tongue" or "transcendental signifier" (AO 38). Each link in a chain of unconscious significance, [*signifiance*], they argue, is actually a *break*. Thus the only direct connections in the unconscious are between disparate, non-adjacent points/breaks. "Connect-I-cut," as Bruno Bettleheim's patient little Joey puts it, is the riddle of the unconscious (AO 37).

For Deleuze and Guattari, there is no negativity in the unconscious. On their view even Freud's famous supposition of a death instinct that pervades the unconscious is a positive force or what Deleuze and Guattari will call a "desiring-machine." Deleuze and Guattari claim that

> . . . the psychoanalysts who refused [Freud's supposition of a] death instinct did so for the same reasons as those who accepted it: some said that there was no death instinct *since* there was no model or experience in the unconscious; other that there was a death instinct precisely *because* there was no model or experience. We say, to the contrary, that there is no death instinct because there is both the model and the experience of death in the unconscious. Death then is part of the desiring-machine, a part that must itself be judged, evaluated in the functioning of the

> machine and the system of its energetic conversions, and not as an abstract principle. (AO 332)

For Deleuze and Guattari, death is not a force of negativity but an autonomous principle which, along with other principles, plays a role in those "desiring machines" in which the unconscious is actually *effective*. Whereas traditional debates in psychoanalysis assumed a homogeneity of effects of the death instinct while arguing over its one true cause, Deleuze and Guattari claim that what must be realized is precisely the multiplicity of the effects of this inchoate principle.

For traditional psychoanalysis, "everybody knows" that the death instinct shows up as pleasure in self-imposed mortifications—the analyst needs only to investigate why different types (sadistic, masochistic, depressive) achieve this pleasure, in a given case. For Deleuze and Guattari, on the contrary, the unconscious presents us with an overabundance of "sufficient reasons" for the death drive in dreams, in art, in obsessions, in repetitions. "As the authors of horror stories have understood so well," they write, "it is not death that serves as a model for catatonia, it is catatonic schizophrenia that gives its model to death" (AO 329). Or, as Deleuze puts it in the *Logic of Sense*, it was Freud's genius to realize that Hamlet and Oedipus do not show us the meaning of neurosis, "neurosis" explains something of Hamlet and Oedipus. What must be evaluated are the *uses* to which the death drive is put, relative to different bodies, different arrangements of power, different modes of becoming, different machines of production. On a "positive" view of the unconscious, forces are not seen as typified or allegorized in the figures of fantasy; rather, the "names of history" are conceived as autonomous productions of desire.

Capitalism and Schizophrenia

For Deleuze and Guattari, the "evil genius" of capitalism is that it knows the secret of unconscious identification, which consists not in the struggle for recognition but in the ecstasy of production. As Marx put it, capitalism is the society of producers. In capitalism, the ultimate terms of social representation, the countable identity, is no longer a function of recognition in an Other (the Nation, the Family, the Father) but a function of what x produces relative to y. In capitalist society, the unconscious or non-representable aspect of identity (i.e. its "natural resource") need no longer be conceived in terms of the (mis)adventures of recognition by the Other or representation for the Other. As Deleuze and Guattari put it,

> If capitalism is the universal truth, it is so in the sense that makes capitalism *the negative* of all social formations [famililal, state, religious]. It is the thing, the unnamable, the generalized decoding of flows that reveals *a contrario* the secret of all these formations, coding the flows, and even overcoding them, rather than letting anything escape coding. Primitive societies are not outside history; rather, it is capitalism that is at the end of history, it is capitalism that results from a long history of contingencies and accidents, and that brings on this end. (AO 153)

Hegel had already posited the idea that desire is inherently relational: my desire for an object is motivated by another's desire for the same object. We are all either masters (and/or) slaves because of the inherently relational nature of desire. Misrecognition is built as it were, into our *conatus essendi*. For a Christian like Rene Girard, this is a consequence of the Fall, but even an atheist Hegelian like Slavoj Zizek agrees that the "deadlock" of desire, in terms of which we are bound to desire that which is prohibited to us, can only be undone by a kind of grace (even the grace of analytical transference or revolutionary political emancipation).

In *Anti-Oedipus*, Deleuze and Guattari set out to deny not that desire is relational, but to deny that its drama need be played out in the way imagined by Hegel and Freud, in terms of a struggle for recognition by an Other. For Deleuze and Guattari, this struggle is neither ontologically nor psychologically basic, as both Hegel and Freud thought it was. For Deleuze and Guattari, capitalism exposes the fact that recognition is not mediated reflection but a produced effect. In capitalism, desire does not fill in for but rather continuously re-produces a gap *within*. This gap is not between subjectivities but a gap *within objects themselves*, creating an ambiguity or lure in things that is their potential as a commodity. This is the sense in which everything on the market is a "partial object," a desiring-production: all products transmit a potential connectivity or connectibility that is *intensive* rather than either qualitative or quantitative, a hook-up point for styles and affects materialized in and manipulated by advertising.

It is not to the depressed or the neurotic that advertising is addressed, but to the schizophrenic. Advertising speaks directly to the schizo in us all. The paranoid schizophrenic best exemplifies both the suffering and the ecstasy of desire. That which the schizo eats rots into words, that which she says cuts her mouth like a sharp tin can. The schizo has lost the surface of sense, the metaphysical screen between words and things. Fallen into the depth of words and lost in the heights of objects, the schizo lives on, in, and by the flows of partial objects. This is her ecstasy and her terror.

Advertising is a kind of primary or hieroglyphic inscription. It has a tautological form common to the discourse of schizophrenics: this burger is a burger. What becomes obvious to all in the advertisement is what is obvious to the schizo: when you eat that burger you are eating McDonald's, when you drink that coffee you are drinking

Starbucks. You don't blow your nose with a tissue but with a Kleenex. You don't drive a car, you drive a Honda). You eat food, but more importantly you eat the label. Or the label eats you, which is why the schizo feels like her mouth is being cut up when she says "knife." Instead she says "*cateau*" (*couteau* would be too close to the real thing).

The Body Without Organs (BwO)

The schizophrenic has a magical (if terrorized) relationship with reality, where the word is the thing.[93] At the heart of schizoid experience is what Deleuze and Guattari call the experience of a "body without organs." This does not mean that the schizo has no organs, but that the schizo does not refer the organs to one another in terms of an "organism." Rather, for the schizo the organs are "partial objects." Developmentally speaking, schizophrenics are frozen in that phase where children experience objects not as discrete things but as connectors or radiators or interrupters of different flows. This can be a flow of love or desire, or it can be a physical flow (of urine, of food, of toys given and received, etc.) None of these things contain their being in and for themselves. Feces is a partial object: it does not contain the essence of its being in itself, but in something else. It must be referred to a mouth or an anus to be what it is. Therefore its being is constantly in flux. Partial objects are flows, becomings, "multiplicities" in the sense that their being is constantly being differentiated and repeated (or as Derrida would say, "supplemented") along a series of actions or events. An organ like the mouth is a partial object when it functions in connection with other organs or other objects in ways

that are not dominated by its "proper" role in the organism (i.e. the anorexic shits through her mouth).

Considered with respect to the organism, the organs represent quantitative and extensive limits to how energy can flow in, out, and between parts of the body. Considered in relative autonomy from the organism (an autonomy taken to extremes by the paranoiac schizo), the organs are *intensive quantities* defined only by how those intensives connect, disjunct, and combine. For Deleuze and Guattari, the body without organs (BwO) is the "place" or the "field" (*complexe*) where nonorganized, noncenetered flows take place. As the "matter" that fills in and flows between partial objects, the BwO is also the "raw material" of the organs (AO 326). The BwO is the "whole" of the flows, but not as a synthetic or unifying whole, not as a restored or patched-together body. It is rather a glorious or astral body that exists *alongside* the partial objects, the flows. If partial objects are like the phrases of a song, the body without organs (the "immobile motor" [AO 327]) is like the limit of the various ways in which the song can be informally *arranged* and still be a song.

Although there are different strategies for composing on the BwO, *its* composition always begins with a decoding of dominant or "master" codes. The BwO constitutes minor or molecular chains or regimes of sings, opposed to the despotic chains linking organs in representable forms. Nevertheless, the BwO is not merely irrational or arbitrary in its effects. As Deleuze and Guattari put it,

> the molecular chain [on the BwO] is still signifying because it is composed of signs of desire; but these signs are no longer signifying, given the fact that they are under the order of the included disjunctions where *everything is possible*. These signs are points whose nature is a matter of indifference, abstract machinic figures that play freely on the

> body without organs and as yet form no structured configuration—or rather, they form one no longer." (AO 328)

But this is not pure anarchy or pure chaos. It is anarchy *crowned*, and a *chaosmos* constructed not from the logic of essence but of accident, not of being but of *becoming*.

Is there a naming or a language proper to the flows on the BwO, or is the "proper" name always an imposition on desire? Are there names or signs , an indigenous or autochthonous code on the BwO? Much is at stake for Deleuze and Guattari in this question. They write,

> It is a question of . . . identifying races, cultures, and gods with fields of intensity on the body without organs, identifying personages with states that fill these fields, and with effects that fulgurate within and traverse these fields. Whence the role of names, with a magic all their own: there is no ego that identifies with races, peoples, and persons in a theatre of representation, but proper names that identify races, peoples, and persons with regions, thresholds, or effects in a production of intensive quantities. The theory of proper names should not be conceived in terms of representation; it refers instead to the class of "effects": effects that are not a mere dependence upon causes, but the occupation of a domain, the operation of a system of signs. This can be clearly seen in physics, where proper names designate such effects within fields of potentials: the Joule effect, the Seebeck effect, the Devlin effect. History is like a physics: a Joan of arc effect, a heliogabulus effect—all the *names* of history, and not the name of the father. (AO 86)

On the BwO, an intensive space with which the schizophrenic is tragically familiar, proper names do not refer to but in some sense *are* regions, thresholds, or effects in a production of intensive quantities. On the BwO, naming is not a matter of referring or representing but of occupying or "territorializing" or even "operating" in the sense that a Shaman operates a healing ritual. Here names are never references to static entities, but operators of power, harbingers of becomings, transformers of that anorganic stream of singularities where a "profound complicity" between mind and nature subsists.

Force and Signification

Much of the writings of Jacques Derrida, a contemporary and friend of Deleuze's, seems to deny the possibility of this kind of naming, a "proper" naming of the force of becoming. In an early and important essay, "Form and Signification," Derrida writes:

> To comprehend the structure of a becoming, the form of a force, is to lose meaning by finding it. The meaning of becoming and of force, by virtue of their pure, intrinsic characteristics, is the repose of the beginning and the end, the peacefulness of a spectacle, horizon, or face. Within this peace and repose the character of becoming and of force is disturbed by meaning itself. The meaning of meaning is Apollonian by virtue of everything within it that can be seen.
>
> To say that force is the origin of the phenomenon is to say nothing. By its very articulation force becomes a phenomenon. Hegel demonstrated convincingly that the explication of a phenomenon by a force is a tautology. But in saying this, on must refer to language's peculiar inability to emerge from itself in order to articulate its origin, and not to the *thought* of force. Force is the other of language without which language would not be what it is. (WD 27)

Derrida's argument here is essentially that "force" and "phenomenon" can be tautologies, but "force" and "signification" cannot. On Derrida's view, force is the "other" of signification. This means that signification distinguishes itself by *not* being force (being pure sense), but only by denying its own inherent force, a force which appears only through gaps or fissures or "deconstructions" in signification.

For Deleuze and Guattari, the immanent codes of becoming indeed appear as the undoing or breakdown of molar or arborescent regimes of signs. In a certain way, therefore, Deleuze and Guattari's project has similarities to Derridean deconstruction. For Derrida, the history of both natural and human sciences in the West is the story of how dualistic oppositions such as those between "force" and "signification" (as well as between essence and accident, form and content, speech and writing) are held in place by

a logic of "supplement." Every manifest dualism in signification is subject to a logic whereby the identity of the superior or master term (male, essence, form, signification, etc.) is constantly consolidated by an irrational and unjustifiable exclusion of the other term (female, accident, content, force, etc.) which leaves that term with no inherent definition or identity apart from what the master term *is not*.

Derrida's premise, at least in his early works, is that the cornerstone of this unstable dualistic edifice in Western thought is a dualism between writing and speech that in some sense *causes* all the other dualisms, in the sense that an unconscious trauma causes conscious mishaps. There is thus a "symptom" of Western discourse that makes it always "metaphysical": we are traumatized by a certain difference between the "absence" encoded in writing and the "presence" presumed in speech. If the "presence" of speech implies the fullness or *parousia* of being, writing represents an absence or death of being in signs. For Derrida, this problematic can be traced not only in Platonic anxiety about writing, but in "onto-theological" anxiety about the relationship between God and the signs of revelation (for Derrida, why we don't see the platonic forms directly amounts to the same problem as why God needs discourse).

But whether it be discourse in religion, the sciences, in literary criticism, or in philosophy per se, Derrida sees the entire history of Western thought as governed by the notion that writing fails to capture the essence of being. Following Heidegger, Derrida argues that we will never know whether there is a being outside of our conception of being, and we cannot conceive of being without "writing" it. Since the only being we know is a written or inscribed or signified being, being is inexorably lost or disseminated among signs. Signs can never *be* what they *say*. Signs are inherently violent to

themselves and do violence to "things" in such a way that there are no things before or after this universal "writing": *il n'y a pas d'hors de text*.

For Derrida, This violence inherent to signification (and repressed by it) has a mythological dimension, captured by the troubled relationship between Apollo and Dionysus. Derrida writes,

> The divergence, the *difference*, between Dionysus and Apollo, between ardor and structure, cannot be erased in history, for it is not *in* history. It, too, in an unexpected sense, is an original structure, the opening of history, historicity itself. *Difference* does not simply belong either to history or to structure. If we must say, along with Schelling, that "all is but Dionysus," we must know—and this is to write—that like pure force, Dionysus is worked by difference. He sees and lets himself be seen. And tears out (his) eyes. For all eternity, he has had a relationship to his exterior, to visible form, to structure, as he does to his death. This is how he appears (to himself). (WD 29)

If writing represents an irreducibly "Apollonian" moment, a dream, an after-thought, a repose or a settling of the "Dionysian" forces that give rise to thought, then the impulse to think (in the sense of Husserlian sedimentation or the structuralist "soliciting" of a structure), the force of thought itself is always somehow *betrayed* or *abused* by its own self-presentation. For Derrida, writing can never be purely Dionysian: if the force that is being written is essentially Dionysian, and writing is essentially difference or differ*a*nce—the differing and deferring of meaning along signifiers—then the ecstatic, Dionysian unity of force "in itself" is something always already lost in reflection, in a seeing that is always already a tearing out of the eyes, a dismembering of what remembers, or a remembering-as-dismembering.[94] For Derrida, Schelling's affirmation that "all is Dionysus" can be true only in the sense that force is internally castrated and divided up by signification: Osiris scattered to the winds.

Beyond the Despotic Regime: Incantatory Signs

For Deleuze and Guattari, force and signification are not opposed: it is a matter of two kinds of what they dub "vocal-graphic power." According to its magical and invocational powers, the voice retains the dominance proper to it, its power to tattoo or cut into reality, but not to survey or represent it. This power is opposed to (or doubled by) a despotic graphism that dominates the voice (the song, the refrain, the chant). As they put it,

> For there is indeed a break which changes everything in the world of representation, between this writing in the narrow sense and writing in the broad sense—that is, between two completely different orders of inscription: a graphism that leaves the voice dominant by being independent of the voice while connecting with it, and a graphism that dominates or supplants the voice by depending on it in various ways and by subordinating itself to the voice. (AI 203)

In one case there is a dynamic, magical interplay between vocal and graphic powers, mediated by the eye or by a vision that *sees* the effect of the word on things, on the other hand a *reading* of the effect of things-as-words (AO 204).[95] But the graphism that remains subordinate to voice (although not necessarily a human voice, but a voice susceptible of becomings-other), does not represent or survey forces as much as it makes things into a potential talisman or an emblem of still *other* forces.

This incantatory and hieroglyphic form of representation is opposed to the despotic form of representation, in which the eye no longer sees but reads the world (AO 206). With despotism there is an *absorption* (as opposed to the positive, magical "adsorption") of the voice by writing, and a *reduction* of things to signs which makes writing present in the voice at the cost of making the voice absent when it speaks. As Deleuze and Guattari put it,

> In the first place, graphism aligns itself on the voice, falls back on the voice and becomes writing. At the same time it induces the voice no longer as the voice of alliance, but as that of a *new alliance*, that of *direct filiations* . . . Then there occurs a crushing of the magic triangle; the voice no longer sings but dictates, decrees; the graphy no longer dances, it ceases to animate bodies, but is set into writing on tablets, stones, and books, the eye sets itself to reading. (AO 203)

In other words, in despotic signification writing buries the voice while the voice haunts writing—it is this situation that Jacques Derrida found interminable, original, and irreducible (AI 203).[96] If for Derrida writing perennially repeats the loss of the magic triangle (connecting voice, graphy, and eye), for Deleuze and Guattari this is not an ontological "given" of "historicity as such," but rather a contingent effect of an attachment to despotic forms of power. The despotic power-play is to consolidate "all eyes on him," to make the magic of meaning the despotic consolidation of magic. Under despotic conditions, we write to retrieve what, according to the despot's consolidation of desire, we never had: a circuit between desire and object without reference to the desire of the Other, the despotic Other. As in Sophocles' *Antigone*, incestuous desire, where desire for the sister or the brother comes to name the suicidal hallucination of (com)union without the gaze of the sovereign.

But because Deleuze and Guattari distinguish between historically emergent and contingently structured orders of representation, they can bypass the Derridean (and Oedipal) crux. Deleuze and Guattari need not reduce all graphism to writing or all desire to desire of the Other's desires. For Deleuze and Guattari, desire only *becomes* the other's desire (and the unconscious only becomes Oedipal) *under despotic conditions* of representation.

As Deleuze and Guattari will analyze it in *A Thousand Plateaus*, all societies operate in terms of segmentation, divisions, arrangements, assemblages of flows (of food, property, money, apprenticeships, etc.). Even primitive societies work according to dualisms that are quite entrenched. But as Levi-Strauss demonstrated, in primitive societies these binary machines never operate for their own sake. It is only in modern state societies that a form of organization emerges that takes the development of binary oppositions as a *goal* and not as the means of various activities. It is true that the shaman plants a tree between his legs, and draws power to himself. But the circles of activity (becomings-animal, becomings-vegetable, etc.) do not become rigidly concentric, as they do in modern bureaucratic societies. In State societies,

> The segmentarity becomes rigid, to the extent that all centers resonate in, and all black holes fall on, a single point of accumulation that is like a point of intersection somewhere behind the eyes. The face of the father, teacher, colonel, boss, enter into redundancy, refer back to a center whose center is everywhere and whose circumference is nowhere. There are no longer *n* eyes in the sky, or in becomings-animal and -vegetable, but a central computing eye scanning all of the radii. (ATP 211)

The modern, bureaucratic form of organization tends to force all the circles to *resonate* with each other. For Deleuze and Guattari, what is important is not that primitive societies don't have power centers, but that the apparatuses of primitive power resist or "inhibit" translations of one form of power into another. The power is as different as the things which concern it ("depending on the task and the situation" [ATP 209]), even if it is centralized or organized in the shaman or healer. The difference is not between a centralized and a segmented society, but between two different organizing principles, two different ways of orchestrating segments.

But there is another graphism, that of the "primitive territorial sign." This sign is non-signifying—it is not a sign of signs, but a connection of things among themselves. As Deleuze and Guattari describe it,

> The primitive territorial sign is self-validating; it is a position of desire in a state of multiple connections. It is not a sign of desire nor a desire of a desire. It knows nothing of linear subordination and its reciprocity: neither pictogram nor ideogram, it is rhythm and not form, zigzag and not line, artifact and not idea, production and not expression . . . two forms of representation, territorial and imperial. (AO 203)

In territorial sign-making, glyphs establish a nexus between peoples and milieus. But societies become set on forming networks of mobile signs, equivocal and analogical signs, that *no longer require re-enactment for their meaning* (AO 204).[97] In territorial as opposed to imperial signs, what is at stake is perpetual and collective work, not the "expression" of a national consciousness which "reflects" its essence. However, with the development of nations all performance, all ritual, and all magic becomes transformed into arbitrarily erected structures of "meaning" which offer not the things we desire but the Master's desire for our desire: in a word, recognition.

The way that Jose Gil described his anthropological research into how human bodies become the subject of transformations in healing rituals can be applied to Deleuze's project of reading power in this way. In his *Metamorphoses of the Body*, Gil, like Deleuze, asserts that

> . . .the relationship between signs and the forces that underpin them has not been sufficiently studied, and yet, whether it is a question of stories, rituals, art, or raptures, their signs appear to be shot through with particularly intense investments of affectivities, to the point where one is tempted to take their affectivities as their characteristic traits. (Gil 88)

In Gil's study of the signs used in healing rituals, he finds that force and signification cannot be opposed. Why are signs forceful? Why do we speak of them as "arresting"

us? Are we forced to make meaning? Is meaning itself a force? These questions arise whenever we abandon the idea that meaning or interpretation is something cultures and individuals do for its own sake, rather than for the sake of doing *work*.

But what if the plurality of sign systems, of systems of "meaning," is due neither to the sheer contingencies of nature (physical energy or force) nor to the arbitrary necessities of cultural concepts (ideas or concepts), but to a power specific to the *manner in which* and the *purposes for which* signs are produced or emitted? This would point to a third term between nature and culture that would nevertheless not be a "mediator" but rather an "operator," what Deleuze calls the "quasi-cause." It would be a matter not of discovering what signs refer to (functions, structures, meaning systems), or what coerces them (arbitrary will), but rather a matter of asking *how* signs are meant to direct and redirect the work of bodies, never for its own sake (Hegel's master) or simply for the sake of work itself (Hegel's slave), but *for the sake of other work*. Here is how Gil explains it.

> Now, what "work" does the operator do? It acts on a force and on its internal features and places it in communication with other forces. The first aspect refers to another characteristic of forces: their intensity has the property of being able to grow or diminish without changing in nature. This means it has the capacity to work with internal differentiations or rhythmic heterogeneities without losing its wholeness or even creating a division in its heart. The intensity of a force is not enough to give birth to meaning (force would not have this privilege of being able to produce meaning all by itself). For that to come about, some other limitation would have to apply to the intensity of forces. This limitation would be the result of its opposition to external force, and the "remainder" would add to the internal gap a double determination. It gives the force an orientation and, coming from the outside with an absolute limit, recalibrates the system of internal gaps around (while opening it up to) another system of references.
>
> As precipitate of the remainder, the sign thus refers both to another system of signs and to a relation of forces. It refers to a relation of forces because it is the result of whatever flies off from the struggle between two

> specific forces. It refers, by itself, to a body of signs because it is the result of a transformation of determinations which are internal to force. In starting up this transformation in this way the operator paradoxically makes a force meaningful for a force of the same type, and at the same time makes it susceptible to the actions of other external operators. This is where the translatability of the sign comes from, why it is treated "fetishistically," giving it the power to mean all by itself (Thesis) and making it dependent on forces (Antithesis). (MB 12)

Why is the power of a sorcerer or magician to give or take life described in a set of signs that belong to magic or sorcery alone? Why is the ethnologist's attempt to reduce the *forces* of magic and sorcery to a "normalized" set of signs or representations or beliefs always frustrated? Is this the weakness of words or the power of force? What if this is because forces are already meaningful, paradigmatically in magic and sorcery, where "forces don't have to be signified; they signify" (M 18)? Gil hypothesizes that "the discourses of the magician and the bewitched draw their powers and their effectiveness from the region where the surplus of meaning becomes mingled with the surplus of force" (18). This is a magical space, a space of healing as much as destructive power.

But both territorial and despotic forms of signification are immanent "planes of consistency." The imperial despot as much as the territorial leader makes use of the energies of a connotative-magical power (AO 205). However, territorial sign-making functions by pure connotation, by the establishment of multiple connections over non-linear time and over a baroque, complex space.[98] Despotic representationalism subordinates all connections to connection with or through the despot, the desire of the despot, the desire which, like the voice, can no longer be experienced as belonging to anyone, and even more importantly cannot directly connect with *things*.

Writing Without Other: Unconscious Magic, Pragmatic Signs

Deleuze and Guattari's notion that there might be an indigenous language of partial objects and decoded flows does not necessarily deny Derrida's insistence that Dionysus is a terrifying, even violent passage into *membra disjecta*. The Body without Organs certainly consists in decoded flows and asignifying chains of signs, the passage into which is fraught with danger and suffering. But the point of *Anti-Oedipus* is not to revel in that violence or that suffering *per se*, but rather to show that there is a level of Dinoysian experience, produced by and in capitalism, that points to a form of signification that cannot be captured by the dualism between being and writing, force and signification.

This decoded inscription, this magical glyph-making, would always be a kind of writing without opposition to any "other" of writing, be it speaking or being. This writing has an archaic model in ritual magic, as Jose Gil shows, but it also resonates in the practice of making certain forms of contemporary art. In essence, the artist or sorcerer "writes" or emits signs in a way that Derrida's theory denies: as a form of signification that is evidently force, as a force that *is* only as sign.[99] It is precisely this sense of a "pragmatic" sign, as opposed to a "paradigmatic" sign, that Deleuze and Guattari explicate as that which exceeds the requirements of "Oedipal" sense.[100]

Oedipus precludes magic for the same reason that deconstruction obscures the constructivist or pragmatic view of signs. Both the Oedipal paradigm and Derridean deconstruction assume that a certain despotic form of representation is ineradicable at every level of the emission or reproduction of signs. In the same way that for Freud,

every desire is always already either a precursor to or a failure of desire to be the father or to restore the mother, for Derrida, every signification is always already either a violent interruption of difference by the sign or a trace of that violence. Both Freud and Derrida remain under the spell of Hegel's opposition of Nature and Spirit. Nature is nothing but the "indivisible remainder" of a Spiritual process of auto-contradiction: I both am and am not yet the father; I both have and do not have the mother as my own; I say what I mean but I distort what I refer to: meaning and/or desire is only ever *remainder*. The unconscious is a grave-yard, a haunted house, a city dump.

Traditional psychoanalysis reads the images of the unconscious as so many refractions of familiar, familial forms. Even if it admits that other images become present, "in the beginning" all the images are derived or derivative of parental images. Deleuze and Guattari insist, on the contrary, on an *infinite* or *unbounded* unconscious, an unconscious that is no less political and historical than it is familial.

In *Anti-Oedipus*, Deleuze and Guattari argue that it was colonialism, our great "excavation of the other" that exposed this "It is strange that we had to wait for the dreams of colonized peoples," Deleuze and Guattari write, "in order to see that, on the vertices of the pseudo-triangle, mommy was dancing with the missionary, daddy was being fucked by the tax collector, while the self was being beaten by a white man" (AO 96). For Deleuze and Guattari, the adventures of early childhood (no less than of the unconscious itself) cannot be reduced to the family romance. Children already *produce* (rather than represent or reflect) scenarios that use the parents in larger dramas, dramas including the dreams and misfortunes of entire civilizations. As Deleuze and Guattari put it,

> Go back through the course of the ages, you will never find a child caught in a familial order that is autonomous, expressive, or signifying. Even the nursing child, in his games as in his feedings, his chains, and his meditations, is already caught up in an immediate desiring-production where the parents play the role of partial objects, witnesses, reporters, and agents, in a process that outflanks them on all sides, and places desire in an immediate relationship with a historical and social reality. It is true that nothing is pre-oedipal, and that we must take Oedipus back to the earliest age, *but within the order of a repression of the unconscious*. It is equally true that everything within the order of production is anoedipal, and that there are non-oedipal, anoedipal currents that begin as early as Oedipus and continue just as long, with another rhythm, in a different mode of operation, in another dimension, with other uses of syntheses that feed the autoproduction of the unconscious—unconscious-as-orphan, the playful unconscious, the meditative and social unconscious. (AO 100, emphasis mine)

As an example of the workings of the social unconscious, T.E. Lawrence is instructive, here. Lawrence (an orphan if ever there was one) fantasizes Arabian nights, has homoerotic desire for Turks and turbans, has private dreams of vast empty sands and epic adventures, and a masochistic love of pain. Yet these are not private delusions, but social and political, world-historical Events because of the connections or "machines" with which they are equivocal. For Lawrence it is never "mommy-daddy-me." It is Brit-Arab-Turk, Redeemer-Betrayer-Redeemed, Money-Oil-Guns. As Deleuze and Guattari put it, "it is the function of the libido to invest the social field in unconscious forms, thereby hallucinating all history, reproducing in delirium entire civilizations, races, and continents, and intensely "feeling" the becoming of the world " (AO 98).

Another example is in Proust's literature. By *not* representing or expressing the political consequences of the Dreyfus Affair and of World War I *other than in terms of the Guermantes family*, Proust shows the direct consequence of politics on the libidinal scenario. Homosexual and heterosexual dynamics in a family are altered by the trauma

of world wars, and the wars are "sexualized" accordingly. The private is immediately the public: the unconscious reality or virtuality of the events cuts across the distinctions between families and nations.

For Deleuze and Guattari, a new form of analysis is required to complete the project psychoanalysis began: schizo-analysis. The schizophrenic position obliterates the distinction between public and private, ego histrionics and social history. It is the schizophrenic who becomes all the names of history. The schizo's private names (his impossible words) are public things (the partial objects of the real). The family is only a "stimulus" for these adventures—the images of the unconscious may be initially provoked by the family, but the *response* to the family "always comes from another direction" (AO 98). The real forces of the unconscious, for Deleuze and Guattari, are cosmic, of the order of transpersonal Events.

This is why *Anti-Oedipus* becomes an exercise in experimental or imaginative anthropology, an attempt to expose or analyze the libidinal investments cutting across various social forms. This makes the questions children ask irreducible: Why are there poor people? Why be rich? Who can be king? Why is Australia so far away?

Oedipal interpretation flattens all options into biunivocal identifications. The King is your father, Australia is your mother, you're poor because you've displeased Daddy. Oedipus "applies" everywhere because it began everything or "expresses" everything. Deleuze and Guattari protest: "rather a society of neurotics than one successful schizophrenic who has not been made autistic" (AO 102). Reducing our desires to Oedipal formations is how we are all kept gregarious, sociable, and how we are

convinced that all our energies belong to the attempt, however tragic, to become father to ourselves.

But as long as we are trapped in "interpretation," we are not yet thinking from the point of view of the multiplicity, of the multiple desires and the varieties of productions that Oedipus precludes. It is not Oedipus that determines its "reflections" in culture (the boss as father, the Madonna as mother). Rather, Deleuze and Guattari write, "it is not the father who is projected onto the boss, but the boss who is applied to the father, either in order to tell us 'you will not surpass the father' or 'you will surpass him to find our forefathers'" (AO 104).

Schizoanalysis looks for those places where our energies have been arbitrarily and artificially consolidated under Oedipal constraints, and seeks to release desire that "cuts across the interest of the dominated exploited classes, and causes flows to move that are capable of breaking apart both the segregations and their Oedipal applications—flows capable of hallucinating history, of reanimating the races in delirium, of setting continents ablaze. No, I am not of your kind, I am the outsider and the deterritorialized, "I am of a race inferior for all eternity . . . . I am a beast, a Negro" (AO 105). The Word deterritorialized on the voice, the Logos deterritorialized on the hieroglyph, the opaque pyramid become the translucent triangle. Schizoanalysis calls for a nomadic and polyvocal use of the unconscious as opposed to its segregative and biunivocal interpretation. It calls for a multiple and multiplied improvisation of orders of meaning, rather than the codings of a monomaniacal despotism.

The Subtle Difference of Immanence

In his review of *Anti-Oedipus* entitled "Delirium as System," Rene Girard claimed that "mimetic desire," the desire of the other's desire, as the root of all cultural and political evil, and once wrote a passionate review of *Anti-Oedipus* which accused Deleuze and Guattari of utopianism.[101] As if they were asking us simply to break with the despotic forces of consolidation and return to the immanent-magical-connotative "origin" of sense. As if we could return to a time when we allowed our bodies to be marked and tattooed, as the earth's body is also transmuted by the events (cataclysms, storms, upheavals, plate shifts) that traverse it. As if invited to an originary *passivity*, to move back from represented States to territorial milieus, from the unconscious fixated on Oedipus to the cosmic or world-historical unconscious of the schizo.[102]

But to think that Deleuze and Guattari are simply celebrating delirium, let alone a "return to the mother" is a massive over-simplification of their point, and is also one they take pains to specifically repudiate.[103] For artists as much as politicians are involved in contemporaneous and immediate de-and re-territorialization, and the delirium of the artist is as timed, as measured, as deliberate, and as "ethically motivated" as are the pontifications of pundits. The ethics of the earth called for by Deleuze and Guattari is an extremely subtle art of knowing how and when and where and why and under what conditions to impose a little order on chaos, *to do the same thing the despot does, but differently*. The paradox of the artist, and the child, is the practice of a *non-despotic imperialism*. "A little order," says Nietzsche.[104] Artists especially must guard against the fascist within (one thinks of the comic megalomania of Orson Welles as opposed to the tragedy of Howard Hughes). As Deleuze and Guattari put it, "that is why the material

problem confronting schizoanalysis is knowing whether we having it within our means to make the selection, to distinguish the BwO from its doubles: empty, vitreous bodies, cancerous bodies, totalitarian and fascist" (ATP 165). The magical-Artaudian cruelty (or masochism) of the artist-shaman-leader is extremely close to the mechanistic sadism of the despotic bureaucrat.

In capitalism the artist-impresario is the uncanny double of the entrepreneur-manager, as Andy Warhol's life, played out hysterically between these two poles, well attests. The tragedy and comedy of our day is played out between these two figures. They write "the test of desire: not denouncing false desires, but distinguishing within desire between that which pertains to static proliferation, or else too-violent destratification, and that which pertains to the construction of the plane of consistency (keep an eye out for all that is fascist, even inside us, and also for the suicidal and the demented)" (ATP 165).[105] Two varieties of violence, two versions of cruelty, as in the recent Russian film *Night Watch*, where the forces of light and darkness have the same means at their disposal, and the distinction between them is nearly untraceable.[106]

This brings us to what is both the strongest and weakest aspect of Deleuze's experiment with concepts: "doubtless, anything is possible" (ATP 166). Deleuze heralds the untrammeled power of materiality and demands that modern philosophy, rather than developing transcendental logics, invent a set of immanent criteria that can be neither formulated nor expressed apart from the experiment to which they give rise. But he also speaks as if the totality of the BwO's, the totality of our experiments, our plane(s) of consistency. harbored a secret positivity—the positive sense in which the eternal recurrence of the same tends to only select affirmative, life-giving forces. As if

eventually (in some non-linear sense of eventual) only "non-cancerous" BwO's would remain. In an ambitious claim Deleuze and Guattari insist that "the plane is the totality of the full BwO's that have been selected (there is no positive totality including the cancerous or empty bodies)" (ATP 165).[107]

What is the modality of this claim? Is this a hope? Is this a necessity (a la Hegelianism)? Is this fated to be (a la Stoic ontology)? Is this Spinozist or Parmenidean necessity, that has no alternate term (cannot be opposed by the contingent or the arbitrary)? Once again we are confronted with the paradox that thinking through immanence produces: we cannot decide in advance whether the elements of different assemblages and the planes on which they insist will be healthy or cancerous: we cannot clarify the obscurity of their potentials; they cannot clarify our desire to actualize them in the ways we do. In immanence, are we abandoned or free? This is the ambiguity of immanence, of the *saeculum*.[108] The achievement of a multiplicity of healthy plane(s) is not exactly a matter of chance, and not exactly fated.[109] But it is a matter of being *assembled*, constructed, and continuously re-created, according to criteria immanent to materials themselves.

VI. Being Assembled: Creating the Planes of Immanence

The culmination of Deleuze's ontology is the following point: beneath "molar" as opposed to "molecular" structures of organization, with their analogical relations (between states and families) and their equivocal problematics (are you a man or a *really* a man?), there is the plane of consistency, or plan(e) of immanence on which things develop and devolve prior to and beyond all recognizable identity. On this plan(e),

> Nothing develops, but things arrive late or early, and form on this or that assemblage depending on their composition of speed. Nothing subjectifies, but haecceities form according to compositions of nonsubjectified powers or affects. We call this plane, which knows only longitudes and latitudes, speeds and haecceities, the plane of consistency or composition (as opposed to the plan(e) of organization or development). It is necessarily a plane of immanence and univocality. We therefore call it the plane of Nature, although nature has nothing to do with it, since on this plane there is no distinction between the natural and the artificial. (ATP 266)

On these planes, which are also cartographies or plans, new worlds are constituted. When philosophy intuits these new sets of possibilities, it creates concepts that do not transcend those consistencies but rather remain immanent to them. Immanence, for Deleuze, is a rule for keeping philosophical creations closer to the exploits of art (and the most experimental forms of science). Immanence is, in a way, the rule of rules for forming concepts. It is less a perceived feature of things, an attribute of the world, than it is a kind of technology, a making of multiplicities. Analogous to how a painter prepares a surface to receive paint in a process different in kind from painting, there is an a-semiotic or a-signifying operation of an abstract machine that prepares a new surface on the earth.

For Deleuze, this creation of a new geography, or geo-philosophy, is a peculiarly *modern* problem. Michel Foucault, in his early works on the emergence of modernity, framed it in terms of the issue of the place of "the human" in dynamics (tectonic, astral, microbial) that surpass have been discovered to surpass our categories of identity on both the macrological and micrological levels. No one has perhaps yet understood the subtlety and cruelty and missed potentials of the modern situation as well as Foucault. As Deleuze summarizes Foucault's research, in modernity "the Human is traversed by an essential disparity, almost an *alienation by rights*, separated from itself by its words, its works, and by its desires" (DI 91). This auto-alienation it is what Foucault called the "unthought" in thought, the presence of an essentially cosmic and impersonal desire or power that will not be reduced to our reflection upon it or our attempt to adjudicate its adventures.[110]

While modernity, with its voracious quest for freedom and autonomy and novelty, calls for a life beyond identity and the calculations of a unified self, Foucault's early works show how the human sciences, in league with the consolidation of power in nation-states, constantly back-fill the "empty square" of our subjectivity with old images of kings, great men, geniuses, matrons, in order to develop "essences of man" that arbitrarily limit the possibilities for life. In a way, Deleuze's pluralism attempts to make good on the modern situation by *not* filling in the empty square, or better, by filling it with a verb: art.

As modernity has clearly shown, all great politicians are in some sense fallen artists. Politicians preserve the technical knowledge required to create plan(e)s of consistency, but do so only for the sake of consolidating the status quo and coordinating

desire with what is recognizable, with what *resembles* (the face of the father, the girl next door, etc.). There is a hair's breadth of difference between the demagogue and the avant-garde. There is a fascist lurking within every great artist, as much as it is true that the fascist employs all the power of art. Witness the genius of media manipulation by American politicians, let alone the extraordinary fetishization of desire managed by Adolf Hitler's Nazi regalia. Politicians are artists who work in a medium that has been artificially limited and distorted.

Politicians design faces that come to "represent" us—they offer us a "resemblance" of what we want (progress, liberty, power, food). While *Anti-Oedipus* sets up the terms for a political economics of such dynamisms as Bush's grin, *A Thousand Plateaus* makes good on the promise of a generalized symptomology of how we facialize our bodies and "landscapize" the earth (ATP 181). George Bush's political success is inseparable from his cocky grin, the Baptist-preacher swagger that also did so much for Bill Clinton. We follow the face before we follow the policy (or lack thereof). "The face is a politics," Deleuze writes (ATP 181).

But if the formation of a face, a cultivation of univocity or consistency, is how we subjectify the earth and subjugate ourselves, artists and children develop *another* consistency than that proper to the colonization of the earth: becomings-other and becomings-animal that tend to disengage the inherent multiplicity and polyvalence of cosmic dynamisms from orders intended to corral and crush them. As Deleuze puts it, "it is the wolf itself, and the horse, and the child, that cease to be subjects to become events, in assemblages that are inseparable from an hour, a season, an atmosphere, an air, a life" (ATP 262). Artists, like children and schizophrenics, but more like shamans and

magicians, are able to develop plan(e)s of consistency that enable the earth to speak on its own terms, no longer in terms of discrete objects but of *compositions of forces*. Here, "the street enters into composition with the air, and the beast and the full moon enter into composition with each other" (ATP 262). Artists find themselves mimicking or repeating traits (animal traits, sonic traits, visual traits) in a way that tears them away from all patterns of recognition and resemblance. Artists come to entertain circuits of impersonal affects, affects that cross the divide between human, plant, animal, and star. If there is always something suicidal or death-driven in this experimentation, it is in the sense that Don Juan teaches Carlos Castaneda to make friends with his death, to know its specificity. Or in Blanchot's sense that writing is death. Or, perhaps most of all, in the sense of Shamanistic initiation in which organs are removed, washed, and replaced in the body of the neophyte.

For Deleuze philosophy, or concept creation, means *experimentation*. But an experimental mandate also means that the concepts philosophy creates are not the consolidation of philosophy, but the point at which thought becomes other than itself. This always involves a great risk. As Deleuze puts it,

> Immanence can be said to be the burning issue of all philosophy because it takes on all the dangers that philosophy must confront, all the condemnations, persecutions, and repudiations that it undergoes. That at least persuades us that the problem of immanence is not abstract or merely theoretical. It is not immediately clear why immanence is so dangerous, but it is. It engulfs sages and gods. (WIP 45)

Crossing the divide between gods and man, immanence establishes the field for a game beyond every discernible identity, every discrete essence. It is a field of transmutation, of apocalypse and metamorphosis, as Norman O. Brown once put it, where the fate of the cosmos as much as the human ego is fully at risk and at play.

Multiple Matters: Inventing the Anexact Essence

> Schizoanalysis, or pragmatics, has no other meaning: Make a rhizome. (ATP 251)

For Deleuze's transcendental empiricism, only multiplicities provoke thought. This is partly because multiplicities do not obey the rules of representation and partly because multiplicities are "eventful" – they are "happenings," to use the term current to 1960's and 1970's guerilla art. In the same way that events pose questions to us, multiplicities remain "problematic." A multiplicity—a ready-made of Duchamp's, a phrase of Sockhausen's, a shot of Goddard's, the flight of a crow—carries or incarnates only one possible "solution" of an ideal problem multiplicities express. Likewise, a historical event (the assassination of JFK, the attack on the World Trade Center, Gandhi's walk across India) does not decide some issue but rather raises latent issues or questions to a certain surface, a surface of possible sense. Here it should be clear why the consistency or "immanence" of multiplicities is not a matter of history, and why Deleuze is not an "historicist" – he would never admit that philosophical concepts are reducible to forces of a given historical milieu. Transcendental empiricism allies itself not with history but with *becoming*.

But transcendental empiricism's "realism of becomings" is not the realism of tradition, which always supposes a correspondence between the truth of a linguistic (or otherwise semantic) "account of the facts" and "the way the world is out there." For Deleuze such a realism is at least arbitrary and at most incoherent, because on his view the true being of things is inherently problematic, from both an epistemological and an ontological perspective. For Deleuze, multiplicities embody *virtual* problems that are

irreducible to cases of solution. In other words, sense is irreducible to the propositions which nevertheless expresses sense. Since the "propositional content" of a description of reality can only state a case of possible solution, it cannot be such a description that "corresponds" to the real.

On the contrary, only the problem "corresponds," or better, *resonates*. As Manuel Delanda puts it in his work *Intensive Science and Virtual Philosophy*, Deleuze's realism is one of an *isomorphism* between the problems humans pose and the problems (virtually) existing in life.[111] Delanda even goes so far as to say that the equipment in a physicist's laboratory, the practice of using these machines, and the activity that includes those components "would be isomorphic with the intensive processes of individuation which solve or explicate a virtual problem in reality."[112] In the practice of physics a heterogeneous assemblage is formed. Here a machinic phylum (rather than a "history of science") can be discerned which connects experimenter, apparatus of experiment, selected materials, and materiality in general.

Even if the dynamics (physical properties, possibilities, field states, etc.) of some system can eventually be explained in simple linear causal terms which are no longer problematic, this is the case only if it is assumed that matter itself is inherently unproblematic (i.e. non-self-organizing) can the inherently problematic assemblage of experimenter, apparatus, and matter be assumed as a temporary "subjective" distortion in our account of nature. On a Deleuzian view of the matter, the scientific assemblage (i.e. the "practice") of science resonates with the real intensive (i.e. problematically self-initiating) processes inherent in the material world.

The nature of what has gone by the name of "matter" in the history of philosophy is a fundamental problem for a philosophy that posits the co-genesis of thought and being. Despite evidence that matter at its deepest levels functions according to dynamics in which *what* it is depends upon *how* it is observed, there remains much resistance to the view of an animate matter. For Deleuze, however, the presupposition of a dead and inchoate matter presupposes a subject-object dualism that violates the fundamental intuition of transcendental empiricism: that genuine thought is always forced.

In *A Thousand Plateaus*, Deleuze argues that thought must be willing to follow lines of flight like a metallurgist follows flows of ore. Whereas traditional anthropology had defined the cultural status of the metallurgist or smith in terms of a difference from or contrast with either the sedentary farming culture or nomadic people groups (essentially how the smith is evaluated by an "other"), Deleuze and Guattari insist (following the work of anthropologists like Griaule and Childe) that this middle or "mixed" personage of the smith, existing between the "smooth" or "deterritorialized" flow of ore and the "striated" or territorialized food supplies of an empire, should *not* be understood as a bastardized or impure amalgam of Others, but as something Husserl might have called an "anexact essence."

The itinerant or vagabond smith differs (differently) from both the nomad and the farmer. Mines must be near mountains or deserts, on frontiers and not in the rich "alluvial" valleys of imperial, sedentary farming. Yet metallurgists require a consistent and stable food supply from those same farms. However, the identity of the smith is not a negative derivation from these two positive variables. This is because the metallurgist is defined above all by the peculiarities of the *space* proper to metallic ore itself, a space

Deleuze and Guattari call "holey space." This space, as they put it, is *connected* with nomad space and *conjoined* with sedentary space (ATP 415)—metallurgists are not of the land or of the soil but of the subsoil, the *underground*.[113]

There is something strange about the space of the metallurgist. Rather than dividing the earth up into striated, criss-crossed fields or herding animals across smooth, unbounded plateaus, smiths transpierce mountains and excavate lands. They bore holes and set up caves or workshops that connect to other workshops, the storehouses of empire, other mines. Rather than imposing forms on the earth (farmers) or subjecting themselves totally to its material ebb and flow (nomadic herders), metallurgists follow the flow of a specific material. They ambulate with it. They therefore create "lines of flight" or "rhizomes" that blur the lines between art and nature. A whole network of holey spaces whose inhabitants have an ambiguous political status: are smiths slaves (to the metals, to the empire)? Demigods (lords of the underworld)? Heroes (weapon makers)? Demons (consorts with fire)? And how do they manage to live so close to the uncanny forest, from which they get their charcoal—do they speak the language of beasts? Of trees? Of gods?

On Deleuze and Guattari's view, the "marginal" status of the smith cannot be explained in terms of its negative relationship with either of the two others.[114] It has an autonomy proper to it, the autonomy of a vagabond or itinerant person, neither sedentary nor nomadic. "Their relation to others results from their internal itinerancy, from their own vague essences, and not the reverse," they insist (ATP 415). What a smith is, in terms of her identity cannot be explained in terms either of the plight of a form or the pure potencies of a material. For Deleuze, Edmund Husserl had some notion of this

"ambulant coupling" of matter with itself that cannot be understood in terms of "fixed essence-properties."

Anexact essence, for Husserl, is not prime matter, nor is it a sensible object. It is something between those two, an "affect-event": something taking place in matter that is not yet the imposition of a form, but which is inseparable from expressive or intensive qualities—"singularities" that are prolonged or extend over features of objects that would seem, on either formal or material terms, to be discontinuous (ATP 407). These singularities or affects-events are related in what Deleuze calls the *machinic phylum*: "*a constellation of singularities prolongable by certain operations, which converge, and make the operations converge, upon one or several assignable traits of expression*" (ATP 406). As Deleuze puts it here, in *A Thousand Plateaus*, "this operative and expresssive flow is as much artificial as it is natural: it is like the unity of human beings and Nature" (ATP 406).

Specific operations allow the flow to come to the fore *as a flow*, and not as a "form" distinct from matter. The farmer, the nomad, the smith, and even the merchant seem in their own ways to follow the ebb and flow of a peculiar material assemblage. But only the artisan, and the smith in an exemplary way, truly follows the flow of the material. Whereas the farmer follows the seasons, changes crops in rotation, etc., this is always to bring the labor back to a certain fixed point from which the process can begin again. What is expected from the land is wholly determined by what it has produced in the past in accordance with the form imposed upon it, with preconceived ideals. The farmer is not truly itenerant, nor is the merchant, who is bound to a flow of goods that must depart from and return to the same fixed point. These "transhumants" (ATP 409)

do not so much follow a flow as much as continually draw a circuit which takes only the part of the flow that it requires (ATP 410).

The artisan, on the other hand, is the true itinerant, the true ambulator. The carpenter-artisan follows the flow not only of the grain of the wood with which s/he is working, but also the supply of wood itself, the whole entire earthly adventure and vicissitude proper to wood itself, from his or her "prospects" as a carpenter. S/he must go where it goes. Whereas the nomad holds a smooth space and the farmer and the merchant bind flows to rotation, the artisan is bound most intimately to the flow of the material itself. Although all artisans exist in this manner, it is above all the metallurgist who reveals what is latent in all the other crafts. Why?

It has to do, again, with peculiarities of material. In metals more than any other sphere it is unclear where a potency ends and a form begins. As Deleuze and Guattari put it, "an energetic materiality overspills the prepared matter, and a qualitative deformation or transformation overspills the form" (ATP 410). Quenching, which finishes the forging, takes place *after* the form has been fixed. The existence of ingots, which are prepared potentials, cannot be reduced to mere potentials or stocks. Even though it seems like the distinction between form and matter is clearer nowhere else than metallurgy, what actually happens is a continuous development of form and a continuous variation of matter, as in music. Deleuze and Guattari write,

> If metallurgy has an essential relationship with music, it is by virtue not only of the sounds of the forge but also of the tendency within both arts to bring into its own, beyond separate forms, a continuous development of form, and beyond variable matters, a continuous variation of matter: a widened chromaticism sustains both music and metallurgy; the musical smith was the first "transformer." In short, what metal and metallurgy bring to light is a life proper to matter, a vital state of matter as such, a material vitalism that doubtless exists everywhere but is ordinarily hidden

> or covered, rendered unrecognizable, dissociated by the hylomorphic model. (ATP 411)

The music of the smith is not just the sound of his hammer, but a transformational relation with the ore: the smith plays through the malleability of the ore; the musician forges through a continuous variation of notes. Smiths as much as musicians do not impose forms but *transform*: they only ever deal with forms in and as transitions. These arts reveal "a life proper to matter," but this life is not organic, not exactly natural (and not exactly an "autopoiesis" which would rigorously distinguish the alive and the dead).[115]

Deleuze's view of matter cuts against the grain of the hylomorphic assumptions underpinning much traditional philosophy. For hylomorphism, change must have measurable thresholds determining when potencies are or can become matters that can be considered as potencies to be actualized, or used as form—i.e., why some sounds and not others can be composed to make a symphony. All this would be well and good except that hylomorphism misses the *passages* proper to the materials themselves that are vague or anexact. It determines as attributable to "form" all that is recognizable or knowable in materiality. There may be an acknowledgement, as Husserl seems to have made, that there are intermediate forms, but these are always constricted to being "intermediaries" or "passages" that have intelligibility only in terms of that which is becoming finalized—they have no identity in and of themselves worthy of the name.

On the Husserlian view the essence of a circle emerges from vague roundness into sensible, clear roundness, achieving an *eidos*. But Deleuze insists that there is an autonomy to roundness (or to music) itself which is a "threshold affect" (neither flat nor pointed, neither silence nor noise) or "limit process" (becoming rounded, becoming

music). Deleuze is thinking here in terms of the ancient Epicurean view of nature as inherently flux-based or "in becoming," where all transformation, growth, and death are the results of the *clinamen* or minimal diversion of an atom from a straight line. These minimal deviations or "lines of flight" are not the unruliness of matter resisting formal order. They are autonomous forces inhabiting "problematic figures": not circles but round-like forms—lens-shaped, umbelliform, indented; not meters but rhythmic forms—the stuttering, the glitchy, the funky; not organisms but bodies—bands, packs, tribes. Whereas the traditional or "Statist" impulse is to account for these variations as simply "variables in content" or "distortions in expression," for Deleuze these anexact essences are distinct from *both* the things that incarnate them (wheels, glasses, songs, races) *and* ideal, fixed essences.

Even though Husserl acknowledged the presence of intermediate essences, "anexact yet rigorous ("essentially and not accidentally inexact"), Husserl always considered them stopping points on the way to complete eidetic substance (ATP 367). For Deleuze anexact essences are found in and as "passages to the limit" or "thresholds" in material flows that cannot appear via "reflection upon the object," even under conditions of the *epoche*. The singularity of a material flow, for Deleuze, becomes evident only when mind ambulates along with matter in an ambulant state that is not passive but is nothing less than that activity we call *artful*.[116]

That is why, for Deleuze, the "essences" of art, ritual, therapy, and magic are the subject of a minor or nomad science, proper not to the State but to a kind of "war machine" that is always caught up in *flows*, caught up in the adventure of materials themselves. Only here, "at the limit" do we perceive what Deleuze calls

> A single phylogenetic lineage, a single machinic phylum, ideally continuous: the flow of matter-movement, the flow of matter in continuous variation, conveying singularities and traits of expression. This operative and expressive flow is as much artificial as natural: it is like the unity of human beings and Nature. But at the same time, it is not realized in the here and now without dividing, differentiating. We will call an assemblage every constellation of singularities and traits deducted from the flow—selected, organized, stratified—in such a way as to converge (consistency) artificially and naturally; an assemblage, in this sense, is a veritable invention. (ATP 406)

The "minor knowledge" of these flows is the knowledge required to, for instance, square stones without prefabricated templates, a procedure used in the making of the Gothic cathedrals. Here "one does not represent, one engenders and traverses" (ATP 364). Or to make something round, a procedure involving not just the knowledge of a form but of immanent material requirements (millstones, lathes, spinning wheel sockets, etc.). State science, with its methodism, always fails to *ambulate*: "the State is perpetually producing and reproducing ideal circles, but a war machine is necessary to make something round" (ATP 367).

In making music, composers attempt to follow an "esprit de corps" of the notes themselves. There is a sieve or interweave between mind and materials, where what the material will have been becoming is known only as I artfully accompany or trace its trajectory over time. This is why Deleuze and Guattari always think of true change and its dynamics in terms not of "objective" or Natural lineages, but in terms of a "machinic phylum" that is strictly speaking neither natural nor cultural, but artful, *inventive*. Major or "State" science seeks always to eliminate this element of "following," which is potentially subversive and autodidactic. Minor science does all it can—even as it is continually compromised—to keep moving with matter, to remain an endless pedagogy, a doing-with matter. *Minor science builds up not arborescent or organized hierarchies*

of knowledge, but rhizomatic surfaces of connection between extraordinary points and singular traits that are not so much given in nature as "naturally" available under certain intense conditions, conditions such as those found in artistic creation or shamanic ritual.

There is thus a peculiarly *affective* dimension to minor science. But these affects bring into play not "unreason" but immanent forms of determination. This is why Deleuze calls his thought, paradoxically, a "transcendental empiricism"—rather than space, time, and the categories schematizing things, something like the reverse is true: time, space, and the categories are "out of joint," untimely, a function of affects in flux. This is what it means that the artisan *belongs* to the stone, the composer is *led* by the music, the painter *feels her way along* the canvas, the shaman's body *becomes* the body of the entire tribe.

Moving Through Music: Baroque Becomings-Other

This is why Deleuze is a "baroque" as opposed to "romantic" thinker.[117] The movement he is tracing in art is not what flows through the soul of the composer who hears the silent cry of his people's heart, but the forced movement that occurs as a *result* of art: the flow that appears (as simulacra) in the baroque interior, where it appears that pillars supporting the ceiling are hanging from the painted clouds. Deleuze's theory of music is that it is not the music itself, its formal purity, that gives it power, but rather its mixed or *impure* affect, its "suggestiveness" or becoming-other. It is not that music represents emotions or characters, but that it mobilizes forces that are shared affects

moving across various forms of life. As Deleuze puts it "music [here, Mozart's] takes as its content a becoming-animal; but in that becoming-animal the horse, for example, takes as its expression soft kettledrum beats, winged like hooves from heaven or hell; and the birds find expression in *gruppeti*, appogiaturs, staccato notes that transform them into so many souls" (ATP 304).

Notes do not represent but in some sense *become* horse-steps, bird-flight, or love-making. But this is only because, says Deleuze, in this process horses, birds, and love become something they never were. The horse is "deterritorialized," transfigured, magnified or diffused into something else yet again—fear, or joy, or yet more music. This occurs not because of any imitative power in art, but because of a transmutation that cuts across life as much as art. As Deleuze puts it, "the painter and the musician do not imitate the animal, they become-animal at the same time as the animal becomes what they willed, at the deepest level of their concord with Nature" (ATP 305). Music does not imitate life or even suggest its representable figures. It captures and releases affects cutting across both organic and nonorganic life. Drum n' bass beats, for instance, are as much the affect of electricity through silicone chips as they are the untamed rampage of buffaloes and the eerie longing of hyenas. We do not dance to it to understand the "spirit of our times," but to connect over time and space affects that can blend and even transform one another: the becoming-digital of the herd.[118] This singular affect crossing human, animal, and machine does not reflect the times as much as extract what is most singular about the times from its mundane self-representation.

The dance of the tarantella is supposed to magically cure its victims of tarantula bites. But it works, Deleuze and Guattari emphasize, not because the dancer imitates a

spider but because there are affects of the spider that *cross* it or *traverse* it and that become available in a dance that connects to these more or less mobile affects. We don't dance the spider, we dance the spider's *color*, *mood*, or *timbre*. As Deleuze puts it, "the victim, the patient, the person who is sick, becomes a dancing spider only to the extent that the spider itself is supposed to become a pure silhouette, pure color and pure sound to which the person dances" (ATP 305).

This sheds light on why Deleuze's theory of art is not an "aesthetics of qualities," or a theory that all sensible qualities have inherent eternal essences that provoke reminiscence or phantasm (ATP 306). Whereas it does seem as if for Deleuze the extraordinary signs Proust encounters had the status of eternal Ideas (the idea of Vinteuil's phrase, of the madeleine's taste, of the church's steeple), Deleuze insists that even in Proust, as much as in Melville or Kafka, the sensations are functional blocs, indexes of a becoming, "components of a deterritorialization passing from one assemblage to another" (ATP 306). And even there he insisted on as much by making the "essences" Proust learns a function of a signs that can only be taken *as* signs (of love, betrayal, fidelity, hatred) for someone subject to the vicissitudes of the colliding worlds, the disasters and delights of a given machinic flow, the adventures of a deterritorialized of earth.

The earth Deleuze thinks art reveals is not the earth of sensations, but of supersensible *forces* which are found at the *limits* of sensation. These limits are found in the intensity of experimental art and actual science, as well as in great love and experimental faith. The paradigmatic role of art for thought is not due to the fact that art's materials are platonic forms of the real. Rather, it is the *function* art

paradigmatically plays (in its "modernity," at least) as an *experimentation in becomings*, and the function sensations play in those becomings, that ultimately matters to Deleuze.

While art deals in sensation, the virtue of art, for Deleuze and Guattari, is that art unleashes the forces of a becoming-*imperceptible*, a knowledge that is at once a sorcery. Artists are sorcerers, Deleuze writes, because the animal is the only party to whom they feel beholden.[119] That is to say, artists want to be in their created worlds as animals are in their "natural" ones. For Deleuze, constituting a territory is nearly the birth of art: in making a territory, it is not merely a matter of defecatory and urinary markings, but also a series of postures (standing/sitting for an animal), a series of colors (that an animal takes on), a song [*un chant*]. These are the three determinants of art: colors, lines, song, says Deleuze in an interview with Claire Parnet.

This animal art and artistic animality has nothing to do with imitation, resemblance, or representation. The camouflage skin of chameleons or certain fish does not imitate anything, does not resemble anything, but captures imperceptible flows, movements, trajectories proper to a given milieu.[120] A fish makes an abstract line or develops a complex, "gothic" variation within his world—a world that is not a Whole, a "collection" of lines, but a world that is, in itself, an abstract line of which the fish is like a piece of a puzzle.

Artists are animals in the sense that they, too, de-and re-territorialize their milieus as experimental forms of life. The artist wills to de- and re-territorialize to the infinite, to become everything and everybody (as did Woolf, Kerouac, even Artaud): "to be present at the dawn of a world" (ATP 280).[121] But this world is built not through a grand synthesis or integration (as in Romanticism), but through what Deleuze calls a

synthesizer (ATP 342-343).[122] The figures or phrases, strokes or beats of an artist are not so many parts seeking a whole, or exiles seeking home, but machines for extracting affects from nature the way that synth oscillators divide and recombine sound waves. Just as synth sounds do not resemble the sounds of other instruments, but draw of principles from their timbres, the principle of art, generally, is always to first *eliminate* resemblance and analogy between clichéd figures and stereotyped narratives in order to capture the imperceptible and the indiscernible, and to make a new world from them.

Toward a Haptic Form of Thought: The Figure of Geophilosophy

What Deleuze means by a "haptic" form of thought is one which would join with the work of art in overturning platonism by establishing certain extraordinary Perspectives as the only Ideas worthy of repetition. This is a form of thought that results in concepts that embody, perform, or *entertain* the very material dynamisms that provoke its formation. It is what Bacon is able to do with his mastery of color: the knowledge of how to bring colors together in a way that results not from their optical value but from a "pure internal rapport." The image of thought distances us from the intensive and singular "dynamics of difference" by representing in analogical forms that are pre-given and recognizable. But it is not enough to "ruin representation" to achieve a haptic thought. To think haptically does not mean merely to deconstruct[123] given forms of sensibility and forms of life. It means to get closer to the real genesis of thought than is allowed for by the image of thought, by representation, by concepts.

What a haptic philosophy would share most profoundly with art is the cultivation of *figures*—for Deleuze, concepts are to philosophers what figures are to art. Both

philosophy and art, for Deleuze, "crosscut the chaos and confront it," even if not in the same way or with the same results. Philosophy develops concepts from the same matter of expression in which art develops figures.

What is a figure, for Deleuze? Deleuze writes, "figures have nothing to do with resemblance or rhetoric but are the conditions under which the arts produce affects of stone and metal, of strings and wind, of line and color, on a plane of composition of a universe " (WIP 66). For art to cultivate a figure is for it to develop one particular affect or percept to such a degree that such an affect causes others to coalesce around them in a way that would not happen otherwise.

For Deleuze both Francis Bacon's painting and Marcel Proust's literature share a common quest for a Figure that is neither abstractly apprehended nor concretely narrated. Bacon paints "portraits" of humans that are organized by chaotic or random traits (marks) through which parts (eyes, mouths), places (butcheries and living rooms), and states (being meat, being the Crucified) are related in ways they could not be otherwise (they are elongated, truncated, etc.). Proust would give us not an "impression" of Combray through descriptive flourish, nor a "day in the life" of a person living there, but Combray in a tea-cup, Albertine in a bedroom, a nervous breakdown and a mystical epiphany together in a sonata. As Deleuze puts it,

> This [connection] is perhaps because Bacon, when he refuses the double way of a figurative painting and an abstract painting, is put in a situation analogous to that of Proust in literature. Proust did not want an abstract literature that was too voluntary (philosophy), any more than he wanted a figurative, illustrative, or narrative literature that merely told a story. What he was striving for, what he wanted to bring to light, was a kind of Figure, torn away from figuration and stripped of every figurative function: a Figure-in-itself, for example, the figure-in-itself of Combray. (FB 56)

Deleuze analyzes the paintings of Bacon in terms of their ability to create informal diagrams that map intensive spaces of coloration that cannot be understood in either optic or manual terms alone. Diagrammatic transformations are those which start with a formalized set or regime of signs (in this case, the clichés of painting), and proceed to extract from them—or make a "machine" capable of extracting from them—a new set of potential traits or "particles-signs" (ATP 145).[124] Once the diagrammatic moment has occurred, an abstract machine can be established that organizes or fully actualizes the new regime: in this case, the new regime is Bacon's finished painting.

In *Three Studies for Figures on Bends* (1972), for example, Bacon's diagram-smudge becomes a hip bone that joins all three bodies in an "impossible" new human-animality. The diagram (the "random" trait with which Bacon starts) is not the final "matter of fact" or "brute fact" painted; rather, the diagrammatic-chaotic *trait* is what enables the *entire painting* to render a brutality or a "cruelty" (in Artaud's sense) of fact that it would not be able to do without that *trait* (meaning in French a line but also a characteristic). The chaos introduced by the diagram allows for the breakdown of pre-given identities (human/animal, bone/skin, etc.). But this distortion or contamination or becoming-imperceptible is never the goal in itself. Rather the goal is to create something genuinely new: a new assemblage. As Deleuze puts it,

> Save the contour—nothing is more important for Bacon than this. A line that delimits nothing still has a contour or outline itself. Blake at least understood this. The diagram must not eat away at the entire painting; it must remain limited in space and time. It must remain operative and controlled. The violent methods must not be given free reign, and the necessary catastrophe must not submerge the whole. The diagram is a possibility of fact—it is not the Fact itself. Not all the figurative givens have to disappear; and above all, a new figuration, that of the Figure, should emerge from the diagram and make the sensation clear and precise. To emerge from the catastrophe . . . (FB 89)

We emerge from the catastrophe not into transcendence, not into a governing purview, a judgment seat, a transcendental Archimedean point, but into *immanence*. The development of a Figure without need of description in figurative or abstract terms is the construction of immanence, of a plane or plan of immanence that is also a new way to feel, to move, to act, and to think. It is the achievement of an assemblage: a new machine for being, a new regime of signs relating a new set of possible actions, along new lines of territorialization. But again, if this is the goal, it is not the end: it is only the beginning.

Philosophy carries this beginning through on what Deleuze calls a "thought-plane" as opposed to the plane of a universe (where science works). The planes are neighborhoods of extraordinary points or variations that appear in various guises, sometimes even as the masks a philosopher puts on in order to think. But Plato's Socrates, Kierkegaard's Don Juan, Nietzsche's Zarathustra, even Bergson's runner are more than examples, illustrations, or "representations" in the service of concepts. They are idiosyncrasies without which the thought of a peculiar philosopher cannot occur. This is why sometimes truly brilliant philosophers like Plato or Nietzsche will allow their texts to be populated by characters that are antipathetic to themselves (Christ and/or the priest for Nietzsche, Gorgias or others for Plato). The greatest philosophers thus display, like great artists, a kind of "athleticism . . . like acrobats torn apart in a perpetual show of strength" (WIP 67). Philosophy is a Dionysian form.

Why it matters so much to Deleuze to have us understand philosophy in these terms is because the *territory* revealed in a philosophy, or in a "conceptual personae" developed by a philosopher, is ultimately more important than the "propositional content"

of her work[125]. Great philosophers, like great artists, are like animals (and great inasmuch as their animality succeeds) in de- and re-territorializing. This is why Deleuze calls the philosophy of the future "geophilosophy": not because truth is relative to different regions of the earth, but because there is no truth that is not an assemblage, and it is always already the earth that is de- and re-assembled.

In this way animals sometimes seem "truer" than self-conscious man, even though humanity constantly de- and re-territorializes itself even more than do animals with their delineation of various locales as friends and of their family pack as a "mobile home." Humans deterritorialize themselves to the infinite. My hand immediately grasps my dad's hammer, and then my drumstick. First, as a child, I deterritorialize the hammer as a drumstick, playing primitive beats on my toy box (it was very important that it be my Dad's "real" hammer and not a toy). Later on, when the hammer is re-territorialized as a tool, the drumstick is deterritorialized as a hammer when I learn to speak on the drums, to build beats, to nail the groove, but to speak with hammer blows. In which case *language* becomes deterritorialized for me (as it always already was due to my hearing loss) as pure rhythm and bodily sensation, sensation which is re-territorialized as the song I am playing, today.

Philosophers can complete and carry out these becomings, these "lines of flight." They deterritorialize not only themselves—the preconceptual life they live—but also the concepts with which they deal and the "history of reception" of those concepts. To use an example Deleuze gives in *What is Philosophy?* (WIP 64-65), Descartes' "idiot" is the indispensable frame of the cogito, without which the idea of the cogito (everyone knows what it means to think) is unintelligible. But then the idiot, emergent in Nicholas of Cusa

(deterritorializing itself from St. Augustine's idea of learned ignorance, in which we forgo our possible specification of the finite in view of God's elaboration of the finite at infinity) and used again in Descartes, becomes deterritorialized in the Slavic world when Dostoyevsky takes it up as his theme. The idiot passes from the faith of "learned ignorance" to unenlightened naiveté to a radically affirmative immodesty—from faith to doubt to the absurd, to the absurd affirmation of nonsense as itself the only truth, of the "ruins of history" the unforgettable, the irreplaceable. From impiety to piety (Augustine to Cusa), tragic madness to profound comic insight (Descartes to Dostoyevsky), the idiot becomes perverse, fixated in the real, refusing not concepts but refusing the idea that the exceptional, the obscene, etc. does not have its own concept.

The tracing of these kinds of lineages and trajectories is what Deleuze calls "geophilosophy." Geophilosophy is not the reduction of truth to territory; it is the affirmation of the superiority of territory over truth, insofar as genuinely new and different territories are wrested from chaos. "To think is to experiment," Deleuze writes, "but experimentation is always that which is in the process of coming about—the new, remarkable, and interesting that replace the appearance of truth and are more demanding than it is" (WIP 111). And geophilosophy is not any more relative to *time* than it is to place; time and place only become significant *as* the peculiar or distinctive locales (neighborhoods, milieus) they can be when *made* subject to the power of concepts, which is to say the power of a creative *becoming*. This becoming is no simple historical occurrence: "it is born in History and falls back into it, but is not of it" (WIP 110).

Philosophy is not of history, but of the earth, of the earth in a sense that can only be (re)created in an alliance between the earth and philosophy. "The philosopher must

become nonphilosopher so that nonphilosophy becomes the earth and people of philosophy" (WIP 109). Why is philosophy connected to the idea of a new earth? Because the immanence or the univocity philosophy attempts and more or less succeeds to establish is not a homeland, not a *heim*, but an/other earth—we write not to imagine a new earth, but to imagine this earth otherwise. The attraction of philosophy should be like the attraction of science fiction—as if the only way we can solve the "problems" of human existence is if we pose them on a plane which re-names our dependencies.[126]

This is why Deleuze's new vision of philosophy as "geophilosophy" is not at all an "historicism." It would be better dubbed a "fictivism," if only in the sense Lacan picked up with his famous quip that truth has the structure of a fiction. For Deleuze History teaches nothing, which is why Hegel's *Phenomenology* fails insofar as it attempts to wed itself to an historical narrative. History itself is a hollow echo of more profound becomings (de-terrritorializations) that are re-territorialized in different ways depending on the different milieus of thought and the events corresponding to them, depending on what *forced* them to come into being.

An example: the birth of the French and Italian New Wave film schools after World War II. World War II forced these *auteurs* to think in a different way, a way that reflected the way in which WWII had interrupted temporal continuity and destroyed connections between places and traditions. But their thinking is not reducible to history. The films are not "reflections on World War II," but experiments that take the conditions of post-War life (its event or advent) as the real conditions of a new idea. With Fellini and Goddard and others, a new way of making films comes into being along with a new

way of conceiving: the time-image, as opposed to the movement image, an image not moving in time but showing an autonomous movement *of* time.

The paradox is that while this emergence happens as a result of history, it is more accurate to say that the real consequences of World War II, what is truly new and extraordinary about the post-war world, can best be seen (if not exactly "understood") *as* these time-image. The time-images (of discontinuity, rupture, fragmentation, the uncanny, the displaced, etc.) are not "examples" of "how people felt after World War II." The thought *of* a time-image is itself the "counter-actualization" or re-lease of that which history is only a kind of negative image or chaotic suggestion. As Deleuze puts it,

> What History grasps of the event is its effectuation in states of affairs or in lived experience, but the event in its becoming, in its specific consistency, in its self-positing as concept, escapes History . . . History is not experimentation, it is only the set of almost negative conditions that make possible the experimentation of something that escapes history. Without history experimentation would remain indefinite and unconditioned, but experimentation is not historical. It is philosophical. (WIP 111)

What does Deleuze mean by a non-historical form of experimentation? Does not all experimentation, like all experience, take a time that can be marked as historical, recorded as "what happens"? It is a geography or a geology of morals of which "history" is only one rendering, one possible reading, just as the "ego" is only one possible rendering of the self. And the goal for Deleuze in getting beyond this perspective is not to escape the self or history but to make something *other* of those perspectives.

This is what he means by what he calls the "becomings-animal," "becomings-child," and "becomings-molecular" which happen in and as art, but it is also how and what he envisions as the true definition of philosophy itself: philosophers do not write to

consolidate their identity as philosopher but in order to become something else, to think for those who cannot, to speak for the dumb, to hear for the deaf, to become wolf or snake or rat so that these animals, or those mountains, or that painful family romance becomes something else: becomes an abstract line, a figure, a painting, a piece of music.

As Deleuze puts it in his exchange with Claire Parnet,

> Man only becomes animal if the animal, for its part, becomes sound, color, or line. It is a bloc of becoming which is always asymmetrical. It is not that the two are exchanged, for they are not exchanged at all, but the one only becomes the other if the other becomes something yet other, and if the terms disappear. As Lewis Carroll says, it is when the smile is without a cat that man can effectively becomes cat as soon as he smiles. It is not man who sings or paints, it is man who becomes animal, but at exactly the same time as the animal becomes music, or pure color, or an astonishingly simple line: with Mozart's birds it is the man who becomes a bird, because the bird becomes music. Melville's mariner becomes albatross itself becomes extraordinary whiteness, pure vibration of white (and Captain Ahab's whale-becoming forms a bloc with Moby Dick's white-becoming, pure white wall). (D 72)

What we seek in these experiences, these experiments, is not simply the destruction of our egos or the "ruin of representation," although this is part of its effect. We seek something highly specific: participation in what Deleuze calls " . . . Lovecraft's Thing or Entity, the nameless intellectual beast," all the less intellectual for writing with its wooden clogs, with its dead eye, its antennae and mandibles, its absence of face, a whole mob inside you in pursuit of what, a witch's wind?" (D 76).

How can philosophy be such an experience? What kind of thought rides the witch's wind? It has to do with following the flow of a matter of expression in order to select and affirm something within it that, as John Rajchman put it, we must become imperceptible in order to *see*.[127]

VII. Immanence, Challenged: Politics, Art, and the Fourth World War

> Must we say that the return to Nietzsche implies a kind of aestheticism, a renunciation of politics, an "individualism" as depersonalized as it is depoliticized? Maybe not. Politics, too, is in the business of interpretation. *The untimely* . . . is never reducible to the political-historical element. But it happens from time to time that, at certain great moments, they coincide . . . when the people struggle for their liberation, there is always a coincidence of poetic acts and historical events or political actions, the glorious incarnation of something sublime or untimely. . . Here we have something that reminds us of Rimbaud's or Nietzsche's imperatives, and that puts one over on Marx—an artistic joy that comes to coincide with historical struggle. (DI 130)

Global Positioning: Cultural Critique in An Age of Terror

After the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center, French sociologist Jean Baudrillard declared that what took place that day was not an isolated act of insanity by deranged outlaws, but the symptom of a global phenomena he called the "Fourth World War."[128] For Baudrillard, after the wars of Europe against itself (WWI), of the free world against fascism (WWI), of the West against communism (a third "world" war, if a cold one), this fourth or "global war on terror" is in fact a war of the entire world against itself.[129] We might think this war has always been going on—for as long as history can remember, a succession of empires has swept across the globe; for as long as myth can imagine, the gods have been at war. But perhaps in an unprecedented way it is indeed the *earth itself* that is threatened by our current war on terror. For Baudrillard, at least, globalization—the seemingly unstoppable conversion of the world into a single marketplace, and the absorption of all human languages and meanings into a single univocal stream of incandescent images—is in some sense a war of the earth against the earth itself. As he puts it, "it is the globe itself which resists globalization."[130]

This cryptic statement, as well as Baudrillard's essay, were by and large dismissed by American critics. Perhaps his thesis, that there is a symbolic or ritual action that took place on 9/11 which is not reducible to the actions of "others" (acts of war, murder, sabotage, etc.) about which we might make condemnations and for which we might seek redress, seemed to glib and abstract for a wounded populace. Baudrillard believes that the terrorists sought to enter into a *duel* with Western capitalism, and that the only way for them to do so was to play a card unrecognizable to the Western system, with its "culture of life": the card of their own deaths. The fact that this play was monstrously successful, for Baudrillard, can be read in the fact that the relatively inexpensive but devastating attack resulted in a massive expenditure of energy (the bombing of Afghanistan, the invasion of Iraq) which resulted in very little. For Baudrillard, if death for death is ultimately an immaterial exchange, this makes a little death a supreme way to embarrass the powers that be.

What Baudrillard means to signify by "the earth," by that globe that resists globalization (as much our own dream of destroying this perfection we've achieved as it is the terrorists') is in fact closely related to death, or the "death drive"—what in us or our species persists beyond our individual preferences, hopes, dreams, predilections; it is all that cannot be recognized by a system that depends on pacification and rectification of its subjects, constant surveillance and control of its people's desires by a technocracy—one thinks of a science fiction fantasies in which it becomes illegal to die.

Baudrillard's "earth" here is a concept parallel to Deleuze's notion of a non-organic life in the name of which Deleuze had hoped to philosophize by affirming creativity. But what can be powerful about creativity in the age of terror ushered in by

the struggle of the earth against capitalism? Globalized capitalism seems to be nothing if not eminently creative, endlessly able to produce something where there was nothing, able to shape and reshape materials with seemingly effortless grace, to connect disparate times and places with the magic of transportation, communication, and microcomputing. Capitalism, as many critics have noted, is a master of de- and re-territorialization.

If as Deleuze and Guattari assert in *Anti-Oedipus* there is only a minute difference between the despotism of the artist and the politician, then should we consider human creativity to be something which might end or at least ameliorate this war of the earth against itself? But why look to art to end the slow and subtle terror which is now taking the shape of the militant marshalling of all cultures and religions against one another, reducing the surface of the earth to an advertising screen where all human languages become a single univocal stream of advertisements? What can the creation of more difference do to ameliorate the fourth world war?

Since at least the mid-1990's the growing anxiety of liberal intellectuals over the instability of global life and the reality of religious and ideological warfare has put a quick end to "postmodern" taste for proliferating creative differences (and the "culture studies" which tried to identify more and more differences). This anxiety has ushered in a new taste for a fighting, unilateral bid for universal truths that would cut across religious, ethnic, and cultural differences. In *Wars of Position*, for instance, Timothy Brennan laments the way that cultural studies, much of which was inspired by *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, contributed to the decline of a genuine political position.[131] Brennan's thesis is that instead of developing a truly radical political position, cultural studies in the 80's and 90's enshrined "subaltern" subject positions in lieu of active

engagements in politics: resistant subjectivities rather than militant subjects. In Brennan's story, marginalized intellectuals within the West and ostracized third-worlders without it came to mirror one another in their abject difference from the entitled and included citizen.

Brennan laments the passage of leftist theory to a subjectivity "beyond representation." For postmodern leftism, the terms of representation are always already decided by the subterfuge of positive law operating at the sole behest of market interests and the so-called "human rights" the imperial markets require. Cultural studies, as not only Brennan but Zizek, Jameson and others have shown, created a sterile academic game of "resistance" to the "hegemony" all positive discourses of identity within politics imply. For Brennan (as for Zizek and others), the problem with contemporary culture studies that the subaltern position is not a political, but an *aesthetic* one.

The problem, the critics of the "aestheticization of politics" argue, is that the aesthetic or subjective or even religious discourse in terms of which the difference of the subaltern is presented turns out to have no properly *political* demands.[132] This "voice of the other" demands, according to Brennan, something inherently apolitical and therefore publicly unanswerable. Cultural studies for Brennan turns out to be nothing but the attempt of an intellectual elite to console themselves for their inability to build a popular consensus *within* empire by mirroring their impotence in those *without* it, in the spectral half-lives of those who suffer and die in the desert of the third world.

There is much to Brennan's critique, at least as an analysis of the political failure of US academics. As Slavoj Zizek has shown, it is not the powers that be that need to recognize the authenticity of others; it is the oppressor who must realize what is wrong

with herself. But Brennan's argument is limited by its own horizon of what it takes as the site of political contestation: liberal democracy. He faults (and rightly) the US academic left for its inability to bring the radicality of the insights of Althusserian-Gramscian theory to bear in a way that can build a genuine alternative to the "managerial" fight within the liberal-capitalist hegemony, a fight that is completely internal to the unquestionable forward march of empire. But Brennan is wrong, I will argue here, in thinking that the positions occupied by those in popular politics should not come under "subjective" forms of critique. Those who occupy "political" positions can be in the business of avoiding politics as much as is anyone else, and liberal democracy may be a ruse of just such an avoidance.

Which Way Left? Badiou's Number, Deleuze's Life

Deleuze's approach to politics passes beyond the terms of Brennan's critique. In a Deleuzian "culture studies," understanding the ruses and devices of the politician in a way that links them to those of the artist may help us address much larger issues than how to make a difference within the confines of liberal democracy, which after all is only one form of power and not the ultimate horizon of experience on earth. Deleuze and Guattari do not aestheticize politics, but they do politicize art in a way that makes is powers matter to social life.

Deleuze and Guattari see, and rightly, it seems to me, that liberal democratic subject is always the economically privileged one. Capitalism is the ultimate horizon of politics in our day and age, not liberalism or democracy. Deleuze and Guattari would

insist that the politics of the future is beyond the topic of the rights of Man, the autonomy of the Subject, the voice of the Citizen, etc., and therefore true politics must include something racially "inhuman" or transhuman in its calculus.[133] In the wake of Deleuze and Guattari, Alain Badiou and Slavoj Zizek have in some sense once again taken up, *contra* Brennan, the politics of an unnamable or uncanny singularity that while unrepresentable can nevertheless revolutionize the very terms in which current debates take place. However, both Badiou and Zizek ultimately reject Deleuze's philosophical idiom in favor of what each claims, in his own way, to be a more truly materialist and truly revolutionary project.

For Badiou, Deleuze's ontology is that of a nature mystic. That is to say, for Badiou, Deleuze's is a kind of panentheistic participationism of Ideas: virtual ideas are univocal but there are symptoms or "cases" of the presence of ideas that are analogically related and participate in the singularity of the idea. As Badiou puts it, for Deleuze both Bartleby and Spinoza are participating analogues of Christ, tuber plants and wolf packs are analogous rhizomes, metallurgists and composers both participate in the singularity of "ambulant" and so on. For Badiou, this analogizing undermines the project of a thought of the univocal and the singular, the thought of the truth of an Event that can never be reduced to its historical vicissitudes, and thus have revolutionary power to change.

In an essay summarizing his book on Deleuze, Badiou encapsulates his criticism of the Deleuzianism as follows. Badiou writes,

> I share with Deleuze the conviction (which I think is political) that every genuine thinking is thinking of singularities. But since for Deleuze actual multiplicities are always purely formal modalities, and since only the Virtual univocally dispenses sense, I have argued that Deleuze has no way of *thinking* singularity other than by classifying the different ways in which singularity is not ontologically singular; in other words, by

> classifying the different modes of actualization. After all, this was already the cross borne by Spinozism, whose theory of "singular things" oscillates between a schematism of causality (a thing is a set of modes producing a single effect) and a schematism of expression (a thing bears witness to the infinite power of substance). Similarly, for Deleuze, singularity oscillates between a classificatory phenomenology of modes of actualization (and virtualization), on the one hand, and an ontology of the virtual, on the other.
>
> I maintain that the "link" between these two approaches is not compatible with either univocity or immanence. It is this incompatibility that furnishes the clue as to why Deleuze's texts swarm with analogies, which are required in order to determine the descriptive Ideas for which singularities provide the cases. That these Ideas (Fold, Rhizome, Dice-throw, etc.) aim at configurations in becoming, at differentiations, counter-movements, interlacings, etc., changes nothing. I have always claimed that Deleuzian singularities belong to a regime of actualization or virtualization, and not to one of ideal identity. But the fact that only concrete becomings provide the descriptive models for a schema in no way precludes the latter from being an Idea to which the models are isomorphic. (TR 79)

Badiou's own view is that multiplicities are *internally* defined by their inherently inconsistent composition: singularity is not a virtual but always an actual attribute of certain sets. What singularizes a multiplicity is not a virtual element that renders it open but an actual part that is indiscernibly present/absent. For Deleuze, on the other hand, the inconsistency or excess that renders an assemblage problematic and makes each one "open" is a function *external* to each ensemble. This is why, for Deleuze the "senses" of politics, art, science, love, and so on, all contaminate one another, whereas for Badiou the "evental" power of each of these "truth procedures" is internal to each one. For Deleuze, on the other hand, sense is donated univocally by events of resonance or intense conjunctions. This is why sense is always virtual, not inherent in the interplay of the parts of any one milieu or regime, and the subject of a "transcendental" empiricism as opposed to a positivist induction.

For Badiou, Deleuze's view is problematic because transcendental empiricism seems to introduce a kind of "horizontal" transcendence—the transcendence of a One-Life, however "clamorous" its resonance may be across disparate assemblages. As Badiou puts it,

> The attempt to subvert the "vertical" transcendence of the One through the play of the closed and the open, which deploys multiplicity in the mobile interval between a set (inertia) and an effective multiplicity (line of flight), produces a "horizontal' or virtual transcendence which, instead of grasping singularity, ignores the intrinsic resources of the multiple, presupposes the chaotic power of the One, and analogizes the modes of articulation. When all is said and done, we are left with what could be defined as a natural mysticism. (TR 80)

To summarize Badiou here, his complaint is that Deleuze does not see the assemblage of actual parts of a multiplicity, what Badiou will call its "count-as-one," as already a singularity.[134] For Deleuze singularity emerges in or is extracted from cliché or what Badiou here calls "inertia" as a consequence of the contamination of discrete things in one another. The consequence, for Badiou, is that the event of sense, as Deleuze describes it, fails to be fully different, univocal, and immanent to itself. The Deleuzian multiplicity, because it emerges through virtual connections with other multiplicities, fails, Badiou claims to mobilize "the intrinsic resources of the multiple." Deleuze's multiplicity, Badiou argues, manifests the *same* chaotic power of the One resounding analogously across various assemblages, through various analogous planes of consistency or immanence.

In my view, however, because Badiou has now been forced to develop a "verificationism" of his own in the form of "logic of worlds," I would argue that Deleuze is *ahead* of Badiou in admitting a quasi-transcendent, "aesthetically analogous" status to lines of flight or intensities. This is what Badiou tries to develop with his notion of life as

being that which exists in the service of an idea.[135] Deleuze's "contaminated" notion of singularity (which is physical or biological or aesthetic rather than mathematical) is thus at least equally productive a concept than Badiou's ascetic set-theoretical gambit.

But in order to clearly see this point, it is necessary to clarify how the "horizontal" form of transcendence in Deleuze is not a natural mysticism but might be what I will investigate in my next and final chapter as a form of natural *magic*. There I will argue that what Deleuze calls concept creation only fully realizes itself not in a mystical intuition but in a kind of natural magic, a transformative traversal of and unlimited pedagogy in the life of the intense, the vital, and the singular. This magic would not be a contemplative process of mystification, but a dynamic process of transformation of knower into known and known into knower.

As we have briefly seen in the work of Jose Gil, ritual magic exemplifies the notion of a powerful, transformative sign. And a brief look in my final chapter at the period in which Western philosophy thought most seriously about magical transformability will help expand and clarify the nature of the transformations Deleuze saw happening in authentic art (and also, though less frequently, in science and philosophy). This is where I will begin my concluding chapter. There I will argue that Deleuze's vision of a transformative relationship between things and concepts should be allied to how certain Italian Renaissance philosophers, especially Giordano Bruno, admired magic for its sophisticated view of the relationship between an ultimately unknowable depths of nature and a surface of images that nevertheless give entrée to an infinity of transforming powers.

Badiou *contra* Deleuze

In a footnote to his critical appraisal of Deleuze's philosophy "One, Multiple, Multiplicity,"[136] Badiou praises Deleuze's early notion that the singular is a simulacral effluvia of the always different and wholly abstract One (the univocal sense of eternal return). This early notion seems to place the generative force of events purely in ideal forms of becoming and not in the dynamics of concrete ideal-material complexes.[137] In Deleuze's later collaborations with Felix Guattari, Badiou argues, Deleuze lapses from constructionism and univocity into phenomenological verificationism. In the later Deleuze, Badiou argues, creating a concept amounts to verifying whether some intuition (of a rhizome or war machine or becoming-other) has been fulfilled (TR 78). For Badiou, Deleuze's early notion of a *static* sense of difference in itself that does not emerge from but supervenes on actual configurations is the superior strategy.

Why Badiou objects to an "emergent" reading of the event, and why he himself rigorously distinguishes being and event, has to do with the fact that Deleuze's notion of multiplicity is not a purely mathematical one.[138] It is a notion that is "contaminated" by the empirical. A multiplicity "emerges" for Deleuze, not simply when the virtual is added to the actual or insofar as it exceeds the actual, but when a certain conjunction of (actual) parts causes a divergence of (virtual, quasi-causal) elements.[139] In Deleuze's work with Guattari, it seems that an Event emerges only in case certain configurations tare constructed in a way that makes them susceptible of intersecting with other assemblages in singular ways—ways they would not if a certain matter of expression

(weaponry, music, architecture, etc.) did not achieve the particular, historically determined form of intensity that makes them susceptible to that transformation.

For Badiou this ruins Deleuze's philosophy because it makes the power of the multiple dependent upon a contingent empirical power that is always indeterminate or vague, whereas for Badiou, the singular event is always exacting and prescriptively determinate. Badiou accuses those of us still attracted to this empirical side of Deleuze's philosophy of attraction to a "speculative demagogy whose strength lies in addressing itself to each and everyone's animal disquiet, to our confused desires, to everything that makes us scurry about blindly on the desolate surface of the earth" (TR 69).

This anti-naturalism arises from Badiou's reading of Lacan: being and the letter are the only two adequate things: *l'etre c'est la lettre*. In other words, mathematics is the only ontology. Badiou's argument for this seems to be a kind of *reductio*: if ontology is anything other than mathematics, there is no way to escape mystification and ultimate idolization of "the given"—what Deleuze calls the full body of the earth. This false idol of singularity can be erected by any particular tribe into its private fetish. The ultimate charge here is that Deleuze's intuitionism (his "vision" of the various ways in which singularities "manifest" themselves across various cases or types or orders of actuality) is a covert "holism" which has the double fault of being mathematically impure (it's not formal enough, because it allows the matters of expression to in some sense *cause*/quasi-cause singularity) and politically impotent (singularity always remains virtual, so a truly disruptive political event—a revolution, a love—would always fail to fully *subtract* itself from its situation).

But Deleuze's "contaminated" notion of singularity, I would argue, is much more interesting than Badiou gives it credit for.[140] Badiou claims that Deleuze betrays immanence and univocity by "adding" analysis of "analogically" related deployments of the "same" ideal dynamic (form of becoming). But it should be clear, if my argument has been convincing in earlier chapters, that the nexus between virtual and actual which comes to be through creative processes (natural and cultural, but not necessarily "mystically vital"), does not *mediate* univocity from virtuality into actuality, but rather *invents* a consistency. The event of invention, in Deleuze, is always split between causal and quasi-causal features. On my reading this is actually a *break* with the vitalist tradition because it places an "artistic diagonal" where a dualism of powerful substance and empowered modes might lie (for Spinoza) or where a dualism of matter and memory might persist (as for Bergson). For Deleuze, *we must create concepts in order to continually connect sense and nonsense, being and becoming, and it is the pragmatic value of any regime or extraordinary Figure that must stand to account*.[141]

Badiou's argument against thinking singularity as Deleuze does—as a Figure which invents immanence and consistency—seems to be that if we allow singularity to include both form and matter, as all Figures do, it will not have that absolute, eternal, infinite claim to truth that number does. But what if it is neither Number nor that which is counted that is the source of infinite truth, but rather the contingently universal *figure* that remains exemplary? This is, I think, what Deleuze is ultimately claiming, even if he does not exactly articulate it in this way until late in his career (in the works on cinema, the works on Leibniz and Francis Bacon, and in *Essays Critical and Clinical*). For Deleuze it is not that ideas are singular and their incarnations can be spoken of as

"analogical" due to the idea's permutational power. It is rather that being's eventfulness is always *figured* in a creative expression that succeeds *as event* in reconfiguring both sense and nonsense, virtual and actual.[142]

For Badiou, the problem of contemporary philosophy is to say exactly what a universal singularity is. Badiou denies that this can be done in the "poetics of natural language" or in any kind of "speculative empiricism" such as Deleuze's *A Thousand Plateaus* and the writings on art. Badiou's reason for rejecting this "empiricist" or "materialist" Deleuze is his claim that while Deleuze has accurately realized that the wealth of the empirical consists in the problems it poses, Deleuze is wrong in thinking that the contours of the problem posed by a multiplicity are inherent in its materiality: wrong to think that we can take any concrete assemblage as a starting point for analyzing the power of singular ideas, wrong to think that a tuber plant is as good a place as a pack of wolves to analyze a rhizome (TR 77). What Badiou presumes about philosophy, and about Deleuze, is instructive here, and worth quoting. Badiou writes,

> . . . these singular determinations [actualizations of the virtual, in Deleuzian terms] are by no means within the reach of philosophical description, since they are internal to the effectuations of truths (political, artistic, etc.). What is philosophical is rather setting aside every kind of speculative empiricism, and assigning the form of these determinations to their generic foundation: the theory of the pure multiple. From this standpoint the 'concrete' operators of the vitalist type, which finally refer the positivity of the Open to an immanent creationism whose foundation is to be found in the chaotic prodigality of the One, are obstacles, not supports. The concrete is more abstract than the abstract. (TR 77)

Whereas Deleuze articulates singularity as a problematic aspect of actual assemblages that is immanent to the limits of perception, memory, and thought which that assemblage presents along its line of flight, for Badiou the singularity of any configuration can only be captured in the language of mathematics, since only mathematics "adds" nothing to

the event, and so avoids "contamination" by Being, to which the Event is always opposed.

Zizek, Badiou, Deleuze

For Slavoj Zizek, Being is already contaminated by its own internal self-inconsistency. There is no need for Badiou's Kantian dualism between schema and content. This is because, following the later Lacan's formula *y'a de l'un* (there is something of the one),[143] Zizek conceives of the "singularizing" force of being (that which makes it open) as "not the totalizing One of the master signifier, but the supplementary partial object (organ without a body) that functions as the enabling obstacle of the sexual relationship, as its condition of (im)possibility)" (OwB, 99). Sexuality, or "sexuation" in Lacan's terminology, is paradigmatic for ontology. As Zizek summarizes the master:

> *Y'a de l'un* is thus strictly correlative to *il n'y a de rapport sexuel*: the two sexual partners are never alone, since their activity has to involve a fantasmatic supplement that sustains their desire (and can ultimately be just an imagined gaze observing them while they are engaged in sexual intercourse). *Y'a de l'un* means that every erotic couple is a couple of three: 1 + 1 + *a*, the "pathological" stain that disturbs the pure immersion of the couple. In short this "one" is precisely that which *prevents* the fusion of the amorous couple into One . . . Furthermore, not only is this Real of the One not opposed to freedom—it is its very condition. The shocking impact of being affected or "seduced" by the enigmatic message of the Other derails the subject's automaton, opens up a gap that the subject is free to fill in with his (ultimately failed) endeavors to symbolize it. Freedom is ultimately *nothing but* the space opened up by the traumatic encounter, the space to be filled in by its contingent/inadequate symbolizations/translations. (OwB 99)

Deleuze's own notion of the singularity of sense-events is somewhat closer to Zizek's idea than Badiou's. This is the case because as for Zizek, for Deleuze being and event

are not opposed. Ideas, as Deleuze puts it in *Difference and Repetition*, have a double status of transcendence (as virtual events) and immanence (as actually existing assembled *haecceities*). Or, to put it in the language of *The Logic of Sense*, simulacra are distributed on a surface constructed from a sense shared by bodies and propositions. And to put it in the language of *A Thousand Plateaus*, assemblages are multiplicities due not to their form or their content, their materiality or their "expressivity," but due to the intense creativity of an ungrounded diagonal , a line of flight.

Zizek's resistance to Badiou's dualism of being and event thus has much in common with Deleuze, at least on a formal level. Zizek's insistence (following the late Lacan) on the centrality of a "phantasmatic supplement" to every event (what Deleuze called the "dark precursor" or "object = x"), a supplement that links any two discrete series of terms by being excessively signified by one series and a signifier missing from the other series.[144] For both Deleuze and Zizek, the intensity which certain assemblages achieve (their Zizekian "freedom" to struggle or their Deleuzian "perverse" or "schizoid" flow) need not only be described in terms of mathematical formalisms about inconsistency (through the paradoxes of Cantor or Dedikind).

Zizek, in fact, gives a good reason for *not* clinging to Badiouian mathematical purity. Reducing ontology to mathematics places us on the horns of a dilemma which is crippling to philosophical intervention in our times (which as we saw above is Badiou's mandate for philosophy). In fact Zizek accuses Badiou, an avowed Maoist revolutionary a truly Marxist vision of emancipation to a violent Jacobean view. This comes out, not unexpectedly, in the rift between the form of a prescription and the content which it informs. We may univocally demand the equal rights of all workers, but equal rights to

what? Is not the notion of equal rights always already compromised by the hidden content of its message: equal rights to *inequality* in the form of being enslaved to their employers? As Zizek puts it

> Is this axiom not much closer to Jacobin revolutionary radicalism than to Marxism? Did Marx not claim again and again that the whole topic of equality is a bourgeois ideological topic par excellence? The opposition between formal equality and factual inequality, the way the very form of equality sustains the inequality of exploitation, is at the very core of the market logic, and the way towards its overcoming does not lead through "true equality" but through suspending the underlying conditions of this tension between equality and inequality, namely, the market economy. And is this insight not more actual than ever? Does globalization not mean, among other things, that workers all around the world are progressively "equalized," which is why multinational capital, far from being racist and sectarian, happily asserts and practices the equality of, say, an Indonesian and an American worker. (OwB 104)

The dilemma Zizek poses for Badiou seems to be this: if Being and Event are absolutely opposed to one another, and the presence of events can only be described in non-empirical terms (i.e. in terms of set theory), then the presence of a truth-event is either an illusion or we are always in a position of having to claim full reality for the Event without ever being able to specify its point of full "incarnation" or substantial "mode" of presence (OwB 107).

Badiou definitely sides with the latter option[145]. But the consequence of this is that Badiou encourages us to vigilantly guard the "purity" of the distance between the undecidable event and the "situation" of being, the "alterity" of the event to the generic process it opens up.[146] For, as Badiou himself admits, to claim that an event has fully realized itself in being amounts to totalitarianism: fidelity must remain open-ended.[147] This means that, just as the Kantian Man of Duty can never know exactly how or when he is finitely instantiating the infinity of moral truth (which can never be realized fully),

the Badiouian Man of Truth can never claim that his truth is being realized concretely. He can only know (based on the paradigm of mathematics) that his truth has the correct "prescriptive" form relative to a situation.

As Zizek correctly points out, this is what prevents Badiou, in his penetrating look at the 20th century, *Le Siecle*, from accounting for the two opposed forms of the 20th century's "passion for the Real": the politics of purification (Stalinism) and the politics of subtraction (authentic struggle).[148] Badiou's dualism makes it impossible to see how the opposition between the "error" of purification (Stalinist purges, etc.) and the "correct" procedure of subtraction (Badiou's "fidelity") can be overcome if we admit that the Real (the singularity of the event, its unnamable sense) is simply the formal inconsistency of Being.

Seen in that way, the "error" of purification becomes a necessary moment (a disaster) that the correct procedure of subtraction "creatively repeats." Badiou cannot claim, as Zizek more consistently does (a la Hegel), that the "empirical" disaster is a necessary moment in the process of truth. For Zizek the possibility of freedom is already inscribed in a formal antagonism *in being*, already in place before the alternative between purification and subtraction appears. In order to radically decontaminate the singularity of truth, when faced with a given attempt at fidelity Badiou will always be caught between advocating the destructive process of purification, and a lapse into a kind of Levinasian or Derridean ethics of "not deciding." His injunction to us not to "force the unnamable" seems to indicate that Badiou chooses the latter option, remaining at a level of formality (regulative ideals) whose limitations for intervening in the concrete deadlocks of our capital times Zizek correctly sees.

For Zizek, any contemporary theory that celebrates the "disappearance of the big Other" is a capitulation to capitalism. The idea Zizek resists, an idea he sees as controlling much "postmodern" cultural theory, is that in our day and age, there is no longer any need to think of the deadlock of freedom in terms of the absence of a master signifier of freedom or a "Big Other" who is the absent subject supposed to know the riddles of desire. Where Zizek's own materialism fails, I would argue, is when he insists that we must remain with the deadlocks of Oedipal formations (castration, lack, stain, *synthome*) in order to think freedom.

As Deleuze and Guattari analyzed it in the Capitalism and Schizophrenia volumes, in the context of late capitalism through the diffusion or "deterritorialization" of information, power, opportunity, and marketplaces, different ways of differentiating (and identifying) emerge that need not pass through the Oedipal triangle. As we saw earlier (Chapter 3), in the *Logic of Sense* Deleuze agrees that the Oedipus "complex" is what enables us to begin to experiment with sense, to begin to move beyond our "literalist" infancy (lit. *in-fans*, "unspokenness") into the playful (if also dangerous) space of the metaphysical surface. But Deleuze came to think that psychoanalysis had artificially limited its capacities for analysis by "fixating" on reducing all subjective experimentation to more or less failed attempts at achieving Oedipus. Deleuze and Guattari try to expand psychoanalysis into schizoanalysis as a way of doing what Reich wanted to do: cause a "song of life to pass into psychoanalysis" (AO 119).[149]

As Zizek admits, the later Lacan himself insists that Oedipus is only Freud's peculiar "dream" of how to solve the problem of the relationship between brute drives (animal forces) and sublimated mental life.[150] The debate between Deleuze and Zizek

really hinges on the fact that Zizek will not give up the binary model of differentiation: the idea that, on the model of the male-female "impossible" rapport, all other antagonisms are formed, and on the basis of this "tragicomic" gap alone can we hope for insight into our disasters. Deleuze's less Hegelian or "contradictive" model, is that different assemblages have different ways of passing into the intensity which singularizes them, and so we have to think desire without a model for itself but with "things for itself"—Reich's magical objects, desiring machines.

This is why I suggest that Deleuze's is a "magical" thought: the structure of desire (or truth, or freedom, or power) cannot be analyzed as a system apart from the things (i.e. the machines) which instantiate different desires and powers. Zizek's own obsessive exemplification of the "impossibility" of sexual rapport (and of our illusions about healing that wound, in every area from love to politics) is something like a tribute to the Deleuzian practice of "analogizing" that Badiou so despises.

What I would argue is that the fact that "singularity" and "univocity" are not pure but contaminated by traces of their material actualization is not a mark against but for the power of Deleuze's approach to philosophy. Deleuze may have indeed failed to preserve a pure notion of singularity (it "contaminates" itself by "appearing" in various matters of expression, providing immanence "analogically" across various forms of life), but this for me is its strong suit, not its weakness. Singularity *is* ontological in Deleuze, because it is around singular points that planes of consistency (art) or immanence (philosophy) form.

In the heart of Deleuze's philosophy we find something that Badiou cannot imagine: the figure of the philosopher not as transcendental logician successful (Badiou) or faltering (into "idolatry" or "iconography," as he accuses Deleuze), but as an inventor

of pataphysical technologies, where the sign shows the thing rather than indicating or even describing it. This was Deleuze's dream of language pushed to its "nth" power, its stammering, its apocalypse, its art. As Deleuze puts it in an essay that describes the surrealist Alfred Jarry, with his impossible machines and his science of imaginary solutions, as a precursor of Martin Heidegger's meditations on the power of language,

> The limit of language is the Thing in its muteness—vision. The thing is the limit of language, as the sign is the limit of the thing. When a language is hollowed out by turning within language, it finally completes its mission: the Sign shows the Thing, and effectuates the nth power of language . . . (CC 98).

If Deleuze only partially envisions this as philosophical, Badiou simply rejects a "pataphysical" project of philosophy, reserving it for the truth procedures, alone, of which philosophy is not one.

Material Forms

If we take the debate between Badiou and Deleuze seriously, as more than the mere attempt of Badiou to clarify his own position and stake new ground, what comes to the fore is a very important question about the status of materiality, or the status of our earthliness as subjects. The debate over materialism that I am tracing here should be distinguished from other, more classical debates. There are at least three levels of this kind of materialism that are easy to distinguish.

1. *Reductivist Materialism*. Sense is an effect of a set of causes (not necessarily physical, but on the model of physical causation) which underlie it in such a way that, in order to explain the meaningfulness of a statement, we must reduce that statement to its anterior causes.

2. *Dialectical Materialism*. Sense and the causes of sense are related such that one reciprocally conditions the other: the cause of meaning does not exist independently from the meaning it produces.

3. *Problematic Materialism*. Sense is a *cause* of the non-closure of any set of causes (or of the inability, specific to each event, of that event to be fully self-consistent).

Badiou, Zizek, and Deleuze all want to situate themselves at the third or what I call "problematic" level. The multiple (Badiou), or the specters (Zizek), or multiplicities (Deleuze), are defined as being non-self-identical assemblages whose consistency is defined by an undecidability (Badiou), an antagonism (Zizek), or a line of flight (Deleuze) that makes them susceptible of producing transformations (genuine novelty or singularity). How these three thinkers differ is in the descriptive account they give of what it is that is singular about the singularity of a multiplicity. Badiou wants us to make nothing of the fact that we are animals scurrying about on earth. Zizek wants to make something rather more of it, but that some Thing ends up looking as ghostly and ephemeral as Badiou's is unaccountable. However, Zizek's notion of the Hegelian Thing is much closer to a Deleuzian multiplicity.[151]

In somewhat oversimplified terms, while what distinguishes Deleuze and Badiou is the thought of an ascetic or purified multiple as opposed to the thought of a One that is contaminated or transversed by its matter of expression, Deleuze and Zizek differ over the pragmatics required to evoke or "force" (Badiou's term) the event. Zizek works with a Hegelian and dialectical vision of materiality, which means that each "turn of the screw" in a dialectical process (of self-knowledge or political emancipation) will manifest in and as a material remainder or excessive "stain" that diagrams an obscene or "obverse" sense of every desire claiming autonomy and self-transparency. Philosophy consists in "tarrying with the negative" of these remainders/stains/gaps (Zizek never tires of inventing new names for it), incessantly pointing out the gaps or contradictions in

every material configuration passing itself off as whole, complete, coherent, substantial. For Deleuze, on the other hand, all negativity is only the after-effect of a more fundamental and positive expressive force, a different force relative to different matters of expression and differently-functioning projects or "abstract machines."

It is true that Deleuze seems to hegemonically decide in advance *for* difference, *for* intensive flows of affects, *for* experimentation, when it might seem that concrete situations should require us to decide in each case whether we need more difference or more identity, more or less intensity, experimentation or dedication to a working model. What Badiou is sensitive to is the way in which the language of art plays into what Zizek calls "the plague of fantasies." Badiou thinks that we are appealed by the decision for intensity simply because of our animal discontent and our confused morass of desires. It feels good to have someone affirming that we should all follow "lines of flight" that would finally liberate our animals and clarify our desires. But Badiou is wrong to think that this is simply the preference of an elite culture. It is rather a call to every culture to cultivate that which is difficult and rare for it. In what follows I will argue that what needs all our art, for Deleuze, can best be understood as a kind of magic.

VIII. Immanence, Transformed: Modernity, Magic, and Metamorphosis

> The thought suggests itself that we may have completed a gigantic cycle of language from Homer's time, where the word evokes the thing, to our own day, where the thing evokes the word, and are now about to go around the cycle again, as we seem to be confronted once again with an energy common to subject and object which can be expressed verbally only through some form of metaphor.
>
> Northrop Frye, *The Great Code*, 15

In this final chapter, I suggest that Deleuze's aesthetic philosophy is a latter-day avatar of certain Renaissance Neo-Platonist ideas about the poetic nature of reality, and suggest that Deleuze's transformative conception of philosophy is in league with a pre-Cartesian poetic, creative, even "magical" conception of the human mind as not merely a knower but a *transformer* of universally expressive being. Although Deleuze does not share the neoplatonic taste for a transcendent One that hierarchically orders or analogically mediates difference, Deleuze does view our ability to comprehend life—which for him is an intense, anorganic force—in terms of an uncannily univocal "clamor" whose note is continually heard at the subterranean intersection of various worlds. From this unstable, problematic immanence of life to itself, creation is born.

As I hope to make clear, connecting Deleuze to his Renaissance avatars is not simply an aesthetic and metaphysical gesture, but also ethical and political. The quest of certain Renaissance philosophers to validate the knowledge of the magician took place in a period of deep questioning about the nature of the human, a period which has much in common with our own postmodern day. The Renaissance saw a deep shaking of philosophical and theological presuppositions about how to constitute religious and

political communities, about where religion ended and science began, and about what a new and unbounded sense of nature entailed for the categories of philosophical thought.

In philosophy this took the form of the late-medieval crisis in Aristotelianism. While humanist rhetoricians attempted to sidestep the depth of the peripatetic crisis, those who held onto a real relation between the substance of the nonhuman world and the structure of the human mind turned to the paradigm of magical interactions—bonds and rituals—with nature. For the Renaissance thinkers that we will briefly cover here, *homo magus* is both more and less than human(ist): his way of knowing puts him in a liminal space between animal and human, elemental and cosmic, earth and heaven—a space constituted by precisely the kind of rapport between mind and matter that peripatetic logic had tended to obscure, would soon be undermined by Cartesian skepticism and finally rendered opaque by Kantian transcendental dialectics, where mind resigns itself to validating its own operations, with or without things themselves. Nature is abandoned to obscurity. But what the *magus* knows is a rhetoric worthy of nature's gift: philosophy, but only insofar as philosophical categories (form/matter, substance/accident, infinite/finite) are *activated* in those investigations and experiments—indeed with those rites and incantations—that might work with natural energies to bring about the supernatural fulfillment of life's desires.

According to Kant, magical knowledge is impossible: we can't know whether God, or powers amenable to our needs, underwrites the laws of nature—at least not through any "experience" Kant can legitimate in his critiques.[152] We can only know the extent to which our faculties of understanding, sensation, and reason are functioning properly, or are "resolving" objects in accordance with the rules of possible experience,

determined by a priori categories. The knowledge of the *magus* does not answer to the transcendental limits Kant delineated for experience. The magician, or shaman, or ritual healer, can think *across* the categories of space and time, as well as across the other categories, because the ritual space is one where *knowledge* of the power of images, signs, and ideas is at one with the *transformations* they make real.

As anthropologist and philosopher Jose Gil puts it in his study of the power of the Ndembu healing ritual,

> Magical-symbolic thought and practice not only resolve the antinomies of the discourse of power, but also—and it is definitely the same thing—the antinomies of the power of discourse. Is this not to say that this way of thinking provides a solution to the problems posed by the transcendental dialectic of Kant? What was at stake there—in the question, What is it possible to know?—was the power of scientific discourse itself. For magical-symbolic thought there is no obstacle in getting to the noumena, and it is the same for the hypothetical Kantian figure of the *intellectus archetypus*, which knows the unconditioned: magical words are action, thought coincides with being, time and space do not impede the grasping of the thing in itself—because, on the contrary, they are organized in such a manner that they can be transformed by appropriate techniques (such as those at work in the therapeutic ritual) and at the same time remain linked to their normal perception—in order to create from it the conditions of possibility and the formal framework for knowledge of the absolute. (MB 84)

"Magical" knowledge, such as the knowledge involved in the construction and execution of a healing ritual, performatively passes beyond the Kantian division of phenomena and neumena. This is because, under the correct ritual conditions, words are actions, time is space, forms are materials, and the "loose and overcoded" energy of divine powers constrains itself in ways that humans can, as Gil puts it, "treat" (MB 84).

In our Kantian modernity, knowledge of appearances (phenomenologically or dialectically) enables judgment, but never *transformation*. But in the pre-Kantian era, prior to Cartesian dualism and before the rise of Baconian science, certain philosophers in

the Renaissance, from Cusa and Ficino to Pico della Mirandola and Giordano Bruno considered that the idea that the knowledge implied by certain forms of magic (especially mathematical and ritual magic) might hold the key to the unification of not only science and art, but of heaven and earth. For in magic they saw, as does Gil, a form of knowing that blurs the distinction between nature and art, subject and object, matter and memory, powers human and divine. Insofar as Deleuze has invented concepts that once again cross the thresholds of Kantian antinomies, Deleuze in a sense re-poses problems about the nature of the human mind that modern philosophy pre-empted and postmodern philosophy nihilistically dismissed. Here, however, in his "postmodern" magic, the "human" is no longer anthropomorphic, and the earth is no longer "in its place," but is understood as a set of mobile cosmic forces, a set of elemental powers that are not pregiven in static archetypes but require *experiment*—artful, poetic, even magical—to be truly known.

My gamble here is that by connecting Deleuze's questions to those posed about magic in the Renaissance, the problems Deleuze is concerned with become clearer than they do when understood, as they usually are, against the background of post-Kantian debates (in phenomenology and hermeneutics). There is thus a kind of "Renaissance" in Deleuze's thought, a renaissance of renaissance problems. What philosophy does not yet understand in Deleuze's thought is also what it has yet to comprehend in Renaissance thought: the idea of an operative or pragmatic evaluation of concepts. that nevertheless has an immanent principle of selection, a poetic-magical principle that works toward the increase of life. In this thesis I suggest that reading Deleuze in this way, the problematic ideas existing in the uncanny relations between the Renaissance epoch and our own can

become distinct, if not fully clear. These problems can only be re-posed here, between Deleuze and a few of the Renaissance avatars of his work. I will not be attempting to solve the problems, but to clarify what problems are really being posed.

A Deleuzian Renaissance? Legacies of Transformative Knowing

Part of why it is difficult to understand the transmutational or operational focus of Deleuze's aesthetics, and why we seem to lack to categories for it, and why he insists that these categories need to be continually invented, has to do with modernity, as such. Deleuze is sometimes labeled a "postmodern" philosopher because of the way he invites us to think without or beyond modern assumptions. But there are many aspects of his work that do not fit the postmodern mold. If postmodernism represents the breakdown or undoing of modernity, and the either raucous or melancholy playing among modernity's ruins, Deleuze's inherently *constructive* thought is better situated in what we might call a kind of occult or unconscious modernism—a modernism we know without understanding, as Lacan might have put it.

Bruno Latour's *We Have Never Been Modern* analyzes the modern era as a kind of hypocrisy. On the one hand, we moderns systematically attempt to separate out what is natural from what is cultural, what is mental from what is material, what is fact from what is value, what is illusion from what is real. On the other hand, we systematically live and work with objects that in and of themselves mediate between these realms. Our dilemma is that while we insist that mind and matter, nature and culture, are ontologically separate (different in kind) and epistemologically unrelated (except by an arbitrary system of representation), we nevertheless attempt, in various ways, to reduce one regime

to the other in order to render our arbitrary system of representation "grounded" in some way, either in a theory of which categories are valid *a priori* or in a positivistic theory that reduces one side of the duality to the other, *a posteriori*. Latour sees postmodernity as the exacerbation of this situation, not its solution.

For Latour, the solution is not to give up the process of "modernizing" by simply pointing out the incoherence of the dualities (deconstructionism) but to realize that we generate modern dualisms as an effect of our attempt to succeed at what we are already doing, which is to involve ourselves in *processes* that both precede and exceed us, but also completely involve us. For Latour, the act (we are always already engaged in) of "delegating" a series of objects (machines, religions, rituals, styles) to bear the weight of reality is not the creation of "hybrids" of the two sides of the modern story, but is rather the generation of "transcendent" things that can no longer be opposed to things immanent to one side or the other of the great post-Cartesian divide. Here is how Latour puts it.

> I call this transcendence without a contrary "delegation." The utterance, or the delegation, or the sending of a message or a messenger, makes it possible to remain in presence—that is, to exist. When we abandon the modern world, we do not fall upon someone or something, we do not land on an essence, but on a process, on a movement, a passage—literally a pass, in the sense of this term as used in ball games. We start form a continuous and hazardous existence—continuous because it is hazardous—and not from an essence; we start from a presenting, and not from permanence. We start from the *vinculum* itself, from passages and relations, not accepting as a starting point any being that does not emerge from this relation that is at once collective, real, and discursive. We do not start from human beings, those latecomers, nor from language, a more recent arrival still. The world of meaning and the world of being are one and the same world, that of translation, substitution, delegation, passing. We shall say that any other definition of essence is "devoid of meaning:" in fact, it is devoid of the means to remain in presence, to last. All durability, all solidity, all permanence will have to be paid for by its mediators. It is this exploration of a transcendence without a contrary that makes our world so very unmodern, with all those nuncios, mediators, delegates, fetishes, machines, figurines, instruments, representatives,

> angels, lieutenants, spokespersons, and cherubim. What sort of world is it that obliges us to take into account, at the same time and in the same breath, the nature of things, technologies, sciences, fictional beings, religions large and small, politics, jurisdictions, economies and unconsciousnesses? Our own, of course. That world ceased to be modern when we replaced all essences with mediators, delegates and translators that gave them meaning. That is why we do not yet recognize it. It has taken on an ancient aspect, with all those delegates, angels and lieutenants. (M 129)

The last time *philosophy* had such an "ancient" aspect was in the eclectic neoplatonic philosophies of the Italian Renaissance. Prior to the laying down of the great Cartesian grid over matter, and before Cartesian ambivalence about the role of the imagination in mind, a series of post-scholastic philosophers considered the possibility of mind serving exactly that angelic or lieutenant or delegational role Latour insists we moderns have not yet acknowledged as that which we already practice. These 15th- and 16th- century thinkers, including Nicholas of Cusa, Marsilio Ficino, Pico della Mirandola, and Giordano Bruno, were all inspired by a "materialist" strand of Neo-Platonism whose roots go back at least to Plotinus' student Iamblichus.

Traditional Plotinian Neo-Platonism takes a rather gnostic view of the relation between materiality and mind, seeing matter as inherently fallen and duplicitous, a chaotic depth from which the soul hopes to emerge and of which the soul hopes to purify itself. Iamblichus begged to differ. For Iamblichus, rather than the material world being envisioned as that which is purified by the sanctifying or purgative effects of contemplation, material multiplicity is seen as the occasion of the One to display the magnificence of its powers. The paradigm for this display is *theurgy*, the act in which mathematical forms and material elements ritually combine to make the world a suitable seat for divinity.[153] The one who knows the proper theurgies is nothing less than one

who has mastered philosophy not only in its contemplative or reflective dimension, but in its active, incantatory, and transformative powers. A new figure of the "knower" emerges, one that is neither exclusively a priestly practitioner nor an isolated contemplative.

This is the figure of the *magus* man, a figure whose history in the West goes back at least to the *Corpus Hermetica*, and whose legacy inspires the esoteric research of everyone from medieval alchemists to modern freemasons. The *philosophical* legitimacy of the *Corpus* only came to the fore briefly, during the Italian Renaissance. This happened partly because of the Catholic Platonist Marsilio Ficino's attempt to recover the *prisca theologica*—an ancient pagan theology dating from Egypt and constituting a kind of justifiably universal pagan natural religion that could be sanctified by Catholic faith in a God incarnate in that ultimate *magus*, Jesus Christ.

In the words of Ficino's student Pico della Mirandola, nothing proved the divinity of Christ as much as magic and the cabala. Pico could claim this because both the esoteric sciences (divination, astrology, etc.) depend on the principle of "as above, so below." For Pico, the created world, though fallen, can be restored through "magical" knowledge of its true forms, available through processes first espied by the Egyptian sorcerers and the Chaldean oracles, transmitted to the West through Plato and the *Corpus Hermetica*, preserved in Jewish cabalism, experimented with in Arabic and medieval alchemy, and sanctified in the Christianized taxonomy of spirits undertaken by Pseudo-Dionysius in *The Divine Names*.[154]

Pico's mentor Ficino, took a rather more reserved, contemplative, and "aesthetic" interest in magic, one that had little interest in real operations of transformation,

divination, or sorcery. Ficino attempted to "neoplatonize" the magic of the *Asclepius* in his *Pymander* by making magical talismans correspond to the celestial hierarchies of the pseudo-Dionysus. Ficino approved of an Orphic magic in which the operator ascends through ranks of divine names or angelic hierarchies, for the express purpose of worshipping the Triune God. But there was evidence in both the pseudo-Dionysus and the *Corpus Hermetica* that some forms of practical and ritual magic might be reconciled with Christian practice.

In this vein, Pico della Mirandola added a kind of practical cabala which gave the magus a much more active relationship with the angelic world (Ficino's was ultimately a system of contemplation, not of magical action or transformation).[155] In his 900 Theses, left undebated due to the censors of Pope Innocent, Pico della Mirandola defined (and was willing to defend) natural or practical magic (as opposed to purely contemplative ascent) in the following ways.

> Given any practical object, the operation that acts on it (*quae eum practicat*) is nobler than that which contemplates it [Thesis 3>46].
>
> No power exists in heaven or earth seminally and separated that the magician cannot actuate and unite [Thesis 9>5].
>
> The form of all magical power comes from the soul of man standing, and not falling [Thesis 9>12].
>
> If there is any nature immediate to us that is either simply rational, or at least exists for the most part rationally, it has magic in its summit, and through its participation in men can be more perfect [Thesis 9>14].
>
> To operate magic is nothing other than to marry the world [Thesis 9>13].[156]

Pico's goal in defending magic was to create a more meaningful connection between theology and natural philosophy than could be conceived by scholasticism. He in fact taught that this connection was the key to reconciling various wisdom traditions

with Christianity, and that certain healing and divining magics would be the logical and glorious outcome of the synthesis of all philosophies in one system. In his preface to the 900 Theses, "Oration in Praise of Philosophy," Pico writes,

> I have proposed theorems about magic, too, wherein I have signified that magic is twofold. The first sort is put together by the work and authorship of demons, and is a thing, as God is true, execrable and monstrous. The other sort is, when well explored, nothing but the absolute consummation of the philosophy of nature.[157]
>
> Having carefully investigated the harmony of the universe, which the Greeks called *sympatheian*, and having looked closely into the knowledge natures have of each other, this second magic [as opposed to dark or black magic] applying to each thing its innate charms, which are called by magicians *hyles*, as if it were itself the maker, discloses in public the wonders hidden in the recesses of the world, in the bosom of nature, in the storerooms and secrets of God. And as the farmer marries elm to vine, so the magician marries earth to heaven, that is, lower things to the qualities and virtues of higher things.[158]

Pico thus went far beyond Ficino in reviving the mythic figure of *homo magus*, the idea of a human "operator" who is able, through moral purity and mental acumen, to ascend through the levels of natural, mathematical, and finally divine orders, finally reaching a parity with divine *mens* that makes him a co-creator with God.

Pico's cosmology was Christian and neoplatonic. For Pico the sympathies between things—that "knowledge things have of each other"—is an effect of their being hierarchically ordered in a divine economy of exchange whereby the lower (i.e. animal) is disposed to receive what the higher (i.e. human) gives, just as that higher (human) in turn receives from that on which it depends (the angelic or rational). The practice of magic is thus a process of spiritual ascent and descent "on" the hierarchies, and this analogical, hierarchical order legitimates the link between natural philosophy and theology, and makes possible the marrying earth and heaven.

In the century that followed, however, Giordano Bruno developed a view of magical sympathies that set the possibility of transformation not in the interlocking hierarchy of forms but in the fecundity of matter itself. He writes, in *Cause, Principle, and Unity*,

> . . . forms do not exist without matter, in which they are generated and corrupted, and out of whose bosom they spring and into which they are taken back. Hence, matter, which always remains fecund and the same, must have as the fundamental prerogative of being the only substantial principle; as that which is, and forever remains, and the forms together are to be taken merely as varied dispositions of matter, which come and go, cease and renew themselves, so that none have value as principle. This is why we find philosophers who, having pondered thoroughly the essence of natural forms, such as one may see in Aristotle and his kind, have finally concluded that they are only accidents and peculiarities of matter, so that, according to them, it is to matter that we must accord the privilege of being act and perfection, and not to the things of which we can truly say that they are neither substance nor nature, but relative to the substance and nature—that is to say, in their opinion, matter, which for them is a necessary, eternal and divine principle, as it is to Avicebron, the Moor, who calls it "God who is in everything" (CPU 61).

Ultimately the idea that matter is God comes out of Nicholas of Cusa's idea of *complicatio*. This was a way of thinking of a divinity immanent to an infinite universe. If the universe is infinite, the divine can no longer be conceived as the limit of the finite, but must be envisaged as that which the finite "complicates" in itself. "God" is the fully explicated aspect of that same infinity. Both Cusa and Bruno attempted to construe a paradigm of natural process in the universe that exceeded the medieval image of fixed and essential cosmic hierarchies, or visibly fixed limits (from the *primum mobile*, through angelic *mens*, down to all other forms of order. Cusa achieved this new epistemology, a *docta ignoranta*, by inserting a cosmic Word at the center of a world that no longer had a center and whose circumference was nowhere. The invasion and insinuation everywhere

of the Word made Flesh could be discerned by the "holy fool" whose perceptions were enlivened by the faith of a *docta ignoranta*.

Nicholas of Cusa could allow the possibility of an infinite cosmos on the assumption of an invisibly present possibility for nature to everywhere adumbrate and exult the perfections subsisting in a divine transcendent *complicatio* immanently figured in the event of the God-Man, Christ. Giordano Bruno emptied this Christological center and made transformation or the *vinculum* [bonds] of transformability, in all their manifest and magical variety, the only guarantee of metamorphosis.[159] Bruno anticipates both the monadology of Leibniz and the *Deus, sive natura* of Spinoza. But unlike the metaphysics of his post-Cartesian cousins (and this is crucial for the connection with Deleuze), Bruno's thought is neither perfectly "geometrical" nor the object of an infinite calculus. Unlike Spinoza and Leibniz after him, Bruno was no mathematician and considered the mathematization of nature as being unworthy of true natural philosophy. For Bruno thought must always entertain an empirical and pragmatic moment of attention to things in their contingency and volatility, and never take nature as the manifestation of formalizable objects. Bruno thought that even Aristotle, for all the power of his thought of substance, obscured nature with his logic of potential and actual, and his subordination of accident to essence.

As Eliot Ross Albert has comprehensively shown, Giordano Bruno's metaphysics of accidental vicissitudes has much in common with the ontology of Gilles Deleuze.[160] The plurality of becomings, the life of *mater materia*, is not an entity given to reflection, but is espied only in an active, incantational, and even "magical" science, a science driven by a certain kind of passion or love. This is, for Bruno, a passionate or "frenzied"

experience of inventing finite images of being that penetrate the secrets of nature only insofar as they suffer their own limitations. This, at least, is how it is ultimately formulated in Bruno's *Heroic Frenzies*, where ascent to true knowledge of nature is allegorized as the continually (failed) quest of the lover to hymn the beloved.

How is this passion of the image a way of knowing (a question we could also put to Deleuze)? For Bruno, what ultimately what distinguishes a true image of nature from a false one is not a matter of whether it correctly imitates nature, but whether it invents a passage beyond the "shadows" of nature which we perceive. This is why in the critical literature Bruno is sometimes thought of as a proto-Kantian (as Vico is sometimes perceived as a proto-Hegelian). The difference, here, is that the "rules" for constructing truly inventive images answer to no pre-given schema or transcendental set of categories. It is the poetry that makes the rules, not the rules that makes the poetry.[161] Ultimately "magic" for Bruno is the poetic act with which knowledge of nature begins. We can only know through images of nature, despite their ultimate "inadequacy."[162] Bruno's view of mind is that it is immanent to the fecundity of the *infiniti universi i mondi*—he believed consort with nature's infinity forced him to become other than himself, to undergo the greatest destructions and undoings.

Whereas for Pico, God is still communicated in the universe on the basis transcendence, for Bruno it is the immanence of the divine in matter itself which enables fundamental transformations to occur. For Bruno this is a generalized process of bonding that he names "love," a kind of Leibnizian communicates of each and each to all. As Bruno puts it in his *A General Account of Bonding*,

> . . . the love by which we love, and the tendency by which all things desire, are intermediaries between good and evil, between the ugly and the

> beautiful (not themselves being ugly or beautiful). And so they are good and beautiful because of a sort of sharing and participation, for the bond of love has a nature which is both active and possible. And by this, things act, or are acted upon, or both, as they desire to be ordered, joined, united and completed, insofar as it is within the nature of each nothing to be occupied with order, joining, union, and completion. Without this bond there is nothing, just as without nature there is nothing. Because of this, therefore, love is not a sign of imperfection when it is considered in matter and in the chaos before things were produced. For indeed, anything which is considered in the chaos and in brute matter, and is also said to be love, is simultaneously said to be a perfection. And whatever is said to be imperfect, disordered and not to be, is understood not to be love. Thus, it is established that love is everywhere a perfection, and this bond of love gives witness everywhere to perfection. When an imperfect thing desires to be perfected this, indeed takes place in something which is imperfect, but not because it is imperfect. Rather, this happens because of a participation in a perfection and in a divine light and in an object having a more eminent nature, which it desires more strongly inasmuch as the object is more vivacious. That which is more perfect burns with greater love for the highest good than that which is imperfect. Therefore, that principle is most perfect which wishes to become all things, and which is not oriented to any particular form but to a universal form and universal perfection. And this is universal matter, without which there is no form, in whose power, desire, and disposition all forms are located, and which receives all forms in the development of its parts, even though it cannot receive two forms at the same time. Hence matter is in a sense divine, just as form, which is either a form of matter or nothing, is also in a sense divine. There is nothing outside of matter or without matter, otherwise the power to make and to be made would be one and the same thing, and would be grounded in one undivided principle, because the power to make anything and the power of anything to be made would be either present or absent together. There is only one potency taken absolutely and in itself… it is not a foolish opinion which was defended by David of Dinant and by Avicebron in his *Fons vitae*, who cited the Arabs who also ventured to assert that God is matter. (CPU 173)

For Bruno this takes place in an unbounded cosmos, an infinite universe and worlds. Despite his enthusiasm for the Copernican move beyond Ptolemaic geocentrism, Bruno famously reproached Copernicus for having "studied mathematics more than nature," just as he criticized Aristotle for never tiring of dividing in reason that which is unified in nature.[163] For Bruno, the ultimate power of nature is not its formal attributes,

but its *energy*, an energy which in an infinite universe full of infinite worlds—much like the "chaosmos" we will read of Deleuze—cannot be limited to a fixed set of shapes or types, no matter how pleasing to geometry and mathematics such a vision may be. Historian of science Fernand Hallyn formulates Bruno's move well. Hallyn writes, in *The Poetic Structure of the World*,

> Ultimately, it is the dissociation between form and image of the universe that Bruno radicalized, and in the very name of the *decorum* of the infinite: if, by its form, the universe represents the divine being, it can only do so by presenting the unrepresentable as such. It is therefore necessary for its form to be such that no "image" can contain it, and so to be infinite. God, moreover, cannot "appear" except in unrepresentable form; organistic *decorum* cannot reside in the finite perfection of mathematical relationships. Bruno situates it in inexhaustible energy, with respect to which all things, including distance and time, are equal.[164]

Despite the impossibility of imaging the infinity of the cosmos, we must do so. Bruno's quest in the *On the Composition of Images, Signs, and Ideas* is a mannerist one: a speculative quest for an image of that which is beyond form. This puts Bruno on the edge of the world Foucault defined, in the *Order of Things*, as the epistemic world of *similitude*, a world where things and words resemble one another and relate through relations of convenience, empathy, analogy and sympathy.

Connecting the Orders of Things: Love's Magic

In the Renaissance all things—plants, animals, and minerals, as well as humans—were "ruled" by different celestial powers. It was necessary to construct images—of, say, Saturn as an old man with camel's feet and a sickle—in order to work magic on objects under Saturn's purview. Thus, Agrippa writes,

> Mercurius Trismegistus writes that a demon immediately animates a figure or statue well composed of certain things which suit that demon;

> Augustine also mentions this in the eighth book of his *City of God*. For such is the concordance of the world that celestial things draw super-celestial things, and natural things, supernatural things, through the virtue running through all and the participation in it of all species.[165]

In this Renaissance *magus* images are indispensable for thought: they are not illustrations or examples but talismans and emblems of reality. For magic requires thinking in and through images because it takes the world itself as shadow or simulacrum of God's absolute infinity, and views natural philosophy as active practice in which the final goal is not contemplation but dynamic action, a revolutionary science of love that is at once an art of power.

This is, anyway, how it was for Bruno, who used images not only to remember (by constructing Lullian memory theatres) but also to access that which had not yet been seen. The image is both where knowledge is housed and also where it reaches its own limits, a limit that only the heroic will can cross. As Agrippa puts it,

> . . .you must know that these kind of figures are nothing unless they are vivified so that there is in them . . . a natural virtue, or a celestial virtue, or a heroic, animistic, demonic, or angelic virtue. But who can give soul to an image, life to stone, metal, wood, or wax? And who can make children of Abraham come out of stones? Truly this secret is not know to the thick-witted worker . . . and no one has such powers but he who has cohabited with the elements, vanquished nature, mounted higher than the heavens, elevating himself above the angels to the archetype itself, with whom he then becomes co-operator and can do all things.[166]

Who can be magical? Who can be the co-operator of nature? Who is worthy? Only certain minds can "vivify" the images. Only certain images pass from imitation to invention.[167] What, then is the criteria for a worthy image? What is the criteria for magic? How do we know who the good poet is? We repeat her poetry. How do we know good magic? If the possibility of knowing nature is the possibility of constructing an inventive image of nature, then the possibility of true magic is also the possibility of

true art. And how do we recognize true poetry? Because, as Bruno's Tansilio says in quite a Deleuzian phrase, it bears repeating.

But also because true poetry like true magic loves life. In his commentary on love in Plato's *Symposium*. Ficino had already argued that love is the essence of magical power. "Why is Love called Magus?" he asks. "Because all the force of Magic consists in Love. The work of Magic is a certain drawing of one thing to another by natural similitude. The parts of this world, like members of one animal, depend all on one Love, and are connected together by natural communion" (*Commentary*, Oratio VI, cap. 10). This is the theme Bruno takes up in his account of bonding, *De Vinculum*. But its ultimate source is in the *Pimander*, one of the texts of the *Corpus Hermetica*. The Magus Man comes down to earth from above because he loves nature and is passionately drawn to her beauty. The magus has a fundamentally erotic relationship with nature.[168]

This relationship is played out in terms of an heroic ascent, which is also a descent into the depths of nature. This remains neoplatonic in the Iamblichan sense, where it is not contemplative ascent of the one but theurgical descent of the "ones," ritually evoked, that transform matter into a worthy seat of divine life.[169] This is what Bruno explores in his *Heroic Frenzies*. Knowledge of nature itself is impossible, but through the construction of images we experience the limits of our own minds. This limit experience causes us to press further and further into the depths of nature, until the maker becomes the un-made and re-made, the hunter the hunted, the knower the known, and the bonder the one who is bonded. It is the beauty of Diana which seduces the philosopher. Bruno writes,

> I say very few are the Acteons to whom destiny gives the power to contemplate Diana naked, and the power to become so enamored of the

> beautiful harmony of the body of nature, so fallen beneath the gaze of those two lights of the dual splendor of goodness and beauty, that they are transformed into deer, inasmuch as they are no longer the hunters but the hunted. For the ultimate and last end of this chase is the capture of a fugitive and wild prey, through which the hunter becomes the hunted, the pillager becomes the pillaged. Because in all the other species of the chase undertaken for particular things, it is the hunter who seeks to capture those things for himself, absorbing them through the mouth of this particular intelligence; but in that divine and universal chase he comes to apprehend that it is himself who necessarily remains captured, absorbed, and united. (HF 225)

How does this vision connect to Deleuze? It has to do with the activation-affirmation relationship between life and thought. If this relationship has been distorted by categorical and representational habits of mind, the effect of this distortion is, essentially, to preclude a magical rapport between mind and matter. Deleuze's epistemology takes a step toward restoring this rapport by making the adventure of mind equivocal with the difference and repetition of elemental powers, and our life of learning equivocal with the discovery of life's most vital signs.

The Elemental Powers of Art: Deleuze's Vital Signs

> Modes of life inspire ways of thinking; modes of thinking create ways of living. Life *activates* thought, and thought in turn *affirms* life. Of this pre-Socratic unity we no longer have even the slightest idea. We now have only instances where thought bridles and mutilates life, making it sensible, and where life takes revenge and drives thought mad, losing itself along the way. Now we only have the choice between mediocre lives and mad thinkers. Lives that are too docile for thinkers, thoughts too mad for the living: Immanuel Kant and Friedrich Hölderlin. But the fine unity in which madness would cease to be such is yet to be rediscovered—a unity that turns an anecdote of life into an aphorism of thought, and an evaluation of thought into a new perspective on life.
>
> In a way, this secret of the pre-Socratics was already lost from the start. *We must think of philosophy as a force*. But the law of forces is that they can only appear when concealed by the mask of preexisting forces. Life must first imitate matter. (PI 67)

This notion of a knowledge that transforms is obviously where Deleuze connects to the Renaissance. But it is also obvious that we no living any longer in that episteme. So how is transformative knowledge possible in our time? In *The Order of Things*, Michel Foucault traced the difference between our time and the Renaissance in terms of a contrast between a world entirely written and a world constituted by a gap between the tables on which knowledge was represented and the represented things. In "The Prose of the World," Foucault explains how the Renaissance could accept the idea of a nature always already self-inscribed, a nature in itself already a kind of revelation. Foucault writes,

> For it was very possible that before Babel, before the Flood, there had already exited a form of writing composed of the marks of nature itself, with the result that its characters would have the power to act upon things directly, to attract them or repel them, to represent their properties, their virtues, and their secrets. A primitively natural writing, of which certain forms of esoteric knowledge, and the cabala first and foremost, may perhaps have preserved the scattered memory and were now attempting to retrieve its long-dormant powers . . .
>
> . . . And indeed, when one goes back to take a look at the *Historia serpentum et draconum*, one finds the chapter, 'On the serpent in general' arranged under the following headings: equivocation (which means the various meanings of the word *serpent*), synonyms and etymologies, differences, form and description, anatomy, nature and habits, temperament, coitus and generation, voice, movements, places, diets, physiognomy, antipathy, sympathy, modes of capture, death and wounds caused by the serpent, modes and signs of poisonings, remedies, epithets, denominations, prodigies and presages, monsters, mythology, gods to which it is dedicated, fables, allegories, and mysteries, hieroglyphics, emblems and symbols, proverbs, coinage, miracles, riddles, devices, heraldic signs, historical facts, dreams, simulacra and statues, use in human diet, use in medicine miscellaneous uses . . . And indeed for Aldrovandi and his contemporaries, it was all *legenda*—things to be read. But for this reason for this was not that they preferred the authority of en to the precision of an unprejudiced eye, but that *nature, in itself, is an unbroken tissue of words and signs, of accounts and characters, of discourse and forms* [my emphasis]. . . to know an animal or a plant, or any terrestrial thing whatever, is to gather together the whole dense layer of signs with which it may have been covered; it is to rediscover also the

> constellations of forms from which they derive their value as heraldic signs Aldrovandi was neither a better nor a worse observer than Buffon; he was neither more credulous than he, nor less attached to the faithfulness of the observing eye or the to the rationality of things. His observation was simply not linked to thing in accordance with the same system or by the same arrangement of the *episteme*. For Aldrovandi was meticulously contemplating a nature which was, from top to bottom, written.[170]

The possibility of a unified "prose of the world" lay, for Renaissance Neo-Platonism, in the transcendence of a divine donating of sense as *creation*. Deleuze was an atheist, but he nevertheless re-poses the possibility of a prose of the world—this time in terms of the artful immanence of things to themselves. What happens to the status of the sign when we accept the possibility that *things signify themselves*—that sign structures are not "overlayed" on things by human consciousness, that language is not "papered onto" things, but that things have a power to signify all their own? This is the possibility Deleuze entertains.

When the Classical period began to attempt to purify and clarify what was objectively natural and subjectively cultural, it immediately abandoned or ostracized those *places* or *conditions* under which things might signify themselves. Latour has brilliantly and clearly explicated this as the attempt to empty out the true locus of being (which is mediation, transition, translation, and transformation) into two isolatable and opposed poles. But the solution, for Latour, is not to "go back" to primitive magic and sorcery, but to see how *already* in our times there are masked, diverted, overcoded, or de- and re-territorialized conditions under which objects and subjects are *not* isolated into opposed dimensions. There are already practices vibrant in our own day which give us, if only in perverse or hysterical or schizoid forms, the truly complicated nature of things. These spaces, situations, and activities are those Deleuze analyzes in terms of the

achievement of "immanence," an achievement, in our day, that is unfortunately more and more fraught with the possibilities of psychosis, disenfranchisement, and apartheid.

This transforming immanence, for Deleuze has no contrary, in God or in Ideals (which is why it is, in a way better to think of Deleuze as a kind of pantheist than an atheist). It can even be called a form of non-opposable transcendence, as it is by Bruno Latour. Latour writes,

> . . . if, instead of attaching poor phenomena to the solid hooks of Nature and Society, we let mediators produce natures and societies, we reverse the direction of the modernizing transcendences. Natures and societies become the relative products of history. However, we do not fall into immanence alone, since networks are immersed in nothing. We do not need a mysterious ether for them to propagate themselves. We do not need to fill in blanks. It is the conception of the terms "transcendence" and "immanence" that ends up being modified by the moderns' return to nonmodernity. Who told us that transcendence had to have a contrary? We have never abandoned transcendence—that is, the maintenance in presence by the mediation of a pass. (Latour 128).

Despite some evidence to the contrary, the experimental modernism of Gilles Deleuze, affirming immanence is *not* a new form of transcendental idealism.[171] It is *not* the supposition of a new "ether" in which things propagate themselves. Deleuzian immanence, I would argue, is nothing but the *peculiar "transcendent" reality* of assemblages, the plan(e) established by those delegates, angels and lieutenants (Latour 129).[172] With Deleuze's notion of a *virtual* set of ideas or complications insinuating themselves across different assemblages of being, it is not that we return to the world of similitude and analogy, but that under certain conditions the world of similitude uncannily returns to us, developing analogies that, if aesthetic (rather than natural) are nonetheless all the reality we can desire.

It is in this combined erotic, pragmatic and poststructuralist semiotic that this Deleuzian lieutenant, this angel takes command: she is an artist whose creativity cannot be opposed to that of scientific experiment or philosophical conceptuality. Not because art and science and philosophy are indistinct in their ways and means, but because the thinking that philosophers do can be as productive and as generative as that of film-makers and physicists. We lack terms for what philosophy produces because we situate concepts outside of their referents, ideas outside of things, signs in opposition to forces, in keeping with the modern dichotomy of inchoate nature and rationalized society. Above all we oppose identification (this is that) and creation (this becomes that), still caught in the "transcendentalist" illusion, or even the "Socratic" one, that the essence of mind is the right judgment of a world from which it is de facto or de jute separated. But Deleuze shows us that this is driven by the habitual presumption that thought is a matter of good and common sense—that truth is the opposite of error or mistakes in judgment, when it is in fact the opposite only of the blank and sterile repetitions of habit. The truth worth apprehending, for Deleuze, cannot be opposed to falsity, but only to the ordinary, and the real error of thought is not falsehood but *stupidity*, that *betiment* in which we slumber.

If it is not philosophy's task to give account of regularities but of singularities, it is no longer its task to give laws. Concepts can no longer be thought of as generalities in the way that law "covers" different sets of experiences or different sets of objects. If genuine concepts and singular events emerge together, as Deleuze insists they always do, the intuitions to which these sense-events give rise cannot be larger than discrete sense-events. We are, as Latour puts it, "weavers of morphisms" (M 137). We make (and break) alliances and exchanges between things (that are never merely inert objects). The

Deleuzian philosopher is magical in the sense that she inhabits the modern world as a "weaver of morphism," and not as a judge or even an inquirer. The peculiar magic of philosophy is that its concepts, like the affects of art render the world of a singular thing. It does this in a way that immediately transforms the philosopher into a "conceptual personae": no longer the bearer of a personal identity but a character, an agent, a mediator of morphisms, transitions, and becomings.

This means that the philosophical concepts worth creating are those that function like signs in a healing ritual: no longer descriptions or deductions of the world, but transformations of it through *acts* that are located at a place where signs and powers are indistinguishable. Science in action, art beyond cliché: this is the "magic" of a philosophy Deleuze envisioned, a philosophy no longer located at the "ground" of a synthetic a priori judgment. The synthesis of such a thought, writes Deleuze, "is of the molecular and the cosmic, material and force, not form and matter, *Grund* and territory. Philosophy is no longer synthetic judgment; it is like a thought synthesizer functioning to make thought travel, make it mobile, make it a force of the Cosmos (in the same way as one makes sound travel)" (ATP 343).

Astral travel, but to a star called this world, not another. The great film-makers of the Italian neo-realism and the French new-wave sought to make us believe again in *this* world. They did this by synthesizing our experience in ways that made our lives much more mobile, our affects much more impersonal, our self-conceptions much more plastic and pliable than we though possible. As he puts it in the second volume of his work on cinema, *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*, it is the quest of the film auteur to address the fact that "we no longer believe in this world" (C2 171). Yet we film the world in order to

create links within it: "the less human the world is, the more it is the artist's duty to believe and produce belief in a relation between man and the world, because the world is made by men" (C2 171)[173].

Bruno once said that the creation of new worlds always involve the disintegration or the vicissitude of things. He writes,

> This is the most important and most fundamental and of all the principles which provide an explanation of the marvels found in nature; namely, that because of an active principle and universal soul, nothing is so incomplete, defective or imperfect, or, according to common opinion, so completely insignificant that it could not become the source of great events. Indeed, on the contrary, a very large disintegration into such components must occur for an almost completely new world to be generated from them. (CPU 111).

"Magical" knowledge, like the magic of a cinema working with time images, knows that the seemingly meager elements (or disjointed times) into which things dissolve are closer to the genetic elements of new worlds than the "molar" or "arborescent" forms (or movement images) around which our habits and memories tend to ossify.

And the magically productive knowledge of modern art is never merely a matter of arbitrary experimentation, but of a rigorous construction of machines that avoid total effacing and absolute scrambling of elements (conceptual, sonic, visual, or physical) (ATP 344). "The sobriety of the assemblages is what makes for the richness of the Machine's effects," Deleuze writes (ATP 344). This means that there must be a distinctness to the assemblages' obscurity or fuzziness. If the interesting aggregates are fuzzy, this is not because we force them to be so but because, by delight, by instinct, by attraction, we find fuzzy aggregates that have the necessary consolidation or consistency.

All good magicians know which images to work with, how much chaos to let into the trance, how many spirits are required. If children and the mad sometimes indicate the

direction we should go towards finding assemblages, they are not exemplary for the truly modern translator or mediator or transmuter: "the modern figure is not the child or the lunatic, still less the artist [in the Romantic sense of the genius] but the cosmic artisan . . . To be an artisan and no longer an artist, creator, or founder, is the only way to become cosmic, to leave milieus and the earth behind. The invocation to the Cosmos does not at all operate as a metaphor; on the contrary, the operation is an effective one, from the moment an artist connects a material with forces of consistency or consolidation" (ATP 345).

Like Bruno, Deleuze saw philosophy, painting, and poetry as a common act. There is also an intense connection between a world that is infinite, unbounded, even chaotic and certain signs, images, and ideas through which that infinity can be known. For Bruno it is still a finite-infinite relation created by an icon, however temporary.[174] For Deleuze, it is an infinite-infinite relation distilled in a finite Figure. The paradox is that it is the series of finite figures that is the ultimate ontological term, or what Aristotle would call first in the order of being. Not a substance, but an act. A pure transition. An act of creation, an expression. An event—and its image.

Magical Figures: Poetic Life in Modern Times

What, in Deleuze's terms, is the magic of the event? It lies in the image of itself. Or, as he puts it in his late work on Leibniz, the magic of events is that they are "folded" on themselves, creating a screen over the chaos of natural energies.

> An event does not just mean "a man has been run over." The Great Pyramid is an event, and its duration for a period of one hour, thirty minutes, five minutes . . ., a passage of nature, of God, or a view of God.

> What are the conditions that make an event possible? Events are produced in a chaos, in a chaotic multiplicity, but only under the conditions that a sort of screen intervenes.
>
> Chaos does not exist; it is an abstraction because it is inseparable from a screen that makes something—something rather than nothing—emerge from it. Chaos would be a pure *Many*, a purely disjunctive diversity, while the something is a One, not a pregiven unity, but instead the indefinite article that designates a certain singularity. (F 76).

Because events come in terms of screens, Deleuze's is not a "naturalism" of the event. There is always a Figure or Diagram or Image (cinematic, musical, even animal) that brings the event with it, which *gives* us the *singular* distinctions between form and content, matter and expression proper to the arrival of an assemblage. As he puts it in *Logic of Sense*, thought is never just of the event, but of the *sense*-event, and the counter-actualization—the transmutation, experimentation—of that event that is possible for a character combining the openness to chance of a Zen Master, the courage of a Stoic, and the humor of Lewis Carroll's Alice.

Humor is especially important, because of the nature of what is magical in Deleuze, those things he calls the machinc or, following the humorist and surrealist Alfred Jarry, "the pataphysical." Whereas irony sees the failure of the machine as the impossibility of life, humor sees the *machinc* as life itself: life is a special effect of certain machinc functions. Certain modern art forms help us see this. Transformative modulators in Bacon; movement-, affection-, and especially time-images in cinema; the becoming-cosmic of the refrain in music; the becoming-animal of musical affects; the transpersonal and transindividual permutation of affects across the subjects and objects of literature in T.E. Lawrence, Joyce, Melville, Kafka, and Proust . . . all these "machinic

functions" extract something in sensation that is not sensibility but simultaneously the *limit* of sensibility and the *real condition* of creating new worlds of experience.

This is why philosophy's relationship to art is not for Deleuze the one of articulating the conditions of possibility for the effects of art upon our subjectivity. It is rather a thinking *along with* art, an extrapolating of the real conditions under which life becomes artful experimentation and sensory affectivity becomes the holographic experience of other worlds. Philosophical concepts, as much as scientific percepts and artistic affects, do not reflect but *deploy* that experience.

At issue here is Deleuze's "vitalism," his affirmation of "life" as that good in whose service philosophy works. Whereas Deleuze enthusiasts like Keith Ansell Pearson and Manuel Delanda have seen in this what is most "revolutionary" about Deleuze's thought, Badiou and Zizek have found Deleuze's notion of Life his most naïve and counter-productive moment. But neither side of the debate, it seems to me, takes seriously enough the *artistic* character of Deleuze's notion of life.

Deleuze thinks of life in artistic terms—life is an art form for Deleuze. But it is not a representational art form, nor an organic life. It is an abstract art and a non-organic life. The life that interests Deleuze is a twisting, free, and fragile line that passes between the inertia of matter and the rigidity of form. Philosophy, as much as art or science, comes to have an intuition of these "machinic" lines (that are not mechanized, as they were for 17th- and 18th-century physics) when it invents concepts along with those becomings or trajectories that pass between the categorical dualisms of form and matter, content and expression. This was how Worringer described the Northern or "Gothic"

line. As Deleuze puts it, in a passage that summarizes the research of *A Thousand Plateaus* (which he called his favorite work):

> The Greek organic line, which subordinates volume and spatiality, takes over from the Egyptian geometrical line, which reduced them to the plane. The organic, with its symmetry and contours inside and outside, still refers to the rectilinear coordinates of a striated space. The organic body is prolonged by straight lines that attach it to what lies in the distance. Hence the primacy of human beings, or of the face: We are this form of expression itself, simultaneously the supreme organism and the relation of all organisms to metric space in general. The abstract, on the contrary, begins only with what Worringer presents as the "Gothic" avatar. It is this nomadic line that he says is mechanical, but in free action and swirling; it is inorganic, yet alive, and all the more alive for being inorganic. It is distinguished both from the geometrical and the organic. It raises "mechanical" relations to the level of *intuition*. Heads (even a human being's when it is not a face) unravel and coil into ribbons in a continuous process; mouths curl in spirals. Hair, clothes . . . This streaming, spiraling, zigzagging, snaking, feverish line of variation liberates a power of life that human beings had rectified and organisms had confined, and which matter now expresses as the trait, flow, or impulse traversing it. If everything is alive, it is not because everything is organic or organized but, on the contrary, because the organism is a diversion of life. In short, the life in question is inorganic, germinal, and intensive, a powerful life without organs, a Body that is all the more alive for having no organs, everything that passes *between* organisms ("once the natural barriers of organic movement have been overthrown, there are no more limits"). (ATP 499)

The most concrete image of how philosophy can be such a transformative "poetic" process is the role of mind in ritual magic.[175] When the operators of magical rituals establish symbols, signs, and movements, this is not in order to realize what it *would* take for a result to be produced, but in fact to produce that result. This is accomplished when the operators in some sense *become* the signs (of healing, of divination, of necromancy, etc.) that they have made. When Deleuze calls philosophy to become-other in thought, this can happen because the signs of things are *in* things, but force us to think only when they (creatively) intersect with or diverge from other things and the signs they emit. In this way Deleuze does not think of what is signified in a sign

(or what is reflected in concepts) as being "immaterial" as opposed to the materiality of the affects and percepts of art and science. On the contrary, affects and percepts are *limits* of what can be felt and sensed, as much as signs are the *limits* of what can be thought. A general form of experimentation with signs, and an apprenticeship to signs which is a form of "intense" life, would look for ways in which affects, percepts, and concepts continually push beyond what we have habitually accepted as reality, for the sake of a life we do not yet recognize as our own.

This is why Deleuze is not a materialist in the classical sense, and in fact it is easy to read him as an idealist, since he often writes in his early work as if ideal dynamisms of becoming, or what he later calls abstract machines, were somehow the foundation or ground of reality. The misapprehension here is that what is basic and fundamental for Deleuze is not a substance of any kind, whether ideal or real, but an event which is always an act of creation. These events have specific structures, but it is the structure which depends on the event and not vice versa—as he says in *Anti-Oedipus,* "structures are in things" (*elles sont dans les chose*s).

There are as many matters of expression as there are events of creation. Deleuze's is thus a *monism of becomings* that has only a pragmatic and semiotic "substance"—a form of content (issuing in signs) and a matter of expression (issuing in possibilities for transmutation). But much like Spinoza's 3rd-order knowing, the real being of these structures is apprehended only under certain conditions, under essays or assays critical and clinical, which I will explore in the next five chapters. That we should conceive of these conditions as "magical" is what I suggest here. However, I am not arguing for a "return" to a premodern sensibility that sees the world as enchanted. It is

enough, already, to remark the affinity between Deleuze's metaphysical vision, which is an encounter with a transformative signs that requires the special conditions of art, science and philosophy, with the magical vision of certain Italian philosophers who, on the cusp of "modern" philosophy, also envisaged the intuitions of a genuine first philosophy as being available only under the intense, ecstatic, and ritualized conditions of magical enactment.[176] What magic there may be left for modern times is a question we can only pose along with Deleuze. The answer depends upon possibilities of life we may still need to admit we truly desire before they can become as real as they are.

Notes

[1] Both "real" and "experience" here are highly contested terms in philosophy. What Deleuze means by reality and by experience will become clear only gradually and by contrast with other positions (Aristotelian, Kantian, Hegelian, and phenomenological).

[2] As in Foucault, where the visibility of the visible is not a secret but is hidden on the surface of things. See Rajchman's *Michel Foucault: The Freedom of Philosophy* (New York: Columbia UP, 1985), p. 15.

[3] See Foucault's essay on Klossowski's own "Acteonism," his vertiginous descent into the world of simulacra which inspired Deleuze, "The Prose of Acteon" in James D. Faubion, ed., *Foucault: Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology* (New York: The New Press, 1998), pp. 103-124. This is of course the preface to a novel, *The Baphomet* (Trans. Sophie Hawks and Stephen Sartarelli. New York: Marsilio, 1988), about perverted modern magicians, the templars, who can do nothing in 20th century life but make real those sexual perversions and inhuman violences of which they were accused in the 17th century. Klossowski depicts the predicament of those who experience magic as lost, and the world as simulacral. To some degree Deleuze is able to transform or counter-actualize this predicament (being as simulacra) into a positive opportunity (for potentially boundless—if still selective—becomings). One of the most important ethical questions of our time is how to bring magicians, who can only be marginalized and ostracized subjectivities, into positions of power where their arts become healing and giving rather than self-destructive.

[4] What the new defenders of transcendence and universality really object to, in Deleuze, is the way in which he does not allow an isolated logophonic or logographic axiom to stand as a self-sufficient form of thought. For Deleuze, thought is not thought until it is connected with something else, another activity, other events. The power of any one interruption or interruptive performance by any one group cannot constitute an event, because for Deleuze it is of the nature of singularities (which "are" universals) to exist in the *transits* between various events, in a peculiar hapticity or tangibility which blurs eye and hand, or "situation" and "unnamable" (to put it in Badiou's language). This is why Deleuze asks us to experience his concepts like we experience the tangibility of a work of art—a tangibility that exists or insists *across* the medium, materials, and characters the work involves on its way to establishing an extraordinary Figure.

[5] What is meant exactly by magic here will become clear in the concluding chapter.

[6] I use "critical" here in the sense common to Marxism, psycho-analysis, structuralism, and the Frankfurt School. For all of these schools of thought, philosophy is first and foremost a critique (of ideology, of consciousness, of sense, etc.). Deleuze's thought is also primarily critical in the sense of such "critiques" of the history of Western philosophy, per se, as Foucault's archaeology, Nietzsche's genealogy, Bataille's "excessive" thought, Heidegger's *Destruktion*, Derrida's deconstruction, Gadamer's critique of historicism, and Wittgenstein's "therapy." Deleuze's is part of a vast movement in 20th century thought (both analytic and continental) to renew the possibility of thought *in spite of* philosophical presuppositions, yet *within* philosophical discourse itself.

[7] Affirmation is a technical term in Deleuze. It is linked to the idea that being is inherently expressive—that, as Deleuze critic Dan Smith put it at a recent conference, being and event are

one and the same expression (Villanova University Graduate Student Conference, April 2006). Artists affirm the nature of the world, but the nature of the world is available only in and through that expressive affirmation. As I will emphasize in my concluding chapter, affirmation has a sense captured not only by the "yes" of Nietzsche and of Joyce, but also in the "magical" theories of *complicatio* coming out of Nicholas of Cusa and culminating in Giordano Bruno (Deleuze acknowledges Bruno as the "master of complicatio" at *Difference and Repetition*, 57). For the magical tradition in Neo-Platonism (which begins in Iamblichus and comes to Bruno through Marsilio Ficino and Pico della Mirandola), the universe as God's essence *in complicatio* is "operable" (if not fully "knowable") through certain powerful images, signs, and ideas. Deleuze's notion that art "evokes" or, as he quotes Proust, "performs the rites necessary" for the essences of worlds to insist in artful signs, has deep resonances with this pre-modern magical view of an "operable" nature. In "Learning Signs," I will show how Deleuze sees this at work in the art of Marcel Proust.

[8] Readers of Nietzsche will immediately recognize the "anti-*ressentiment*" flavor of Deleuze's work. For Deleuze as for Nietzsche, critique is not just a matter of resisting the ossifications or stratifications of (modern, bourgeois, fascist) life, but of a much more global attack on the types or *forms* of life—human, animal, social, mechanical—that tend to resist life's unpredictable and uncanny dimension, since for them it is only (or primarily) through that dimension that creativity, the life of life, is encountered.

[9] Deleuze's procedure has resonances with Nietzsche's method of genealogy and Foucault's method of archaeology.

[10] For Deleuze's use of Nietzsche's "untimely," see *The Logic of Sense,* 265 ff.

[11] See Michel Foucault, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History." In Faubion, James D., ed. *Foucault: Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology* (New York: The New Press, 1998), pp. 369-389.

[12] Deleuze sees a profoundly "empiricist" tendency in Spinoza, since freedom in Spinoza arises not through our will but through our essence—an essence which must pass through the modes of our existence, or be *practiced*. As Deleuze writes in *Spinoza: Expressionism in Philosophy*, for Spinoza "one is never free through one's will and through that on which it patterns itself, but through one's essence and through that which follows from it" (149).

[13] This is a paradox Deleuze confronts again and again in his work, posed as a question early in his career: "How can a subject transcending the given be constituted in the given?" (ES 86). We will continually return to this topic.

[14] It is not only in modern art, but also already in the baroque that Deleuze finds a "subordination of the true to what is singular and remarkable" (*The Fold*, 91).

[15] It also becomes subject to those moral and epistemological criticisms Socrates levies against the poets in the *Ion* and the *Republic*. For Socrates, if artists are striving to reproduce the essence or idea of a man or a war in an *image* of that man or war, s/he has already failed by looking not to the invisible truth of that thing but to an inherently limited and flawed appearance (of virtue or courage). But if art does *not* imitate, but rather repeats the world, then images are not representations of supersensible ideals, and the authenticity of art can no longer be a matter of

how well it figures the True or demonstrates the superiority of the Good, at least as "platonically" conceived.

[16] But it is not so much in the solutions (heroic virtues or villainous exploits), but in the *problems* these characters pose: that is the "rub," that is where we learn from art.

[17] Romanticism might be defined at least in part as the quest for contact with the sublime origins of nations, peoples, and destinies—the quest for a life beneath or beyond the illusions of state, class, and creed. A romantic genius who apprehends a vital source might seem like Deleuze's ideal artist. But Romantic art (particularly German and English) attempts to subsume or include or synthesize the intense differences and uncanny repetitions of life into a unified shape or form (even if one that is only "tragically" present). Romantic art is the art of the "people" who rise up to declare what the true world should be, even if it is impossible, and of the genius who speaks in the name of that impossibility. For Deleuze, however, *c'est la peuple qui manque*—the people are always missing from art, the people always remain to be conceived, created, born from the elements art transforms, the signs art reads.

True creation or "genesis" for Deleuze is not Romantic because for Deleuze creativity is not a synthesis but a synthesizer that channels current through different modulators to make sound, forcing differences and resonances of sound not available apart from that experimentation. Synthesizers are used as key exemplars of how to form "planes of immanence" in both *A Thousand Plateaus* and in *Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation.* In the latter, Deleuze contrasts analogical with digital synthesizers (FB 95). Analog synths (which, interestingly, have experience a revival even after the ascendance of "superior" digital technology) operate with an immediacy that is similar to the "brute fact" of Bacon's painting methods, which forces paint through modulators or "diagrams." Bacon's diagram is immediately present in his painting in the same way that analog synthesizers create sound. Rather than converting electrical energy into digital information (binary code) and then back into actual sound waves, analog synths operate directly on the waves, in "real time." The possibilities of analog synths are at one with their operations, whereas in digital synths the possibilities for transformation are on another plane (in computer "modules," not in physical modulators). This makes a massive difference in the tonality of the instrument. While digital synths can "imitate" other instruments (trumpets, flutes, organs) better than analog synths, the analog *synth* sound is overwhelmingly preferred by professional keyboard players to its digital counterpart. In Deleuzian terms, the analog synthesizer has an "immanence" to itself that the digital does not, and this has obvious effects and ramifications in the sound medium.

[18] For Deleuze, the "chaosmos" *in* which the artist works in some sense *is* the work itself. Deleuze here depends on his novel and controversial interpretation of Nietzsche's doctrine of the eternal recurrence of the same. Nietzsche insisted, that "eternal return" and chaos are the same *affirmation*. For Deleuze, modern art attempts to "make" the affirmation of the eternal return. This is an affirmation which, according to Deleuze's reading of Nietzsche, causes only "positive" differences—the true if hidden powers of life—to return (see Deleuze's *Nietzsche and Philosophy* for elaboration of this point). As Deleuze is careful to note, Nietzsche never clearly explains what eternal return amounts to. Yet there are indications in Nietzsche's texts (especially in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*) that "attaining to" the insight of the truth of eternal return, "living up to" the truth of the doctrine, has to do with the activity of a creative will, or a principle of selection, that is neither natural nor cultural, but can only be ascribed to an "overhuman" sensibility that, like the Greek god Dionysius identifies itself fully (without pity or resentment) with chaotic processes of creation and destruction.

Although this Dionysian sensibility, with its appetite for destruction and aggression, is part of the "revenge" of simulacra and the attempt of modern art to liberate itself from representation, I downplay throughout this thesis the connection of Dionysianism with eternal return. This is because, in my view, Deleuze's claims about the knowledge art makes possible become harder and harder to defend the more they are linked to a doctrine of immanence and univocity that is expounded as if immanence and univocity were "cosmic givens"—as if art, as much as science or philosophy, tapped into a resource of sense that was pre-given or in principle available, as if thought could be divorced from what forces us to think. What I emphasize, instead, is that Deleuze always coordinates the donating of sense (the presence of the virtual, or ideas, or ideal dynamics that, themselves a part of history and becoming, are nevertheless not reducible to sensible qualities or measured quantities) with the achievement of a creative endeavor. This makes Deleuze's project primarily epistemological and ethical rather than metaphysical—a theory of relations rather than of natures. Reading Deleuze this way helps Deleuze avoid the charge of panentheistic vitalist mysticism with which he is often saddled. Although, following Whitehead and Bergson, Deleuze has an intuition about how apparently mechanistic evolutionary and bio-social processes are inherently creative, this intuition, I will argue throughout, emerges where and when Deleuze sees dynamics at work in the world *as artfully rendered*. This is the point I try to make clear in Chapter VI, "Being Assembled: Creating the Planes of Immanence."

[19] Although of course, for Vico, the truth of any making is ultimately tied to a transcendent paradigm of beneficent divine creation. See *The New Science*. (Marsh, trans. New York: Penguin, 2001).

[20]For Deleuze, Nietzsche's *Zarathustra* is a comic opera about terrible things, and the *übermensch* is a comic actor, a kind of buffoon (DR 9). And in an important passage of Difference and Repetition, Deleuze takes issue with Marx's notion, from the *Eighteenth Brumaire*, that in history comic farce follows tragic metamorphosis. For Deleuze there is a comic repetition, "once for all" that lurks beneath the apparent "education" (*Bildung*) which tragedy seems to represent. As he puts it,

> Comic repetition works by means of some defect, in the mode of the past properly so called. The hero necessarily confronts this repetition so long as "the act is too big for him:" Polonius' murder by mistake is comic, as is Oedipus' enquiry. The moment of metamorphosis, tragic repetition, follows. It is true that these two moments are not independent, existing as they do only for the third moment beyond the comic and the tragic: the production of something new entails a dramatic repetition which excludes even the hero. However, once the first two elements acquire an abstract independence or become genres, then the comic succeeds the tragic as though the failure of metamorphosis, raised to the absolute, presupposed an earlier metamorphosis already completed. (DR 92)

[21] For the issue of health and sickness in relationship to knowledge in Nietzsche, see Klossowski, Pierre. *Nietzsche and the Vicious Circle*. (Trans. Dan Smith. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997). Deleuze's reading of Nietzsche owes much to the work of Klossowski, who, a painter and novelist, emphasized the necessity of a willed or attained insight of the truth of the eternal return—an insight that depends on the strength of a new and uncanny kind of health.

[22] For Deleuze's reading of Leibniz as a baroque "mannerist," see his *The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque*. Trans. Tom Conley. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1993.

[23] Hence there is always something "catastrophic" about creation in Deleuze, as James Williams makes clear in "Deleuze on J.M.W. Turner: Catastrophism in Philosophy?" (*Deleuze and Philosophy: The Difference Engineer.* Keith Ansell Pearson (ed.), London: Rutledge, 1997, pp. 233-46). Williams notes that in Deleuze's work the affirmation of catastrophe is linked to a critical function, as it is in Spinoza. Affirming catastrophe reverses the idea of a judgment of god or the gods: catastrophic events must be affirmed and embraced *in order that* we do not fall into the illusion that they are punishments meted out by divine anger (see Spinoza, Baruch. *Ethics.* Ed. E. Curley, Princeton: Princeton University Press, p. 111). Catastrophe, for Deleuze, is the occasion of re-creation beyond social stratification and psychological fixation. The "ethics" of catastrophe, for Deleuze, consist in constantly testing and contesting the limits of our individual and collective ability to be flexible, to be in a dynamic transformation in response to catastrophes large and small, rather than in a stupid [*betise*] insistence upon identity and representable difference from that identity.

[24] In *A Thousand Plateaus*, Deleuze shows how musical *refrains* perform a special "territorializing" function between chaos and pre-established (oppressive or stultifying) order. See "1837: Of the Refrain." *A Thousand Plateaus*. Trans. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1987), pp.310-350.

[25] *Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation*. Trans. Dan Smith. (Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 2003), pp. 81-90.

[26] A concept from *A Thousand Plateaus.*

[27] For Joyce's use of Bruno, see Gose Jr., Elliot B. *The Transformation Process in Joyce's* Ulysses. (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1980). See also Boldereef, Frances M. *Hermes to his Son Thoth: being Joyce's Use of Giordano Bruno in Finnegan's Wake*. (Woodward: Classic Non-Fiction Library, 1968).

[28] Manuel Delanda makes this point very clear in the glossary to his *Intensive Science and Virtual Philosophy* (London: Continuum, 2002).

[29] Rene Girard accused Deleuze and his collaborator Felix Guattari of making delirium into a systematic approach to thought in his "Delirium as System." "*To Double Business Bound*" : *Essays on Literature, Mimesis and Anthropology*. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1978), pp. 84-120. In this scathing critique, Girard misses much of the subtlety of the aesthetic paradigm, but his criticisms of Deleuzian ethics is important and will be addressed in Chapter V, "Writing Power."

[30] John Rajchman, *The Deleuze Connections* (Cambridge: MIT, 2000), p. 127.

[31] This is precisely why Deleuze's philosophy cannot consist in merely the *ruin* of representation.

[32] See also Alain Badiou's "Kant's Subtractive Ontology" in *Alain Badiou: Theoretical Writings*. Ed.. and trans. Ray Brassier and Alberto Toscano. London: Continuum, 2004.

[33] Ian Buchanan clarifies this point in "Deleuze and Cultural Studies" in *South Atlantic Quarterly* 96(3) (1997), 483-97.

[34] For a fine exposition of this point see Ian Buchanan's "Deleuze and Cultural Studies."

[35] Deleuze's is a rather Peircian view of mind. See Peirce's "How to Make our Ideas Clear" in *Philosophical Writings of Peirce.* Ed. Justus Buchler. New York: Dover, 1955, pp. 23-41.

[36] Deleuze, *Empiricism and Subjectivity*, 107-108.

[37] John Rajchman, *The Deleuze Connections* (Cambridge: MIT, 2000), p.131

[38] Plato, *Republic* 510.

[40] See Foucault's famous reflection on the structure of visibility in Velazquez' painting *Las Meninhas* that opens Foucault's history of systems of representation, *The Order of Things* (New York: Random House, 1970), pp. 3-16.

[41]John Rajchman points out that although phenomenology also attempted to free art from pre-given representational forms, it still does so in the name of judgment and not in the name of experimentation. He writes,

> Deleuze thinks there remains a Kantian element in phenomenology—it as it were reinserts transcendence into the "life-world," and so retains something of the poisoned gift of transcendental philosophy; it still wants conditions of judgment rather than of experimentation. It is precisely this element of transcendence that it then calls upon the arts to show us. Phenomenology still *needs* the arts to "disclose the world, " whose conditions it then describes, a kind of Urdoxa in which the flesh of world and the body would coincide, for example. (TDC, 131)

The relation between Deleuze and phenomenology has many aspects, and is beyond the scope of my argument. However, it is as decisive for me as it is for Rajchman that, because phenomenology as traditionally conceived (and as Deleuze by and large knew it through Husserl and Merleau-Ponty) remains a quest for an appropriate basis for judgment rather than an adequate platform for experimentation, it is not yet an exercise in the creation of concepts. There are exceptions to this, especially the work of Alphonso Lingus. See for example his "Phantom Equator." Eds. Busch and Gallagher. *Merleau-Ponty, Hermeneutics, and Postmodernism*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1992, pp. 227-239. If Lingus' philosophical goal is ultimately a reflection on experiences had elsewhere, his reflections are nevertheless always geared toward a further experiment of sensation, of life.

[42] See Alain Badiou's beautiful essay, "Language, Thought, Poetry," on this point. In Trans. Brassier and Toscano. *Badiou: Theoretical Writings* (London: Continuum, 2004), pp. 233-241.

[43] In "Language, Thought, Poetry" Badiou (a sometime student of Deleuze's) writes, "What is philosophically opposed to the poem is not philosophy itself directly, but *dianoia*, the discursive thinking that connects and argues, a thinking whose paradigm is mathematical . . . what disconcerts philosophy, is not illusion and imitation [Plato's—apparent—objections to poetry as "untruths"]. Rather, it's the fact that the poem might indeed be a thought without knowledge, or

even this—a properly incalculable thought" (240). For Badiou as for Plato, poetry represents a temptation that philosophy must resist in the name of allegiance to a mathematical paradigm. Deleuze, as much as Heidegger or Derrida, has "fallen prey" to the temptation to model philosophy on poetic forms of reasoning—the thoughts of a transcendental empiricism are *forced* or "incalculable thoughts" that cannot be explained apart from intense experimentation. In my concluding chapters here I will try to justify Deleuze's blending of poetry and philosophy against Badiou's objections.

[44] I take this point to refer to the work of Jurgen Habermas and to all versions of faith—liberal, communitarian, transcendentalist—in a "communicative" rationality. The only communication that interests Deleuze, at least from a truly ethical (and at once truly "aesthetic") perspective, is strictly speaking *unconscious*. For Deleuze (as for Spinoza and Nietzsche), we may debate and pass laws about what we will tolerate from one another as conscious intention, but the true law that is operative in social formations (in inventions, or in what Foucault called regimes of seeability and sayability) is the law governing unconscious ideas and the forces of which they are the archetypes. Deleuze's ethics is, as we will see, essentially a Spinozist ethics-as-physics, with the added twist that Spinozist naturalism is supplemented by a strange or paradoxical "realism" or reversed "platonism" about certain features of experience. Deleuze takes as fully real certain features of life (signs, images, diagrams, etc.) that Spinoza would have subordinated to a temporary, imaginative detour within reason. For Deleuze these fixations carry an ontological weight they do not in Spinoza. As Julie Klein and others have shown this is a complex issue in Spinoza, and the imagination may have more weight in his thought than has been traditionally realized by Spinoza's critics. See Spinoza's *Theologico-Political Treatise*. S. Shirley, Trans. (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1998) p. 12 ff for his critique of imaginary formations, here in the context of Biblical interpretation.

[45] "Oppose repetition to the generalities of habit but also to the particularities of memory" (DR 7). What repeats is not a "past present," but a present that is also a present past. The only dimension of the past that repeats is its *virtual* dimension, which is the presence, for instance, of a past taste of the madeleine, the taste that it was, *immediately with* or adjacent to the *same present taste* (that it is). See Deleuze, *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*, for the idea of a multi-dimensional time appearing in cinema as "sheets of past, points of present" (C2 98-102).

[46] Antonin Artaud, *The Theatre and its Double*. Trans. Richards. (New York: Grove Press, 1958), p. 13.

[47] Contemplation, for Deleuze, is what happens once we have already created a concept. Communication, as well, is something that comes after the fact, and only serves, along with reflection and contemplation, as a machine for producing Universals through which philosophy dreams of dominating other disciplines, other ways of knowing. A description of "what goes on out there" is not philosophy, for Deleuze.

[48] This is why Deleuze was often asked whether he was a Platonist. As we will see in the next two chapters, Deleuze is a Platonist in the sense that he thinks that differences are real, positive multiplicities irreducible to sense experience or "actuality." But Deleuze is *not* a Platonist because the extraordinary or dramatic ideas that befall us or happen to us like a great crime or a great love are not ahistorical entities. Ideas must be traversed or incarnated or evoked, *to exist*. They must be counted, "in history," one by one or two by two. That is why Deleuze seeks to analyze the real conditions of what forces us to think, and to learn, and to keep learning, in a

process that is in principle and in fact endless. What is it that forces us to think? It is a Difference, something different every time (it repeats), a non-identical repetition, a dynamism inhabiting and
constituting a world.

[49] Nicholas of Cusa's "idiot," Dostoyevsky's idiot, the character of Job in the Bible, and Plato's Socrates are all examples of conceptual personae. Conceptual personae are constituted by the *implicit presuppositions* or *affective traits* upon which those concepts depend. When it comes to the history of philosophy, for Deleuze, the question is not, What are the objective presuppositions of such-and-such a concept (Platonic forms, Aristotelian substances, the Cartesian *cogito*, the Leibnizian monad, the Nietzschean will-to-power), but rather, What are the real conditions of the appearance of this kind of character, this character who creates a concept in response to those real conditions in which she lives? (WIP 69). This approach puts the emphasis on the "extraordinary" or even hyperbolic aspects of a philosophical system, the *singularities* and *intensities* which a philosopher's concepts include and upon which her propositions and "statements" (in the Foucaultian sense) depend for their *sense* (rather than their *truth*). Again, it is imperative to see that this is not a relativistic or subjetivistic move on Deleuze's part. If Deleuze makes concepts into "nominal" entities, this is in the name of a deeper, pre-propositional realism of force, affect, and event. What is "objective" in Deleuze is not knowledge per se but the project in whose service that knowledge stands (which is why Deleuze owes so much to empiricism). As we will see later, this affects Deleuze's semiotic theory, which as Bogue and others have pointed out does not analyze signs in terms of their placement in codes or chains, but in terms of their expression of a socially and historically constitutive force that determines, all at once, both a form and matter of content and a form and matter of expression. For a concise explanation of Deleuze's semiotics see Ronald Bogue's "Word, Image and Sound: The Non-Representational Semiotics of Gilles Deleuze. *Mimesis in Contemporary Theory: An Interdisciplinary Approach*, Volume 2: Mimesis, Semiosis, and Power, Ronald Bogue (ed.), (Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1991), pp.77-97.

[50] This is the critique of Rene Girard, as well as of Alain Badiou and Slavoj Zizek. For Zizek, see his *Organs Without Bodies: On Deleuze and Consequences* (London: Rutledge, 2004). Badiou's critique is in his monograph on Deleuze, *Deleuze: "La Clameur de l'Etre*. Paris: Hachette, 1997, and in "One, Multiple, Multiplicities" (Trans. Brassier and Toscano. *Badiou: Theoretical Writings*. London: Continuum, 2004), pp.67-80.

[51] I owe this point to Rocco Gangle (in conversation, December 2005).

[52] This formulation is deliberately casual and suggestive, aiming at a general tone or tenor of much "mainstream" or "academic" philosophical work going on in Deleuze's time and in the present, especially as that work conforms to what Deleuze will call the "Image of Thought." As I will explain in the next chapter, under this image of thought concepts should ultimately conform to a good and common sense, to a *recognizability* that for Deleuze is precisely the enemy of genuine thought.

[53] Hegel in particular is in view here, as well as Schelling, but also to some extent Husserlian phenomenology, with its idea of "infinite tasks," is viewed by Deleuze as generating concepts which are, ultimately, *reflective* and not truly generative of ideas, and part of the entire post-Kantian attempt to substitute a unified (if transcendental) I for the absence of an objective world.

[54] "Proust, for example, has the idea that every thought is an aggression, appearing under the constraint of a sign, and that we think only when we are forced and constrained to think." ("On Nietzsche and the Image of Thought," in Ed. Lapoujade, trans. Taormina. *Desert Islands and Other Texts: 1953-1974*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2004, p. 139).

[55] In the non-traditional sense Deleuze gives the term. As Bruce Baugh emphasizes, Deleuze's empiricism is not a doctrine of the essence of mind or nature or reality, nor is it the idea that the "source" of knowledge is the sensible. On the contrary, the sensible for Deleuze is not knowable but *thinkable*. This thought occurs in and as the intuition of the sensible. As Baugh puts it, "Deleuze's intuition is not governed by concepts, and yet is still rational insofar as it tries to grasp empirical actuality through determinate causal processes which constitute actualities as the singular results of singular encounters between forces, and so as determinate singularities" (Baugh, Bruce. "Deleuze and Empiricism." *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 24(1) (1993): p. 31).

[56] Deleuze variously calls these forces ideal dramas, sense-events, folds and "machinic assemblages."

[57] Deleuze writes,

> If the concept is a solution, the condition of the philosophical problem are found on the plane of immanence presupposed by the concept (to what infinite movement does it refer in the image of thought?), and the unknowns of the problem are found in the conceptual personae that it calls up (what persona, exactly?). A concept like knowledge has meaning only in relation to an image of thought to which it refers and to a conceptual persona that it needs; a different image and a different persona call for other concepts (belief, for example, and the Investigator). (WIP 81)

[58] Deleuze puts art, science, and philosophy on an equal plane. And art as much as science and philosophy has often fallen prey to the strictures of what he will call the "image of thought." For my purposes, art is a clearer paradigm, even though Deleuze is as inspired by differential calculus, molecular biology, plate tectonics, and certain concepts from physics (strange attractors, phase space, etc.) as he is by art. But as I read it, the first and final term of endearment to Deleuze is an aesthetic one, and he is taken by science where it seems to resonate with what he sees in certain forms of "modern" (and baroque) artistic practice.

[59] See *What Is Philosophy*, pp. 205-206. For Deleuze, science only fails to create concepts when it submits is program to "opinion," which manifests in science as the drive to reduce chaos to "the elementary" from which "composites" are formed. What science truly seeks are phase states or successions of filters or "attractors" which are not "initial conditions" but which determine which initial conditions will be (probabilistically) selected. Manuel Delanda has explained this point in *Intensive Science and Virtual Philosophy*.

[60] Be that as it may, Deleuze's conception of the superiority of problems to solutions, of singularities to the trajectories they determine, and his interpretation of forces points to a different conception of science, one that breaks with the dogmatic image of thought, as Manuel Delanda has elegantly shown in *Intensive Science and Virtual Philosophy*.

[61] See *A Thousand Plateaus* for a description of the miner/metallurgist as an ambulant or itinerant model of a thinker "at the borders" (of sedentary and nomadic identities).

[62] According to Deleuze, immanence carries concepts "back to the sea" (WIP 208).

[63] In a chapter which his preface to the English edition (1994) singles out as being "the most necessary and the most concrete, and which serves to introduce subsequent books up to and including the research undertaken with Guattari" (DR xvii),

[64] There is currently a debate in the literature about whether Deleuze and Hegel's positions are as different as Deleuze makes them out to be.

[65] There are multiple refs to Castaneda in *A Thousand Plateaus*, and Deleuze explicitly invokes the figure of the *sorcerer* as a model for thought not only in that text but also in his invocation, in *The Logic of Sense*, of a figure that would combine the traits of a Zen master with that of stoic humor and the playfulness of Carroll's Alice.

[66] In "The Method of Dramatization" (DI 105), Noël Mouloud says that he considers mathematical concepts to be shattering to intuition, but this is not what Deleuze means by being forced to think. Simply moving beyond empirical intuition toward mathematical truth is not enough, because there is still a coherent order (even if we cannot "image" it without computer modeling) that revolves around a self-identical object (represented by the fixed variables of an equation). For Deleuze we are forced to think because things are not identical with themselves but are simulacra, becomings, virtual-actual complexes, multiplicities that remain stranger than the strangest mathematics—they are those "strange attractors" which determine which initial conditions will tend to be selected in a given field.

[67] Deleuze would deny that there could be anything "natural" about natural law, at least in the sense that the moral law might be grounded in anything consistent in "life" other than misleading generalities. Deleuze is definitely on the side of Kierkegaard's idea that the right or good is something ultimately uncanny and unrecognizable.

[68] Or a divine power, for Kierkegaard. Deleuze wonders whether Kierkegaard's dismissal of the "aesthetic" actually dismisses the great repetition of a work of art. Deleuze is also suspicious of Kierkegaard's placement of authentic repetition in an "alliance between God and a self rediscovered," (DR 11), which is a spiritual movement. Slavoj Zizek has pointed out, however, that when one passes from the ethical to the religious, in Kierkegaard, this movement takes the form of an "aesthetic" choice. Perhaps this would be the way in which, for Kierkegaard, the rediscovered self is itself a great work of art (and not a recollected soul).

[69] See Nathan Widder's excellent explanation in "The rights of simulacra: Deleuze and the univocity of being" in *Continental Philosophy Review* (Kluwer, 2001) 34: 437-453.

[70] Although, Deleuze admits, it may ultimately be possible to reconcile the univocity he wishes to attribute to being with a certain refined notion of analogy (see DR 38).

[71] Leibniz came close to conceiving of a series of differences such as Deleuze conceives it, but falls short by making the monads harmonize (even if the harmony is known only by God) (DR 47). Hegel seems to be thinking through difference in his dialectic of Spirit which is constituted

by a series of contradictions, but for Deleuze the differences which result in contradiction are epiphenomena: conflict is an effect of deeper, positive forces which persist in their difference prior to any negativity (DR 46). Both Leibnizian and Hegelian "infinite representations" of the world remain beholden to an orienting point (the world or the self). It was Nietzsche, for Deleuze, who most fully conceived of an ungrounded world of differences that, as the subject of a certain kind of *affirmation*, persists beneath our conscious "conflicts." Deleuze interprets Nietzsche's notion of a "will to power" as a cosmic force that, as affirmation, selects from the eternal recurrence of the Same those forces which are truly differential, which truly make difference—which are truly alive. And even more than Nietzsche it is the art of Mallarme, Joyce, Proust, Carroll, Goddard, Resnais, and Klee that truly is able to make being univocal, make things resound with one another without subordinating them to a synthetic or pregiven identity.

[72] *Proust et les Signes* first appeared in French in 1964.

[73]The contrast here is with Hegelianism. If the *Phenomenology* is a reflection "on" the world's forces (history as the ruse of reason), it is not yet, for Deleuze, a repetition *of* the world, or of the infinitesimally small, sub-representational ideas that are truly at work in the world. If what truly moves Spirit are secret, subterranean pressures that cannot be represented, but only *repeated*, then Hegel's "mediation," which occurs only through "large" contradictions (instead of small differences), is not truly that which "forces" thought. The *Phenomenology* remains an after-thought. For the forces of difference to come to mind, Deleuze argues, we had to await Kierkegaard and Nietzsche. They were the ones who introduced a truly radical *theatre* of ideas into philosophy. "They do not reflect on theatre in the Hegelian manner," Deleuze writes, in *Difference and Repetition*, "neither do they set up a philosophical theatre. They invent an incredible equivalent of the theatre in philosophy" (DR 8).

In what does this theatre consist? More even than being a theatre "without representation," (although it is certainly that) it is a theatre of *immediate encounters* between mind and the movements of material forces. Like the theatre of Antonin Artaud, which was meant to assault the sensibilities of his audience. Deleuze believed the Kierkegaardian-Nietzschean theatre should be a model for how to create a theatre not so much of but *in* philosophical texts. He writes,

> . . . it is a question of producing within the work a movement capable of affecting the mind outside of all representation; it is a substituting direct signs for mediate representations; of inventing vibrations, rotations, whirlings, gravitations, dances, or leaps which directly touch the mind. (DR 8)

The theatres Nietzsche and Kierkegaard introduce, through their disguises, pseudonyms, animals, masks, and dances, a response to and a recreation of powerful signs of life, signs that force thought and that cannot be thought apart from *repetition*: disguise, displacement, diversion, *divertissement*. For Deleuze this is how we contact (if not communicate with) forces that go directly from *physis* to *psyche*, without mediation in concepts (DR 8).

[74] The French word for experience, *experiment*, also contains the sense of the English "experiment."

[75] Where Deleuze departs from Spinoza is that for Deleuze, the order of ideas and the order of things *really* interact (which entails that thought and extension are *really* distinct). For Deleuze, the order and connection of both body and mind can be attributed to a "quasi-causal operator" that transverses thought and extension in reverse, "counter-actualizing" all events or forcing them

to resonate in ways which would at first appear, on a Spinozistic view, to be the errors of the imagination (nonsense). For Deleuze, however, this uncanny source of distributions of sense and nonsense is ultimately the prerogative of a creativity or an artfulness that is the true co-generator of thought and being. For Deleuze the paradox is that this "free" counter-actualization is ontologically prior to both the actual and virtual regimes of sense and nonsense (which are both, in their own ways, historically or efficiently *determined*). Perhaps this is the insight to which Spinoza's famous third order of knowledge attains, where events are finally seen "sub specie aeternitatis."

[76] Is this a subjective or an objective affair (to put it in somewhat dated language)? Both. It is as if those who are sensitive to the signs of a given world or territory or *patrie* come into existence with that world itself—it is as if the reality of a world were something paradoxically producing both an objectivity and subjectivity proper to it. The model here is the Leibnizian monad, but without any prearranged harmony between monads guaranteed by God—only a resonance which yields "epiphanies" of forces beyond our ken. The "harmony" of perspectives is something external to every conceivable "whole," be it History, Man, God or *Geist*. It arises from a paradoxical element or "dark precursor" that belongs to no one series but insists at and as the resonance of any two discontinuous lines, or worlds, constantly displaced with relation to itself and constantly disguised in the series to which it gives rise.

[77] Although Slavoj Zizek, perhaps, might disagree, insofar as the sublimity of the Kantian *Ding an sich* can be said to correspond to the "real" of psychoanalytic experience.

[78] This is why Platonic ideas rather than Aristotelian generic concepts excite Deleuze, even if Aristotle's notions seem to originate in the material world in a way closer to Deleuze's idea that the virtual emerges from the actual. For Plato's ideas, at least as Plato begins to admit in his later works, only encompass or unify to the extent that they violently carve up or divide experience. Platonic ideas are therefore of more use to artists than Aristotelian genera, again despite the fact that Aristotle's *Poetics* attributes a much more sophisticated type of knowledge to the poet than does Plato's *Ion* or *Republic*. It is because Plato is in *competition* with artists that he interests Deleuze, as he haunted Nietzsche, because Plato is trying to outdo them, whereas Aristotle is merely reflecting on the "nature" of art understood from the point of view of his concepts (discerning what is potential and actual, discerning how potentials are actualized in art). See ATP, where the plane of consistency has a "platonic" status in relation to that of the plane of organization or development. In the end, for Deleuze, Aristotelian ideas of evolution, genesis, and so on, are all subscript to the order of representation. Platonic forms ineffably or *magically* appear in materials that have been specially prepared to receive them, as the theurgist Neo-Platonists realized. Plato is not really dualist but triplist—there must be a screen prepared for matter to receive its form.

[79] Deleuze's image of Socrates is controversial relative to more recent scholarship by Vlastos, Nehamas, Brogan and others.

[80] In "The Image of Thought" chapter of *Proust and Signs*.

[81] Again, Deleuze's view of Socrates is a product of the scholarship of his time. Vlastos, Nehemas, Foucault and others have shown that Socrates' irony may be more complex than Deleuze realizes: Socrates may know in advance that the views of others are incorrect, but he

may not yet know if his own views are sound, healthy, etc., and may be truly "encountering" himself, if not others.

[82] Deleuze uses the Neo-Platonist notion of *explicatio* here to both stay with the Platonist register but also to further illuminate how the "eternity" in which essences reside is not a static extension of limitless existence but "the complicated state of time itself." The Word was the supreme example of this unity of contradictories, this unstable opposition in essences (which Deleuze says is the Heraclitean animal still untamed at the heart of Plato's thought, the source of the simulacral). Deleuze's own notion of expression owes much to the complicatio-explicatio pairing. Deleuze's affinity with Bruno is in part an affinity with the idea of an infinite world or worlds that are held together in a coexistence of contraries that are not dialectically related to one another. Hence the absence of a "logos" for the all—it can only come to us hieroglyphically, in signs, because that is its nature. This is where Deleuze moves beyond that German Idealism which still tries to make a logos (Schelling) even of the aporetic mythos.

[83] Heidegger had a way of criticizing the history of metaphysics that is similar to the approach used by Deleuze. For Heidegger the prejudices of modern scientism and those of platonism are at one . . . For Deleuze also, because of the energy Plato exerts to eliminate not difference but *certain kinds* of difference or a certain *image* of difference from the field of thought. The sophist is auto-disqualified by being a dissembler, by willfully attempting to be what s/he is not. So also the false statesman. What the philosopher sees or knows is not so much the brilliance of the Ideas per se but the differential lineage or heritage that can properly manifest itself—he knows which copies of the idea are idols and which are icons. The dialectic can only bring us to the point at which Socrates and the sophist appear identical in all respects except the one the philosopher can recognize.

[84] This is why Deleuze's platonism is allied to that of the Iamblichan, Ficinian, and ultimately Nolan forms of theurgic magic. In this neoplatonic tradition, ideas are understood magically or alchemically as being seeds and sources of possible material transformations. For Iamblichus, and for Ficino and Bruno, the destiny of the material world is not so much to be purified or distilled by the work of the ideas as it is the work of the ideas to incarnate themselves in the depths of material configurations. Philosophy is only *initially* dialectical purification, it is only *initially* an attempt to eliminate confusion or illusion. Transcendental philosophy stops at this level, or pushes this level of mental activity into the deepest recesses of being. Deleuze's move past transcendental philosophy is to bracket its "transcendentality" as being superficial (we might say, overly "cognitive").

[85] Cf. Umberto Eco's skepticism about what Joyce has to "give" us, claiming that Joyce's relationship to his own "chaosmos" is tinged with the irony of one who is fascinated by a form but unattached to its content: "materials whose form captivates him but whose content does not solicit his belief" (*The Aesthetics of Chaosmos: The Middle Ages of James Joyce*. Trans. Ellen Esrock. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989. p. 84).

[86]See Dan Smith's article in *Between Deleuze and Derrida* (Patton and Protevi, 2003), pp. 62-63.

[87] in the Derridean sense that nothing can ever fully be just, beautiful, a gift, etc. (see Derrida's *Given Time I*).

[88] Deleuze does not speak to that intuition many people have that something is tragically missing from the world, something (i.e., God) that would if present change everything, make everything better, everything whole. This is part of why Deleuze has been so slowly received by continental philosophy in America which has traditionally been the bastion of those philosophers who require the idea of a tragic absence to begin thinking, at all.

[90] Klossowski's list of attributes of the simulacral include, according to Foucault, "a vain image (as opposed to the reality), a representation of something (in which this thing designates and manifests itself, but withdraws and in a sense conceals itself), a falsehood that causes one to take one sign for another, a sign of the presence of a deity (and the converse possibility of taking this sign for its opposite, the simultaneous coming of the Same and the Other (originally, to simulate meant to come together)" ("Prose of Acteon" in Faubian, 127).

[91] This is where it becomes possible to see where Deleuze departs from Spinoza. For Deleuze the attributes of substance are real, if fictive. They are "quasi-causes."

[92] Even if this creativity is a perverse play or masochistic ritual. See Deleuze's *Masochism: Coldness and Cruelty*. Trans. Jean McNeil. New York: Zone Books, 1989.

[93] Deleuze and Guattari wonder if it is terrorizing for the schizo only *because* the schizo is already institutionalized, already *judged* (AO 88). What if the flow were not interrupted? What if we only go too far on the body without organs because we get scared by the specter of mommy and daddy?

[94] Derrida's is obviously a very different way of overturning Platonism, involving the tracing of simulacral "invasions" of the idea, or the "haunting" of language by "the thing itself" (what Deleuze calls partial objects or objects=x). As Derrida puts it,

> This state of being haunted, which keeps the city from returning to nature, is perhaps the general mode of the presence or absence of the thing itself in pure language. The pure language that would be housed in pure literature, the object of pure literary criticism. Thus it is in no way paradoxical that the structuralist consciousness is catastrophic consciousness, simultaneously destroyed and destructive, *destructuring*, as is all consciousness, or at least the moment of decadence, which is the period proper to all movement of consciousness. ("FS" in WD 6)

"Structuralism" names for Derrida the moment at which we realized we have lost what it is a pure language, a pure literary language, *would* offer us *if we did not imagine* that there was something outside of that language. In other words, structuralism (the reduction of the imaginary to the symbolic) is the "archive fever" of a dispossessed romanticism. It is protest or critique *par excellence*. Its "synchronicity" is the *ressentiment* of those who have no more events, no more genetic powers at their disposal. But structuralism only manifests or brings to clarification (if not finality) the tragedy of western reason, besotted by the loss of the thing in language, the loss whose written symptom is supplemented by the quest for immediacy in the voice. Deleuze and Guattari interrupt the Derridean meditation on this tragic scene. They do this in a gesture that Derrida might have suspected to be a new romanticism: they insist on a primitive sign that is not significative, that is not subject to the laws of *signifiance* (the "signifyingness" that the despotic or "transcendental signifier" gives to all the signs.)

[95] Cf. ATP 237 on the sorcerer and becomings as super-mythic, irreducible tales not reducible to mythical formulas and borderings.

[96] In *A Thousand Plateau's* "1933: Micropolitics and Segmentarity," Deleuze and Guattari argue that despite the fact that binary oppositions are very strong in primitive societies, these binaries are produced from multiple centers of power and not from a single despotic center whose effects are everywhere the same. Only in modern societies, they argue, are such dualisms as man/woman, ruler/ruled elevated to the level of a self-sufficient organization (ATP 210).

[97] Cf. Bergson on magical language, here. *Two Sources of Morality and Religion*.

[98] See John Milbank's essay in "On Complex Space" in *The Word Made Strange* (London: Blackwell, 1997).

[99] If in certain practices forces are already significant, and being is already writing, then why do we have to chose, as Derrida insists we must, between writing and dance (between force and signification)? According to Derrida, even Nietzsche despairs of being able to write as a dancer:

> Nietzsche recommends a dance of the pen in vain: ' . . .need I add that one must also be able to dance with the pen—that one must learn how to write?' . . . but Nietzsche was certain that the writer would never be upright; that writing is first and foremost something over which one bends. Better still when letters are no longer figures of fire in the heavens" (WD 29).

But there is an alternative Derrida does not see. This is the sorcerer, who draws figures of fire not in the heavens but on the earth. On what Deleuze calls the plane of immanence.

To his credit, in a passage of writing that is extremely Deleuzian, Derrida sees that even his own notion of history as the history of metaphysics (the unstable attempt to prioritize being over writing in writing) leaves open the option of either a nostalgic "Rousseauistic" desire for a state of nature before writing or a joyous, "Nietzschean" affirmative stance toward the play of chance. If the emergence of structuralism in the human sciences was caused by a loss of meaning, by a crisis in meaning, then Derrida is with Deleuze in agreeing that this loss is not something that happened recently, but is something (something like Foucault's death of Man) that we are finally waking up to.

However, what forces the necessity of interpretation, or of these two interpretations of interpretation—what Derrida calls *difference*—while yet to be fully understood is still viewed as a meta-historical force that encloses us within a history that disables the possibility of choosing between nostalgia and affirmation. This is Derrida at his most honest: he cannot write from without writing, and writing is always subject to the slippage between writing and being, the slippage which prevents writing from being dancing, which prevents signification from being force, which prevents signs from *being* what they say.

[100] See Felix Guattari, *The Anti-Oedipus Papers* (Trans. Kalina Gottman. New York: Semiotext(e), 2006), pp. 201-279.

[101] Rene Grirard, "Delirium as System," in *To Double Business Bound: Essays on Literature, Mimesis, and Anthropology* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1978), pp.84-119.

[102] As if like new-ager's in 1980's Hollywood we thought we could do a little yoga and usher in world peace. Girard perhaps inaugurated this misread.

[103] "The BwO is not "before" the organism; it is adjacent to it and is continually in the process of constructing itself. It is tied to childhood, not in the sense that the adult regresses to the child and the child to the Mother, but in the sense that the child, like the Dogon twin who takes a piece of the placenta with him, tears from the organic form of the Mother an intense and destratified matter that on the contrary constitutes his perpetual break with the past, his or her present experience, experimentation . . . it is the strict contemporaneousness of the adult and the child, their map of comparative densities and intensities, and all of the variations on that map" (ATP164). Deleuze and Guattari only *seem* to narrate this in "earth goddess cult" terms, as if our True Origin were in the body of a Mother Earth whose things (original, positive, non-parsed fetishism of desire) we are organically and symbiotically in communion with. Zizek and Badiou both mistake Deleuze for thinking in this way about the One. But Deleuze insists that things begin in the middle so it is never a matter of moving backwards to the origin but of inventing right *now*.

[104] See especially ATP 163-164 for the difficulties of the" three-body problem"—making yourself susceptible of sorcery, making yourself a body without organs, using your egg, is extremely difficult process of trial and error. "How can we fabricate a BwO for ourselves without its being the cancerous BwO of a fascist inside us, or the empty BwO of a drug addict, paranoiac, or hypochondriac? How can we tell the three bodies apart? . . . Even if Artaud did not succeed for himself, it is certain that through him something has succeeded for us all" (ATP 161-64).

[105] Part of the current retreat to Kantianism in some "continentalist" circles (which is possibly the most reactionary force modernity has ever seen) is an attempt to restore a non-materialist criteria by which one of the doubles could be eliminated as an illusion or an hallucination, or even as "radically evil." Not only is this tendency gnostic, it is practically impossible under the present circumstances. George Bush is as artful as ever Warhol was. Prior to the effects of their enterprises, there is no criteria to distinguish between the fascist and the magic flute. Welcome to pragmatism, welcome to the experiment, welcome to the desert of the real.

[106] John Milbank has been right to notice that all philosophies of immanence (from Plato to Spinoza to Heidegger to Deleuze) culminate in dualisms of this kind. In my view, whether this is a drawback of these philosophies depends upon whether the specific dualities produced in any case has the potential to facilitate acts of healing and experiments of creation.

[107] Cf. Deleuze's work on Nietzsche's eternal return and its selective power, here.

[108] In James Wetzel's understanding of the term as he articulates it in "Splendid Vices" in the *Journal of Religious Ethics*. (London: Blackwell. 32:2), pp. 271-300.

[109] Probably without some theory of providence by which freedom and determinism is mitigated in a mythico-theological drama, it is simply not an answerable question, and is probably a poorly posed problem, already "viewing" or "reflecting upon" reality from an unreal and arbitrary standpoint. One of the most sophisticated versions of such an ideal drama is put forth by the Radical Orthodoxy school of theology. Their metanarrative depends on the thesis that thought (meaning, sense, teleology) is unintelligible apart from liturgical formations and praxis. Without

this claim theology, too, falls into a Kantian transcendentalism that leaves a rupture between form and content, finite and infinite, concept and intuition.

[110] This is what Pico della Mirandola already saw and embraced in the Renaissance because he saw the plurality of world religions and wisdoms as already announcing our homelesness "by right" on earth.

[111]Manuel Delanda, *Intensive Science and Virtual Philosophy* (London: Continuum, 2002).

[112] Ibid., p. 135.

[113] However, holey space is not a utopian space: there are no smiths without imperial prospectors who have gone before and imperial merchants which come after the work (ATP 415).

[114] Unlike Levinas, Deleuze is not interested in the fantasy of a pure transcendent other. He is intrigued by the smith *as* another, an (internally doubled) double.

[115] Eliot Ross Albert has exhaustively covered the topic of the great distance between Deleuze's vitalism and any form of "autopoetic" thinking in his dissertation, *Towards a Schizogenealogy of Heretical Materialism: Between Bruno and Spinoza, Nietzsche, Deleuze and other Philosophical Recluses* (University of Warwick Dissertation, 1999), Ch. II.

[116] But also ritual, therapeutic, even magical.

[117] The Romantics thought of the Genius as in some sense the mouthpiece of the Object or the Thing desired by the People. Rock stars are often thought of in this way. Deleuze's "minor" epistemology might seem like an epistemology of genius or inspiration, or at least of intuition (Badiou reads him as an intuitionist). And Deleuze does speak of artists like Proust, Melville, Kleist, minor scientists like Archimedes, Desargues, Perronet, and "minor" philosophers like Nietzsche, Foucault, Chatelet, and Democritus as being "inspired." But what differs Deleuze's epistemology from that of the Romantics is that the "special connections" these figures entertain are not enjoyed in the name of a synthesizing or "tragic" vision. They do not speak for the Whole, although they do in some sense speak of the All of "our" experience. Again, what is distinctive is the different objects to which these subjects become beholden, the Difference constituted by a peculiar perspective into which an artist, scientist, or philosopher is pulled or toward which s/he is carried by the materials themselves.

[118] Then a second thing that distinguishes an animal is that it also has a territory (Deleuze indicates that with Guattari, he developed a nearly philosophical concept about territory). Constituting a territory is nearly the birth of art: in making a territory, it is not merely a matter of defecatory and urinary markings, but also a series of postures (standing/sitting for an animal), a series of colors (that an animal takes on), a song [un chant]. These are the three determinants of art: colors, lines, song --, says Deleuze, art in its pure state." Paraphrase of interview with Claire Parnet; trans. Stivale. (http://www.langlab.wayne.edu/CStivale/D-G/ABC1.html#anchor540856)

[119] ATP 240.

[120] Cf. Bogue, "Natura Musicans: Territory and the Refrain," in *Deleuze on Music, Painting, and the Arts*.

[121] The rule of artful becoming is to be always present, accompanying, ambulating rather than identifying, imitating, or representing. How is this possible? By forcing what we *can* perceive and experience to speed up, slow down, be cut up, compacted, put alongside things it doesn't belong next to. Montage, cinema. But also theatre, not only Artaud's theatre of cruelty but also the theater of Le Coq which Artaud inspired. In the Le Coq method, character is built from the outside in, from gesture, and above all from the "neutral mask": an impersonal, indiscernible, nearly imperceptible double of a face that is put on and must be animated by the body of the actor. Seeing an actor in a neutral mask forces us to wait much longer than normal for the revelation of psychological states (fear, joy, etc.) because the entire body must work through it or distill it in a time much longer than the actual "consciousness" of the emotion. At the same time what the actor is doing (running, jumping, hitting, pointing) happens much faster than it would if we could slow it down through the face-machine, through reference to the "personality" from which we could imagine the action derived. Le Coq's methods make linguistic self-consciousness subordinate to massive or microbial affects which continually provoke and interrupt the superficial continuity of intentional activity—hence his emphasis on clowning and its almost unbearable witness to the real. See Lecoq's *Lettre a mes eleves* (Paris: Ecole Jacques Lecoq, 1995).

[122] Psychoanalysis reduced artistic becoming-everything and -everybody to a narcissism gone wild. But it has missed the boat, missed the true plane, the true surface. "They see the animal as a representative of drives, or a representation of the parents. They do not see the reality of a becoming-animal, that it is affect in itself, the drive in person, and represents nothing. There exist no other drives than the assemblages themselves" (ATP 259). In Peter Schaffer's *Equus*, the young man Allen who has put out the eyes of five horses is cured by a psychoanalyst of the religious mania which drove him to worship horses and to fear their witness to his "infidelity" to them when he nearly succumbs to the seduction of his girlfriend in their stable. In a deeply moving speech at the play's end, the analyst effectively condemns the value of his own ability to cure or work through the trauma with the boy, because now that it has been narrated and reduced to meaning, or interpreted, the *passion*—the line of flight—connecting the boy's body to Equus (his god/horse) is effectively destroyed. He re-enters normalcy at the cost of his desire, his passion.

Perhaps Lacan (and certainly Zizek) would revel in this "traversal of the fantasy," since for them the boy-horse-god assemblage, with its absolute tactility and nonverbal or nonsensical sense (chinkle chankle) is wholly imaginary and simply compensates for (is the mirror image of) the excessively verbal, hysterical father. The real victory on the Lacanian view would be in the fact that the boy has realized the vulnerability of his father and is now ready to give up his idol of an Absolute Good Power opposed to the Absolute Evil Power of his father. But the problem here is that it is the horse who pays. It is the earth who pays, not just the literal material world, but our magical connection with it, the singularity of the boy-horse-god connection, as such. And psychoanalysis might say yes, indeed, we must all give up our Jungian alchemical fantasy of a spiritual matter or mother as the true seat of desire. However, this (imagined) solution is deeply problematic, from a Deleuzian perspective. It says nothing of the earth.

[123] Although deconstruction can be something like a prelude to conceptual creation. There does not have to be an either-or relation between creation and deconstruction. Derrida seems to have well understood that.

[124] Deleuze locates Bacon's gesture at the third position in his four-part schema of sign-creation. As Deleuze analyzes it in *A Thousand Plateaus*, signs pass through at least four moments (which are not necessarily distinct): generative, transformational, diagrammatic, and machinc.

[125] This is in keeping with the theory of ideas which are superior to concepts.

[126] As in Frank Herbert's *Dune* chronicles, which pose all the problems of capitalism, politics, and religion on the plane of immanence of a cosmic desert and the plane of consistency of addiction to the spice mélange.

[127] *The Deleuze Connections* (Cambridge: MIT, 2000), p. 75.

[128]Jean Baudrillard. *The Spirit of Terrorism* (London: Verso, 2002), p. 20

[129]*Ibid*., pp. 11-12.

[130] *Ibid.*, p. 15

[131] Timothy Brennan, *Wars of Position* (New York: Columbia, 2006).

[132] Agamben, after Derrida, thinks of the marginalized in "messianic" terms, in terms of a passive potentiality that cannot be dialectically exploited. See *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998).

[133] It seems the only non-alternative non-position Brennan can imagine for those against whom he complains is an "obviously failed" eurocommunism. Given that liberal democracy is the political game of the day, Brennan may have a point that the left should marshal a narrative that is more compelling than the story of ostracized or abject subjetivities, or at least one that more explicitly attempts to bring "subaltern" aspects of subjectivity under the purview of legal and legislative action. Martha Nussbaum's recent book in a way attempts to do this when she augments the Rawlsian/liberal notion of justice by pointing out its failure to include non-human animals, the disabled, and migrants in its concept of who can be recognized as a bearer of rights.

[134]See Alain Badiou, *Being and Event* (London: Continuum, 2005), p. 504.

[135] In the closing pages of *Logique des Mondes* (Paris: Seuil, 2006).

[136]In Ray Brassier and Alberto Toscano, eds. and trans., *Theoretical Writings* (London: Continuum, 2004), pp. 67-80.

[137] Zizek has similar praise for the notion that events that are not emergent from material processes but are static, intransitive, and quasi-causal . . . a nonsense inherent to sense that gives body to the incompleteness of all causal chains. See *Organs without Bodies* (London: Rutledge, 2004), p. 28.

[138] See "One, Multiple, Multiplicity," in *Theoretical Writings* (London: Continuum, 2004), p. 70, where Badiou claims that Deleuze lags behind the development of mathematics, and that his notion of multiplicity is impoverished by comparison with that of the Multiple which is only available through Badiou's notion of a wholly "subtractive" view of events.

[139] The real crux of Badiou's critique seems to be that Deleuze fails to distinguish parts and elements (*ibid*., 76), which set theory does. This is a distinction between elementary belonging and partative inclusion. Badiou thinks the whole question of what a universal singularity is, is in the relation between these two ways of "being-in."

[140] Zizek's rehabilitation of Hegel's "concrete universal" as the deficiency of materiality plus its "undead" fiction of hideous eternity is very close to Deleuze's notion. See especially his *Tarrying With the Negative* (Raleigh: Duke, 1993).

[141] Because Badiou takes the quest of his own philosophy to be an attempt to instruct the times about what it may yet be able to do, I find it highly limiting that he allows only mathematically-minded souls to intuit when and where truth has taken hold of us. Why, in our times, mathematics, rather than molecular biology, or particle physics, or film, or music? William S. Burroughs as much as Deleuze thought that biological experimentation was the key to showing our times what it would be capable of, and Burroughs's question was whether we could become capable of loving something that we alone can take responsibility for creating.

Deleuze seems a much more adroit reader of the power of our times precisely because, unlike Badiou, Deleuze does not take the success of global capitalism to be a case of massive self-deception, as Badiou and even Zizek seem to think it is. Deleuze realizes that the genius of capital times, which is surely an evil genius, consists in how we have abandoned the illusion of the big other, and submitted ourselves to the reality of our drives, or the "plague of fantasies," as Zizek puts it. The only way out of our current state is through it, for Deleuze.

[142] Badiou claims he is going for something like this in reading truth as an excess of any *actual* multiplicity (which makes it a "multiplicity" in the technical sense and not merely a collection or coagulation of parts). However, Badiou claims not to need to category of the virtual in order to explain "undecidability" or what Deleuze calls the "ambulatory" or "mobile" aspect of multiplicity. As Badiou puts it,

> . . . there is no need to look to the virtual for the principle of indeterminacy or undecidability that affects every actualization. Every multiple is indeed *actually* haunted by an excess of power that nothing can give shape to, except for an always aleatory decision which is only given through its effects. (TR 77)

What Badiou denies here is any importance to the "shape" in which the aleatory appears (its slogan, its emblem, its declarative form).

[143] Remarkably, this formula fits the pattern of what the theurgic Neo-Platonists claimed about the ability of certain material formations (those with the correct geometry) to invoke the One by activating the "ones" latent in the material world. This was the view of Iamblichus, as Gregory Shaw explains it in *Theurgy and the Soul: the Neo-Platonism of Iamblichus* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press), p. 162. Pre-Kantian sources such as Neo-Platonism are not acknowledged by Badiou and Zizek, but in his early work Deleuze welcomes the insights of certain Neo-Platonists, especially Cusa and Bruno, on the nature of *complicatio*.

[144] Despite the shift over time in Deleuze's discursive strategy, this basic "structuralism" of Deleuze's approach never really goes away. Rather, it takes on a less and less "binary" mode of explication—signs, Deleuze comes to think after his encounter with Guattari, are better though to

as coming in regimes and not in series. But his later concepts of time images in cinema, Leibnizian "folds" in being, of diagrams in painting, and machinic phylum's in various matters of expression (linking tools and weapons, or steppes and deserts, or animal behavior and musical sounds) all maintain the theme of the necessity of Figures or "partial objects" that, while seemingly external to the nature or being of things, are the actual image of their (virtual) inability to maintain homogeneous consistency (i.e. to attain to the status of an "All" or a completed "Whole").

[145] For this see Badiou's "Truth: Forcing and the Unnamable" in *Theoretical Writings*, pp. 119-134.

[146] As Zizek rather cheekily puts it, this makes truth resemble something like the Levinasian absolute other, before which I can only have a kind of abject relationship of fealty.

[147] At a conference of the European Graduate School in Saas-Fee, at which I happened to be present, along with Zizek (August, 2002).

[148]In *Le Siecle* (Paris: Seuil, 2005), ch.5 "Passion du reel et montage du semblant."

[149] As Deleuze and Guattari put it,

> [Reich] denounced, in the final resignation of Freudianism, a fear of life, a resurgence of the ascetic ideal, a cultural broth of bad consciousness. Better to depart in search of the Orgone, he said to himself, in search of the vital and cosmic element of desire, than to continue being a psychoanalyst under those conditions . . . Reich was the first to attempt to make the analytic machine and the revolutionary machine function together. In the end, he only had his own desiring-machines, his paranoiac, miraculous, and celibate boxes, with metallic inner walls lined with cotton and wool. (AO , 119).

[150] *Le seminaire, livre XVII: L'envers de la psychanalyse* (Paris: Seuil, 1991) p. 159.

[151] Contrary to the liberal dream of ideals that exist apart from our contingent failures to realize them, for Zizek ideas like equality or justice never exist apart from a concrete situation that produces a "phantom" opposition between equality and inequality, a debate that cannot be in principle resolved because the debate itself is only an effect of another antagonism that cannot be disputed. This is why Zizek as a Marxist is so attracted to the Lacanian distinction between the Symbolic and the Real. The real just *is* the deadlock between, say, equality and inequality under the conditions of, say, global capitalism. The way that the deadlock is symbolized is not an opportunity to solve the problem, but *is* already the problem itself. The real and the symbolic are related in something like a moebius strip, where the right side of one is the reverse side of the other, but in actuality they are the same surface, the same place. However, our epistemic situation is always one of a "parallax" (as he puts it in his latest book): we can only experience the real in the place where it is symbolized, and we can only have symbolic knowledge of the real in oppositions that move us away from the real itself.

[152] Leaving aside the question, for the moment, of whether the 3rd *Critique* changes things for Kantianism.

[153] Justinian actually assigned Iamblichus the task of reviving authentic paganism.

[154] Pico della Mirandola, "Oration on the Dignity of Man," 26-29.

[155] Frances Yates, *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), p.123.

[156]In S.A. Farmer, *Syncretism in the West: Pico's 900 Theses (1486)* (Tempe: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1998).

[157] Pico della Mirandola, *On the Dignity of Man and Other Works* (Ed. Charles Glen Wallis. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1965), p.26

[158] *Ibid*., p.28

[159] See Hans Blumenberg, *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age* Trans. Robert M. Wallace. (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1983), for the importance for modern culture of the shift from Cusa to Bruno.

[160] Albert's Warwick dissertation is entitled "Toward a Schizogenealogy of Materialism: Deleuze and Bruno, Spinoza, Nietzsche."

[161] See Nuccio Ordine, *Le Seuil de l'ombre: litterature, philosophie, et peinture chez Giordano Bruno* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2003), pp. 309 ff.

[162] "Inadequate" should not be thought of as "incomplete" or "finite," and should be translated into Deleuzian terms. Each figure embodies a *distance* proper difference in itself, a bounded but unlimited intensive quantity proper to each multiplicity of sense.

[163] Hallyn, *The Poetic Structure of the World: Copernicus and Kepler* (Trans. Donald M. Leslie. New York: Zone Books, 1990) p. 155.

[164] Fernand Hallyn, *The Poetic Structure of the World: Copernicus and Kepler* (Trans. Donald M. Leslie. New York: Zone Books, 1990), p.160.

[165]Cornelius Agrippa, *De Occulta Philosophia*, I, 38 ed. Cit., p. 53 in Frances Yates, *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition.*

[166]*Ibid*., l, 50, ed. Cit., pp. 230-1 in Frances Yates, *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition*.

[167] See Ordine, *Seuil de l'ombre*. *Literature, philosophie et peinture chez Giordano Bruno*. Trans. Luc Hersant. (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2003).

[168] See Frances Yates, *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition.*

[169] See Shaw, *Theurgy and the Soul*: *the Neo-Platonism of Iamblichus*.
[170]Michel Foucalt, *The Order of Things*. *An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (New York: Random House, 1970), p.40

[171] Even though it is very easy to read much of Deleuze's work in this way.

[172] The reason we can think of a Deleuzian "Renaissance" is thanks to the semiotics of Peirce and the linguistics of Hjemslev, and generally to the "poststructuralist" movement, which complicated the relationship between signifier and signified and enabled us to see the projective or "abductive" nature of certain signs—a diagrammatic function wherein mind pre-figures the real in signs according to motives that, if not clearly assignable (to empirical or ideal forces), nevertheless produce distinct results

[173] Note the almost Vicoean perspective, here.

[174] See Nuccio Ordine, *Le Seuil de l'ombre* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2003), pp. 310-311.

[175] Because it goes beyond language, per se, into that which would be considered "extra linguistic."

[176] For someone like Zizek, this *takes too much time* to realize. He calls for dramatic and immediate performative hegemony, and for the eruption of truth and resistance in dramatic and immediately intiuitable reversals. The eruption of the uncanny, the strange. Deleuze calls for this as well, but he is willing to see or to attempt to see the emergence of the new as a larger, more "geological" process rather than as the invasion of an uncanny unworldliness (a return of the undead).

Bibliography

Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Albert, Eliot Ross. "Toward a Schizogenealogy of Materialism: Deleuze and Bruno, Spinoza, Nietzsche." University of Warwick Dissertation, 1999.

Artaud, Antonin. *The Theatre and its Double*. Trans. Mary Caroline Richards. New York: Grove Press, 1958.

Badiou, Alain. *Being and Event*. Trans. Oliver Feltham. London: Continuum, 2005.

---. *Le Siecle.* Paris: Editions du Seuil, 2005.

---. *Logiques des mondes*. *L'etre et l'evenement 2.* Paris: Editions du Seuil, 2006.

---. "Kant's Subtractive Ontology." *Alain Badiou: Theoretical Writings*. Ed. and trans. Ray Brassier and Alberto Toscano. London: Continuum, 2004.

---. "Language, Thought, Poetry." *Alain Badiou: Theoretical Writings*. Ed. and trans. Ray Brassier and Alberto Toscano. London: Continuum, 2004.

---. "Truth: Forcing and the Unnameable." *Alain Badiou: Theoretical Writings*. Ed. and trans. Ray Brassier and Alberto Toscano. London: Continuum, 2004.

Baudrillard, Jean. *The Spirit of Terrorism*. Trans. Chris Turner. London: Verso Press, 2002.

Baugh, Bruce. "Deleuze and Empiricism." *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 24(1) (1993): p. 31.

Bergson, Henry. *Matter and Memory*. Trans. N.M. Paul and W.S. Palmer. New York: Zone Books, 1991.

---. *Two Sources of Morality and Religion*. Trans. R. Ashely Audra and Cloudesley Brereton. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977.

Blumenberg, Hans. *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age*. Trans. Robert M. Wallace. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1983.

Bogue, Ronald. *Deleuze on Music, Painting, and the Arts*. London: Rutledge, 2003.

---. "Word, Image and Sound: The Non-Representational Semiotics of Gilles Deleuze." *Mimesis in Contemporary Theory: An Interdisciplinary Approach*, Volume 2: Mimesis, Semiosis, and Power. Ronald Bogue, ed. Philadelphia: John

Benjamins, 1991, pp.77-97.

Boldereef, Frances M. *Hermes to his Son Thoth: being Joyce's Use of Giordano Bruno in Finnegan's Wake*. Woodward: Classic Non-Fiction Library, 1968.

Brassier, Ray and Toscano, Alberto, eds. and trans. *Alain Badiou: Theoretical Writings*. London: Continuum, 2004.

Brennan, Timothy. *Wars of Position*. New York: Columbia, 2006.

Bruno, Giordano. *The Ash Wednesday Supper*. Ed. and trans. Edward A. Gosselin and Lawrence S. Lerner.

---. *The Cabala of Pegasus*. Trans. Sidney L. Sondergard and Madison U. Sowell. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.

---. *Cause, Principle, and Unity*. Ed. Richard J. Blackwell and Robert de Lucca. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

---. *The Expulsion of the Triumphant Beast*. Trans. Arthur D. Imerti. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1964.

---. *The Heroic Frenzies*. Trans. Eugene Memmo, Jr. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1964.

---. *On the Composition of Images, Signs and Ideas*. Trans. Charles Doria. New York: Willis, Locker, and Owens, 1991.

Buchanan, Ian. "Deleuze and Cultural Studies." South Atlantic Quarterly 96(3) (1997): 483-97.

Castaneda, Carlos. *The Teachings of Don Juan*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971.

Carroll, Lewis. *The Annotated Alice*. New York: Norton, 2000.

Copjec, Joan. *Imagine There's No Woman: Ethics and Sublimation*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002.

De Cusa, Nicolas. *Unity and Reform: Selected Writings of Nicolas de Cusa*. Ed. John P. Dolan. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 1962.

Delanda, Manuel. *Intensive Science and Virtual Philosophy*. London: Continuum, 2002.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Cinema I: The Movement-Image*. Trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara

Habberjam. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.

---. *Cinema II. The Time-Image*. Trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

---. *Desert Islands and Other Texts (1953-1974)*. Ed. David Lapoujade. Trans. Michael Taormina. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2004.

---. *Difference and Repetition*. Trans. Paul Patton. New York: Columbia, 1994.

---. *Empiricism and Subjectivity: An Essay on Hume's Theory of Human Nature*. Trans. Constantin Boundas. New York: Columbia, 1991.

---. *Essays Critical and Clinical*. Trans. Daniel W. Smith and Michael A. Greco. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

---. *Expressionism in Philosophy: Spinoza*. Trans. Martin Joughin. New York: Zone Books, 1990.

---. *Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation*. Trans. Dan Smith. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2003.

---. *The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque*. Trans. Tom Conley. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.

---. *Foucault*. Trans. Sean Hand. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988.

---. *Kant's Critical Philosophy*. Tran. Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1984.

---. *The Logic of Sense*. Trans. Mark Lester and Charles Stivale. New York: Columbia, 1990.

---. *Masochism: Coldness and Cruelty*. Trans. Jean McNeil. New York: Zone Books, 1989.

---. *Nietzsche and Philosophy*. Trans. Hugh Tomlinson. New York: Columbia, 1983.

---. *Proust and Signs*. Trans. Richard Howard. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000.

---. *Pure Immanence: Essays on a Life*. Trans. Anne Boyman. New York: Zone Books, 2001.

---. *Two Regimes of Madness: Texts and Interviews 1975-1995*. Ed. David Lapoujade. Trans. Ames Hodges and Mike Taormina. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e),

2006.

Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus*. Trans. Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1987.

---. *Anti-Oedipus*. Trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983.

---. *What Is Philosophy*. Trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell. New York: Columbia, 1994.

Deleuze, Gilles and Claire Parnet. *Dialogues*. Trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. New York: Columbia Press, 1987.

--*Dialogues II.* Trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. New York: Columbia, 2002.

Derrida, Jacques. *Writing and Difference*. Trans. Alan Bass. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Dischner, Gisela. *Giordano Bruno: Denker, Dichter, Magier*. Tübingen & Basel: A. Francke Verlag, 2004.

Eco, Umberto. *The Aesthetics of Chaosmos: The Middle Ages of James Joyce*. Trans. Ellen Esrock. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Farmer, S.A. *Syncretism in the West: Pico's 900 Theses (1486). The Evolution of Traditional Religious and Philosophical Systems*. Tempe: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1998.

Faubion, James D., ed. *Foucault: Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology*. New York: The New Press, 1998.

Foucault, Michel. "The Prose of Acteon." *Foucault: Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology*. Ed. James D. Faubion. New York: The New Press, 1998.

---. "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History." *Foucault: Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology*. Ed. James D. Faubion. New York: The New Press, 1998.

---. *The Order of Things*. *An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Random House, 1970.

Freud, Sigmund. *The Freud Reader*. Ed. Peter Gay. New York: W.W. Norton, 1989.

Gil, Jose. *Metamorphoses of the Body*. Trans. Stephen Muecke. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.

Girard, Rene. "Delirium as System." "*To Double Business Bound*" : *Essays on Literature, Mimesis and Anthropology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1978, 84-120)

Gose Jr., Elliot B. *The Transformation Process in Joyce's* Ulysses. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1980

Guattari, Felix. *The Anti-Oedipus Papers*. Trans. Kalina Gottman. New York: Semiotext(e), 2006.

Hallyn, Fernand. *The Poetic Structure of the World: Copernicus and Kepler.* Trans. Donald M. Leslie. New York: Zone Books, 1990.

Harvey, Irene. *Labyrinths of Exemplarity*: *At the Limits of Deconstruction*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2002.

Hegel, G.W.F. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Trans. A.V. Miller. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.

Jarry, Alfred. *Selected Works of Alfred Jarry*. Ed. Roger Shattuck and Simon Watson Taylor. New York: Grove Press, 1965.

Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Trans. Norman Kemp Smith. London: Macmillan, 1978.

Kierkegaard, Soren. *Fear and Trembling and Repetition*. Trans. and ed. H.V. and E.H. Hong. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.

Klossowski, Pierre. *The Baphomet*. Trans. Sophie Hawkes and Stephen Sartarelli. New York: Marsilio, 1988.

---. *Nietzsche and the Vicious Circle*. Trans. Dan Smith. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.

Lacan, Jacques. *Le seminaire, livre XVII: L'envers de la psychanalyse*. Paris: Seuil, 1991.

Latour, Bruno. *We Have Never Been Modern*. Trans. Catherine Porter. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Lecoq, Jacques. *Lettre a mes eleves*. *1956-1996*. Paris: Ecole Jacques Lecoq, 1996.

Leibniz, G.W. *Philosophical Writings*. Ed. G.H.R. Parkinson. London: Dent, 1973.

Lingus, Alphonso. "Phantom Equator." Eds. Busch and Gallagher. *Merleau-Ponty, Hermeneutics, and Postmodernism*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1992, pp. 227-239.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Basic Writings*. Trans. Walter Kaufmann. New York: Modern Library, 2000.

---. *The Portable Nietzsche*. Ed. and trans. Walter Kaufmann. New York: Penguin, 1982.

Milbank, John. "On Complex Space." *The Word Made Strange*. London: Blackwell, 1997.

Nussbaum, Martha. *Frontiers of Justice: Disability, Nationality, Species Membership*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Ordine, Nuccio. *Giordano Bruno and the Philosophy of the Ass*. Trans. Henryk Baranski and Arielle Saiber. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.

---. *Le Seuil de l'ombre. Literature, philosophie et peinture chez Giordano Bruno*. Trans. Luc Hersant. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2003.

Parnet, Claire. Interview with Gilles Deleuze. Trans. Charles Stivale. http://www.langlab.wayne.edu/CStivale/D-G/ABC1.html#anchor540856

Patton and Protevi, eds. *Deleuze and Derrida.* New York: Continuum, 2003.

Pearson, Keith Ansell. *Germinal Life: The Difference and Repetition of Deleuze*. London: Rutledge, 1999.

Peirce, Charles. "How to Make our Ideas Clear." *Philosophical Writings of Peirce.* Ed. Justus Buchler. New York: Dover, 1955, pp. 23-41.

Pico della Mirandola, Giovanni. *On the Dignity of Man and Other Works.* Ed. Charles Glen Wallis. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1965.

Plato. *Complete Works*. Ed. John M. Cooper. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1997.

Rajchman, John. *The Deleuze Connections*. Cambridge: MIT, 2000.

---. *Michel Foucault: The Freedom of Philosophy*. New York: Columbia UP, 1985.

Scott. W. Ed. and Trans. *Corpus Hermetica*. *The Ancient Greek and Latin Writings Which Contain Religious or Philosophic Teachings Ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus. Vol. I.* London: Dawsons of Pall Mall, 1968.

Shaw, Gregory. *Theurgy and the Soul: the Neoplatonism of Iamblichus*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995.

Spinoza, Baruch. *Ethics.* Ed. E. Curley, Princeton: Princeton University Press

---. *Theologico-Political Treatise*. S. Shirley, Trans. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1998,

Spruit, Leen. "Giordano Bruno and Astrology." *Giordano Bruno, Philosopher of the Renaissance*. Ed. Hilary Gatti. Hants: Ashgate, 2002, pp. 229-250.

Vico, Giambattista. *The New Science*. Trans. Marsh New York: Penguin, 2001.

Wetzel, James. "Splendid Vices." *Journal of Religious Ethics*. London: Blackwell. 32.2, pp. 271-300.

Widder, Nathan. "The rights of simulacra: Deleuze and the univocity of being." *Continental Philosophy Review*. Kluwer, 2001. Vol. 34: 437-453

Williams, James. "Deleuze on J.M.W. Turner: Catastrophism in Philosophy?" *Deleuze and Philosophy: The Difference Engineer.* Keith Ansell Pearson (ed.), London: Rutledge, 1997, pp. 233-46

Yates, Frances A. *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Zizek, Slavoj. *Organs Without Bodies: On Deleuze and Consequences* (London: Rutledge, 2004).

---. *Tarrying With the Negative: Kant, Hegel, and the Critique of Ideology*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1993.