When I read Deleuze and Guattari, I hear Jung. The internal resonance between Jung's psychological theory and Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy is uncanny. Zizek in characteristically pithy fashion states: "No wonder, then, that an admiration of Jung is Deleuze’s corpse in the closet; the fact that Deleuze borrowed a key term (rhizome) from Jung is not a mere insignificant accident – rather, it points toward a deeper link."¹ This deeper link has been more sympathetically explored by Kerslake,² Semetsky³ and McMillan.⁴ They provide us with the only systematic studies of Deleuze and Jung available thus far.

Hallward observes, “If there is an analogue within the psychoanalytic tradition to Deleuze's conception of the cosmos-brain it is not Lacan's unconscious, but Jung's cosmic consciousness.”⁵ Sadly there is no smoking gun to aid us in the quest to analyse Deleuze and Guattari's relationships with Jung. In other words, there are no Deleuze or Guattari archives, that I have been able to locate, that contain books and working papers that might offer traces of their encounters with Jung's ideas. We have no marginalia or notes.

Deleuze and Guattari criticised a number of key psychoanalytic concepts, such as the Oedipus complex, repression, the nature of libido, the nature of instincts and the privileging of neurosis over psychosis as the essential paradigm of psychic normality. Much academic work on the relationship between Deleuze and
Guattari and psychoanalysis focuses on theoretical and personal links with Lacan. (Interestingly Guattari was at one time the heir apparent of the Lacanian project, but he was ousted by Lacan’s son-in-law.) Other work consists of attempts to rehabilitate Freud and Lacan within the Deleuze and Guattari corpus.

Holland points to three features of Jung’s thought that are important to Deleuze and Guattari.

Firstly, "whereas Freud’s understanding of psychodynamics was based squarely on neurosis, and therefore could accommodate psychosis only cursorily and with great difficulty, Jung’s perspective centers on processes of dissociation, of which neurosis and psychosis are milder and severer versions." This issue must also affect their reading of Lacan who maintains an absolute divide between the neurotic and the psychotic. One of the rallying cries of Delueze and Guattari was that we are all schizophrenics.

Secondly, they agreed with Jung over Freud on the question of the nature of libido or psychic energy. It is not exclusively or primarily sexual.

Thirdly, according to Holland:

While Jung’s theory of instinct resembles Freud’s earlier theory, it is not dialectical but evolutionary and developmental: instincts evolve in each
human being from a concern for preservation of the organism itself to a concern for the perpetuation of the species. Moreover, Jung's theory is not dualistic but multiple: there are many instincts (not just two), and for Jung they take the form of archetypes; it is here that he (Jung) draws most directly on Bergson and Kant.\textsuperscript{vii}

With reference to this third point, Deleuze writes: "... one of the most important points of Jung's theory [is] to be found here: the force of 'questioning' in the unconscious, the conception of the unconscious as an unconscious of 'problems'"\textsuperscript{vii}

There we have an interesting amplification of the concept of the archetype – the archetype is a problem, not an entity. One way to read Deleuze through a Jungian lens is to see "archetype" when he writes "problem."

Those are the three features of Jung's thought that Holland selects as being particularly important to Deleuze and Guattari.

Deleuze and Guattari have produced a host of terms that, it seems to me, are able to provide interesting and suggestive amplifications for many clinical concepts in analytical psychology. A brief list might look like this:

- Schizoanalysis
- Body-without-organs
- Assemblages
• Becoming
• Becoming-woman
• Rhizome
• Lines of flight
• Deterritorialisation/reterritorialisation
• Chaosmos
• Intensity

This list simply scratches the surface of what Deleuze and Guattari have to offer. This isn't the place to go into detail about particular concepts and what they might bring to our practice and to our thought, but the prospect of developing these connections seems very exciting to me. For now however I want to change focus from these elements of their theory to their metaphysics.

I am approaching this research as a psychotherapist, not as a philosopher or intellectual historian, and there are three problems or questions that I am posing to Deleuze and Guattari:

• The gap between the archetype and the archetypal image – a problem of theory
• The passivity of the analyst – a problem of practice
• The operation of transference – a problem of process

The problem of the gap - It is not evident to me how one gets from the archetype to the archetypal image. There is a gap in the theory. The attraction for some of
theories of emergence could be seen, at least in part, as attempts to respond to this aporia. Another approach is get rid of the archetype altogether. Hey presto no more gap. No problem.

The problem of the analyst’s passivity – It seems to me that an essential element of the analytic frame is the passivity of the analyst. This is imaged in language about openness, receptivity, coniunctio, and sharing the alchemical bath. I feel the need however for a more developed philosophy of passivity to guide technique.

The problem of transference is to some degree a problem of how to measure intensity and how to imagine the qualities of energy. Often transference is thought of in spatial or structural terms. This can easily slide into, what is to my mind, an excessively materialistic or concrete view of transference.

I sense that there are resources within the work of Deleuze and Guattari that might help me to think about these questions. Here then we come to the key problem of my research – Do Deleuze and Guattari provide analytical psychology with a metaphysical framework that will enable it to think through and re-imagine its theory and practice?

In a quick detour before we look directly at Deleuze and Guattari. We can see here how Neumann described a detailed three-fold system in *The Origins and History of Consciousness*. In some ways its detail addresses the issue of the gap between the archetype and the archetypal image:
• The creation myth/The original unity
• The hero myth/The separation of systems
• The transformation myth/Centroversion and stages of life

Following a similar three-fold structure is Kant, who was so important to Jung.

• Synthesis of apprehension/sensibility
• Synthesis of reproduction/understanding
• Synthesis of recognition/reason

Here we have Deleuze’s three syntheses of time:

• First passive synthesis of time – habit, present
• Second passive synthesis of time – memory, past
• Third synthesis of time – empty form of time, eternal recurrence

Deleuze of course goes into a great deal of detail about the nature of each of these syntheses and their relationships. All I’m offering you here a very superficial, schematic glimpse of a densely argued philosophy.

According to Kazarian:

The three syntheses of time that form the principle structures of [Deleuze's] transcendental philosophy (habit-living present, memory-pure past and eternal recurrence-empty form of time) are shown to
correspond precisely to an entire series of basic Freudian structures: the elements of the late topography (Id, Ego, Superego); the principle stages of infantile sexual development (auto-erotic, pre-genital, and genital); and the three essential 'founding' moments of the psyche that Freud comes to theorize in the crucial period between 1914 and 1921 (the compulsion to repeat, primary repression, and primary narcissism).  

My thesis is that Deleuze’s three syntheses do not simply "correspond precisely" to Jung's thought, but can provide a matrix for re-imaging analytical psychology. It is not simply a question of mapping Jung on to Deleuze – or vis-versa – but of imagining differently the matter of analytical psychology: 

- 1st synthesis – Collective unconscious, archetypes
- 2nd synthesis – Archetypal image – Collective memory, collective consciousness, cultural complexes
- 3rd synthesis – The human – Future, infinity

With regard to the gap between the archetype and the archetypal image, it makes sense to think of the archetype as being the present and the archetypal image as being past, because as Holland observes, "archetypes become accessible to consciousness only through their expression in and translation into historically contingent images, behaviors, rituals, and institutions, it is impossible to infer the true nature of an instinct from any actual representation of it." In other words, it is the passage of time that transforms the present into the past. There is no representation of the archetype in the archetypal image, but
rather a shard of a different order of time subsists in the archetypal image. Paradoxically a shard to the present which we cannot know subsists in the past which we can know. As we read in analytical literature, there is an archetypal core to the complex.

There are some interesting resonances between what Deleuze says about the 3rd synthesis and what I am calling the human:

What does it mean: the empty form of time or third synthesis? The Northern Prince says ‘time out of joint’ … The joint, *cardo*, is what ensures the subordination of time to those properly cardinal points through which pass the periodic movements which it measures (time, number of movement, for the soul as much as for the world). By contrast, time out of joint means demented time or time outside the curve which gave it a god, liberated from its overly simple circular figure, freed from the events which made up its content, its relation to movement overturned; in short, time presenting itself as an empty and pure form.\(^{xi}\)

… one steps outside what’s been thought before, once one ventures outside what’s familiar and reassuring, once one has to invent new concepts for unknown lands, then methods and moral systems break down and thinking becomes… a “perilous act,” a violence, whose first victim is oneself… Thinking is always experiencing, experimenting… and
what we experience, experiment with, is... what’s coming into being, what’s new, what’s taking shape.\textsuperscript{xii}

This has striking resonance with Jung’s description of what happens in analysis when the client has as they say “worked out their issues” but they are still pursued by an insoluble question or longing:

And though this desire opens the door to the most dangerous possibilities, we cannot help seeing it as a courageous enterprise and giving it some measure of sympathy. It is no reckless adventure, but an effort inspired by deep spiritual distress to bring meaning once more into life on the basis of fresh and unprejudiced experience. Caution has its place, no doubt, but we cannot refuse our support to a serious venture which challenges the whole of the personality. If we oppose it, we are trying to suppress what is best in man – his daring and his aspirations. And should we succeed, we should only have stood in the way of that invaluable experience which might have given meaning to a life.\textsuperscript{xiii}

Where do we discover this experience? Jung suggests that it is in the imagination:

The \textit{imaginatio}, as the alchemists understand it, is in truth a key that opens the door to the secret of the \textit{opus}... The place or the medium of realization is neither mind nor matter, but that intermediate realm of subtle reality which can be adequately only expressed by the symbol. The
symbol is neither abstract nor concrete, neither rational nor irrational, neither real nor unreal.xiv

Thinking with Deleuze and Guattari opens the possibility of seeing "the place or the medium of realization" that Jung refers to, as time. "The symbol is neither abstract nor concrete, neither rational nor irrational, neither real nor unreal." Perhaps it is time.

For me the most suggestive implication of the thought of Deleuze and Guattari, as far as I understand it, is that we may be able re-imagine analytical psychology as being about time rather than about structure, substance or representation.

Finally, in terms of the theme of this conference, we might say that otherness is a feature of time. Like characters in the old TV series – The Twilight Zone – we wonder through dimensions of time and each dimension others us in a different way.
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