This book explores the concept of the whole as it operates within the psychology of Carl Gustav Jung (1875-1961), the philosophy of Gilles Deleuze (1925-1995), and selected areas of wider twentieth-century Western culture, which provided the context within which Jung and Deleuze worked. Addressing this topic from a variety of perspectives and disciplines, the book aims to clarify some of the epistemological and ethical issues surrounding attempts, such as those of Jung and Deleuze, to think in terms of the whole, whether the whole in question is a particular bounded system (such as an organism, person, society, or ecosystem) or, most broadly, reality as a whole.

In a climate in which ‘holistic’ thinking seems to be in equal measure championed as part of the solution to the fragmentation of the modern world and condemned as either hopelessly vague or else one of the causes of totalitarian thinking, there is a need for deeper scrutiny of what is at stake in thinking in terms of the whole. The psychological thought of Jung and the philosophical thought of Deleuze, each honed over the course a lifetime, provide apt frameworks – individually, in alliance, and in critical tension – through which to address this pressing issue.

Comprising a set of original essays by renowned experts on the thought of Jung and Deleuze, the book will contribute to enhancing critical self-reflection among the many contemporary thinkers and practitioners in whose work thinking in terms of the whole plays a significant role.

The book addresses a variety of epistemological, ethical, and methodological questions relating to the concept of the whole, including the following:

- What is the relationship between a particular concept of ultimate wholeness and the multiplicities of experience?
- Can unitary reality be experienced directly?
- What is the status of symbolic knowledge of the whole?
- What are the ethical (including social, cultural, and political) implications of different concepts of the whole?
- Is there an intrinsic relationship between concepts of the whole and totalitarian thinking?
- Is it possible to avoid totalitarian dangers of holism by developing a form of critical holism based on the concept of an open whole?
- What is gained for the thought of Jung and Deleuze by staging an encounter between them?
- Can psychotherapeutic concepts such as Jung’s be usefully appropriated by a philosophy such as Deleuze’s, and can philosophical concepts such as Deleuze’s be usefully appropriated by a psychology such as Jung’s?
- How do the preoccupations of Jung and Deleuze in relation to the whole connect with other thinkers (such as Kant, Bergson, Klages, Reich, and Pauli) and other fields (such as complexity theory, physics, political economy, esotericism, and cultural history)?
While reflection on the concept of the whole and its relations to the elements that constitute the whole has been a staple of the Western philosophical tradition since the ancient Greeks, such reflection has had, from the beginning of the twentieth century, several moments of particular salience – for example, in the life and mind sciences as well as the physical sciences within the German-speaking world of the first half of the twentieth-century (Harrington 1996), in the countercultural movements of the 1960s and 1970s (Wood 2010), and in the proliferation of alternative spiritualities, therapies, and work practices since the 1980s (Hanegraaff 1998, Heelas and Woodhead 2005). Perspectives giving central importance to the concept of the whole have also acquired, especially in the English-speaking world, an influential new moniker: holism (Smuts 1926). Coined by Jan Smuts in 1926, the term ‘holism’ and its adjectival form ‘holistic’ are now used, with varying emotional loading and varying degrees of clarity and emphasis, in practically every area of contemporary life, including academic as well as popular contexts. Reflecting this widespread usage, the terms ‘holism’ and ‘holistic’ are also used at many points in the present work, even though Jung never employed the German translation of holism (der Holismus) nor Deleuze its French translation (le holisme) – they wrote instead in terms of die Ganzheit and le Tout, respectively. (For a more dedicated exploration specifically of the concept of holism, see McMillan, Main, and Henderson, Holism: Possibilities and Problems [in preparation].)

Whether dubbed holism or not, thinking in terms of the whole has a presence in recent and contemporary thought that could benefit from being more fully explicated and examined. This is the case not least because of the strong positive and negative valuations that can attach to such thought. To their advocates, holistic perspectives tend to be associated with desirable qualities such as inclusion, integration, balance, and wider vision and to be championed as remedies for the fragmentation that is considered to beset the modern world (e.g., Berman 1981). To their critics, however, holistic perspectives tend to be vague, to erase differences, and, through subordinating individual elements to a superior whole, to lead ultimately to totalitarianism (e.g., Popper 1945, Phillips 1976).

In focusing on the works of Jung and Deleuze we have selected two influential twentieth-century thinkers whose work has in crucial respects been governed by the concept of the whole. For Jung, psychological wholeness, signified by the archetype of the self, was the goal of individual development (abetted where necessary by therapy). Furthermore, in his later work he theorised that the wholeness whose realisation was aimed at was not just psychological but included also the world beyond the individual psyche: psyche and matter were considered two aspects of a single underlying reality which he referred to as the unus mundus or ‘one world’ (1955-56). The process of realising wholeness was for Jung central not only to therapy and individual development but also to addressing many social, cultural, and political ills, which he considered largely to stem from thinking in a one-sidedly conscious (usually materialistic and rationalistic) way, without taking due account of the unconscious (1957).

Compared to Jung, Deleuze had a more conspicuously ambivalent relationship to the concept of the whole. On the one hand, he was relentlessly critical of organicistic thinking – often taken as synonymous with holism – in which the parts of a system
are all considered to work harmoniously within the whole, like organs within an organism (Deleuze and Guattari 1972: 43). On the other hand, his entire opus was driven by the attempt to articulate a philosophy of pure immanence in which being was considered ‘univocally’, that is, not to be ‘realer’ in some expressions (e.g., as thinking, as consciousness, or as the Creator) than in others (e.g., as extension, as matter, or as creatures) (Deleuze 2001). Within such a philosophy, reality constitutes an open and ever changing whole in which the parts, even though not all internally related as in an organism, are, by dint of their existing in a single ‘plane of immanence’, capable of being endlessly interrelated externally, horizontally, or, in the term Deleuze may have borrowed form Jung, ‘rhizomatically’. For Deleuze, such a conception of the open whole removed the need to conceive of an organising principle (e.g., mind, God) that is transcendent to what it organises (e.g., matter, the world). This had wide-ranging ethical and political implications for Deleuze, since he considered transcendence – the conception of a dimension of reality that was separate from and superior to the rest of reality – to be the root of totalitarian and other forms of despotic thought through providing a locus where privileged values and aspects of identity could order the rest of reality while themselves remaining shielded from criticism (1968).

Some of the essays in this book explore the tensions between Jung’s and Deleuze’s different concepts of the whole and their respective ethical implications (Main, McMillan, Bishop). Others use the two authors primarily to amplify each other’s thought (Henderson, Semetsky, Atmanspacher). Others again focus on contexts or topics equally informed by or equally relevant to both authors (Ramey, Hogenson).

The contributors to the book are all experts on the thought of either Jung or Deleuze, if not both. All are, or have been, academics, while some are also practitioners (Henderson, Hogenson, Semetsky, Ramey). Between them they represent a significant array of disciplines: philosophy (Ramey), psychotherapy/analysis (Henderson, Hogenson), education (Semetsky), physics (Atmanspacher), German studies (Bishop), and psychosocial and psychoanalytic studies (Main, McMillan).

Rationale
This book will be relevant to scholars of Jung, scholars of Deleuze, and those interested in the role of the concept of the whole/wholeness/ holism whether in psychology, philosophy, or other disciplines or combinations of disciplines. The chapters are pitched to be accessible to graduate students, academics, professionals, and interested general readers. To date there have been very few books bringing together the work of Jung and Deleuze, probably the most significant being Deleuze and the Unconscious (2007) by Christian Kerslake, one of the contributors to the present volume, and Eros and Economy: Jung, Deleuze, Sexual Difference (2017) by Barbara Jenkins. Both these books rightly signal the relevance and potential productiveness of bringing together the thought of Jung and Deleuze. But, unlike the present volume, neither has a principal focus on problems relating to the concept of the whole.
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1. **Introduction**  
   *Roderick Main, Christian McMillan, and David Henderson*  
   In this introductory chapter the editors concisely explain the significance of the concept of the whole, both in the longer history of Western thought and more specifically from the beginning of the twentieth century through to the present. They then outline and provide a preliminary comparison of the specific concepts of the whole found in the work of Jung and Deleuze. Finally, they signal the range of specific issues to be addressed by the current volume through briefly discussing each of the chapters that will follow.

2. **The ethical ambivalence of holism: An exploration through the thought of Carl Jung and Gilles Deleuze**  
   *Roderick Main*  
   Episodically over the ninety years since it was coined, the term ‘holism’ has fallen in and out of favour across a wide range of academic disciplines and cultural arenas. Frequently its appearance has been accompanied by strong positive and
negative valuations: holism has been promoted by some as a solution to the fragmentation and alienation of modernity, yet it has been identified by others as one of the roots of totalitarian thinking. In this chapter Roderick Main explores this ethical ambivalence of holism through comparing aspects of the work of two twentieth-century thinkers who reflected deeply on the concept of wholeness. Using the psychology of Carl Jung as a sophisticated and influential example of holistic thought, he first highlights relevant holistic features of Jung’s model, especially the concepts of the self and unus mundus (one world), identifies the implicit metaphysics of the model’s concept of the whole, and traces the cultural and social benefits that are claimed to flow from such a version of holism. He then confronts Jung’s model with Gilles Deleuze’s more constructivist way of thinking about wholes and totality in terms of multiplicity, univocity of being, and pure immanence. The Deleuzian perspective arguably exposes a number of questionable philosophical assumptions in Jung’s holism, as well as some less salubrious cultural and social implications. In order to assess whether the Deleuzian critique of Jung’s holism is answerable, Main focuses attention on the understanding and role of immanence and transcendence within each thinker’s model, comparing Deleuze’s more pantheistic concept of the whole, which aims at pure immanence, with Jung’s more panentheistic concept, which embraces both immanence and transcendence. He argues that Jung’s position is in fact an ally of the Deleuzian critique whose real target is the kind of strong transcendence characteristic of classical theism, which both thinkers eschew.

3. The ‘image of thought’ and the State-form in Jung’s ‘The Undiscovered Self’ and Deleuze and Guattari’s ‘Treatise on Nomadology’

Christian McMillan

A number of conceptual affinities in thought of C.G. Jung and French philosophers Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari can be discerned in their respective publications ‘The Undiscovered Self (Present and Future)’ (1957) and ‘Treatise on Nomadology: The War Machine from A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia’ (1980). McMillan argues that Jung’s critique of the ‘abstract idea of the state’ and Deleuze and Guattari’s critique of the ‘State-form’ are isomorphic in character. He demonstrates that Deleuze’s criticism of the ‘image of thought’ from Difference and Repetition (1968) resonates with Jung’s criticism of a certain ‘orientation’ or one-sidedness towards what he refers to in the ‘Undiscovered Self’ as the ‘conceptual world’. Jung, Deleuze and Deleuze-Guattari are engaged in a process of exposing an image of thought whose logical and ethical implications have had profound effects on Western society. This image contains within it certain presuppositions about the organisation of power relations within the social and political ‘whole’. Critically examining these relations through the novel use of a number of concepts; ‘mass-man’, ‘extramundane’, ‘creed’, ‘statistical’ (Jung), ‘minoritarian’, ‘majoritiarian’, ‘nomad’ (Deleuze-Guattari) indicates that these authors were concerned with the negative implications of an image of thought which left individuals powerless and unable to engage with extramundane forces of ‘this world’. Such an engagement is characterised by Jung as a religious process and by Deleuze-Guattari as ‘becoming-minoritarian or ‘becoming-revolutionary’. Wholeness is the cultivation of an attitude towards this engagement, fostering an experimental spirit in which
one is capable of ‘becoming’ with forces that have been released from their capture by the image of thought. In this regard Jung and Deleuze-Guattari present themselves as ‘untimely thinkers’ in their respective essays, heralding a ‘people to come’.

4. Jung as symptomatologist

David Henderson

In their work C. G. Jung and Gilles Deleuze ventured into territory that blurred the distinction between clinical thinking and philosophical thinking. In this chapter David Henderson raises questions about the relationship between clinical concepts and philosophical concepts as they present themselves in Jung’s and Deleuze’s writings.

Deleuze’s symptomatological method enabled him to find a ground for engagement with non-philosophical discourses. ‘Symptomatology is situated almost outside of medicine, at a neutral point, a zero point, where artists and philosophers and doctors and patients can encounter each other’. In what ways can Deleuze’s symptomatological method amplify Jung’s complex psychology and study of archetypal image? Does the idea within analytical psychology of the symptom as symbol bring anything to Deleuze’s project?

According to Jung, ‘once we leave the domain of measureable facts we are dependent on concepts … The precision which measure and number lend to the observed fact can be replaced only by the precision of the concept’. For Deleuze ‘concepts do not simply describe things but, rather, express events’. In what ways are Jung’s and Deleuze’s concepts able to account for movement and affect in the psychoanalytic encounter?

Jung links the psychological intuition of wholeness to an encounter with the self. ‘Wholeness is thus an objective factor that confronts the subject independently of him’. He asserts that ‘The self is not a philosophical idea’. What is he thinking of? Is it realistic to expect clinical concepts to do the work of philosophical concepts? Many of Deleuze’s formulations have strong resonance in the clinical setting, but is this a legitimate use of his concepts? Is the unus mundus a clinical concept or has Jung here moved beyond the clinic?

5. One, two, three … one: the edusemiotic self

Inna Semetsky

Jung and Deleuze afforded a special significance to signs, symbols, symptoms and images (even as Jung’s definitions of signs and symbols appear to be reversed). While Deleuzian-Guattarian schizoaanalysis critiques both Freud and Jung, Deleuze’s own works are permeated with subtle Jungian inflections, especially regarding the unconscious or ‘unthought’ dimension of experience. The crux of Jung’s depth psychology is the existence of the collective unconscious (objective psyche) structured by archetypal patterns manifesting in the form of typical habits. In a number of works, Jung referred to the axiom of Maria Prophetissa, a 3rd-
century alchemist, as a metaphor for the process of individuation. Inna Semetsky’s chapter positions this axiom in the context of Deleuze’s paradoxical logic of multiplicities (problematic Ideas) central to his philosophy of transcendental empiricism. When phenomena betray their representation by clear and distinct ideas but flash their veiled meanings as signs, they need to be explicaded and ‘read’ so that problematic encounters can make sense. Signs are formal structures of relations that function on the basis of the included ‘third’ – the elusive tertium quid. The reading of signs is an experiment that involves experiential learning (self-education or apprenticeship) and, ultimately, self-knowledge in the form of deep gnosis. Only as such can we become in-dividual, ‘whole’ selves. Semetsky’s chapter also addresses ethics as the integration of the Jungian Shadow archetype that may manifest in events of which, according to Deleuze, we must become worthy. To conclude, the chapter presents an example of the transformative, healing (‘making whole’) practice that demonstrates the actualisation of the virtual archetypes via their ‘dramatisation’ in the esoteric yet ‘real characters’ of a neutral language envisaged by Pauli, Jung’s collaborator on the concept of synchronicity. Deleuze’s call to retrieve and read the structures immanent in the depth of the psyche is thereby answered: we self-transcend by becoming-other.

6. Symbols of wholeness: mandalas and labyrinths as manifestations of cosmic structure

George Hogenson

In an important paper, the philosopher Paul Ricoeur, drawing on the work of Mircea Eliade, makes a distinction between what he terms manifestation and proclamation. Proclamation is fundamentally discursive, language bound and therefore open to the free construction of metaphor, while manifestation is based on the image and ‘bound to the configurations of the cosmos.’ In this regard the symbol only comes to language when it reveals that configuration and in so doing opens the space of the sacred.

In 1701 Leibniz presented a paper on the occasion of his election to the Paris Academy where he outlined his formulation of the binary number system, which would eventually become the basis for digital computer systems. Around the same time he caused a medallion to be struck memorializing the discovery, which he presented to Duke Rudolf August. The medallion represented the first 16 integers in Arabic and binary notation, and also bore the inscription, ‘Image of Creation.’

In The Fold Deleuze examines in detail the implications of the infinitesimal calculus for Leibniz’s metaphysics, arguing that metaphysics takes the form of mathematics in the Baroque philosopher. He is also interested in other forms of infinitesimal analysis, notably for the purposes of this chapter an interest in the Koch curve, an early form of fractal geometry that foreshadows the full development of fractals by Benoit Mandelbrot.

In this chapter, George Hogenson compares the relationship between certain formally constructed mandalas and other geometric forms associated by Jung with the notion of wholeness with the iterative elaboration of the equations associated
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with Mandelbrot’s fractal geometry. Hogenson argues that these symbols of wholeness are manifestations of fundamental mathematical structures that manifest throughout the natural world, and connect psyche to the rest of nature in a fundamental form. Additionally, his analysis illustrates how the breakdown of psychic wholeness can be modelled in the breakdown of unity into chaotic states, thereby providing an argument for Jung’s model of the psyche moving from the individual complex to the \textit{ unus mundus} and the unity of the Self.

7. The status of exceptional experiences in the Pauli-Jung conjecture

\textit{Harald Atmanspacher}

The Pauli-Jung conjecture is a coherent reconstruction of Pauli’s and Jung’s scattered ideas about the relationship between the mental and the physical and their common origin. It belongs to the decompositional variety of dual-aspect monisms, in which a basic, psychophysically neutral reality is conceived of as radically holistic, without distinctions, hence discursively inexpressible. Epistemic domains such as the mental and the physical emerge from this base reality by differentiation.

Within the conceptual framework of the Pauli-Jung conjecture there are different options to address so-called exceptional experiences, i.e. deviations from typical reality models that individuals develop and utilize to cope with their environment. Such experiences can be understood (i) as either mental images or as physical events, (ii) as relations between the mental and the physical, and (iii) as direct experiences of the psychophysically neutral reality. These three classes are referred to as reified, relational and immanent experiences.

8. Holistic enchantment and eternal recurrence: Anaxagoras, Nietzsche, Deleuze, Klages, and Jung on the beauty of it all

\textit{Paul Bishop}

In this chapter Paul Bishop argues that for Nietzsche the world is both disenchanted and enchanted: from a transcendental perspective (associated with Judeo-Christianity), the world is disenchanted, it is ‘the work of a suffering and tormented God’. Yet from an immanent perspective the world is in fact enchanted — or potentially so, and the means by which Nietzsche proposes to re-enchant (or rediscover the primordial enchantment) of the world is the doctrine of the eternal recurrence. In \textit{Thus Spoke Zarathustra}, his animals proclaim Zarathustra to be ‘the teacher of the eternal recurrence’, and this passage from the chapter entitled ‘The Convalescent’ has caught the attention of numerous commentators, including Heidegger and Deleuze. Deleuze’s reading of the eternal recurrence is different from that of the majority of other commentators, however: yet, in fact, Deleuze is by no means the only critic of Nietzsche’s doctrine of eternal recurrence. For another one is the German philosopher Ludwig Klages, one of the earliest significant commentators on Nietzsche’s work and a figure whose thought is deeply invested in the challenges of disenchantment and re-enchantment. Klages offers a wide-ranging critique of Nietzsche’s work, especially of its doctrine of eternal recurrence. Central to Klages’s philosophy are his doctrine of the ‘reality
of images’ and his related notion of ‘elementary similarity’. Elementary similarity informs the kind of perception he associates with die Seele, that is, with the soul or the psyche, and which he regards as essentially symbolic. Can the concepts of identity, similarity, dissimilarity, and difference help us relate and coordinate the thought of Klages, Jung, and Deleuze — and not just in relation to Nietzsche?

9. **Holism and chance: markets and meaning under neoliberalism**  
*Joshua Ramey*

In this chapter Joshua Ramey explores how extreme variants of neoliberal ideology about the power of markets, particularly as articulated in the late work of Friedrich Hayek, produce illusions about the kind of meanings that can be construed on the basis of chance or random processes. Randomness poses an interesting problem for holism in general, but here Ramey focuses on the specific power that uncertainty (linked to the basic fact of extreme contingency, or chance) is supposed to display, within ‘correctly’ functioning markets, to generate meaning. In Ramey’s recent book *Politics of Divination: Neoliberal Endgame and the Religion of Contingency*, he has argued that the extreme version of neoliberal market apologetics holds that markets can function as divination processes — that is, as inquiries into more-than-human knowledge. The complex and unstable relation between chance and the Whole is figured here in an equivocation over whether chance means everything or nothing, and helps to explain the particular role between neoliberal ideology and nihilism.
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