

From Psychoanalysis to Schizoanalysis
Chaos and Complexity in Therapeutic Practice

Scott William Gremmels

PhD Thesis

London School of Economics

University of London

UMI Number: U615615

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI U615615

Published by ProQuest LLC 2014. Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346



THESES

F

8198

1015589

Abstract

From Psychoanalysis to Schizoanalysis Chaos and Complexity in Therapeutic Practice

Scott William Gremmels

Human life is engaged in a continual process of mapping and modeling the external universe. From the immediate level of sensation to more abstract forms of emotional and cognitive mapping, the human organism builds a web of inner experience which forms the basis for the construction/perception of "reality." This act of learning forms the genetic, neural, linguistic, and social programming by which individual and collective subjectivity is constructed. Theories in philosophy and science are simply more abstract higher-level models of reality akin to our neuro-semantic mappings. They are similar to cultural, artistic, and religious stories in that their modeling includes not only process but the organized gestalt of content which endows the model with meaning in inner experience. If we move to a higher level of modeling by metamodeling we can understand how various theories of human life have mapped reality. The transversal linking of various theories or models allows us to create clearer maps about process and to transcend the differences resulting from content which supply meaning to inner subjectivity and which organize theories, disciplines, and practices like religious belief systems. Schizoanalytic metamodeling engages this transversal process of communication by which two or more different perspectives of the real - two or more subjectivities or realities - are transcended by moving to the next higher logical level in a nested hierarchy of organization. Schizoanalysis was one of the names Felix Guattari and Gilles Deleuze gave to their lifelong project of reinventing psychoanalysis and therapeutic practice and extending it into the material and social field. By giving a name to this practice and outlining its essence they began to gather together the work of various clinicians, artists, philosophers, and scientists who - though isolated - were already engaged in such a project of transforming human experience and whose history has just begun to be told. The present work continues the development of schizoanalysis as a clinical and cultural practice.

Contents

From Psychoanalysis to Schizoanalysis Chaos and Complexity in Therapeutic Practice

Scott William Gremmels

I. The Construction of Subjectivity - Psychobiology	4
1. The Human Being and Becoming - A Conscious Organism	5
2. The Matter of the Mind - Transversal Mapping	23
3. Chaos and Complexity - Beyond the Brain	39
4. Desire at the Limits of Thought - The Sacred	53
5. Psychoanalysis - A Spiritual Science	60
6. Jouissance - Desire in Knowledge	67
II. Mapping the Psyche - Psychoanalysis	73
1. The Unconscious and the Conscious - Sigmund Freud	74
2. The Schizoid and the Depressive - Melanie Klein	78
3. Containment and Mysticism - Wilfred Bion	81
4. Symmetry and Unfolding - Ignacio Matte-Blanco	85
5. The Aesthetic Object - Donald Meltzer	90
6. Transitional Phenomena - Donald Winnicott	95
7. The Emotion Processing Mind - Robert Langs	99
8. Psycho-Semiotics - Alfred Silver	105
9. The Subject of Analysis - Jacques Lacan	111
10. The Game of the Other - Francois Roustang	115
11. Primary Seduction - Jean Laplanche	121
12. Translation and Poetics - Nicolas Abraham	127
13. Signs of Affect - Julia Kristeva	132
14. Schizoanalysis and Chaosmosis - Felix Guattari	138
III. Mapping the Socius - Ethnopsychology	149
1. Sacrifice and Magic - Shamanism	150
2. Beyond Enlightenment - Pantheism	157
3. From Tragedy to Dialogue - Paganism	161
4. The Sacrifice of the Sacrifice - Monotheism	166
5. From Knowledge to Madness - Nihilism	173
6. Enjoying Your Symptom - Chaotism	184
IV. Clinical and Cultural Practice - Schizoanalysis	193
1. Life and Death - Chaosophy	194
2. Ecosophy and Sovereignty - General Economy	196
3. New Maps of the Psyche - Psychoanalysis and Spiritual Science	198
4. Thinking and Feeling - Abstract Expressionism	200
5. The Social Psyche - Subject, Object, and Other	202
6. Wild Analysis - The Clinic of Everyday Life	205
References	210

Book I

The Construction of Subjectivity

Psychobiology

1. The Human Being and Becoming - A Conscious Organism

Human life is engaged in a continual process of mapping and modeling the external universe. From the immediate level of sensation to more abstract forms of emotional and cognitive mapping, the human organism builds a web of inner experience which forms the basis for the construction/perception of "reality." This act of learning forms the genetic, neural, linguistic, and social programming by which individual and collective subjectivity is constructed. The objective perception of the real which is not fully accessible to human subjective perception is something which we can strive for, but we are never finally free of the limitations of the subjective position from which any one of us experiences this real as our "reality". Further, this reality - or subjectivity or inner experience - forms a world of its own which - while it may be unconscious - is not only a part of the real but perhaps is more determinant in our lives than the conscious or objective experience of the real.

Theories in philosophy and science are simply more abstract higher-level models of reality akin to our neuro-semantic mappings. They are similar to cultural, artistic, and religious stories in that their modeling includes not only objective process but the organized gestalt of subjective content which endows the model with meaning in inner experience. If we move to a higher level of modeling by metamodeling we can understand how various theories of human life have mapped reality. The transversal linking of various theories or models allows us to create clearer maps about process and to transcend the differences resulting from content which supply meaning to inner subjectivity and which organize theories, disciplines, and practices like religious belief systems. At the same time however we must not seek to ignore meaning in subjectivity, but to explore it in all its irreducible multiplicity as the essential end of all human existence. Practical means of survival as well as communication across disparate forms of individual and collective subjectivity depend on the ability to transcend subjective inner experience and to perceive from the point of view of the other in the act of finding a common transversal map between maps. Schizoanalytic metamodeling engages this transversal process of communication by which two or more different perspectives of the real - two or more subjectivities or realities - are transcended by moving to the next higher logical level in a nested

hierarchy of organization.

Schizoanalysis was one of the names Felix Guattari and Gilles Deleuze (1972, 1980) gave to their life-long project of reinventing psychoanalysis and therapeutic practice and extending it into the material and social field. By giving a name to this practice and outlining its essence they began to gather together the work of various analysts, artists, philosophers, and scientists who - though isolated - were already engaged in such a project of transforming human experience and whose history has hardly begun to be told.

A line stretches from Nietzsche to Deleuze and Guattari which sidesteps a century of impoverished work in the field of psychology, psychotherapy, psychiatry, psychoanalysis, and related disciplines. Nietzsche was already a master clinician/physician of the bio-psycho-social whom Freud stated had known more about himself than any single human being, and yet whom he admitted he could not read. The work of Deleuze and Guattari provides an answer to Nietzsche's vision of the therapeutic enfolded into everyday practice. The conclusion of their last book *What Is Philosophy* - "From Chaos to the Brain" - offers a model of the human biopsychic organism as a nexus continually organizing energy-matter into somatic-emotional-cognitive events which could be called "sovereign states". Perhaps the only weakness in their approach is the over-reliance on the brain as opposed to the complex embodiment of subjectivity which involves multiple psychobiological flows of the body including endocrine, immune, meridian, and other energetic-information systems.

Considering the human organism caught in this flux, the idea of ego or consciousness must be seen as relative, and work in psychoanalysis, hypnosis, psychopharmacology, and phenomenology has only sketched out how transference and trance are ubiquitous in everyday life and unresolvable. Existing models of therapy are antiquated. Schizoanalytic practices of speculative and concrete cartography borrow from all of these models - but also from art and literature - in developing ways to seize hold of and communicate with expressive moments and sovereign states of existence. The complexity of schizoanalytic metamodeling allows it to grasp the volatile and chaotic nature of human subjectivity where simplistic models which seek to define it fall short. It differs profoundly from cur-

rent theories and practices of the psyche in several ways:

1. Schizoanalysis develops its modeling of the human psyche on those who worked intimately with “psychotic” or “schizophrenic” experience such as Reich, Laing, Lacan, and Guattari - who saw in the painful condition of these people the truth of their experience. The shaman and mystic prepare to enter such states of mystical ecstasy and the reorganization of normal perception for personal, cultural, and therapeutic reasons. The schizophrenic is plunged into such states unwillingly with no choice and no map to guide him.

2. Schizoanalysis replaces scientific-therapeutic paradigms with ethico-aesthetic paradigms within a mental and material ecology. The ultimate aim of schizoanalysis as a practice of life is the human being in continual creation and expression of his essence as an event in time interacting with other such events in the form of human beings, living nature, cultural ideas, social rituals, and machines of creation. It looks not just to therapists but to artists and scientists of all types to remodel psycho-social experience.

3. Schizoanalysis does not focus on the trap but on the escape or reinvention of the possible. Its point of departure is not the past of familial and biological development, but the present moment as it is lived toward the unknown future. Each session, seminar, workshop, performance, happening, intervention, project - including the meal and the work of survival becomes the analytic space in which the emotional investment of “transference,” or “desire,” or “love” plays itself out against a background of conscious thought reintegrating the divided experience of psyche and soma.

4. Schizoanalysis tracks the image as it organizes inner experience within the individual isolated from the abstracted social symbolic forms of “morality” and “truth.” The best therapy has offered so far is to restore some form of acceptance of the social symbolic order as an alternative to isolated individual symptoms of “madness” or “disease.” But every symptom is an opportunity - desire knocking at the window seeking to escape its rigid confinement. The imag-inary world of the individual creates a speculative cartography of life which frees itself from stagnation and abstraction, yet it longs to be realized materially through a concrete cartography of collective action. Artistic creation is the

link between the speculative cartography of the imaginary and the concrete cartography of collective action or communication. To speak, to write, to paint is to express the imaginary into the real where it can form the symbolic truth of the moment in everyday life among a community of those who agree to share for that moment that "truth." The community of lovers - the community of those who have nothing in common - does not resort to castration before the law but preserves the sovereignty of each moment and the integrity of the story in time of each individual made up of such moments - each community made up of such individuals. The client who speaks in the therapeutic setting and the artist who creates for a community of listeners each invent their symbolic individually and collectively by making concrete or real the imaginary formation of their "drive" or "unconscious." They produce their desire. They enjoy their symptom.

5. Schizoanalysis operates equally in the individual session, the group workshop, or the institutional project through the "four" essential components of analytic experience. *Containment* provides the space to dissolve rigidities and reinvent against the fear of losing oneself. *Interventions* break the patterns which hold imaginary routines in place. The *transference* engages the desire, attraction, or cathexis which binds living entities together in a common project. And the dialectic of *consciousness* brings self-reflection into awareness of how one's unconscious and chaotic desire persists beyond any attempts to finally "know" it or pin it down.

6. Schizoanalysis is not one more model of the psyche, but a practice of metamodeling the complexity of human experience. As such it does not claim to know the truth about life or to institute a way of thinking, feeling, and living, but offers a practice by which experience itself is continually reinvented as the expression of each moment of each individual life within the event of humanity.

Theories are linguistic models which trigger semantic and even physical reactions within the one who perceives them. Metamodeling is the art and science of subjectivity in that it models the ways in which inner experience or psyche operates. By juxtaposing and linking various models from various areas including neuroscience, cybernetics, psychobiology, psychophysics, psychoanalysis and ethnology (cultural, religious, artistic, and linguistic)

tic practices) a more complete understanding of human subjectivity and its transformation can be formulated. Recent research by Robert Langs (1996) suggests that human communication and the formulation of linguistic models follow a mathematical pattern whether in the monologic construction of theories and stories or in the dialogic construction of the communicational or therapeutic setting. Human communication follows a pattern of moving back and forth between redundancy and complexity - between the stability of conscious theoretical language and the transformations of unconsciously encoded narrative language. Within a dyad one communicant always moves to rebalance the dialogue according to the language of the other in a pattern that mimics a monologue. In order for the optimum level of communication and transformation to take place in a therapeutic or dialogical setting both participants must be allowed to develop their stories or models of reality fully through sufficient periods of time to experience the fullness of each model without preconceived ways of judging or framing such stories. Similarly in our research, each model - each discourse - must be allowed to develop itself and to be juxtaposed and linked with others in a multiple dialogue or conversation (Blanchot 1969). Rather than trying to fit theoretical and linguistic models into a pre-existing arguments for support, metamodelling of the psyche emerges from the transversal communication of various models in dialogue.

Any organism or event always functions in relation to the general economy or ecology of forces in which it is embedded. An organic or cybernetic approach recognizes the complexity of integrated systems mutually interacting. Therapeutics is not a question of eradicating disease or restoring normality, but a functional pragmatics of ecological balancing which must grasp not only the movement of interacting processes, but the spirit, meaning, and will which drive such processes. All therapeutic practices - whether physical, psychic, or social - must work within the parameters of the the organism itself rather than applying theories based on preconceived concepts and judgements. What George Vithoulkas calls "the fundamental law of cure" is based on this dynamic and cybernetic approach.

Modern concepts of cybernetics demonstrate a fundamental principle which applies to the human organism as well as to other systems: any highly organized system reacts to

stress always by producing the best possible response of which it is capable in the moment. In the human being this means that the defense mechanism makes the best possible response to the morbid stimulus given the state of health in the moment and the intensity of the stress. . . .

For any therapy to be effective, it is obvious that the practitioner must cooperate with this process and must not deviate from it at all. Since the defense mechanism is already responding with the best possible response, any deviation from the direction of its action must inevitably be of a lesser degree of effectiveness. This is why therapies which are based upon intellectual theories and partial comprehension of the totality can only inhibit the process of cure, and often produce actual harm to the organism through suppression (Vithoulkas 1980, p. 87-9).

Whether at inorganic, organic, or psychic levels, information consists of the organization of forms between the cycles of redundancy and the differentiation of complexity. Moving too far in either the direction of redundancy or that of complexity leads to entropy - the absence of organization or information and the return to chaos. But the ongoing organizational process described by Felix Guattari (1992) as "chaosmosis" allows systems including human subjectivity or psyche to pass through chaos in the deconstruction of rigid forms and their reconstruction as new forms of organization thus eluding entropy through transformation. Through the process of transformation a memory is kept in the movement from one form to another. Organization is transformation - the patterned refrain of redundancy against difference. The human psyche is a volatile system balanced precariously between order and chaos - stability and change. While it is vulnerable to entropy or death, it is rich with organization, information, and meaning: its subjectivity is deep and complex. Ecstasy forms the horizon of meaning in inner experience whether in the collective subjectivity of cultural rituals described by George Bataille's (1973) notion of the "sacred" or in the individual subjectivity of personal rituals, beliefs, and symptoms described by Jacques Lacan's (1966) notion of "jouissance". Ecstasy, jouissance, and the sacred in their myriad forms lead to a return to disorder which plunges stable - and often stagnant - forms into chaos. Subjective desire and meaning - and the drive to return to immanence in the sovereign moment which denies the delay of gratification - are incompatible with the objective processes of knowledge and the mastery of survival. The ecol-

gy of ecstasy allows this return of sacred immanence without it necessarily leading to absolute entropy, chaos, and death, but rather to transformation and reorganization. Where education, religion, therapy, and science today fail to provide this ecology of ecstasy which once was managed by collective cultural rituals, we must introduce a broader understanding of what they seek in the form of psychoanalytic metamodeling, spiritual science, and transdisciplinary practices for the transformation of subjectivity.

The human being is also in a state of becoming. Theories of evolution and adaptation only sketch out a part of the general economy of mutation, change, and transformation which characterizes all complex systems and organisms which live at the border between order and chaos. What unfolds and actualizes itself out of the virtual totality of possibilities sometimes appears immutable from our human subjective perspective, but stability and permanence are only relative. Everything is in a state of flux. Nevertheless, the subjective factors within which we exist affect us as if they were objective parameters. We do exist in a state of being in which quasi-stability “satisfices” to provide us with the order we need to exist - “to be.” It is this tension between order and chaos - between being and becoming - between subject and object - between the tendency to affirm limited beliefs and unique moments above all and the ability to reach across these specific events and communicate - which makes human subjectivity rich, robust, and complex, and gives it its unique sovereign and sacred character.

As opposed to grasping the general economy of integrated systems and the sovereignty of singular events which make up this complex web, contemporary humanity appears to be heading toward an increasingly mechanistic existence dominated by an objectifying perspective which seeks not only to eradicate the subjective sovereignty of the internal horizon of singular forms and replace it with objects devoid of any meaning to be used and consumed, but to install the objectifying organization of our experience of the world into human subjectivity once and for all through the use of modern technology.

As you can see, the conversion is complete. Under the guise of “extraterrestrial” liberation, the technosciences are getting their teeth into a weightless man-planet whom nothing can now really protect, neither ethics nor biopolitical morality. Instead of escaping

from our natural biosphere, we will colonize an infinitely more accessible planet - as so often in the past - that of a body-without-a-soul, a profane body, on behalf of a science-without-a-conscience that has never ceased to profane the space of the body of animals and slaves, the colonized of former empires. We have never, in fact, dominated geophysical expanse without controlling, increasingly tightly, the substance, the microphysical core of the subject being: from the domestication of other species to the rhythmic training of the soldier or servant, the alienation of the production worker, force-feeding sports champions anabolic steroids. All of these examples illustrate this latest project, of which our Australian [Stelarc] is clearly not the instigator, but rather a victim, a willing victim, as so often the case with the servant corrupted by the master. At a time when there is talk of ethnic cleansing in Europe, the auditing of the evacuated living being's viscera is a timely reminder of the dangers of neuroscience's endogenous tyranny, of a cognitive ergonomics already at work on the latest in Human Design, the training of conditioned reflexes, the Metadesign of our conceptual and perceptual faculties. With the latter, the reign of the computer will at last catch up with the patient's body, underneath his clothes, his uniform, thereby achieving a new type of "underclothing" in which the smartening up of our nervous system will supersede the Design of the consumer object of the waning industrial age (Virilio 1993, p. 113-4).

Paul Virilio's analysis of contemporary life is a lucid treatise on the increasing objectification of life and the erasure of the subjective through bio-technology and virtual reality. Technology in its production of beautiful objects and a seemingly easier life is seductive, but we rarely see what it takes away. Georges Bataille (1949, 1973, 1976) elucidated how an excessive appetite for knowledge - whether in science, technology, or philosophy - leads to an impasse. It is an objectifying enterprise which steals the "sovereignty" of subjectivity - the quality of a moment which stands alone and is not transferable by any general equivalent - not quantifiable - not exchangeable. Humanity today may have reached a fear so great that it would seek to snuff out its dearest experience - its foundation - its *raison d'être*. It is difficult to accomplish this feat - which is why attempts at expunging the subject(ive) for the reign of the object(ive) are still sabotaged by the return of the repressed - symptoms which are still our "sacred" subjectivity - or were until recently. Now murder, perversion, and mutilation no longer affect us. Bataille was prescient in his

elucidation of the emerging state of the world, yet few have understood his message even today.

By speaking from within the depths of science in favor of “ethical-aesthetic” paradigms, Bataille, Virilio, and Guattari have attempted to understand complex processes and systems in light of the unfolding of the universe without losing sight of what is most essential to humanity - and without succumbing to this sovereignty through which we experience being. And who could blame those who do succumb since the point is to live. If one seeks to avert one’s sovereign or sacred moment partially like Bataille or Guattari, is it to sacrifice a little for others - or to temper the heat of one’s own?

In recent years there has been increasing interest in consciousness and cognitive processes, but in reality, the mental can never be separated from the realm of sensation, emotion, and desire. Mind and body are in constant interaction - psyche and brain are intertwined. Subjectivity refers to an organism’s total experience in which questions of sensation, emotion, and desire cannot be separated from those of cognition and consciousness. Spinoza’s (1903) pragmatics of events attempts to escape from any preconceived map by which to divide up or judge and instead posits the subject as the sum total of possible affects it might experience. This subject or subjectivity may be individual, social, personal, collective, momentary, or otherwise. The subject is the organization of the “actual” mapped and divided from the totality of the “possible.” Subjective experience takes account of what Whitehead (1969) calls the internal horizon of an organism which is always different from what can be known about an organism, entity, process, or event from the outside - from the objective viewpoint.

In the process of searching for new subjectivities, one cannot help being led into an objectifying experience. This is what happens when we “look upon the world with dead eyes.” This is science: to reach the objectivity which sees from outside of its own internal horizon. This is to escape the subject. Of course, objectivity is just as essential to our condition - events, processes, and subjects die, and the eternal transformation of matter through mutation/evolution is essential to the universe. Equilibrium is nothing. Perturbation, dis-ease, seduction, destruction: this too is required of existence. Sade,

Nietzsche, and Hegel were able to see this - to see “objectively” - and paradoxically this true objectivity only places our subjectivity more firmly where it belongs while augmenting it. Sade’s and Nietzsche’s “beyond good and evil” ethics is a tribute to the relations of subject and object - whereas “morality” is always bio-morality - the limited life-centered view which avoids change and mutation (including death) and seeks to control transformation. We fear death, loss, mutation, and change - but they are inescapable. The complement of mutation is reproduction - replication, survival, and tradition. We preserve through communication: the replication of species and the communication of psyche - through art, literature, culture - across the death and birth of new forms. The interplay of objective and subjective is that of mutation (death) and communication (life).

So how do we face up to the movement of the universe in the process of transformation? How do we maintain the courage to live change? Virilio’s position - like that of Bataille - is a “vitalist” or “gnostic” approach which recognizes that in the heart of Judeo-Christian consciousness - as opposed to “Christianity” as a decaying form (as Nietzsche mapped out) - is the grasping of sovereign subjectivity which squares completely with Alfred North Whitehead’s theory of process, Henri Bergson’s (1896) theory of the composition of events, and Rudolph Steiner’s (1911) “spiritual science.” The analytic or organic approach to thought and being espouses a view of the the universe - different from the Newtonian mechanistic view which still prevails today.

Whether through scientific research, philosophical introspection or other means, we seek to communicate. “You” communicate with yourself through the other. “It” communicates through you. You remind yourself how everything mutates into everything else - how it individuates and fractalizes back into what it was which is still different - how it happens. The universe is constructed ontologically. Religious practices, psychoanalysis, political struggle, and psychoactive chemicals only point the way to the most rudimentary maps of organization. We know nothing. But that does not necessarily stop us from experiencing all there is.

Within the province of the mind, what I believe to be true is true or becomes true, within the limits to be found experientially and experimentally. These limits are further truths to

be transcended (Lilly 1972).

The symbolic, noetic, and ontic world of language, rituals, rules, and meanings forms the essence of the human experience. To search for a cause - an origin - for the birth of human consciousness would already be to approach the question from the objectifying perspective that we are seeking to remedy. Instead, we must take the world of thought and the symbolic as that which has evolved in relation to the biological needs of living bodies. We cannot answer a badly posed question. We must step back, deconstruct the very models through which we have come to perceive and think the world of human experience, and try to remake and remodel our experience. In this way, rigor and common sense will merge in a pragmatics.

The need to survive and to adapt to a given environment is perceived by us to be programmed in animals, and this is what we call instinct. But from birth (and even before) what would be considered pure instinct in the human is always already linked to the symbolic world of meaning. Without a doubt, as bodies we are subject to biological needs, but these immediate needs are always confused with what exceeds them and toward which we are driven as much as our needs - sometimes even at the expense of our needs or our very survival. Psychoanalysts have come to call this human experience desire. Freud's "life" instinct approximates the need to survive, and the pleasure principle extends this to the reduction of tension towards balance and equilibrium. The positing of an opposing "death" drive may be the first clear or "scientific" understanding of the difference between humans and animals from a non-religious standpoint - that is, an understanding not assumed through faith but observed and described through scientific reason and empiricism. Unfortunately, the concept of the death drive - which has aroused so much resistance - is perhaps poorly named in that what exceeds need in human experience - desire - is not so much a drive toward death but a "need" which is more than biological preservation - a drive which is directed toward something other than survival and which may run counter to it - transformation.

Our needs are, then, so many searchlights which, directed upon the continuity of sensible qualities, single out in it distinct bodies. They cannot satisfy themselves except upon the

condition that they carve out, within this continuity, a body which is to be their own and then delimit other bodies with which the first can enter into relation, as if with persons. To establish these special relations among portions thus carved out from sensible reality is just what we call living (Bergson 1896, p. 198).

Bergson poses the question: what if there were no definite answers - only well chosen questions? In scientific research, results are but the confirmation of the hypothesis. In quantum physics the observer affects his measurements. It is not that science is not valid, but that we are and always have been engaged in the scientific - or philosophical, or pragmatic - process of dividing, modeling, and mapping which includes interdependent composites of perceiving, observing, remembering, thinking, and sketching in forms and languages which are communicable to others. This process is what Bergson calls "intuition," what Thomas Sebeok calls "the play of musement," and what Charles Peirce (1935-66) calls "abduction" - as opposed to logical deduction and empirical induction which are processes which follow abduction. Abduction is the hypothesising in which we are constantly engaged as we perceive the world. Deduction and induction are more mediated logical and experimental procedures by which we trace the consequences of our hypotheses. But as Peirce makes clear, without the initial hypothesis or abduction there can be nothing new in understanding or science. In fact abduction is akin to the art of the psychoanalyst, the psychic, and the detective who read signs with an open mind - an unprejudiced perception. Abduction lies somewhere between the immediacy of perception and the mediated forms of conception, and it organizes our subjectivity through affect and emotion - ever attentive to the subconscious messages of our perception which can produce a flash of insight.

Hypothesis substitutes, for a complicated tangle of predicates attached to one subject, a single conception. Now, there is a peculiar sensation belonging to the act of thinking that each of these predicates inheres in the subject. In hypothetic inference this complicated feeling so produced is replaced by a single feeling of greater intensity, that belonging to the act of thinking the hypothetic conclusion. Now, when our nervous system is excited in a complicated way, there being a relation between the elements of the excitation, the result is a single harmonious disturbance which I call an emotion. Thus, the various

sounds made by the instruments of an orchestra strike upon the ear, and the result is a peculiar musical emotion, quite distinct from the sounds themselves. This emotion is essentially the same thing as in hypothetic inference, and every hypothetic inference involves the formation of such an emotion. We may say, therefore, the hypothesis produces the sensuous element of thought, and induction the habitual element. (Sebeok 1981, p.27)

This pragmatic process is no doubt determined by our needs for survival at its foundation, but what in fact does a human need? Beyond basic subsistence - or what would appear to correspond to need and instinct in animals - human beings develop an infinite number of forms which already make "needs" impossible to identify as they are eclipsed by "desire." Desire is not what is beyond need - nor is it a mystical province. Rather it is a name for what determines human beings, just as "need" or "instinct" determine animals in a parallel fashion. It is our "attractor" (Prigogine & Stengers 1984).

For Bergson (1896) the problems resulting from badly posed questions can be solved by dividing an event into different composites. The root of the word science - "scio" - means to divide or to split. Both Bergson and Whitehead (1967, 1969) suggest that our problem in formulating questions and in understanding experience has been the misapprehension of time. We objectify or spatialise time. We ignore it. We act as if objects or matter were given - and time were something to be added to that. For Whitehead there exist only processes or events. The process of a human being for example cannot be understood at any one instant, but only through its dynamic change over the course of its life history. And this is equally true of an amoeba, a molecule, a city, or a culture. Identity is then not determined by static matter or substance but by the dynamic process or event over time.

Similarly Bergson says that we spatialize time. What Whitehead calls a process, Bergson calls a duration. With this he claims that our idea of movement is false. Rather than thinking of an object which remains the same and moves from one spatial location to another, we must see the event as a change of state: from the event with object here to the event with object there. Any event which takes on its own self-consistency or organization has a duration appropriate to it. While the change of state and the event which is a molecule in our body has its duration, so does our body which contains the molecule simultaneous-

ly have its own duration. Time is both subjective and objective, as each organism experiences its own different duration which nevertheless coincides with the duration of others. Further, each organism is simultaneously made up of other organisms - which are embedded in it - and also a part of a larger organism in which it is embedded or nested. This understanding of embedded processes or events enables us to grasp the essential interdependence of the nested hierarchies of organisms without the necessity of control hierarchies determined by power relations.

Thus an electron within a living body is different from an electron outside it, by reason of the plan of the body; the electron blindly runs either within or without the body; but it runs within the body in accordance with its character within the body; that is to say, in accordance with the general plan of the body, and this plan includes the mental state (Whitehead 1967, p. 79).

The message of these thinkers is conceptual, scientific, and ethical: divide things - or analyze - appropriately. For Whitehead, the process or epoch - duration in Bergson's terms - is what gives any organism its consistency - its right to be considered an entity or composite separable from totality. Out of the chaos of the possible emerges the organism or what Whitehead calls concrescence. Each concrescence is an event in time-space which can never be known or determined completely but only probabilistically. But this probability does not pose a problem. We do not need to know whether we are right or whether "it" is true. We need an understanding which "satisfices" - which works. Despite the fact that everything - including ourselves - is in a state of change and we can never finally know it, nevertheless we can know it well enough to live, to act, to function. This functional approach forms the basis for a pragmatics - the art and science of living as an organism.

Bergson's and Whitehead's maps give rich and complex background to what has come to be accepted empirically through quantum physics. Of course one could say that everything sketched out in the work of these philosophers and in the empirical findings of scientists was already communicated long ago through the works of Eastern and Western mysticism - and that each map or system is circular in any case - a tautology - but the

point is how well the system works. Does it provide a convincing map? Does it produce the desired results? Does it satisfy the need for meaning and the desire for survival? And in that sense, the continual creation of maps of existence and experience is always producing new subjectivities - new ways of experiencing the world.

In fact, this process of mapmaking - of creating new ways of experiencing the world is nothing less than what each one of us is continually doing. Recent biological and psychological research in the areas of perception and cognition have given evidence to the Bergsonian idea that human beings are embedded in the world and that cognition is enactive - we create our experience of the world as much as it creates us. In recent decades, a number of scientists have begun to approach the biological world of organisms from a broader perspective, and research is increasingly demonstrating the complex process of organization involved in evolution (Maturana & Varela 1987, Varela 1991, Eigen 1987, Kauffman 1993, 1995, Goodwin 1994, Sheldrake 1988, Gell-Mann 1994). Humberto Maturana and Francisco Varela have developed an approach to living organisms as autopoietic or self-organising. While the autonomy or autopoiesis of each organism is maintained by it producing itself and its own process or concrescence, it does this in constant interaction with other autopoietic entities. Furthermore, this "structural coupling" by which organisms are embedded in and interact with other organisms is not only inevitable but essential. For it is the confrontation with what is other than or outside of an entity that causes the perturbations necessary for an entity to change or evolve through its process. These organisms exist at the edge of order and chaos. While a destructive change would cause the death of the organism and put an end to its event or process, the absolute stasis of the organism without stimulation and interaction from the outside results in this very same death.

According to Maturana and Varela, while the structure of an autopoietic organism can be altered, its organization or concrescence cannot. In a human being for example the structure of matter in the form of cells, organs, or limbs can be eliminated or changed - and in fact they constantly are changing - but the organization - what gives us our particular concrescence or autopoiesis - cannot: we cannot for example exchange the placement of our heart and our head. This would be a destructive change: one which destroys the

organism, the event, the process, the concrescence which was that human being. And since time is a part of our organization in the form of metabolism, changing that metabolism too much in any direction can be destructive too - whether it is a matter of the rapidity of traumatic change or the freezing of time toward stasis.

Our relations to others determine us from the beginning of life and in fact we could not survive without others - this is our lot as human beings. We are social beings as much as we are biological beings, and it is in relation to others that we enact or “bring forth” our experience of the world. Although we are determined by our autopoietic and structurally coupled process, there is something else which differentiates our event from that of other animals. Mind, spirit, or consciousness are those words which have come to indicate that which seems most defining about us - and most difficult to define. And it is through language that human beings have developed such a rich and complex structurally coupled enacting of their experience of the world. Acknowledging this brings ethics in line with consciousness, as every human thought and action has already to an extent been predetermined by others, just as that thought or action will in turn participate in the construction of others’ experience of the world.

Every human act takes place in language. Every act in language brings forth a world created with others in the act of coexistence which gives rise to what is human. Thus every human act has an ethical meaning because it is an act of constitution of the human world. This linkage of human to human is, in the final analysis, the groundwork of all ethics as a reflection on the legitimacy of the presence of others (Maturana & Varela 1987).

Psyche, geist, esprit: this is what philosophers, poets, and psychoanalysts have attempted to map out throughout humanity’s epoch. For Hegel the phenomenology of mind or spirit is the coming to consciousness of the species with respect to its concrescence. Marx only grasped a part of this when he labored to bring to consciousness the history of social relations of mastery and slavery. Similarly, Freud mapped out the coming to consciousness of the formation of the individual subject through the familial relations which determined him. But spiritual sages had already practiced and taught this for centuries: if one hears

the call, one must go away and empty oneself of what the world has programmed - only then will one reach enlightenment or (self)consciousness.

In recent times, questions of emotion, cognition, and consciousness have inspired psychobiologists and neuroscientists in an attempt to close the gap between the physical processes of body and brain and the seemingly elusive experience of mind and psyche (Edelman 1992, Damasio 1994, Pribram 1971, 1991, McKenna & McKenna 1993, Kauffman 1993, Hameroff 1986, Penrose 1994, Scott 1995, Eccles 1994, Stapp 1993, Harth 1993), and this has increasingly brought scientific research in line with the clinical work of psychoanalysis and the speculation of organic philosophers and spiritual scientists such as Bergson, Whitehead, Nietzsche, Steiner, Bataille, and Deleuze.

According to neuroscientists, the nervous system began as an awareness system at the basic level of attraction/repulsion and has evolved in human beings to a brain infinitely more complex than any computer imaginable, let alone constructible. DNA specifies the production of cells but in each human being cells including neurons are “selected” or organized through their own unpredictable drift into groups and networks through processes described as topobiology (Edelman 1992), self-organization (Maturana & Varela 1987), morphogenesis (Kauffman 1993, Sheldrake 1987), or formative forces (Steiner 1920).

In the development of an organism such as a human being, through physical and social environmental interaction the mapping of neural networks and groups are formed or “selected” still further through the long-term potentiation of specific synapses in the generation of recurrent maps of perception and sensation. Some neurons are activated - others are not. These neural maps represent or mimic external experience but not linearly. Similarly, these information maps are integrated with sensational or emotional states (Edelman 1992, Damasio 1994, Pribram 1991, LeDoux 1996).

Different groups of networks map different events, and they communicate transversally. A multidimensional event-concrescence is formed and stored in dispositional micro-quanta, rather than bits of information, which include the constant linking of abstract per-

ceptual facts (time-space) with bodily sensation (energy-momentum). Emotions and feelings partake of the same process as cognition and consciousness. All that exists is disposition or tendency or possibility or virtuality which becomes actualized or realized out of the the possible - out of entropy or chaos - by the resonance of external evocation interacting with internal predetermination. At the biological level of organisms, mutation rides a fine line between the destruction of an organism's "organization" and adaptation to a more optimal evolved form - whether in that particular organism's ontogeny or in the phylogeny of the species.

This has implications at the level of human psyche or mind, for we can experience only what we already "know" unless we "know" how to be open or surprised or to look for the other - or unless an other or an event knows how to break the will to perceive what is already in us: the image - or imaginary realm - of the Other which determines our "symptoms" in Jacques Lacan's (1966) language. This "seduction" by the other is constantly constructing our subjectivity, but the older we get, the rarer it is that we remain open to change. In this sense Felix Guattari (1992) learned Lacan's lesson so well that he has carried it forward where Lacan himself - and even more so his followers - may have failed - for Guattari has mapped out an understanding of human subjectivity and psyche in its complex and vulnerable state between order and chaos.

The human system appears to be extremely rich and complex at perceiving multiple dimensions such as color, form, and rhythm, but recent research and theory asserts that things such as sound and light are broken down into microphysical quanta and reassembled into wholes *ad hoc* according to the above variable conditions which include "desire" - the history of perceptual experience mapped over a lifetime with respect to "drives" - appetitive, gustatory, sensational, sexual, and those relating to such things as safety, containment, rest, and diversity. Henry Stapp (1993) compares perception to the Heisenberg cut in quantum physical theory in which the moment of measurement is the moment of the creation/manifestation of an ordered whole out of the uncertain chaos of flux. Here the difference between active and passive disappear. Perception-action is one as Bergson describes. Similarly, Karl Pribram (1992), Ilya Prigogine(1984), and Stuart Kauffman (1993) theorize that the self-organizing wholes (concrescences in Whitehead's

sense) may be formed in our brain - and our subjectivity - as momentarily stable events based on “attractors”. Perturbations from within or without break the ongoing and unconscious patterns of our brain’s experience in the world and attract us to a new event, making us conscious or attentive and generating new maps which then move toward stability and habituated pattern until the next moment of innovation. The perturbations also make previously accumulated dispositional maps radiate with conscious novelty as they suddenly take on a new light. Again, as Deleuze and Guattari (1972) have described, desire is as active as it is passive. “Desiring production” is the manifestation of order out of chaos by human beings - which is a particular moment in the chaosmic movement between chaos and complexity in the universe.

The emerging ecosophic paradigm of complex interactive systems operating at the edge of order and chaos has profound implications for our understanding of mental, emotional, psychic, and social experience. Apart from understanding, how is it possible to get people to live practically or pragmatically what these philosopher-scientists elucidate? In a sense, all therapy, teaching, and activism hitherto has been only a prolegomena. Nietzsche said he was a bridge to a new type of human - to new modes of subjectivity. If humanity is to survive through its continual transformation and encounter with chaos, we must cross that bridge through the transdisciplinary development of transformative practices which reconstruct our ways of organizing our experience of the universe and create ever new subjectivities within the complex ecology of systems.

2. The Matter of Mind - Transversal Mappings

The “attack” of the neurosciences is not making psychoanalysis defunct, but it is encouraging us to reconsider the Freudian concept of the drive. The drive is a pivot between “soma” and “psyche,” between biology and representation - the highest level of organization and permanency to which Freudian listening and theory can aspire - that is, to which analytic construction (or imagination) can aspire. For what we understand by biology is - drives and energy, if you wish, but always already a “carrier of meaning” and a relation to another person, even though this person may be yourself (Kristeva

1993, p. 30).

“Desire at the limits of thought” defines the complementary, contradictory, and dialectical nature of our experience. Basic organisms are subject to attraction and repulsion, but can this be called desire? Even inorganic forms and events move toward quasi-stable states far from equilibrium toward “strange attractors,” and explanations such as “self-organization” and “morphic resonance” indicate a “drive” even at this level. Animals are said to be subject to instinct. Through increasing levels of consciousness these drives become more mediated. It is through the increasing levels of consciousness or learning that drive is transformed into desire. Desire is in fact increasingly fleshed out by the questioning nature of “learning to learn” which frees man from immediately conditioned responses - whether conditioned by biology or by social learning. By grasping the contexts of situations whereby conditions can be reframed and certainty and immediacy annulled, desire itself - in the form of drive - becomes threatened. The subject free to choose is confronted with the oceanic desert of the possible which can lead easily to psychotic or mystical experience. At this point what saves him or anchors him is desire itself which is no longer akin to instinct or drive, but is closer to faith. Desire becomes consciously chosen enactment.

Consciousness increases to higher and higher levels through continual reframing and the infinite questioning of the contexts of any situation. Desire always constitutes the limits of thought in any one organism’s subjectivity - or in any subject-moment. Gregory Bateson (1972) terms the immediate response of attraction/repulsion “zero learning” whereas the first order of learning is characterized by that which arises from conditioning: learning to correct an immediate response from a set of alternatives. Second-order learning occurs when an organism is able to learn to learn by transferring the process of basic conditioned learning to another situation. This higher order learning or consciousness - of which certain animals can partake - is brought to an extreme in human beings in which the strategy of learning games and playing them out for one’s own end comes to constitute the history of one’s character or self. Third order learning begins when the context of any situation may be questioned from outside its own implicit set of rules and assumptions. Psychoanalysis, dialectical and phenomenological introspection, and vari-

ous “mystical” practices of enlightenment (Zen, Sufism, Gnosticism, Alchemy . . .) have all sought to bring about and teach this third order learning. Bateson’s conjectured fourth order of learning simply continues the infinite questioning of reframing contexts still further, and this process can be performed infinitely as there is always an implicit context from which one questions the current context. Confronted with the chaos of the infinite, desire is what remains of instinct or drive mediated through thought or consciousness. Desire is the Heisenberg or Lacanian cut which produces the event through an act of faith. Desire is the horizon against which consciousness plays itself out.

Ritual, magic, violence, hypnosis, transference, seduction, desire, love, and faith form limits to consciousness. Evolving to higher and higher levels of consciousness through Bateson’s Learning I, II, III, and IV - which is simply the lucidly stated fulfillment of Zen and Sufi practices - is founded on continually questioning oneself out of the implicit beliefs/rules/contexts of the moment. The practice of consciousness puts you in touch with the infinite chaos of the possible to which the individuated actualization of the seizure of the event in ritual, magic, and belief puts an end through arbitrary assent. Consciousness is nothing - the annullment of something - pure negation - but a negation which clears the way for further positing lest there be stagnation, which is truly illusion.

Practices of consciousness can constitute a politics of decontextualization and reframing which serve to mediate amongst the irreconcilable differences of various manifestations of meaning expressed as desire or faith. The practice of consciousness can also become an end in itself. Sade’s practice of “apathy” as a negative theology attempts to achieve ataraxy through pure negation by annulling the reflecting, judging, conscious mind through the immediate enacting of drive, but Bataille claims that this leads to its own impasse, and he instead insists on pitting this immediacy against the always possible recapture of belief. True objectivity is difficult to achieve, but objectivity within subjectivity is even more difficult.

Finally, human experience is dependent on ethical, aesthetic, and noetic paradigms. The question, for example, is not what is violent or nonviolent, or right or wrong, but how energy or drive is transformed, translated, and mutated. Turning the other cheek, surren-

dering, fleeing, retaliating, transforming “violent” attack into its own downfall through martial arts - all of these are possibilities with respect to the most obvious example of physical assault, but this multiplicity of possible responses applies to all situations of human experience. With respect to the different methods of containing-expressing-channeling drive, rituals of sacrifice, representational religions, art, philosophy, law, and games of various types all present possibilities. The choice one makes is one of desire/faith whether individual or collective. No single approach can claim to judge or assert the correct way to another. We can however offer our different modes to be understood, admired, rejected, and even taken up in favor of forever different and/or “better” modes - though this is again a question of arbitrary assent or desire/faith. We could call this seduction or communication. We act, think, feel, and believe according to a set of implicit modes of belief which we do not question. On the other hand if we know what is happening to us - that we are programmed or seduced - that our subjectivity is constructed for us - and we know that the only way out is to become conscious of the ways in which we are programmed - then we might have the ability to enjoy what we are and/or to continually transform these ways of being. We can consciously throw ourselves into the game of seductions where we let ourselves be seduced by new ways.

For Emmanuel Levinas (1961) the only ethical relation is to take the position of the addressee - the “you” to the other’s “I.” A true ethnographer does the same - passing over into another’s way of being so much that one is lost in it for that moment and then returning to one’s own way changed. There is always the risk that one will be transformed or become another through seduction into other beliefs, faiths, or maps of existence, but this is the essential destiny of the human organism poised as it is on the border between order and chaos. Consciousness of the fact that seduction-transference-hypnosis is all there is at least affords the possibility of communication - the ethical-aesthetic-ecological maintenance of a modicum of order and balance within chaos. Meanwhile each subject-event will find his own reason for being - and to another that might appear “violent” or “wrong.”

One of the most interesting facets of Gregory Bateson’s work is that he found a way out of the dead end of specific psychotherapeutic and pedagogical approaches - beyond the

content to the context. Formally, double bind situations can lead to creativity, humor, mysticism, or schizophrenia. Unconsciously applied double binds tend to create “madness,” whereas consciously applied double binds in Zen and similar contexts lead to higher levels of learning, consciousness, and decontextualization. Bateson listened to schizophrenics’ language and put them in double binds with respect to their own systems of symbolic and noetic rules which formed the basis of their experience in order to break them out of their impasses.

Double bind theory asserts that there is an experiential component in the determination or etiology of schizophrenic symptoms and related behavioral patterns, such as humor, art, poetry, etc. Notably the theory does not distinguish between these subspecies. Within systems there is nothing to determine whether a given individual shall become a clown, a poet, a schizophrenic, or some combination of these. We deal not with a single syndrome but with a genus of syndromes, most of which are not conventionally regarded as pathological.

Let me coin the word “transcontextual” as a general term for this genus of syndromes.

It seems that both those whose life is enriched by transcontextual gifts and those who are impoverished by transcontextual confusions are alike in one respect: for them there is always or often a “double take.” A falling leaf, the greeting of a friend, or a “primrose by the river’s brim” is not “just that and nothing more.” Exogenous experience may be framed in the contexts of dream, and internal thought may be projected into the contexts of the external world. And so on. For all this, we seek a partial explanation in learning and experience (Bateson 1972, p. 272-3).

In terms of process, functional therapy and teaching would follow a basic form: provide a containing or holding environment and break the subject out of the modes which possess him, and continue until he can do it for himself (rejecting the master - not identifying with the ideal ego of the therapist/teacher). Finally, there is still the question of meaning in the face of consciousness or “desire at the limits of thought.” Embracing/enacting one’s desire comes to constitute the faith of each moment - which is a “difference that makes a difference” in the ecosophic flow of energy-matter. For Bataille and Sade the

ultimately decentered and radically objective ecosophic grasp of existence only served to increase their own personal subjective moments injecting them with an impossible richness due to their absolute sovereignty. This points out the limited nature of attempting to confine the psyche to what is contained within the skin of the individual subject. Bateson's "steps to an ecology of mind" and Bataille's "general economy" form a movement toward a broader and more complex grasp of the nested hierarchy of levels of experience from bio-physics to socio-cultural phenomena.

Based on an increasing amount of research, neuroscientists currently account for the feeling or quality of our experience through the continual linking of perceptual information and bodily sensation - a view put forth by Henri Bergson (1896) a century ago. From the beginning of an infant's life the process of learning takes place through this linking. A human being is programmed from birth through what begins as conditioned learning and finally reaches higher levels of learning to learn. The fact that each learned behavior, strategy, or perception is affected by the sensations accompanying it is not incidental. In fact it is increasingly understood that cognition depends on the body's kinesthetic perceptual experience in the world. The mind is "embodied" and embedded in its environment (Varela 1993). According to Gerald Edelman, if a brain could exist outside of a body - or if one could be artificially constructed - not only would its subjective experience of the world be different, but it would not even be able to perform the complex cognitive operations which an insect - let alone a human being - performs without having had the long-term bodily learning of experience in the world.

Qualia, individual to each of us, are recategorizations by higher-order consciousness of value-laden perceptual relations in each sensory modality or their conceptual combinations with each other. We report them crudely to others; they are more directly reportable to ourselves. This set of relationships is usually but not always connected to value. Freedom from time allows the location in time of phenomenal states by a suffering or joyous self. And the presence of appropriate language improves discrimination enormously; skill in wine tasting, for example may be considered the result of a passion based on qualia that are increasingly refined by language (Edelman 1992, p. 136).

While the informational aspect of perception-action is mapped in primary sensory cortices of the brain, value-based internal state sensations are simultaneously registered in the hippocampal area of the brain which is directly linked to the body's complete central nervous system. Conceptual categorization based on value-linked perception is stored through neural maps generated in the frontal, parietal, and temporal cortices. For Edelman, primary consciousness occurs as a result of communication between long-term potentiated maps of categorizations stored in memory and immediate short-term maps at the moment of present on-going perception-action. Attention to life is continually linking interaction in the world with the psyche of memory and learning. Even very primitive life forms experience this kind of consciousness or learning. Higher-order consciousness arises in human beings when stored maps begin to communicate and generate their own new learning and feeling experiences without interaction from external conditioning. It is with human beings that the depth of mind or psyche expands beyond what appears to be mechanical interaction with the world and that this higher order consciousness builds an inner experience which forms the basis of thoughts, feelings, memories, hopes, plans, desires, and dreams - and the sense that we are as a self.

Higher order consciousness depends on building a self through affective intersubjective exchanges. These interactions - with parental figures, with grooming conspecifics, and with sexual partners - are of the same kind as those guiding semiotic exchange and language building. Affectively colored exchanges through symbols initiate semantic bootstrapping. The result is a model of a world rather than of an econiche, along with models of the past, present, and future. At the same time that higher-order consciousness frees us from the tyranny of the remembered present, however, primary consciousness coexists and interacts with the mechanism of higher-order consciousness. Indeed, primary consciousness provides a strong driving force for higher-order processes. We live on several levels at once (Edelman 1992, p. 150).

The richness of interacting with other human beings - each of whom has his own inner world of mind or psyche - expands the complexity of human experience many-fold, and although this higher-order consciousness begins to take place through a pre-linguistic form of categorization, language serves to facilitate this increasing complexity. In the

human activity which we take for granted, so many layers of meaning are at work - reaching all the way back to primitive sensational and perceptual states - that we are never aware of this richness and complexity. In truth, emotion and cognition are never separate, and even the most seemingly rational of thoughts and actions are driven by affect.

Meaning takes shape in terms of concepts that depend on categorizations based on value. It grows with the history of remembered body sensations and mental images. The mixture of events is individual and, in large measure, unpredictable. When, in society, linguistic and semantic capabilities arise and sentences involving metaphor are linked to thought, the capability to create new models of the world grows at an explosive rate. But one must remember that, because of its linkage to value and to the concept of self, this system of meaning is almost never free of affect; it is charged with emotions (Edelman 1992, p. 170).

The efforts of neuroscientists to understand the working of the brain in the interaction of mind and body has only served to elucidate the irreducible level of experience which takes place within human life. Although the social is based on the individual which is based on the biological, the chemical, and the physical, no one level can ever serve to fully explain another. Examining phenomena or events at any level is always related to - never reducible to - another level higher or lower. While psychoanalysis and psychology are informed by the sciences of brain and body, in the end human experience can only be understood by grasping what is essential to it.

At a certain practical point, therefore, attempts to reduce psychology to neuroscience must fail. Given that the pursuit of thought as a skill depends on social and cultural interaction, convention, and logic, as well as on metaphor, purely biological methods as they presently exist are insufficient. In part, this is because thought at its highest levels is recursive and symbolic. Because we are each idiosyncratic sources of semantic interpretation, and because intersubjective communication is essential for thought (whether with a real or imaginary interlocutor), we must use and study these capacities in their own right (Edelman 1992, p. 175).

In examining the development of human emotion, Antonio Damasio goes even further than Edelman to elucidate the basis of cognition by claiming that attention to life - to perception, cognition, and action - is constantly dependent on desire or drive. This is similar to Bergson's claim that perception itself is formed by needs or drive. What is selected from the totality of existence for perception - what will be seen, heard, and felt by any entity - is formed by instinct, need, and drive, which in human beings increasingly refines itself into desire. This is obvious in the case of conditioned learning in which one is rewarded for behaving a certain way, but also in more advanced forms of motivated and creative learning - in which one is encouraged to explore and motivated to learn and transform oneself based on immediate desire rather than a delayed reward - or worse yet, freedom from punishment.

In the full somatic-marker hypothesis, I propose that a somatic state, negative or positive, caused by the appearance of a given representation, operates not only as a marker for the value of what is represented, but also as a booster for continued working memory and attention. The proceedings are "energized" by signs that the process is actually being evaluated, positively or negatively, in terms of the individual's preferences and goals. The allocation and maintenance of attention and working memory do not happen by miracle. They are first motivated by preferences inherent in the organism, and then by preferences and goals acquired on the basis of the inherent ones (Damasio 1994, p. 197-8).

In elucidating the formation of subjectivity and the concept of the self in human beings, Damasio claims that the ability to detach the psyche or mind from immediate states of narrow episodic consciousness found in animals and to experience memories and plans is not enough. In addition there must be a constant set of representations of bodily states both past and present in one's interaction with the world in the form of other or object.

Finally consider that all ingredients I have described above - an object that is being represented, an organism responding to the object of representation, and a state of the self in the process of changing because of the organism's response to the object - are held simultaneously in working memory and attended, side-by-side or in rapid interpolation, in

early sensory cortices. I propose that subjectivity emerges during the latter step when the brain is producing not just images of an object, not just images of organism responses to the object, but a third kind of image, that of an organism in the act of perceiving and responding to an object. I believe the subjective perspective arises out of the constant of the third kind of image (Damasio 1994, p. 242-3).

In this theory, subjectivity itself depends on the initial distinction of objects out there in the world which differentiates it from an autistic total immersion in existence. This is similar to Melanie Klein's (1932) phases of development in which primitive object relations and the splitting of events into good and bad objects precedes the formation of the subject in the depressive position who differentiates himself from other objects and integrates himself as a continuous being with a history of interactions with these others or objects. Just as Klein believes that the formation of object relations which remain with us our whole lives and form a significant part of our subjective human experience and interaction with others precedes language, so to does Damasio assert from a neurological position that the construction of subjectivity and the self is not solely dependent on human language.

This basic neural device does not require language. The metaself construction I envision is purely nonverbal, a schematic view of the main protagonists from a perspective external to both. In effect, the third-party view constitutes, moment-by-moment, a nonverbal narrative document of what is happening to those protagonists. The narrative can be accomplished without language, using the elementary representational tools of the sensory and motor systems in space and time. I see no reason why animals without language would not make such narratives (Damasio 1994, p. 243).

The Lacanian notion that language determines our subjectivity from even before birth appears to be at odds with this view. In fact Lacan's whole project was based on redressing the mistake in psychoanalytic work which was to strengthen the ego or self, as he believed that the self was a part of the falsely constructed fantasy which caused suffering by not allowing the subject to be determined by his own desire or destiny but rather causing him to be trapped into patterns of behavior and experience formed by the determina-

tion of the other. Similarly, Michel Foucault (1976) traced the genealogy of the experience of the self as a form of subjectivity and found it to be very peculiar to recent Western Civilization whose discourse came to form this subjective experience of self in individuals and societies. What Damasio calls self is simply a preverbal form of self which is more primitive than the more complex experience of the "I" or ego which modern human beings develop.

Humans have available second order narrative capacities, provided by language, which can engender verbal narratives out of nonverbal ones. The refined form of subjectivity that is ours would emerge from the latter process. Language may not be the source of the self, but it certainly is the source of the "I" (Damasio 1994, p. 243).

On the other hand, for Lacan this preverbal construction of the "I" and the self is always-already being formed by the symbolic which may or may not be spoken and elaborated by human linguistic communication. The human being is born into an elaborate symbolic and noetic world of myths, laws, rituals, and games, and even as the most primitive splitting and object relations are transforming the infant's subjectivity from one of oceanic autism to one of differentiation, the more complex symbolic world has situated him in its own way. Perhaps Daniel Stern's (1985) mapping of phases in the construction of subjectivity based on his ethological research unites the above theories by showing how the most primitive psychic states remain with us even as we gain access to the intersubjective, symbolic, and verbal worlds. Indeed, if we take Stern a step further we could agree with Lacan that even before these later intersubjective and verbal phases of development are triggered and reach their moment of optimum influence, they are nevertheless operating underground from the beginning.

It appears, then, that from the vulnerable state at the moment of birth, human life is an extensive and complex journey of learning in which not only does the subject learn to survive, but the very way in which he comes to experience the world is constructed. Bateson's increasing levels of learning may function similarly to Stern's model of how subjectivity is formed. The human being is born with a certain set of programmed responses, and basic conditioned learning begins to take place at birth or even before, but even as

higher levels of learning to learn and transcontextualization are initiated, these basic levels still operate underneath, forming a complex emotional-cognitive experience.

In analyzing the neuropsychological system, Karl Pribram has elucidated the formation of subjectivity and learning through its interaction with other systems internal and external. Borrowing from Ilya Prigogine's (1984) theoretical physics, Pribram describes the human experience as a complex dialectical or cybernetic circuit with a continual and unpredictable fluctuation between stability and novelty. Safety in the form of order, stability, and familiarity is a basic drive toward which human learning progresses. Once someone has been conditioned to perceive/act in a certain way, it is more likely that he will continue in the same direction based on the conditioned learning associated with bodily sensation related to basic needs.

The thermodynamic considerations put forward by Prigogine regarding stabilities far from equilibrium are intriguing: Stabilities far from equilibrium are attractive; they operate as attractors toward which the process tends. Thus the episode, characterized by its temporary stability far from equilibrium, can act as an attractor during learning - in experimental psychology terms, it values the act by means of a reinforcing process. In the holonomic brain theory, this process is mediated by the protocritic (pain and temperature) system (Pribram 1991, p. 218-9).

As much as possible any organism, including a human being, will seek to incorporate any change into its already operating system of rules. Nevertheless, perturbation from the internal and external environments eventually produces a situation in which a breakdown of stability occurs. In attempting to find a new stability, an organism may become stuck in the resulting confusion or turbulence.

Often the neuropsychological system is actually operating close to equilibrium and perturbation is handled by a return to equilibrium: the distraction of an orienting reaction is either ignored or incorporated into the ongoing process through repetition and familiarization. However if the perturbation is great, a reaction we ordinarily call emotionally upsetting can result in turbulence and a new stability has to be achieved. When, as in the

holonomic brain theory, the process is conceived to be composed of continuous function, for example, as manifolds described by the Lie algebra, vortices can develop in the turbulent system. Thus, an often realized possibility is to be “hung up” in the turbulence. But, because this is a state far from equilibrium, one can deliberately seek alternate constraints in order to change the state (Pribram 1991, p. 219).

Borrowing from Ross Ashby's work on computer systems, Pribram describes a method for preventing the stagnation of a breakdown and turning it into a breakthrough. The injection of randomness acts as a continual perturbation which prevents a system - or subjectivity - from stagnation within any relatively stable state. On the human level this method can serve to avoid fixation, stagnation, and disease.

Ashby described an interesting and powerful method for dealing with turbulence, a method which leads to “catastrophic” restabilizations (“step functions”). In his computational model, stability was achieved by adding to the computation, numbers taken from a list of random numbers. Randomness provides maximum variance, the widest spread of possible consequences. In a system with such a probability distribution there is also maximum possibility (potentiality) for new organizations to develop. As in Prigogine's model one cannot predict just how the system will restabilize because of the randomness injected into the turbulent system.

Ashby's and Prigogine's models have many things in common with the more recently developed thermodynamic models. Effective processing is achieved by a heuristic in which the addition of noise is important to preclude premature closure onto an overriding attractor (Pribram 1991, p. 219).

This is amazingly close to Bateson's methods, and to Zen and Sufi practices of consciousness as well as various forms of shamanism and mysticism in which physical, chemical, and symbolic means are used in order to prevent stagnation and increase emotional and cognitive transformation. In these realms teaching, healing, and sacred experience are an inseparable part of transformative practices.

Even apart from specific practices designed to transform an individual or collective sys-

tem which is at an impasse through pedagogical or therapeutic methods, Pribram describes the ongoing experience of being human as a fluctuating process in which change, difference, and confrontation itself is immanent. No matter how much human beings are driven by their need for stability, it is nevertheless the intrusion of change from the systems with which we are interlinked that gives meaning to our lives. Much of our existence must take place at the unconscious level, yet it is perturbation which brings conscious purpose and awareness to our lives.

Perturbation, internally or externally generated, produces an orienting reaction which interrupts ongoing behavior and demarcates an episode. As the orienting reaction habituates, the weightings (values) of polarizations of the junctional microprocess become (re)structured on the basis of protocritic processing. Temporary stability characterizes the new structure which acts as a reinforcing attractor for the duration of the episode i. e., until dishabituation (another orienting reaction) occurs (Pribram 1991, p. 220).

In addition to meaning, our basic cognitive functions depend on this difference. As Bergson elaborated, the way in which any organism comes to experience its environment will depend on need, drive, and desire. Basic perception/action and attention to life is driven by continual perturbation from outside.

Whenever a situation changes, an orienting reaction occurs, previously habituated perceptions become dishabituated. The orienting reaction signals the perception of novelty, the perceived change in the situation. Perceived changes can be generated internally - as when an organism becomes hungry. In such instances, "novel" perception - restaurant signs begin to populate the landscape - make relevant what had become irrelevant. Effort is expended, attention is "paid," and the familiar is experienced innovatively (Pribram 1994, p. 221).

Difference in itself is nothing however, as there is an infinite amount of difference surrounding any system. What matters - as Bateson says - is the difference that makes a difference, or novelty. Absolute difference tends toward chaos and entropy, whereas the continual reorganization of the familiar into the new strikes a balance between the interplay

of stability and novelty which characterizes the basic movement of human experience, if not all self-organizing systems. It is through this method of reorganization of the play between order and chaos and the maintenance of a state of quasi-stability at a point far from equilibrium that certain (low-temperature) systems are sometimes able to mutate into higher-level organisms rather than going over into entropy, dying, or completing their concrescence.

There is a great deal of confusion regarding the perception of novelty. In scientific circles, much of this confusion stems from the confounding of novelty with information. . . . However, as will be detailed shortly, novelty in the sense used here, neither increases nor reduces the amount of uncertainty; rather it is due to a rearrangement of what is familiar. The skill in writing a novel resides not in providing information in the sense of reducing the amount of uncertainty in communication. Rather, the skill lies in portraying the familiar in novel ways, that is in new combinations (Pribram 1994, p. 222).

Novelty is akin to the randomness Ashby injected into computer systems in order to guarantee that they did not stagnate in quasi-stability far from equilibrium. If equilibrium approximates the entropy or chaos persisting in the absence of difference, and information is a point of relative stability far from equilibrium - a certain attractor - then randomness is what keeps these attractors from themselves becoming stagnant information. Perhaps this is the role of art. Books, films, and music challenge and reorganize our perceptual, cognitive, and emotional experience of daily life even as they provide us with a sense of meaning. Further, we could describe any act which undertakes this task as an art of life - a transformative practice. Finally, the contemporary breakdown of grand narratives within philosophy, science, religion, and art may have opened the way for a more immediate experience of meaning in the world in which the continual influx of novelty becomes the art of life itself. No longer will meaning, or majesty, or truth be outside of us within specific gods, leaders, or great works which capture our desire, faith, or adherence. In modernity, art, science, and philosophy have lead the way to the reconstruction of our subjectivity in which percept, affect, and concept become the act of faith of each moment in our existence.

In order to grasp human experience at any level it is necessary to take account of one's position. In progressing toward the goal of research we sometimes know without knowing - we follow what is guiding us without being able to fully explain it. According to Thomas Sebeok's (1981) reading of Peirce, this method of "abduction" or "the play of musement" is probably how most science and philosophy progresses, yet it is never presented this way after the fact, and it takes a great amount of faith and courage with respect to oneself and others to progress without certainty.

The project of formulating steps toward an art and science of human existence concerns the formation of subjectivity: how the ways in which human beings experience the world become constructed - how these subjectivities can be reconstructed with respect to "pathology" and "optimization" - and what the political and ethical implications of this are. In the course of our work, we must seek to understand as many maps of experience as possible from both within and without - both "emically" and "etically" - as does the ethnographer who immerses himself in another culture - another way of organizing his experience. This includes scientific, philosophical, psychoanalytic, and religious maps of various levels, intensities, and purposes. But the ways in which people experience, understand, and describe the world are irreconcilable, and not only does no single map hold the answer, but even the degree to which one is better or more true than another depends on implicit values, desires, and needs of the moment. Instead of seeking for the right map, we could seek to communicate - to translate across maps. This "transversality" (Guattari 1992) not only facilitates communication (in every respect from information processing to love to ecology) but it increases the multi-dimensionality of immediate experience and human subjectivity.

Seeing how maps translate does not give us the answer - it shows us "how it happens." Not what but how. Which is why the mapping of existence scientifically does not destroy faith, meaning, or ecstasy - unless that faith was only a fundamental fantasy in the first place. No matter how many maps we construct Bataille's (1954) question will remain: "why must there be what I know?"

Understanding systems as nested hierarchies is another way of grasping transversality

provided that what Pribram calls “transfer functions” are sought - the ways to translate from one map to another. This is not simply understanding the leap from quantum physics to classical physics to neural networks to desire, but the leap from one person’s subjectivity to another’s or from the subjectivity of one moment to that of another. Most “systems theory” does not concern itself with this transversality so “systems” for these thinkers are just another single way of seeing - and a mechanistic one. Cybernetic, psychoanalytic, ecological, and organic approaches do not in any way guarantee that one will not get caught in the same mechanistic impasses, but they do hold promise for a more complex understanding of human experience.

3. Chaos and Complexity - Beyond the Brain

The brain or nervous system of the body of individual subjectivity may be conceived of as an extremely sensitive net for the organization of events. What is called mind, psyche, spirit, or information may be conceived of as the momentarily organized event itself - in an infinite variety of forms - which is always unique and irreducible to the matter or energy through which it comes to exist. Rather than speaking of perception, cognition, emotion, or consciousness, we would do better to speak of subjectivity as the total experience of any irreducible event which partakes of all of these. The “feel” of our self, our history, our memory, or any particular moment is always a part of one’s internal horizon as a subjective being which can only be re-presented by being described “objectively” at which time that description, translation, or communication becomes another - different though related - event in itself.

Felix Guattari (1992) characterizes the essential movement of human subjectivity and the universe itself as one of chaomosis - an eternal fluctuation between the individuation of order out of chaos and its eventual dissolution and plunge back into uncertainty and chaos in the process of further mutation - a process which is at once linear, circular, and eternal. Karl Pribram has discovered a similar process within the working of the brain and its role in learning and the development of human mind and subjectivity.

Thus, one way of looking at the relationship between space-time and spectrum involves the least action principle, which mediates between two orders. On the one hand there are potential orders provided by an oscillation between change (measured as energy) and inertia (measured as momentum). On the other, are evolving space-time configurations. Information repeatedly actualizes potential into space-time configurations thus accounting for their evolution. One sort of evolving configuration is experienced by us as perceptual experience (Pribram 1991, p. 271-2).

What is called information in cybernetics is another name for the quantum coherence or self-organized event that gives any entity its unique existence. What we think are things out there in the world which we passively perceive are rather manifested or created by the organizing of human perception - they are organized in the interaction between human perception and the external world. Space-time configurations are actualized or created by our perception - our unique manner of interacting with energy and matter which is experienced differently by other entities. One way of grasping this is to experience how certain chemical substances or physical acts alter the perception of what others are experiencing "normally." Pribram describes mystical practices and psychoactive drugs as altering the body-brain's interaction with the universe and its organization of events as it moves from the temporo-spatial to the spectral dimension dissolving the usual boundaries between mind and matter which we normally maintain. These boundaries which we normally maintain are none other than what Bergson (1896) calls "attention to life" or the mode of subjectivity which applies itself to the external environment in satisfaction of basic needs - pragmatic perception. Mystical practices, psychoactive chemicals, or even the mind altering effects of art, love, or trauma can plunge us into the depth of an inner experience cut off from pragmatic perception and reorganize our subjectivity in other ways.

Frontolimbic excitation can be induced by internal neurochemical stimulation or by external methods such as concentrating on ambiguous (or otherwise meaningless) stimuli provided by a mantra, for example. When the spectral dimension dominates the production of a perception, space and time become enfolded in the experienced episode. Time evolution ceases and spatial boundaries disappear. An infinity of envisioned covariations

characterizes the episode. There fore, the episode is often referred to as spiritual in the sense that, as a consequence of practiced inference, an effective union is envisioned between perceiver and perceived. The boundary between mind and matter, as all other boundaries, becomes dissolved. More on this at a future occasion (Pribram 1991, p. 272-3).

Roger Penrose and Stuart Hameroff have sought to find an explanatory map for the working of the human brain and the manner in which it organizes mind by applying complex mathematical modeling and quantum theory to research in neuroscience. According to Penrose the neural networks responsible for mapping and processing human experience in the world have been found to be infinitely more complex than previously thought, making it clear that artificial intelligence is nowhere near being able to construct anything close to the richness of the human nervous system. The cytoskeleton which forms the basic structural, circulatory, and information processing “nervous system” of single cell organisms such as an amoeba is thought by Penrose and Hameroff to form a complex information processing system within individual brain cells or neurons themselves. Rather than accepting the simplistic idea of neurons either firing or not, they conjecture that the large number of microtubules present on each neuron operate in a large scale quantum coherent manner within and across neurons and neural networks.

Here we envisage that not only must single microtubules be involved in a relatively large-scale quantum-coherent state, but that such a state must extend from one microtubule to the next. Thus, not only must this quantum coherence stretch to the length of an entire microtubule (and we recall that microtubules can extend to considerable length), but a good many of the different microtubules in the cytoskeleton within a neuron, if not all of them, must together take part in this same quantum-coherent state. Not only this, but the quantum coherence must leap the synaptic barrier between neuron and neuron. It is not much of a globality if it involves only individual cells! The unity of a single mind can arise, in such a description only if there is some form of quantum coherence extending across at least an appreciable part of the entire brain (Penrose 1994, p. 375).

Microtubules are involved in transmitting the macromolecules that form neurotransmitter

chemicals which fire across neural networks mapping the complex experience of external perception, bodily sensation, and their recategorization into higher order memory, learning, and consciousness. Research and speculation in the realm of quantum physical events has suggested ways in which the complex human neural system might similarly organize events by mapping our experience of being in the world.

Our picture, then, is of some kind of global quantum state which coherently couples the activities taking place within the tubes, concerning microtubules collectively right across large areas of the brain. There is some influence that this state (which may not be simply a “quantum state”, in the conventional sense of the standard quantum formalism) exerts on the computations taking place along the microtubules - an influence which takes delicate and precise account of the putative, missing, non-computational OR [objective reduction] physics that I have been strongly arguing for. The “computational” activity of conformational changes in the tubulins controls the way that the tubes transport materials along their outsides, and ultimately influences the synapse strengths at pre- and post-synaptic endings. In this way, a little of this coherent quantum organization within the microtubules is “tapped off” to influence changes in the synaptic connections of the neural computer of the moment (Penrose 1994, p. 375-6).

One prevalent theory within quantum physics holds that the superposition of possible states of location for a particle of matter in the form of a wave is reduced to its actual place in the moment of measurement by the act of measuring itself. This “subjective reduction” of the real is unavoidable. Although we as subjective human beings engaged in the act of observation are not able to escape from this blind spot, Penrose and Hameroff nevertheless seek to put forward a theory of “objective reduction” (OR) or “objectively orchestrated reduction” (OOR) in which they conjecture that although subjective perception or measurement actualizes the multiplicity of the possible into a single event, this process of the organization of events or wholes (or concrescences in Whitehead’s term) takes place without our measurement - and that our experience of the world or subjectivity may be the result of ongoing successive moments of perceptual reduction organized into higher level wholes across time similar to the way in which our cinematic perception according to Deleuze (1983) captures and transmits 24 images - or

percepts - per second. In order to demonstrate the effect of the organizational activity of the human nervous system and its relation to our experience, subjects have been given extremely mild electrical pulses through their brain - enough simply to disrupt the organization of events within their neural networks - while trying to complete a perceptual task and compared with a control group doing the same task. It was indeed found that those without the pulse performed better (Hameroff & Penrose 1996).

In focusing on consciousness and free will, Penrose has shown that the true conscious act which intervenes and alters the programmed pattern of responses to events is rare indeed. Recent research by Penrose's (1994) colleagues has shown that cortical activity is altered by the conscious decision to act, and that this willing appears in the brain some time before the actual act and even before the subject is aware of his intention. Primary consciousness or subjectivity may sit above our virtually programmed behavior giving us the feel of our experience (as Edelman and Damasio have argued), but the ability to continually mediate between conscious reflection and actual changes of behavior in relation to that reflection is a rare ability of higher-level consciousness. This is similar to Bateson's third order learning and to the "enlightened" self-consciousness sought after by Zen and Sufi practices and by various methods of psychotherapy.

John Eccles has similarly attempted to account for the interaction between mind and brain and specifically the ability of psychic or mental events to organize the physical events of the brain. As previously pointed out, it is now known that neurons do not simply fire or not, but are engaged in a complex process in which various factors decide whether they will continue to fire and which neural maps will be linked up. The probability of exocytosis in which a neuron releases its neurotransmitter molecules across the synapse to another neuron is actually quite low and the inhibition of firing is as important as the firing itself. Eccles theorizes that psyche or mind itself is the quantum organization of multiplicity or possibility into events through information which is beyond the classical laws of thermodynamics.

Combining these observations with our quantum mechanical analysis of bouton exocytosis, we present now the hypothesis that the mental intention (the volition) becomes neu-

rally effective by momentarily increasing the probability of exocytosis in selected cortical areas such as the supplementary motor area neurons. In the language of quantum mechanics this means a selection of events (the event that the trigger mechanism has functioned, which is already prepared with a certain probability). This act of selection is related to Wigner's selection process of the mind on quantal states, and its mechanism clearly lies beyond ordinary quantum mechanics. This selection mechanism effectively increases the probability for exocytosis, and in this way generates increased EPSPs [excitatory post-synaptic potentials] without violation of the conservation laws. . . . [Q]uantum selection is the only possible way of producing different final states from identical initial conditions in identical dynamical situation, and thus with the same values of the conserved quantities. Such a situation could not prevail in a purely classical process, where a change in the final state necessarily implies a change either of the initial conditions or of the dynamics. Even in the recently extensively discussed processes governed by classical 'deterministic chaos', the final outcome is predetermined by the initial conditions, though in an extremely sensitive manner. Classical chaotic motion is characterized by extreme instabilities with respect to small changes and cannot therefore account for regular brain processes such as exocytosis (Eccles 1994, p. 160).

Without the conscious ability of mind to intervene in the organization of events through behavioral patterns - without the low probability of exocytosis which offers unknown possibilities and the intervention of free will, human beings would not hold their privileged place in the universe between mind and matter - between energy and information - which gives them a certain - though limited - freedom to act in a world of relatively stable determined boundary conditions. Stuart Kauffman (1993) describes how deeply ordered "solid" systems are unable to communicate across other systems and unable to make major adaptations to interacting systems, whereas extremely chaotic "gaseous" systems are so sensitive to slight changes that they are unable to hold on to any order or concrescence. The human neural system, however, is an example of a more liquid system - or a solid system close to liquidity - in which order and chaos are balanced in a unique way to allow for maximum adaptation and interaction with other concrescent systems and events - ever mutating to higher forms of complexity without going over into entropy. Eccles's model elegantly provides a map of the way in which these implicated and inte-

grated systems of physical matter and energy interact with those of mind, psyche, spirit or culture - all of which human beings take part in.

There is an extraordinary consequence of the hypothesis that mental events (psychons) effectively act on the dendrons by increasing the probability of the exocytoses generated by invasion of a bouton by presynaptic impulses. Fortunately the quantal probability is low (0.3-0.4) for the cerebral cortex, the hippocampus. If the probability were as high as 1.0, mental experiences could have no effective action on neural events of the dendrons. The evolutionary development of the mammalian neocortex would not have redeemed the mindlessness of the brain. . . . There would be no 'HOW' of conscious experiences coming to exist as an eventual outcome of the biological evolution of the mammalian brain. All depends on the neural design of the ultramicrosite operations with the low exocytotic probability of the millions of boutons in the mammalian neocortex and in the coming-to-be of some primitive conscious experiences that achieve expression because of the low exocytotic probability (Eccles 1994, p. 182).

The unique position of the human nervous system depends on its sensitivity which acts as a bridge between the "classical" physical world and the as-yet-unmeasurable "quantum" or "psychic" world. The human neural network is not simply programed for permanent connections, but rather the exocytosis which links synapses into complex networks and organizes subjectivity is delicately balanced between potentiation and inhibition - perhaps providing a perceptual or communicational device sensitive to subtle quantum energy which we are just beginning to understand.

Richard Gerber's (1996) description of the Tiller-Einstein model of positive and negative space-time and energy poses a possible explanation for this relationship as well as a map to explain the empirical effects of homeopathy, acupuncture, meditation, psychic healing, and other forms of "vibrational medicine." Einstein's famous equation ($E=mc^2$) demonstrates that all matter is actually an energy packet or light frozen into a stable configuration which our experience of classical physical matter takes for granted. According to Gerber, Einstein's full equation is that energy equals the mass of a particle of matter multiplied by the speed of light constant ($E=mc^2$) *divided by* the square root of one

minus the velocity of the particle divided by the speed of light ($\sqrt{1-v^2/c^2}$). This part of the equation is usually ignored since the velocity of the particle is usually assumed to be so small as to render the denominator equal to 1 for practical purposes. In reality, as the velocity of the energy packet of matter is increased toward the speed of light, the energy is increased to infinity as the denominator in the equation decreases, but beyond the speed of light, the equation would reveal the square root of (-1) - an “imaginary” number. Although the energy to accelerate matter beyond the speed of light is beyond our classical capabilities, it is here that Tiller claims the existence of the quantum or psychic world of negative space-time begins. He believes that this negative space-time operates through a kind of subtle “magneto-electric” energy beyond light-speed and different from the electromagnetism of sub-luminal speeds. Further, this energy is negatively entropic which accounts for the formative forces or self-organizing principles of mind, psyche, and life and also for why measuring this type of effect is difficult through classical techniques as it is affected by subtle energy factors such as will, belief, and unseen vibrational elements.

Henry Stapp has similarly conjectured that the brain-mind organization of experience works in a quantum coherent manner. In likening the brain to an extremely sensitive non-linear system he claims that each brain itself is implicated in the quantum universe as a set of superposed possibilities even on a macroscopic level. At the level of subjective conscious experience this superposition of possibilities must be reduced by an actual event. Stapp asks how and where this event occurs. It is difficult for us to grasp this situation for the very reason that we misconceive the idea that there are patterns or events or things out there in the world to be perceived. It is rather our “quantum” brain which organizes a pattern such as a triangle from the chaos of matter and motion. Other entities - insects for example - do not see a triangle - or a chair - or a sun.

In the quantum ontology a brain attending to an external triangle is not performing the retrograde act of transforming an actual external triangle into some congruent structure of particle motions, which must then be deciphered to be perceived as a triangle. Rather it is transforming the external triangle, which exists only as a pattern of disjoint events and tendencies, into a single event that actualizes, in integrated form, an image of the

structural connections that inhere in the perceived triangle. The brain, therefore, does not convert an actual whole triangle into some jumbled set of particle motions; rather it converts a concatenation of separate external events into the actualization of some single integrated pattern of neural activity that is congruent to the perceived whole triangle. The central question is then: Why is the actualizing of this integrated pattern of activity felt as the perceiving of the triangle? More generally: Why do brain events feel the way they do (Stapp 1993, p. 155)?

For Stapp human conscious experience is the feel or subjectivity or total experience of an event at the level of mind and irreducible to the neural system through which this experience comes to be known. For Stapp, Penrose's question of where the reduction or Heisenberg cut which produces an event occurs is irrelevant: we can make it anywhere and it is in fact made at many levels - and differently - by each subjectivity.

The present theory asserts that each human conscious experience is the feel of an event in the top-level process occurring in a human brain. This brain process is asserted to consist of a sequence of Heisenberg actual events called the top-level events. Each such event actualizes some macroscopic quasi-stable pattern of neural activity. The pattern actualized by a top-level event is called a symbol. It normally consists of a set of other symbols, called its components, linked together by a superposed neural activity.

Actualizing a symbol S engenders enduring physical changes in the synapses (facilitation) that cause any subsequent actualization of any component of S to create a pattern of dispositions for the activations of the other components of S (association) (Stapp 1993, p. 155).

It is here at the level of human subjective events that we find the symbol. In fact what Stapp calls a symbol is the way in which we begin to further organize and recategorize events into more complex higher order events of our own invention by naming, translating, communicating, and combining - a conclusion which Edelman and Damasio have come to through extensive research into the neurology of the human brain. Here we are reminded of the psychoanalytic world of the infant beginning to experience events and to differentiate them through primitive symbol formation. Initially the symbols are barely

distinguishable from the immediacy of experience in relating to matter and energy or from primitive basic drives and bodily sensations. Eventually through a long process in which each individual subject's ontogeny benefits from the phylogenetics of the species, the subject will come to organize his experience in a more complex, empowered, and mediated way - through the reorganization of his subjectivity in the world by rituals, games, intersubjective communication, and language. The constant mapping of psychic or mental experience by the brain through symbols provides an ongoing sense of self which Stapp calls the "generalized body-world schema" in which - much like Stern's concept of subjectivity - complex and integrated systems of symbols make up human experience.

A component of a thought, so far as it is apprehended, is itself a possible thought. Thus each thought has a compositional structure: it has components that are entities of the same kind as itself. Our basic principle is that the compositional structure of the feel of a top-level event is isomorphic to the compositional structure of the symbol actualized by that event: there is a one-to-one mapping of symbols to feels, and this mapping preserves compositional structure (Stapp 1993, p. 156).

Stapp takes a position similar to Whitehead's organic or process-oriented philosophy of existence in which what is real is the symbol or the event which is actualized or organized out of chaos. Stapp calls this an analytic ontology as opposed to a synthetic ontology which perceives that events are reducible to fundamental parts which can be divided at will.

In the quantum ontology the only genuine physical facts are the actual events. Hence some actual event must "serve as the objectively real counterpart to [each] psychic state". But in this case the essential unity of the psychic state - so incomprehensible within reductionist classical thought - mirrors the essential unity of its physical counterpart. In both cases the ontological progression is from the ontologically fundamental wholes to their ontologically subordinate components, rather than from presumed ontologically fundamental elements to assemblies thereof. This shift from synthetic ontology to analytic ontology is the foundation of the present work (Stapp 1993, p. 157).

According to an analytic or organic understanding, subjectivity and objectivity are two different - and united - ways of experiencing the universe, both of which each event partakes of. To perceive objectively is to see from outside - freed from subjective feel as much as possible though this is ultimately not completely possible - the unfolding of totality or chaos into actual events. Whether this is considered chance or determinism is a matter of choice. To perceive subjectively is to grasp the feel of any event from within as unique to itself - an experience in which human free will participates in the active creation of events.

According to the theory advanced here each actual event has two aspects; a feel, and a physical representation within the quantum formalism. The feel is asserted to be a veridical image of the effect of the action of the physically described event.

*At the purely physical level the Heisenberg actual event is passive: it is simply the coming into being of a new set of tendencies. However, in the context of the present ontology the actual event must be constructed actively: the event **actualizes** the shift in tendencies. If the feel is identified as the active aspect of the event, then the feel is the veridical feel of actively actualizing the new state of affairs, and consciousness becomes the efficacious agent that it veridically feels itself to be (Stapp 1993, p. 168).*

This takes us again to Bergson: perception is action. Perception/action is creation/manifestation simultaneously passive and active depending on one's point of view. The human organism which is an event unfolding and evolving objectively in the universe from the totality of the possible (all of which "exists" in the sense of being virtual) and interacting with other events through perception/action has unfolded or evolved to the point of being able to organize events through maximum complexity and conscious choice. To subjectively act with free will within objective boundary conditions. To create.

The question arises: What determines which of the alternative possible brain activities is actualized by an actual event?

According to contemporary quantum theory, two factors contribute to this quantum choice. The first is the local deterministic evolution of tendencies governed by the

Heisenberg equations of motion. This factor brings in all of the local historical influences such as heredity, learning, reflective contemplation on priorities and values, etc., that contribute to the formation of the current state of the brain. These factors determine, however only the tendencies, or weights, associated with the various possible distinct courses of action. Then an actual event occurs. This event actualizes one of the distinct top-level patterns of brain activity, and hence selects one of these distinct possible courses of action. This selection is, according to contemporary quantum theory, made by the second factor: pure chance.

Pure brute stochasticity, with no ontological substrate, is in my opinion an absurdity: the statistical regularities must have some basis. On the other hand, the answer provided by contemporary quantum theory is probably correct in the sense that the basis for the quantum choices cannot be conceptualized in terms of the ideas that it employs. Within that framework these choices must therefore appear to come out of nowhere; they must be, in the word used by Pauli and by Bohr, “irrational” (Stapp 1993, p. 168-9).

Finally, the question is what determines how events will be organized - what measure of freedom and determinism operate in our existence. In grasping the complexity of - and mutually implicated interaction of - systems and events, scientists have developed more and more complex and accurate maps of existence. Nevertheless, in the final moment, the actualization will always be indeterminable from our limited subjective position. What looks like a certainty depends on few enough factors that we may be able to measure or predict the event nearly always, but this is in fact no more certain than events of greater complexity in which we cannot begin to bring into account all the factors. It may be that everything unfolds in an objective manner, but to be a human being is to be within the universe as a partial subjective event unable to know the totality of which it is a part. Nevertheless human subjectivity is of such rich and complex “consciousness” that it can know, feel, think, act, and experience with great freedom. Simultaneously, our lack supplies us with unending mystery. We perhaps know much less than we think and much more than we know. While any map of experience provides us with necessary meaning and the practical means of survival and enjoyment through the immanent capture of the event from chaos, it simultaneously closes us off to ever further layers of possible experience to which we must somehow try to remain open. Dennis and Terence McKenna have

speculated on the possible biochemical and electromagnetic elements of our body-brain's organization of mind, psyche, and subjectivity and our ability to experience conscious events such as thoughts.

If the constant intercalation of 5HT [serotonin] into bond sites between codons, now a recognized part of 5HT metabolism, does significantly alter ESR [electron spin resonance] patterns in DNA, then it seemed likely to us that interference patterns that such a shifting of ESR signatures would generate might provide the mechanism for the holographic standing wave that the living system has developed to model within itself the world it encounters beyond itself. Only 10 percent of DNA is involved in protein synthesis. The functions of the other 90 percent are uncertain, but we suggest that an organism's entire internal horizon of experience is created and maintained in the energy continuum, which neural DNA regulates and maintains. Thought and reflection may be holographic functions that take place against the background of the energy flow of metabolism that DNA controls. It is this flow of energy that is experienced by organisms as the phenomenon of time itself. Organisms evolved in and became patterned in response to this flow (McKenna & McKenna 1993, p. 151).

Catastrophe theory, thermodynamics, and non-linear metamodeling track the movement of complex phenomena, but the event itself is still beyond any map of certainty from our limited subjective point of view. Autopoiesis (Maturana & Varela 1987), formative forces (Steiner 1924), morphic resonance (Sheldrake 1987), and holonymy (Pribram 1971, 1991, Grof 1985) explore the territory further and point toward an understanding of process, event, and organization in being and becoming. Nevertheless the actualization of any event will always appear "irrational" or "chance" or "fate" from a certain point of view. In developing an art and science of subjectivity which would be a pragmatics of life, the contradictory ideas of chance and determinism - fate and free - will dissolve into the faith of each moment in which the event is organized by perception/action but driven by the embracing/enacting of desire - or what Castaneda (1987) says the Yaqi shaman calls "intent." By this token, we can see that the implicated ecosophic approach to understanding the universe as composed of the holistic and complex systems within systems which is being increasingly mapped out by philosophers and scientists leads directly to ethical-

aesthetic practices which form an art and science of human life as developed by psychoanalysts, teachers, activists, and explorers of the further reaches of human existence.

Humankind is not, however, free to choose the when of its completion. The actual moment of conrescence is a property of the most inclusive epoch. In the modular hierarchy of time, it is an imposed fact. Time must be well used; this is a basis for a possible theory of ethics. But even time well used still hurries us and all beings to its own conclusion. To preserve this perception and the idea of a matter- and history-conditioning atemporal interspecies bio-electronic hologram with a temporally expressed and mathematically describable unfolding, it is necessary to take the following view of humankind's freedom to act and the immutability of the order and rate of novel ingressions. Such ingressions only define boundary conditions. In the unfolding of novel ingressions, there are moments of maximum propitiousness. As the probability of a time of renewal intensifies, who can doubt the possibility that humanity, through an act of free will, may anticipate the new epoch? All philosophy springs from the idea that the human mind is the measure and leading edge of all things. And it is with poetry and philosophy that we must take that measure (McKenna & McKenna 1993, p. 205).

At this point in history, we have reached a new understanding of human experience in its interaction with the whole of existence. Scientists move ever closer to grasping the subjective element of their objectivity, while philosophers, psychoanalysts, and social scientists move ever closer to an objective understanding of subjectivity. By seeking a transversal communication which reaches across a variety of practices, disciplines, and perspectives - each of which nevertheless maintains its own essential singularity - we could perhaps begin to draw together a series of steps toward a human science, art, and practice of subjectivity which moves beyond the limitations of separate fields of symbolic knowledge and succeeds in analyzing the ever-changing multiplicity of aesthetic and ethical practices and beliefs at stake in the variety of human experience.

4. Desire at the Limits of Thought - The Sacred

This unequal situation finally poses the problem in clear terms. The intimate order is not reached if it is not elevated to the authenticity and authority of the real world and real humanity. This implies, as a matter of fact, the replacement of compromises by a bringing of its contents to light in the domain of clear and autonomous consciousness that science has organized. It implies SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS taking up the lamp that science has made to illuminate objects and directing it toward intimacy. . . .

What is required by self-consciousness is not really the destruction of the order of things. The intimate order cannot truly destroy the order of things (just as the order of things has never completely destroyed the intimate order). But this real world having reached the apex of its development can be destroyed, in the sense that it can be reduced to intimacy. Strictly speaking, consciousness cannot make intimacy reducible to it, but it can reclaim its own operations, recapitulating them in reverse, so that they ultimately cancel out and consciousness itself is strictly reduced to intimacy. Of course this counter operation is not in any way opposed to the movement of consciousness reduced to that which it essentially is - to that which, from the start, each one of us always knew it was. But this will be clear consciousness only in one sense. It will regain intimacy only in darkness. In so doing, it will have reached the highest degree of distinct clarity, but it will so fully realize the possibility of man, or of being, that it will rediscover the night of the animal intimate with the world - into which it will enter (Bataille 1973, p. 97-100).

If existence actualizes itself from the possible in a variety of ways, then human subjectivity in its self-conscious state holds a privileged position between mind and nature through which it comes to organize events. The objective point of view is synonymous with rational thought - the coming to consciousness which increasingly has allowed man to look upon the world from the outside and to distance himself from his immediate experience. Full self-consciousness entails grasping the subjective nature of one's self from an objective point of view - and realizing the limits of objectivity from within one's subjectivity. The history and variety of sacred experience within humanity revolves around this meeting point of subject and object - or consciousness and immanence. Pantheistic or Eastern forms of the sacred have sought the immanence of immediacy at the height of self-con-

consciousness, whereas a variety of primitive, pagan, and modern rituals more common to the West have relied on an extreme dialectical movement between rational lucidity and the transcendent moment. For us, the sacred is the realization of the moment in which the event becomes actualized from the chaos of the possible - to the extent that we are conscious of its temporal nature.

If subjectivity was at one time submerged in the social, then collective religious rituals were the expression of the return to sacred immanence denied by the rational means of increasing survival. As Bataille has pointed out, during the long process of evolution in which man gained consciousness, he nevertheless did not lose sight of the end of his existence in the sacred experience of the immanent moment. The location of the sacred simply changed, and subjectivity itself “imploded” as it were into the individual being, taking precedence over the social. This further step in the coming to consciousness of humanity as a whole unfortunately brought with it an increasing objectification of life in which the sacred “end” of life was forsaken for the means. Bataille’s project was to redress this situation, by developing a human science in which the general economy of rational consciousness and sacred immediacy would be restored, reorganized, and multiplied toward an unknown future for humanity. Bataille’s ultimate solution of sovereign subjectivity within a general economy of existence is consonant with an ecosophic grasp of the movement of information and energy within current scientific thinking in the approaches of quantum physics, chaos theory, cybernetics, self-organizing evolution, and organic neuroscience, and with the embracing-enacting of one’s *jouissance* or desire in post-Lacanian psychoanalysis.

A science of the human is none other than a science of subjectivity in which perception, action, cognition, and emotion organize the event. Through our research we propose to develop a basic theory of human experience which will provide a framework for a general human science and practice. The problem immediately arises as to what a science or a knowledge of the human could be, given that we are investigating that which is performing the investigation. Quantum physicists have discovered that this fact applies even to the seemingly most objective sciences of inorganic matter. Similarly, Godel’s undecidability theorem states the problem clearly: there is no system of principles attempting to

define or know which can ground itself except from outside of its own system - its own discourse. When we turn to the human sciences the aporias of uncertainty and undecidability become even more complex. But this does not mean we must give up - rather we must find an approach to knowing which differs from the one which has dominated Western thought for so long.

In fact it appears that this is exactly what has been taking place throughout the past centuries within philosophy and the human sciences though often on the margins. According to Spinoza, no right can ever found a power or an ethic, but rather each subject only acts "sovereignly" to the limits of its power which has been conditioned by the subjectivities - or systems - with which it is interlocked. Every act or concept rests on an "arbitrary assent," though the sage can attempt to withhold his arbitrary assent and to place himself on the level of all parallel possible subjectivities. This is the "objective" pole of which the "subjective" pole of sovereign assent is the complement. With Kant and Hegel we find thought attempting to systematize that which it begins to see is unsystematizable. For what remains throughout all of Hegel's attempts to bring closure to thought and speculation through a complete knowledge is the irreconcilable tension of substance and idea - of reality and concept - of fact and principle - of the real and the symbolic - of desire and thought. But this is an opening through which the unknown - the unthinkable - begins to be thought. Heidegger's ontology attempts to focus not on an idea of what is but on the very possibility of (human) thought thinking what is. Through empirical clinical experience, Freud stumbles upon the same thing: the fact that in human experience conscious thought is in the habit of concealing itself from its thinker.

And so slowly speculative or reflective thought has been unseated from its place as a self-evident and unquestioned method for knowing what is. Instead we see that thought is a part of what is - an experience that we as human beings undergo. It is the experience of thought as reflection, speculation, consciousness, logic, knowledge, science, language, and discourse which divides us from our immediacy and allows us to see from outside what is happening to us, but it is this same experience which guarantees that this knowledge will always escape us - that we will be unable to bring a final closure to complete knowledge in the form of objective truth or fact.

Through our investigation into the theorization of human experience in philosophy and the human sciences as well as work produced in psychoanalytic practice, religious experience, and artistic and poetic practice, we seek to present a theory of the human which will serve to guide a general investigation into all facets of existence as well as the development of various practices. This theory elucidates the experience of the human being as radically divided from within by the tension produced by conscious thought endlessly attempting to speculate and define through language its own desire which - in its insufficiency or inability to find closure in the self - is driven toward what is unknown or other.

Throughout our work we will be haunted by one concern. If a rigorous science attempting to know what we are must remain open to what is always new, different, other, unconscious, as-yet-unknown and must continue to develop new subjectivities, new languages, new discourses, new modes of knowing and communicating our experience, does this bring us closer to anything like a practical knowledge of effects in the real or does it simply implicate us further in delirium, fantasy, and madness? Apart from the practical *means* of our survival, what is it that could be taken as the *end* of this human existence?

Human experience is characterized by an essential movement. On the one hand we have desire - the drive which sustains us - our reason for being. On the other we have consciousness - lucidity - the never-ending process by which we think, organize, categorize, and attempt to know what is happening to us through symbols. There is a blind spot or vanishing point between these two facets of our lives. As long as we live, neither one ceases to exist for a moment, and never can one eclipse the other. It is at their point of intersection - in the impossible meeting ground that forms our experiences - where we find what is most essential to our being.

How can we communicate our experience? We would like to include everything, yet we can only begin from inside the symbolic. But in the end, we will find ourselves outside. We are haunted by that which is outside of ourselves - the unknown - the unintended which can take on so many names. Whether it is a question of the other who befalls us, the unconscious thing which speaks through us, the impossible that we are inexplicably

driven to but can never reach, or the sublime experience of the divinity, it is this ekstasis - this beyond which is outside the confines of knowing and thinking - which defines the human.

We are human. We are played through by our drives no less than animals. But - gift or curse - we experience our movements through language - through what is called thinking. To think about "what is" without thinking about what it is to be a human being thinking about "what is" has been the impoverished task of philosophy and the sciences of the past. But proponents of existential ontology and quantum theory have proposed a self-consciousness which betrays the human experience no less. For while they recognize that the very act of thinking, of measuring, of formulating in language is affected by the uncertainty of the human being itself, where does this leave them: with a new certainty of uncertainty - with one more form of "knowledge" - thinking they are one step closer to knowing and waiting patiently for the coming revelation - for the step backward beyond metaphysics. Freud's psychoanalytic exploration opened up another perspective on the crack in the universal by calling this uncertainty the unconscious - or desire - only to see the majority of his followers develop another rigid dogma.

We must pick up where these others have left off - to take these discourses and put them into dialogue rather than refining them into perfect systems which can be applied to the whole of life. We can never know what is, for although there is a "real" - whose effects we experience - we as human beings do not have direct access to this real - including what we ourselves are. We can only formulate or translate or communicate through semi-otic and symbolic means.

What then can we know? Nothing in the traditional sense of knowing as truth or fact, but anything if we can say it. For "knowledge" is produced by that part of us which thinks and formulates in symbols, and the truth of the real is that this thing of knowing and speaking happens in us, which means that it is not a question of what we can know but of the fact that this knowing in us is an imperative. As a universal we can know nothing, but each one of us can and must know what it is that affects us: that is, we must be able to navigate the constant human movement whereby we are fated to translate the reality of

our body, our soul, our desire, our drive, into a story which will satisfy our thought. Caught between that which affects us inside in the reality of our body and outside in the world on the one hand and our mind's attempt to know, to understand, to formulate in language what is happening to us on the other, we live the impossible human experience.

Then what must we do? Again, nothing in the universal sense, for - as Lacan has pointed out - an ethics is relative to a discourse. But a discourse is the well-spoken of our desire, and in another sense each of us is riveted by the same imperative which might be called not ethical but real: we must formulate our real experience into a symbolic discourse and act in accordance with that discourse. In fact in the end it does not even matter which discourse we formulate - as if each of us had a desire that was there to be discovered - but only that we embrace/enact our desire in the symbolic order which escapes us. Any attempt to discover and define the core of our being once and for all will suspend us forever in the imaginary fantasy between the "real" experience of our drive and the fictional story of symbolic "reality". Of course, what people call "the real world" is doubly false in that (1) it is the necessary yet fictional enacting of the unknown inside us and in that (2) it is only that for the one who is speaking or defining this "real world." Nevertheless in order to exist, to live, to stay sane, human beings are required to subjectivize themselves - to narrativize themselves - to create a coherent symbolic story of their enigmatic experience - even if only for a moment.

In the past these stories were handed down to the majority of humanity in the form of rituals, laws, mores, beliefs, and myths. But as conscious thought continues to contest every given, the crisis of human existence becomes how to believe - how to make this leap of faith. Lucid thought has made it increasingly difficult for us to receive our symbolic narratives from outside, but instead we must each learn to translate our experience into symbolic language. This is not knowing but "unknowing" - the *gaya scienza* of the troubadors - the *magnum opus* of the alchemists - the poetic science of translating our experience of the real into language. Yet it is not exactly this subjectivization itself which is the human subject as Foucault (1976) claims, and neither is it the inevitable fall into subjective destitution described by Lacan (1966) and Žižek (1989). Rather we are caught between this inevitable double movement of the human experience - between the organization of our

self through the telling of our story and the inevitable return of the real which punctures holes in our perfect system.

Lacan defined psychoanalysis as the repeated encounter with the impossible real. This is why psychoanalysis is both terminable and interminable. Psychoanalysis is terminable in the sense that at the end of the analytic relationship, the analysand has learned how to navigate the waters of this human experience - he has come to recognize, embrace, and enact his desire in the face of the empty void which opens up with the fact that there is no truth or meaning given from above. He has come to enact his desire in the face of his fall into nothingness - his subjective destitution. This passage to the act is the leap of faith. Even more, it is the dissolution of the difference between fate and free will. Before, the subject may have suffered at the deepest level from the anguish that everything occurred by chance, but in translating his real experience into symbolic language and acting, he accepts and takes responsibility for his "desire" while simultaneously choosing to act upon exactly what he "desires". The very word "desire" does away with the false distinction between fate and free will and becomes what it really is - "faith" - at the moment of this passage to the act at the end of the analytic encounter.

Yet psychoanalysis is interminable in the sense that the navigation of this movement between the inevitable return of the unknown real which causes us to fall into subjective destitution and the subjectivization of this destitution into another symbolic narrative never ends. It is here where the psychoanalyst - and the poet - dwells. Like the alchemists of old, the psychoanalyst of today lives in the dangerous imaginary space of the human - between the void of the real and the fiction of symbolic realities. It is here that we as human beings are fated to live - between two deaths - between two unreachable asymptotic encounters: an encounter with the real - which does exist though we can never master it - and an encounter with reality - which does not exist though we must always create it. When Lautreamont claimed that poetry must be created by everyone, he did not know to what extent he was right. At the time, the call for individual subjectivity to enact its own symbolic faith was but a dream. In a time when social structures and beliefs collapse, it becomes a necessity.

Yet if each man must formulate his discourse of and act in accordance with his own specific encounter with the real, where does this leave us. What then is to become of our desires and myths in the presence of others? What kind of rituals can we share in? How can humanity even survive under the weight of this ethic? Where does it leave love, friendship, family, meaning, myth, and the social fabric? It is to this point that the work of poets, artists, philosophers, psychoanalysts, scientists, and mystics have led us. It is here that we will begin by putting into dialogue those who have followed their desire resolutely to confront these questions.

How else might we pursue our future if not through language - if not through the creation, presentation, communication, reception, and seduction of our discourses - our maps of the world. Lacan once formulated what he considered to be the four discourses under which at different times each one of us must operate. In the discourse of the university (or truth or knowledge) and the discourse of the master he presented two of the most pervasive of discourses that have dominated human history - discourses that we have been trying to throw off throughout modernity. In the discourse of the hysteric (or neurotic or analysand) and the discourse of the analyst he presented his own subjectivization - he spoke from his desire - and he gave us something invaluable. But there are a multiplicity of discourses - and for each discourse an ethical-aesthetic foundation. How are these discourses which speak the same, and how are they different? Who or what speaks in us, for us, to us, with us?

5. Psychoanalysis - A Spiritual Science

Certainly, it is dangerous, in extending the frigid research of the sciences, to come to a point where one's object no longer leaves one unaffected, where, on the contrary, it is what inflames. Indeed, the ebullition I consider, which animates the globe, is also my ebullition. Thus, the object of my research cannot be distinguished from the subject at its boiling point. In this way, even before finding a difficulty in receiving its place in the common movement of ideas, my enterprise came up against the most personal obstacle,

which moreover gives the book its fundamental meaning.

As I considered the object of my study, I could not personally resist the effervescence in which I discovered the unavoidable purpose, the value of the cold and calculated operation. My research aimed at the acquisition of a knowledge; it demanded coldness and calculation, but the knowledge acquired was that of an error, an error implied in the coldness that is inherent in all calculation. In other words, my work tended first of all to increase the sum of human resources, but its findings showed me that this accumulation was only a delay, a shrinking back from the inevitable term, where the accumulated wealth has value only in the instant. Writing this book in which I was saying that energy finally can only be wasted, I myself was using my energy, my time, working; my research answered in a fundamental way the desire to add to the amount of wealth acquired for mankind. Should I say that under these conditions I sometimes could only respond to the truth of my book and could not go on writing it (Bataille 1967, p. 10-11)?

In these times another metalanguage has arrived to tell us that “there is no metalanguage” - no way of standing outside of the speaking subject’s position in time and space in order to grasp or express the “truth” from above. This metalanguage is at once the dissolution of all metalanguages - that is, of all attempts to categorize, define, and posit a true representation of experience without acknowledging the relative position from which one speaks - and also the supreme metalanguage which can - as is evidenced in dogmatic versions of Cynicism or Buddhism - become a metalanguage in itself. For following its own lucidity to the letter, the metalanguage of no metalanguages must recognize that its consciousness - its ekstasis - is different from - albeit no better or truer than - any (meta)language or discourse which remains within - bound to - its own belief and desire.

Practices of consciousness within Zen, Sufism, and other forms of mysticism have offered a few individuals throughout history this experience of standing outside of the beliefs and truths through which they had come to be defined, but what often results from this experience is a cognitively-dominated state which proclaims all desires - along with all beliefs - to be illusions, and which survives on a combination of unconsciously denied belief in the superiority of this conscious “freedom from illusions” and unconsciously denied participation in one’s own practices of desire. On the other hand, shamanistic

healing methods have operated on the fact that human beings function through belief - through desire - and that this belief affects the body. Whether conscious of what they are doing or not, most psychotherapists rely on this belief or hypnotic suggestion.

The true problem of our time is this collapse of "Belief" - of the "death of God" - of the relativism and cynicism of dis-"Belief" which splits cognitive thought from the "belief" of immediate experience or desire. Those for whom the fictions of accepted truth and morality no longer hold, find their own responses. For example, the obsessional who avoids confronting how he believes and desires through obsessive activity - or the hysteric who faced with his inability to acknowledge his desire deconstructs everyone else's in an attempt to make himself the object of desire - or the pervert who repudiates the question of desire or belief by positing an act or object of denial while remaining ignorant of its foundations - or the psychotic who has no choice in the matter but is saturated by belief. It would even seem that the so-called normal person is not served so well by the given social fantasy - or that in fact he does not even "Believe" in what he proclaims - as he so often ends up with an increasingly common array of physical symptoms or maladies.

Throughout history, cultures, communities, societies, and civilizations have formulated different versions of what they have taken to be the truth of existence - although it was a long time before this concept of true or false even entered into the picture - things simply were. In each collection of individuals in each place and time, a certain set of rituals, rules, and beliefs prevailed which guaranteed stability and order and determined what was "true" and who held power - without being questioned for quite some time. Until some outsider, some mystic, some heretic, some revolutionary challenged the "order of things" thus opening the community to destabilization. Inevitably this new order of things - rejected at first - would become the basis for a new order - a new set of practices and beliefs.

Wilfred Bion (1970) described this relationship within individuals and communities as the tension between container and contained. Henry Bergson (1932) called this circular movement of humanity "the two sources of morality and religion," and Georges Dumezil

(1940) described a variety of these practices which provided a social form of psychic health. Georges Bataille (1973, 1976) traced this social version of psychic balance through the ages - primitive to modern - in the unconscious practices of the sacred which would give space to - and thus manage - this double movement of humanity which tended on the one hand to generate stories and rituals of stability in order to lower tension and preserve life, and on the other hand to challenge, to risk, to destroy the very order which had been set up. Bataille also spelled out the dangers toward which humanity was heading in the absence of any such general economy or ecology of the psyche.

In proclaiming the death of God, Nietzsche (1882) was not simply one more philosopher, mystic, or revolutionary challenging the prevailing discourse or metalanguage of his day. Through tracing the genealogy of truths and moralities - as a philologist - he had become aware of the fact that "there is no metalanguage," and he prophesied the dangers, diagnosing the increasing *resentiment* of the petty man whose unconscious individual fantasies remained below the surface of a growing cynical detachment. Trying desperately to find a solution for humanity's new found inability to believe and wavering between the manic ecstasy of too-much meaning and the depressive isolation of too-little meaning, Nietzsche sought a way out simultaneously for his own and the world's approaching psychosis.

Meanwhile, what Sigmund Freud was encountering through the psychotherapists of his day was that hypnotic suggestion - affecting beliefs through suggestion or seduction - could affect the body and convert physical symptoms. What Freud *discovered* was that this only resulted in a new symptom and that by refusing to rely on hypnosis - by working with seduction and belief in another way - a subject could be transformed if not "cured."

What exactly is the psychoanalytic approach to working with the human experience of belief which Freud practiced? If a subject suffers from what he unconsciously desires and believes, then seduce him - hypnotize him into believing in something else - the analyst - through the inevitable transference of love or affect which ensues. But - and this is where Freud took psychoanalytic practice in a direction different from other healing and teach-

ing - do not use this power of suggestion to cause the subject to believe and desire something else predetermined. Instead, disillusion him - like the Zen master. Cure him of this "transference neurosis." Show him that he believes and desires - something - though neither the subject nor the analyst knows yet what that is. And help him discover what and how he believes. Unlike the Zen master, then, the psychoanalyst does not (de)negate desire as an illusion, but preserves it and works with it as the essential characteristic of the human being. In fact it could be said that the psychoanalyst accepts only two empirical facts which he experiences daily - desire and thought. The psychoanalyst has no intention of defining what desire and thought are - they are two experiences which take place in human beings, and the practice of psychoanalysis is one of translating, managing, redistributing, and reworking the web or knot made up of these experiences.

Freud (1938) formulated this knot as the relation between the unconscious drives and desires and the consciousness of thought and language. He also mapped this schema in terms of an unknown "it" (id) of animal forces, the introjection of human law and morality (superego), and a self (ego) trying to stabilize the subject through will and reason. Jacques Lacan (1966) reworked the topology of human experience into a knot consisting of the Real - the fact of "what is" including the body and the universe and not accessible to human knowing; the Imaginary - the pre-symbolic experience of self and other and the translation of drives and forces into human relations and affects of attraction and repulsion - love and imitation; and the Symbolic - the codified rituals and languages of thought which create distance individually and socially from the im-mediacy of drives.

The human experiences of desire, love, and faith correspond to both Freud's and Lacan's topologies, but rather than being objects (it, self, superego) or realms (real, imaginary, symbolic) they are closer to expressing action, relation, and experience. Moving from Freud to Lacan and beyond, it becomes more and more clear that within the psyche the distinction between the individual and the social - between self and other - is impossible to make. The experience of *desire* is one of absolute otherness - the desire for absolute difference and the drive toward the unknown which puts the familiar and stable at stake again and again even at the risk of death (hence the "death drive"). The experience of *love* is a counterforce closer to the pleasure principle that seeks to resolve and reduce ten-

sion - to assimilate the other and the object - to overcome the gap of difference - to find containment and return to the comfort and protection of the womb. The experience of *faith* is that of enacting one's desire or *jouissance* - translating one's unconscious fundamental fantasy into the symbolic act of language and ritual - simultaneously accepting one's individual fate and willing one choice. It is this experience of faith which is at stake in the analytic process - so difficult to grasp for modern man, but something akin to the Kierkegaardian leap of faith translated into our times and disseminated into the continuous experience of the enactment of each moment (Deleuze 1983, 1984).

There are many ways of carving up and (re)presenting this experience of the human psyche. Lacan called this knot one of *jouissance* - indicating that every human being was close to mysticism in his being prey to an experience of desire which was mediated by consciousness - yet nevertheless beyond rational thought - beyond good and evil. It is this experience of *jouissance* that each individual undergoes differently which is both the source of all suffering and the source of everything which sustains humanity. Psychoanalysis does not cure with knowledge, nor with pedagogy, nor with drugs, nor with hypnosis. It does not teach or train or adapt behavior. It does not eradicate desire, and it does not proclaim a truth. Psychoanalysis cures by untying the knot of the psyche. It allows a subject to become conscious of how he experiences desire, seduction, belief, and meaning and how they are translated into thought, language, knowledge, and expression. It allows the subject to rework this experience of *jouissance* and/or to accept and enjoy his particular desire - to enact his desire as faith - as the truth of himself as a subject in the face of the absence of pre-given truths from outside.

Freud often called his psychoanalytic project a metapsychology. This metapsychology would be a psychology of psychologies - a discourse or language or theory of how we think (of) the psyche. Even though there is no metalanguage in the sense of an overarching truth, it is possible to juxtapose various perspectives and fields of knowledge and experience in order to obtain a broader and deeper picture. Following this transversal approach of Guattari, psychoanalytic work must be a metapsychoanalysis - a deconstruction or psychoanalysis of psychoanalysis itself which takes into account not only the history of the formulation of theory and practice within the movement, but its unrecognized

antecedents and influences from outside and its dissemination into the culture in general. As Lacan pointed out, each analyst must reinvent psychoanalysis anew.

The importance of Lacan's work to the psychoanalytic enterprise cannot be overstated. In addition to clinical work, Lacan was steeped in the influence of the intellectual and cultural milieu of his time which enabled him to elucidate the practice and theory of psychoanalysis from outside (Borch-Jacobsen 1991). The influence of Hegel, Heidegger, Nietzsche, Marx, surrealism, and mysticism through his collaboration with philosophers and social scientists of his time allowed Lacan to formulate an approach to a human science and a clinical practice unprecedented in its scope and depth. And yet Lacan himself is already in danger of engendering nothing but disciples and detractors. The seduction of Lacan and his legacy attracts theorists and practitioners who have no notion of Lacan's extensive lineage in philosophical, theological, and cultural research or in his clinical practice. Psychoanalysis has long suffered the schisms of a church. What is needed is a return to the spirit of Lacan rather than to the letter. As Lacan himself said: "He who interrogates me also knows how to read me." This spirit of Lacan is one that knows how to study him rigorously, to learn his lessons, to see his contradictions and transformations, and to extend his work without abandoning or negating him out of narrowness. This is the open spirit which knows how to listen and to learn from everything - theory and practice, clinical cases and literature, cultural and social events and individuals.

Beyond the realm of the clinical setting and the individual's practice of *jouissance*, there is the question of the social and the political. How are we to manage the interaction between conflicting practices of *jouissance* if, for example, one person's desire to enjoy himself in a certain way intrudes on another's enjoyment. These questions of *social psychoanalysis* have been taken up by Freud himself as well as by thinkers such as Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, and Slavoj Žižek in an attempt to analyze the underlying fundamental social fantasies of various civilizations and to disclose how a set of laws and mores based on an unconsciously denied exclusion of certain practices comes to organize power relations between subjects.

Similarly, the *cultural psychoanalysis* of Georges Bataille and Jean Baudrillard focusses

on the seduction of individuals by the creation of new practices of *jouissance* in art, literature, ideology, and ritual. This extrapolated psychoanalytic research examines the poetics of expression and communication as an alternative or supplement to clinical psychoanalysis. Drawing upon the experiences of social and collective beliefs and practices which sustained human beings for thousands of years before the advent of psychoanalysis and translating them into the present may provide an approach to managing the psyche that clinical work alone cannot satisfy.

Finally, there is a *theoretical psychoanalysis* which is concerned with elaborating an understanding of human experience in all its facets - with developing a true human science which would take into account the indeterminacy of the human subject under investigation. Although the real exists, we have no direct access to it. Still we find various means of translating the unknown - of (re)presenting the unrepresentable. In this sense, the art of science and of theory is that of poetics. It is also the art of practice in that theory is a challenge to the real - a challenge to it to exist - to match our desires and fantasies of what it is through our conjuring of truth from the unknown or - as Hegel described life and thought beyond absolute knowledge - our "tarrying with the negative."

6. *Jouissance* - Desire in Knowledge

For the clinician, the human subject is forever trying to overcome the loss of the object - the separation from complete *jouissance* in the unification with the other - the mother - the womb - the pre-life oneness. And as a result, the subject unconsciously engages in practices - fantasies, thoughts, relationships, routines - which return him to the moment when he was whole - even if these experiences lead to suffering or death. The aim of the clinic, then, would be to listen to the subject's stories - his signification of what has meaning for him - through free association - and to try to decipher exactly what these unconscious practices of *jouissance* are. When the subject is made conscious of these fundamental fantasies, he should then be able to alter them - to become strong enough to follow his desire for what is new and unknown rather than remaining trapped in the repetition which causes symptoms of suffering.

This story of psychoanalytic practice, however, retains vestiges of a moralism - of an unconscious fundamental fantasy which places pleasure, health, and balance as the goal and conjures away the “death drive” born out of the complexity of human experience lived at the edge of order and chaos. Certainly if someone comes to an analyst to be helped with his suffering he is asking for something, but for what? The ethics of psychoanalysis for Lacan meant “do not give up your desire” - but this ethics is complex.

Do not cede your desire to the Other. make no mistake - complete jouissance is already gone as you have been born into the human world where one is dependent on sustenance, on work, on others, on consciousness - but do not avoid what remainder of jouissance you have left - the chance you have to move beyond the rational - the proscribed - toward your own absurd and unjustifiable enjoyment. Cross over your fantasy - identify (with) your symptom - and live your unknown drive as a practice of jouissance. This is the ethics of the mystic - of St John of the Cross.

Lacan (1973) moved toward this explication of the ethics and aims of the analytic act at the end of his life, thus purifying his thought of what he perceived to be the remainder of an unanalyzed moralism and unconscious fantasy. He even stated in his seminars that he hoped someone would follow who could live up to such an ethic because he, perhaps, had failed to make it. Failed what?

In the first formulation we have the “masculine” ethics of the hero (despite the female example of Antigone) who sacrifices his jouissance in the name of duty - in the name of a perceived higher order which nevertheless remains bound by the discourse of the Other. In this case, the hero remains determined by the fantasy of the sacrifice itself - remaining in control of - and controlled by - the strength and force of the phallus - of order - of logos. The sacrifice of jouissance becomes another way to avoid the real of jouissance.

What we have in the second formulation is the “feminine” ethics of the mystic (despite the male example of St John). Lacan stated that women - excluded throughout history from social control and “phallic” patriarchal order - were already more open to experi-

encing this jouissance of the “not-all” - of the impossible real - of the unknown beyond rational thought and knowledge. What is at stake in this second formulation is the sacrifice of the sacrifice - *die Versagung* as Freud calls it. This is not the return to the petty jouissance of unconscious symptoms, but the traversing of this unconscious fantasy and the acceptance of - and identification with - one’s own ineradicable practice of jouissance which exists - which insists - beyond stability, health, and rationality.

So everyone is a failed mystic. Everyone experiences jouissance - but a debased jouissance. Neurotic, psychotic, and somatic symptoms are but (the signs of) a blocked jouissance. The aim of the psychoanalytic experience is to enable one to practice one’s jouissance. To accept and enact it, to maintain it, to alter it, to sacrifice it, to dampen it, to inflame it. This is why psychoanalysis is able to dissolve somatic and neurotic symptoms which have arisen from an unconscious and misdirected jouissance, to transform depression into a renewed meaning in life, to redirect uncontrollable and unwanted obsessions and fetishes, and to transform the overstimulation of psychotic confusion. But beyond this, the psychoanalytic process gives one the tools to practice one’s own jouissance. This is why for Lacan there is no such thing as a training analysis. Every analysis is a training analysis, and every analysis - whether the request is to be trained or to have a symptom relieved - should uncover the movement of jouissance.

This is also why analysis is both terminable and interminable. There is no end to analysis, there will only ever be an end to each analysis - to each event or process - and this will be determined only by the circumstances. For most psychotherapists, the termination comes with the dissolution of the original symptoms, but what remains? Psychoanalysts have sought to completely transform the subject and free him from all symptoms. Freud himself recognized this to be impossible as he witnessed the inevitable malaise of civilization’s cultural neuroses within the repression and sublimation of “normality” and the individual ego. The best one could hope for (through analysis) Freud believed was the substitution of painful symptoms with the generally ironic awareness of the vanity of life.

While the details of the theories and techniques of psychoanalysis appear complex, there is a continuous line of development from Freud to Lacan and beyond. The empirical dis-

covery - evidenced daily - and its theoretical elucidation amount to the fact that human beings are affected by a real drive and desire which attempts to find a place through thought and language, and in the gap there results a whole range of painful psychic and physical symptoms in addition to an undefinable experience of jouissance - including memory, dreams, hope, fantasy, love, belief, ecstasy, eroticism, narrative, laughter, tears, joy, sadness Psychoanalysis attempts to make the unconscious conscious and the impossible possible. Psychoanalysis works to redistribute this jouissance between desire and thought, and it produces analysts able to guide themselves and others through a discovery of how they desire - toward the practice of their jouissance.

But human beings do not want to know what is happening to them. Along with a will to jouissance there persists a stubborn will to ignorance. The psychoanalytic experience is then nothing other than a heroic attempt to face the real. But we cannot help resisting. It is in our nature. Who is it that can bear being disillusioned of his fantasies, for they are the only thing sustaining us? It is one thing to face up to the collapse of the Other of truth, law, God, morality, and reason. It is another to face up to the other in each of us - that fundamental fantasy - which sustains us.

It must be acknowledged that Freud was not simply constructing another story or theory or representation of human existence like previous prophets, philosophers, and scientists. He was deriving this theory and practice from observing the radically empirical truth of the lives of his subjects and of himself - supplemented by the assimilation of a history of art, literature, science, and myth. It is only this radically scientific approach itself - stripped from the prejudices of reason and morality - that when turned to the desires, feelings, thoughts, actions, and physical and mental experiences of human beings themselves could reveal to us the real of our existence.

Research begins as a desire to know - in the form of a search for knowledge "out there" in the world. No one can hope to present a theory of human experience without the complete assimilation - both broad and deep - of the work done so far to collect, preserve, understand, and (re)present the many ways of being - the many practices of jouissance hitherto. But disciplines are staked out like dogmatic sects, and in order to avoid these

dead ends requires an almost insane curiosity - even more a perverse refusal to rest - a stubborn desire to continually take up another opposing point of view - another perspective forgotten, rejected, and refused by that which is given. This is the true nature of the dialectic - beyond its misapprehension as an attempt to synthesize or bring into harmony different points of view. This is the simultaneous maintenance of opposing perspectives - the extension of the dialectic into the multiplicities of Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari (1972, 1980), the "différance" of Jacques Derrida (1967, 1973), and the "heterology" of Georges Bataille (1986) as the unending search for knowledge of what is unknown or other.

As opposed to the forms of reason and rationality that have dominated Western Civilization for so long, all of these approaches to knowledge are based on the experience of empathy or ethnography. The ethnographic experience does not seek to know, determine, or control what is outside in the form of other individuals, cultures, objects, or ideas. It seeks to pass over into another way of believing - to leave behind one's own way of thinking, acting, desiring, and believing and to be seduced into another's - and then to return to one's own way with a true grasp of another way, if not a transformation of one's own. Of course this experience always entails the risk of losing one's way, but what choice is there other than to live in the realm of the same, seeking only to remain ignorant of what is different or other or to force others to conform to one's own prejudice. Ethnological research has proceeded this way, and thus set an example for the possibility of a human science. But this approach must take place everywhere: in reading, in critical interpretation, in psychoanalysis, in legal judgment. Levinas (1961) described this as putting ethics before epistemology, ontology, or phenomenology, and he traced it through the Judeo-Christian tradition as care for the other and the willingness to accept the position of being the "you" addressed by the other's "I" - to hear the other before judging.

But even this ethnographic experience of knowledge - focused as it is on what is outside - can guide one into a search for an absolute knowledge. Absolute knowledge must eventually dissolve into a search for self-knowledge. And how is it that anyone could really present a version of human experience without having turned the lamp of science which is focused outwards upon himself? How could one attain any form of objectivity without

analyzing, unveiling, and presenting the subjective position which inevitably affects his experience and his expression as objectively as possible? Even within the realms of physics and mathematics - the most "objective" of sciences - this is now accepted as evident. Within the human sciences - in which the subject is also the object - this is even more essential.

Throughout history, the search for self-knowledge has taken the form of a journey through various Eastern and Western practices of consciousness and mysticism. But practices of consciousness are often based on the mind and body as controllable entities. Beyond nirvana as complete consciousness and freedom from the illusions of desire there lies only the inorganic state of death. The experience of enlightenment often leads one to the state of the living dead in deification, perfection, and totality. On the other hand, what it can lead to is the understanding of what is essentially human: belief, desire, illusion, fantasy, dream The bodhisattva does not refrain from entering nirvana only in order to lead others to it. Having experienced the truth of his being, he lives the human experience to its fullest, and if he leads others to this place, it is so they too can live it.

It is through the mystics and saints - the poets, philosophers, and artists of modernity - that this experience of desire has come to be presented. But it is only with psychoanalysis - with the objective clarity and empiricism of scientific consciousness focussing on this desire - that this experience has come to be known. Freud himself said that the poets had already known what he presented without "knowing" it. Through the symptoms of his patients, Freud discovered that a bodily and emotional experience unsuccessfully repressed could lead to new forms of suffering, and he set out to listen to a neglected aspect of human experience. Psychoanalysis not only reopened the repressed aspects of our divided nature as human subjects, but inaugurated a new field of investigation which continues to map the trajectory of this uncertain human experience.

Book II

Mapping the Psyche

Psychoanalysis

1.The Unconscious and the Conscious - Sigmund Freud

Any attempt to define the analytic experience is doomed to failure. To the extent that the analytic setting is characterized by the impossible, it can only be evoked or suggested. Like ethnography, immersing oneself in the realm of another's organization of jouissance requires openness, credulity, and the courage to risk oneself. The faith or resolution of one's own desire is paramount in entering this territory. It is only the resolution of one's own desire coupled with the distance of consciousness of the other that allows one to be used by another and to reveal the meaning in this usage. Psychoanalysis is not something to be applied - it is the response to a request from another to help relieve symptoms. The response is not simply to relieve them - which would deny their message if not bring on other symptoms - but to make the other conscious of his symptoms as a message about the unconscious expression of desire.

At a time when Newtonian mechanical conceptions of man dominated science, Freud's metapsychology moved in the direction of an energetic approach which in fact owed more to earlier forms of spiritual healing, shamanism, and animal magnetism than he realized. Rather than seeking the cause of human behavior in determinant biology, Freud focused on the environmental pragmatics of the individual's life history of social interaction. The kernel of Freud's discovery and invention relied on the conscious and willful ego's ability to transform the drives that came from within and from without. Repression, denial, disavowal, sublimation are all forms of metabolizing - psychic digestion. The reality of the external world which appears obvious to us, but which remains as unknowable as inner experience, must find a way to be digested by the human being. Life is a continual act of translation: from the metonymy and metaphor of language to behavioral acting out - from the usage of objects to the hallucination of fantasy.

While rituals, myths, and religions were once able to give form to human desire on a grand scale, it was Freud who discovered the "individual myth of the neurotic" born from the family romance. If human experience took a turn such that individual subjectivity was able to dramatize the seriousness of its own life on the level that was once reserved for gods and kings, then it fell upon each individual to find rituals and myths which would

satisfy his drives. If one was not able to do this consciously - through the ego - then the job would be done nevertheless. Unsuccessful attempts to metabolize emotional experience revealed themselves through slips, accidents, dreams, and jokes - through perverse and obsessional actions, hysterical relations, physical illness, and even the complete inability to function.

In the past, those unable to translate emotional experience through the acceptable social forms of the community were perceived as ill or possessed. Perhaps we have hardly come any further, as the dominance of the psychiatric categorization of symptoms through the *DSM-IV* threatens to eclipse Freud's radical challenge that psychological and physical symptoms are not mysteriously acquired from outside the organism but result from the inability to find a way of accommodating biological, social, and environmental experience through thought and language.

Freud's first topography posited a conscious and an unconscious - emotional experience which had and which had not been accommodated fully by rational thought and language. As a supplement to this, he added the preconscious - something like the known but unthought forms of object relations later mapped by the British school of psychoanalysts (Bollas 1987). Paradoxically, the simplicity of this early model may be a better model than the second structural mapping of id, ego, and superego. Freud had discovered the essential elements of translation in the movement of human experience, but in his hunger to formulate an objective science, he began to lose it. Not that the mapping of symptoms and techniques is not useful, but the dangers of turning maps into rigid truths is always imminent.

Freud's work served his own self-analysis well. Not finding enough in the traditions of his day, he fashioned a scientific myth which became a mythological science. In the end he could not see any way out of the symptoms of suffering deriving from a failure to symbolize other than through the domination of rational thought and will. The ego was the whole individual - the steersman in control of the self which would navigate among the dangerous biological impulses of the id and the impingement of trauma from the real outside world and from the introjected versions of others' imperatives in the form of the

superego. Of course to the extent that an individual or culture believes in reason and will, the ego will serve each person well as a structural support, but even Freud at the end of his life recognized the insufficiency of the ego as a means of translating desire.

Whatever the ego does in its efforts of defence, whether it seeks to disavow a portion of the real external world or whether it seeks to reject an instinctual demand from the internal world, its success is never complete and unqualified. The outcome always lies in two contrary attitudes, of which the defeated, weaker one, no less than the other, leads to psychological complications. In conclusion, it is only necessary to point out how little of all these processes becomes known to us through our conscious perception (Freud 1938, 61).

In the splitting of the ego, Freud found the neurotic foundations of the self which would later inspire Lacan to move in a completely different direction than that of the reliance on the ego which came to dominate so many of Freud's followers. Despite the success of the ego in maintaining the rational coherence and strength not to disintegrate, nevertheless this move only succeeds in dividing the subject between the demands of the other - of drive or instinct - and those of the Other - of conscious rationality and the integrated self and of deferment to truth and morality. For Lacan, the demands of the superego in the form of law and morality are in the end inseparable from the ego or self which comes to be constructed by and for the individual subject. The self becomes the fictional story of one's supposed unchanging and undivided role in the world. As opposed to this, Lacan posited the "je" or "I" as that relative sense of self-consciousness maintained at each moment as one's shifting subjectivity navigates the chaotic flux of id impulses - or desires of the other - and the symbolic narratives of self and Other - ego and superego - which form the quasi-stable truths and rituals of our modern socio-psychic experience.

In mapping out the modern psyche and in developing a practice of organizing this psyche which would free the subject of neurotic and physical symptoms, Freud eventually ran up against the inseparable integration of the social and psychic world which forms human experience. In the end there was no position from which to judge the "healthy" or optimal forms of character. Indeed he came to see the possibility that whole collective subjectivities of human civilization could be considered neurotic.

If the development of civilization has such a far-reaching similarity to the development of the individual and if it employs the same methods, may we not be justified in reaching the diagnosis that, under the influence of cultural urges, some civilizations, or some epochs of civilization - possibly the whole of mankind - have become "neurotic"? An analytic dissection of such neuroses might lead to therapeutic recommendations which could lay claim to great practical interest. . . . And as regards the therapeutic application of our knowledge, what would be the use of the most correct analysis of social neuroses, since no one possesses authority to impose such a therapy upon the group? But in spite of all these difficulties, we may expect that one day someone will venture to embark upon a pathology of cultural communities (Freud 1930, 102-3).

Nietzsche had already undertaken such a socio-cultural psychoanalysis some years earlier, and he too was left with nothing but his own desire or judgment by which to measure modern man against those cultures of the past and those possibilities of the future which he felt offered human subjectivity its richest experience. Perhaps Nietzsche's ego or self was not strong enough to hold out against such a lonely position. Perhaps falling outside the boundaries of the unquestioned social symbolic myths and rituals which hold the psyche together plunged Nietzsche into a psychotic realm for which he was not prepared. Or perhaps he sought his schizoid disintegration willingly in order to find new forms - new maps of the psyche - new subjectivities - which he could bring back. The shaman and the mystic risk themselves by journeying to a chaotic realm in order to provoke the mutation of the species maintained delicately between order and chaos (Bergson 1932, Bion 1970, Castaneda 1987, McKenna & McKenna 1993). In the end the containment of society could not hold Nietzsche as it could Freud, and in destroying the container, he too was destroyed - he was lost in the chaos of madness. Freud's challenge to the structures of his day remained just this side of destruction and saturated the modern psyche in slow motion until it was no longer certain to what degree Freud had discovered the new subjectivities of modernity and to what degree he had participated in their creation.

2. The Schizoid and the Depressive - Melanie Klein

Melanie Klein's extensive work with children added another chapter to the understanding of modern human subjectivity which Freud had developed. Before birth the infant exists in an undifferentiated subjectivity of immediate experience. Enclosed in the womb, plugged in, submerged, and unified with the totality of existence, the infant knows nothing of differentiation. Upon birth, he is ejected from his security and immediately plunged into a world of bizarre objects and forces. From the beginning, the infant in the first moments of life is challenged by the "buzzing confusion" (James 1890) which stimulates and provokes the proto-forms of individual subjectivity which constitute what Daniel Stern (1985) calls the "emergent self." For Klein the first six months of life are characterized by a schizoid phase of development which forms the movement toward differentiation. The subjective experience of the human infant is submerged in a chaotic state in which its first steps toward learning to organize its experience come through primary splitting of objects, forces, and events into good and bad, love and hate, safe and dangerous - based on the most rudimentary needs of survival and security. Thus it is through environmental and social interaction with the biological system of the human organism - through learning - that one's perception comes to be organized and one's subjectivity comes to be constructed. Primary splitting introduces the infant to Gregory Bateson's (1972) first order of learning in which responses and ways of experiencing the world are conditioned by satisfying basic needs and avoiding threats.

From the beginning, however, the infant is already involved in a symbolic net which turns immediate sensation into emotion which in turn becomes intertwined with cognition. Primal learning through differentiation and recategorization causes the subject to adapt and to transform his cognitive apparatus into a highly complex organizing and functioning machine through learning to map the world. Simultaneously, however, the emotional residue left by desire, love, and affect deepens, leaving a rich - and to a large part unconscious - psychic world which provides meaning to the sacred subjectivity of existence, prevents practical functioning, and/or leaves the subject emotionally and cognitively divided.

It is part of my theory that during earliest infancy the splitting between love and hate, and correspondingly between good and bad - and in some measure between idealized and very dangerous - objects, is the method by which the very young infant maintains a relative stability. In my Envy and Gratitude I have laid particular emphasis on the importance of the earliest splitting processes. If love and hate, and the good and bad objects, can be split in a successful way (which means not so deeply as to inhibit integration, and yet enough to counteract sufficiently the infant's anxiety) the foundation is laid for a growing capacity to distinguish between good and bad. This enables him during the period of the depressive position to synthesize in some measure the various aspects of the object. I suggested that the capacity for such successful primal splitting depends largely on initial persecutory anxiety not being excessive (which in turn depends on internal factors and to some extent on external ones) (Klein 1961, p. 249).

According to Klein, the paranoid-schizoid phase is followed by a depressive phase in which the multiplicity of dualities set up by primal splitting can begin to be integrated. For the infant, primary forces of good and bad, love and hate, can come from within or from without his own subjectivity and body, but in order to maintain a relative stability, all "badness," "danger," and "hate" is projected outward. When the infant comes to recognize that the split dualities are contained together within himself, within the other, and within the world, he is confronted with the task of reintegrating these opposites. Organizing this ambivalence is one of highest achievements of the human system and continues to challenge the subject throughout his life. The introjection of external objects and others plays an important role in forming our emotional and ethical relation to other human beings and to various parts of ourselves, as well as in forming our ability to cognitively map abstract levels of our being in the world. Splitting and reorganization provide the foundations for the higher-level consciousness of cognition as well for the complex web of emotional experience, character, desire, jouissance, and the variety of psychic symptoms manifested by human beings.

Exploration of the outside world and the organization of subjectivity depends on a relatively stable environment if the infant is to be able to reorganize his splitting and projection into a coherent and complex order. Lacking this security, his world - his subjectivity

- may come to be populated by primal forces and bizarre objects. This schizo phase through which we all pass may come to dominate the subjectivity of the “schizophrenic” leaving him unable to cope with the intersubjective social world of rituals and codes of behavior. Persecution, fantasy, paranoia, and confusion form the chaos which - when reified beyond their reintegration with order and resolution - can provide an impossible experience. Even barring this extreme state, the schizoid phase which forms the foundation of the psyche for all of us can give way to a plunge into psychic chaos at any time which - although it can provide the fruits of our adaptation, mutation, and transformation - always holds the threat of absorbing us beyond the point of no return.

The paranoid position is the stage when destructive impulses and persecutory anxieties predominate and extends from birth until about three, four or even five months of life. This necessitates an alteration in dating the phase when sadism is at its height but does not involve a change of view regarding the close interaction between sadism and persecutory anxiety at their height.

The depressive position, which follows on this stage and is bound up with important steps in ego development, is established about the middle of the first year of life. At this stage sadistic impulses and phantasies, as well as persecutory anxiety, diminish in power. The infant introjects the objects as a whole, and simultaneously he becomes in some measure able to synthesize the various aspects of the object as well as his emotions towards it. Love and hatred come closer together in his mind, and this leads to anxiety lest the object, internal and external, be harmed or destroyed. Depressive feelings and guilt give rise to the urge to preserve or revive the loved object and thus to make reparation for destructive impulses and phantasies (Klein 1948, p xiii-xiv).

Klein's understanding of *phases* rather than the Freudian *stages* of development allows us to grasp the complex map of layers of the human psyche living across time. This “field” theory is more attuned to the organizing principles of complex systems operating between order and chaos which characterize body, brain, and subjectivity in all their individual, collective, cultural, and mythical forms. The Kleinian notion of the part or partial object which is experienced by the primal infant and the adult lost on a schizophrenic line of development gives form to the bizarre and persecutory nature of such fragments -

divorced as they are from any concrescence or wholeness. As Whitehead and Bergson have elucidated, an event possesses its own unique sovereignty - its total subjectivity and character - which can never be divided artificially into parts. Perhaps our development in the world constitutes our learning - as Bergson recommends - to divide things appropriately into organic components and events each with its own self-organizing order. If so, then our contemporary culture is itself falling further and further into a schizoid crisis in which we are unable to return from the increasing destruction of meaningful forms of subjectivity and the accompanying disintegration into chaos which is answered only by the reification, objectification, and mechanistic thinking of forms which try desperately to maintain order in the face of such chaos.

3. Containment and Mysticism - Wilfred Bion

Influenced by Klein's revision of Freudian metapsychology and metaphysics, Wilfred Bion initiated a journey into psychic realms which has transformed our way of thinking about the relationship between emotional and cognitive processes. Bion's concept of mental space enlarges the scope of psychoanalytic theory and practice beyond the specific content of developmental stages and structural forms of human history into the unknown territory of the psyche. In Bion the division between emotion and cognition dissolves in the experience of containment. The notion of container and contained applies across various levels of subjectivity including the individual's relationship with himself, the face-to-face relationships of love and psychoanalysis, and the intersubjective relations of the individual to the group and the group to the society.

Ability to use points, lines, and space becomes important for understanding "emotional space," for the continuance of the work and avoidance of a situation in which two inarticulate personalities are unable to release themselves from the bondage of inarticulation. This mutually sterile relationship provides a model for some relationships of the self with itself. When the relationship of the self with itself is of this kind, either the container or the contained must be destroyed. Finally, the individual cannot contain the impulses proper to a pair and the pair cannot contain the impulses proper to a group. The psycho-

analytic problem is the problem of growth and its harmonious resolution in the relationship between the container and the contained, repeated in individual, pair and finally group (intra and extra psychically) (Bion 1970, p. 15-16).

At birth the infant is ejected from the container of the womb. From this point begins a journey through containment in the mother, the family, and the community, and eventually through the semiotic and symbolic forms of meaning present in both the society and the individual's formation of character, symptoms, and self. The psychoanalytic relationship is similarly a journey through containment which has in some way broken down or proven unsuccessful for the subject. But containment is never simple - rather than being an achievable essence or state, it is a movement in which that which is contained seeks to break the bounds of its containment. This is similar to the relation between order and chaos which characterizes all complex systems. Bion's mapping of the human psyche is in fact remarkably similar to the mapping of brain, cognition, and consciousness by contemporary neuroscientists. Bion's critique of the psychoanalytic community is that it has missed the essential complexity of mind and psyche by attempting to grasp its objective truth rather than recognizing the therapeutic function to map out and contain that which always escapes "knowing," while simultaneously challenging it to reveal itself and move beyond sterile or stagnant containers.

This is a characteristic of the mental domain: it cannot be contained within the framework of psychoanalytic theory. Is this a sign of defective theory, or a sign that psychoanalysts do not understand that psychoanalysis cannot be contained permanently within the definitions they use? It would be a valid observation to say that psychoanalysis cannot "contain" the mental domain because it is not a "container" but a probe . . . (Bion 1970, p. 72-73).

The practice of psychoanalysis both in and out of the clinical domain amounts to dislodging containers which no longer serve their purpose and developing the fluid process of containment itself. In a psychoanalytic relationship, it is the mind or psyche of the analyst which provides a safety net of containment during the deconstruction of subjectivity and entry into chaos which will eventually be reconstructed. This practice is similar to what

takes place in various settings of mystical practice, and in fact Bion compares the development of psychoanalysis to the eternal relationship between the individual mystic and the established group across various civilizations.

My object is to show that certain elements in the development of psychoanalysis are not new or peculiar to analysis, but have in fact a history that suggests that they transcend barriers of race, time and discipline, and are inherent in the relationship of the mystic to the group. The Establishment cannot be dispensed with (though this may appear to be approximately achieved in Sufism and in the theory of Marxism) because the institutionalized group, the Work group, is as essential to the development of the individual, including the mystic, as he is to it (Bion 1970, p. 75).

The purpose of the container or the group is to supply the order which will eventually lead to the emergence of the mystic or momentary flash of genius which will transform individual and collective forms of subjectivity into higher forms. The same story is related by Bergson, Nietzsche, and Bataille, and within the mystical practices of Zen and Sufism which strive to remain conscious of the eternal and inevitable process by which the individual mystic or genius is eventually mistaken for the truth and his words reified into an order of dogma and morality which misses the point of their function as translation, containment, and quasi-stability. It is in the tension between such order and chaos that human civilization, individual subjects, group relations, and multiple subjectivities come to form themselves in continual emergence, creation, and transformation.

A Freud can discover and establish psychoanalysis, but it must be maintained by a continued supply of "genius". This cannot be ordered; but if it comes the Establishment must be able to stand the shock. Failing genius, and clearly it may not materialize for a very long period, the group must have its rules and a structure to preserve them. Thus an environment exists ready, as Nietzsche said of the nation, to fulfill its proper function, namely, to produce a genius. Similarly, it may be said of the individual that he should be ready to produce a "flash of genius" (Bion 1970, p. 74).

The "flash of genius" which produces the sovereign subject or the sovereign moment

which Bataille (1976) describes as essential to human experience emerges in the analytic environment through the “evenly hovering attention” of the analyst which is akin to the abductive method of the detective, the psychic, and the semiotician described by Thomas Sebeok (1981). The “play of musement” allows the subconscious facts which are before our eyes yet hidden to reveal themselves. In this process, any preconceived theory can be a hindrance. Similarly, the processes of deduction and induction hinder the emergence of such insights and revelations. Bion adds that “memory and desire” disturb the psychoanalytic process in which the working of the psyche reveals itself through the unpreoccupied containment of the analyst. For Bion, the act of faith is this “being there” for the other and is the closest one can come to absolute objectivity with respect to human subjectivity.

The more the psychoanalyst occupies himself with memory and desire the more his facility for harboring them increases and the nearer he comes to undermining his capacity for F [the act of faith]. For consider: if his mind is preoccupied with what is or is not said, or with what he does or does not hope, it must mean that he cannot allow the experience to obtrude, particularly that aspect of it which is more than the sound of the patient's voice or the sight of his postures (Bion 1970, p. 41).

Bion's analytic method recalls Steiner's (1920) spiritual scientific method, Bergson's (1896) method of intuition and the pragmatic method of James (1890) and Peirce (1903). But rather than this method being used as a probe and as a translating container for knowledge in the link between subject and world, it is used to maintain the link between two subjects - analyst and analysand - in the hopes of revealing that which operates for the analysand through his psychic universe. The link established by the act of faith - Bion's “F” - in the analytic relationship produces its own revelations free from overt interpretations or constructions predetermined by the mental apparatus of the analyst prejudiced by theory or by memory and desire. Bion's “Grid” which maps out the psyche in a multi-dimensional form is - like all maps - a pragmatic tool for understanding the fluctuating terrain of the psyche. Its use in psychoanalytic practice is to be absorbed and fade into the background providing a modicum of containment - a safety net - which should not intrude on the immediacy of the psychoanalytic act of faith.

The interpretation or construction produced by the psychoanalyst depends on the intuitive link between analysand and analyst. As it is constantly imperilled by deliberate attacks, its essential frailty and ordinary fatigue, it needs to be protected and maintained. The object of the Grid is to provide a mental gymnastic tool. It can be used in relative isolation from attack and cannot do harm so long as it is not allowed to intrude into the relationship between analysand and the analyst as by the elaboration of some theory about the patient which is then stored up and used as something which can be discharged like a missile in a battle (Bion 1977, p. 26-27)

The psychoanalytic act lets the psyche speak. What is unknown or unconscious is so as a result of ways of seeing - subjectivities which are bound by their perceptual organization of the physical and socio-symbolic universe. The benefit of "understanding" or "explaining" one's symptoms is useless apart from the practice which unfolds and reveals to the subject the workings of his psychic or mental space - a practice which elucidates the increasingly objective consciousness of one's experience, including the limits of this objective consciousness in the subjective horizon of desire or jouissance - the act of faith which organizes individual, collective, and momentary subjectivities upon which all thought, knowledge, and consciousness rest.

4. Symmetry and Unfolding - Ignacio Matte-Blanco

According to Ignacio Matte-Blanco, we have never understood emotion and its link to cognition. Emotion thinks and thinking feels. Drawing on Freud, Klein, and Bion, Matte-Blanco turns to complex theories of logic and mathematics in an attempt to grasp the working of the human psyche. Everything that goes under the name of thought or logic is only one kind of logic - one mapping of existence. Though an essential one, it is not even what predominates in human experience. The logical thinking which we have inherited from Aristotle is what Matte-Blanco calls logico-bivalent thinking - a cognitive operation which allows us to individuate and separate. But through an "unconscious" or "emotional" level we think differently, and this thinking can be understood by reference to different logics.

Emotion in so far as it is emotion, does not know individuals but only classes or propositional functions, and therefore, when confronted with an individual, tends to identify these individuals with the class to which it belongs (or the propositional function applied to it).

Once we arrive at this simple formulation, the mysteries of emotion begin to become understandable and can be seen in a clear fashion. To start with a very general question, if propositional activity is a constitutive aspect of emotion then we are immediately freed from the tremendous confusion that pervades the psychological literature, including the psychoanalytical, about the relationship existing between thinking and emotion. Everybody accepts the enormous influence that emotions have on thinking, but nobody, as far as I know, has been able to present a comprehensible account of how a link can be established between both which have been viewed as entirely different. Now if one aspect of emotion is a form of thinking, then it is easier to understand that it may have intimate connections with other forms of thinking (Matte-Blanco 1975 p. 244).

The logic of emotion partakes of such processes as symmetrizing, infinitizing, generalization, maximization, and irradiation - processes which Freud himself began to elucidate through his interpretation of dreams. The symmetrizing logic of the human psyche does not make the distinctions of logico-bivalent thinking, but rather collapses these distinctions or differences into sets based on general attributes. In what is called transference, the affect or cathexis which develops in a subject toward an other can be related to specific attributes shared by the other and a previously cathected object - for example the mother or a previous lover. Consequently, the multiplicity of differences are ignored and the two objects of desire are equalized or symmetrized without regard for difference. This is a classical logical fallacy - but the unconscious emotional mind of the human psyche does not operate by logico-bivalent logic. The human psyche is bi-logical: it operates through symmetrizing and asymmetrizing. Asymmetrizing is what makes distinctions and it is this primal differentiation which actualizes events out of the virtual totality of the possible through the organizations of chaos in our perception thus creating our experience with a modicum of stability. Symmetrizing leads us into the collapse of distinction and difference toward the chaosmic reformation of these differences so that they do not

become stagnant or sterile but continue to transform. But symmetrizing can also lead one into dangerous paths of undifferentiation found in mystical and schizophrenic experience. And the psychotic “breakdown” or fall into this zone which can lead to a breakthrough can also become stuck or “hung up” in turbulence as Pribram (1991) describes of systems faced with catastrophic change.

Viewed from this angle, the action of psychoanalytic therapy consists of divesting persons, things and circumstances from their symbolic meaning (which leads to the confusion of the individual with the whole class) and transforming them, for conscious thinking, into what they really should be, that is, circumscribed entities in which the halo of the class does not interfere with their concrete meaning, by making them appear more than what they actually are. It is, in short, an action of divesting or taking away from the concrete object the infinite set to which it plays host: a process of discharge (Matte-Blanco 1975, p. 185).

Although differentiation and distinction is what saves us from psychosis, the symbolic law handed down from above and the identification of the subject with the ego of the analyst are not the only routes toward emerging from primary undifferentiation. Practices of psychoanalysis, mysticism, and consciousness may give back to the subject his own sovereign and autopoietic ability to organize his psyche as a complex system between order and chaos. Bataille’s (1986) practice of “heterology,” Derrida’s (1967, 1973) practice of “différance” and Deleuze’s and Guattari’s (1972, 1980, 1992) practices of “schizoanalysis” and “chaosmosis” engage in the same pragmatics. Similarly, Matte-Blanco claims that the practice of analysis entails not the lifting of repression or the strengthening of the self - but the “unfolding” of the translating function which operates bi-logically in human subjectivity.

The consideration of the translating function brings the realization that much, probably the majority, of present-day analytic work deals with this function rather than the lifting of repression. In other words, “becoming conscious” seems to be attained more frequently with the help of the translating function than through lifting of repression. This is inevitably so because, after all, the repressed is only a small portion of the unconscious,

which is a collection of infinite sets. In actual practice we often have to work simultaneously on lifting repression and translation (Matte-Blanco 1975, p. 302).

Translation takes place in the subject through the continual organization of matter. And the human subject organizes and differentiates at a complex level of mind and body through what we call emotion, cognition, and consciousness. Signs, symbols, words, meanings, and beliefs - the symbolic and the noetic - are the asymmetrical tools of the translating-unfolding function. But our unconscious emotion is infinite in its reworking of being and becoming.

If emotion is an infinite set, the translating function is, potentially, necessarily infinite. In fact it is only a small part of the translating function that takes place. But the potentialities of the unconscious are actually infinite. And so are the theoretical possibilities of art. Note, again, that when we describe emotion as an infinite set this is an asymmetrical way of describing something which in itself is alien to asymmetry: it is a process of translation (Matte-Blanco, 1975 p. 300).

Matte-Blanco uses metaphysics to understand the psyche at a practical clinical level, and he uses practical experience with the psyche to formulate an understanding of existence. The bi-logical nature of human subjectivity endlessly engaged in the translating-unfolding of “homogeneous indivisible reality” through asymmetrizing and symmetrizing heterogenesis can only ever think about or around this undifferentiated totality. This - Matte Blanco claims - is our “bi-modal” existence. We attempt to think being, but we are limited by our bi-logical dividing subjectivity. If we forget for a moment the subjective limits of our objective attempts to think totality and being we immediately lose all objectivity. Only by grasping our bi-modal state and its limitations can we begin to point toward the real and to think, feel, and live the unique and sovereign subjectivity which is ours.

Similarly, what is divided does not exist for what is undivided, i.e., the homogeneous indivisible reality. Vice versa, the undivided reality is not grasped by thinking, cannot be thought. The translating function is a form of thinking which, however, is not thinking the homogeneous indivisible reality but trying to think about and only succeeding in thinking

“outside” this reality. If we were to look without thinking, (a logico-bivalent or “dividing” absurdity) i.e., to look from the “point of view” of the homogeneous indivisible reality, we should have to conclude that the translating function, which from the point of view of thinking can actually be said to be thinking (and sometimes excellent thinking), is not good or correct thinking if it pretends to convey the homogeneous reality: so far as this pretension or intention is concerned, it is a complete failure, a pitiful babbling (Matte-Blanco 1981, p. 525)

We cannot think chaos, being, or totality - we cannot know the homogeneous indivisible reality. But we can find ourselves plunged into this chaos by the “acrostics” of the mind which - in our logico-bivalent ignorance - we call psychic and psychotic experience. Delusions are real - they are as real as the asymmetrical divisions we live our life by. What turns mystical, psychic, or psychotic experience into a breakdown is not being able to escape from this belief - not seeing that the differentiated reality which we construct is also real and pits itself against the chaos that causes all organized sovereign forms to melt into each other in a hyper-communication which sweeps away all heterogeneity and difference.

All the acrostics of the mind are disquieting: they tend to provoke the sense of the uncanny. As an extreme case we may consider the paranoid delusion that some patients have when they think that people are making references to them on the radio or in the newspapers. From a logico-bivalent point of view this is false, but not from a bi-modal point of view, for any bimodal acrostic - which means every one of the thoughts and utterances of the world - makes a reference to any one of us, individuals, so far as we are the homogeneous indivisible reality. Viewed from this point of view we may say that a delusion always has an aspect of truth. What makes it a delusion is the fact that the “blend” between both modes that is expressed in it does not respect completely the heterogenic mode (Matte-Blanco 1981, p. 527).

For Matte-Blanco this grasp of the essential movement of being and becoming in the bi-modal universe of human subjectivity is both the result and the aim of a psychoanalytic practice which elucidates being by practicing the becoming which we are. His ethical-

aesthetic approach is similar to that of Nietzsche, Steiner, Bergson, and Whitehead who sought to reveal man's subjective limitations in the play of the universe as objectively as possible in order to more fully celebrate such possibilities for becoming and to seize the irreducible and incomparable sovereignty which constitutes the event, process, and concrescence which is ours. For the individual subject, the grasping of one's nature as both "god" and "nothing" through simultaneous and alternating poles of subject and object - which Deleuze (1983) and Guattari (1992) map out in a way similar to Matte Blanco - is the highest achievement in any intersubjective relationship with the other who is both "me" and also "not me." The practice of analysis - individual, collective, institutional, and otherwise - should strive to achieve such an art and science of life lived to its fullest among the multiplicity of subjectivities unfolding from the infinite.

If somebody is authentic and creative, then he feels, symmetrically, that he is God. If and when he discovers the creativity-divinity of another, he feels annihilated. Then he tries deicide. If that God does not die there is no alternative but to accept his existence. A form of polytheism is then born in the depths of one's entrails. Maturity means accepting that one is god and at the same time a point, i.e., so small as to have no dimensions, and that the others are also gods and point as well. This is a very difficult achievement; most people remain at the level of self-deification and annihilation of the other. Maturity contains and implicitly expresses the long and detailed story of self-deification, deicide, annihilation, self-deification, birth of two (or more) gods (Matte-Blanco 1981, p. 527-528).

5. The Aesthetic Object - Donald Meltzer

An aesthetic approach to the psychic apparatus does not necessarily exclude a full understanding of its interaction with and manifestation through the neurophysiological system. Both Freud and Matte-Blanco sought to map the complex operations of the psyche which contains logics of its own. Klein and Bion enlarged the scope of biological developmental stages by grasping the ongoing development of the mind which organizes itself into complex coexisting layers or "fields" of experience. Donald Meltzer draws on such an

enlarged understanding of the bio-social psyche in order to elaborate a metapsychology in which the aesthetic is at stake. For Meltzer, like Bion, thoughts precede thinking - thoughts are what create thinking. But these thoughts are none other than forces, drives, sensations, and above all the enigma of trying to understand - to translate - to think these forces. Bioenergetic drives are intertwined with meaning, belief, and thought in the construction of human subjectivities. There is no definite line between emotion and cognition - only this endless process of digestion.

The “field” orientation which accepts multiple levels of simultaneous and more-or-less integrated functioning seems to allow the question “how” and not only “when” is the mental level called into operation to superimpose itself on the purely neurophysiological? Bion’s approach to the problem, by assuming that the first operation is the creation of thoughts which then require an apparatus to think (manipulate, use) them, seems to be the crucial break with the traditional implication that thinking is prior as a function and generates thoughts (Meltzer 1986, p. 206).

Meltzer describes the journey of the human infant as an extended encounter with the aesthetic object which - although it may begin with the mother - includes an endless array of objects and others. We are not far from Lacan’s (1966) notion of the object (a) - or other - which forms the primal foundation of our desire or jouissance. Indeed what is the aesthetic foundation of human subjectivity described by Meltzer - as well as Peirce (1935-66) and Sebeok (1981) - other than this jouissance. But while the immediate external sensual qualities of the object provide a secure and pleasurable experience for the subject, simultaneously its internal qualities present the subject with an enigma of uncertainty: “what does the other want from me?” in Lacan’s language.

The problem area that the key of symbol formation was called into play to open, was the enigma of the inside and the outside of the aesthetic object. Its power to evoke emotionality was only equalled by its ability to generate anxiety, doubt, distrust. While the sensual qualities of the aesthetic object could be apprehended with some degree of confidence, its internal qualities, being infra- or supra-sensual, carried no such comfort (Meltzer 1986, p. 207).

Symbol formation or the translating function - by which thoughts as forces and enigmas come to be unfolded by a thinking apparatus - attempts to resolve the ambiguity of such pleasureable and frightening - or good and bad - experience. But is it not the very enigma of uncertainty which causes fear, doubt, and anxiety also that which makes sensual pleasure more than just that? What Lacan calls “jouissance” characterizes this experience beyond pain and pleasure that forms the unique basis of human subjectivity. Similarly, Bataille (1954, 1961, 1986) claims that we must live up to such ambiguity and ambivalence if we are ever to heal ourselves or to grasp the essence of being human. Bataille’s project of finding a practice of “turning anguish into ecstasy” is a pragmatic response to our failure to resolve the schizoid experience of primary splitting in the depressive phase of the psyche. Ancient rituals and representations of tragedy worked to enable the collective and individual psyche to learn to tolerate the pain of ambiguity with respect to love and hate, presence and absence. According to Meltzer, in standing before the ambiguity of the aesthetic object and its alternating presence and absence, trust is born in the ability to accept such ambivalence and impermanence.

This then would be the context in which absence of the object makes its crucial impact and tests the mettle. Bion has defined this problem of the absent object as “the absent object as a present persecutor” with respect to the “space where the object used to be”. . . Trust would then be a compound quality of mind, like foot-pounds as the definition of work: hope-hours, or minutes or days or years (Meltzer 1986, p. 207).

This experience of trust in which hope is maintained during the aesthetic object’s absence through the extension backwards toward the memory of its presence reconstructs the organization of time-space in the subject and transforms immediate desire into faith. The experience of faith, trust, and hope extends the human psyche beyond immediate perception and limited episodic consciousness without the requirement of language or the symbolic in a manner similar to the neural recategorization of higher level consciousness described by neuroscientists (Edelman 1992, Damasio 1994). Meltzer’s elaboration of trust, however, need make no reference to biology in mapping the intersubjective world of the human psyche. For despite the biological and physical foundations of the human

experience, it is in the spiritual or aesthetic realm of desire, love, and affect where subjectivities are formed.

By defining the fundamental problem of aesthetic relations in this way and by asserting the aesthetic relationship to the world and the primal stimulus to thought, we have adopted a position compatible with a field theory that is also inherently genetic. What it does, that the differentiation of paranoid-schizoid and depressive positions fails to do in their adherence to a Life and Death Instinct foundation, is to allow for a purely mental approach to values unencumbered by biological speculation. While the issue of mental pain and tolerance therefore loses none of its clinical vibrance as an arbiter of ego strength, a new factor is introduced to the dynamism of conflict. Trust, in units of hope-time, schematically speaking, would seem to have qualitative roots in the richness of the aesthetic experience to which separation is the sequel. And this richness is surely to be found in the element of mutuality of apprehension of beauty. For the baby must be held as an aesthetic object by the mother for the experience of their love-making to reverberate and escalate in intensity (Meltzer 1986, p. 207-208).

For Meltzer the reverberation of love between infant and mother - or between subject and other - depends on a mutual "apprehension of beauty" in which each is experienced as an aesthetic object by the other. It is not enough for the mother to provide a containing or holding environment. There must be desire, love, and faith for the infant to develop the same process. But this intersubjectivity is extremely complicated, for the experience of desire or love without faith which remains dyadic and dependent can lead to subjectivities characterized by a "mimetic desire" caught in the mirror of delusions, fantasies, and insecurities which in turn lead to the collective, social, and institutional formations of bureaucracy, oppression, and master-slave relations which Rene Girard (1978) and Emmanuel Levinas (1961) have described as constituting most civilizations. Fear and dependence on the part of the mother will only be introjected in the infant in the construction of his subjective experience, and the overabundance of desire and love between the mother and infant will not allow for the development of faith through trust. The faith of trust on the other hand will allow the subject to enter into the semiotic construction and symbol formation which will enable him to communicate across time and space with

other subjectivities within himself and in the external environment. Without the intersubjectivity developed through trust, subjective experience will to different degrees be turned in on itself in a world of isolated fantasies projected onto the other forming a range of subjectivities from autism to narcissism.

Such a basis which allows us to conceive the “how” of the calling into action of the capacity for symbolic thought, the product of the mysterious alpha-function, more or less releases us from any great concern with the “when” of the matter. Pre-natal or post-natal, it must occur, and if this conjunction of mutuality is its essential ingredient, its inception may be widely variable in time. But, sadly, we must recognise that it may not occur at all, as in the children who do not seem to make the post-natal adjustment or whose neurophysiological apparatus is not of sufficient complexity to achieve the aesthetic level of response. The autistic and the non-developer may taste it and rebel against its dominance.

But more important for clinical practice is the corollary, that the defensive operations which psychoanalysis is specially fashioned to follow may mostly, perhaps entirely, be seen as moves against the impact of the aesthetic object . . . (Meltzer 1986, p. 208).

If the impact of the aesthetic object is too great - if the encounter is too traumatic to assimilate - the subject may be forced to retreat into the security of the familiar. Meltzer's mapping of this encounter is beyond stages or phases and forms the basis of human individual and collective experience at all times. The psychoanalytic process - like the family, the school, the love relationship - would be an environment for undertaking such an encounter in which defensive operations against anxiety would be released for a confrontation with the depths of anguish found in death, loss, and uncertainty lying at the heart of human experience. The focus of the analytic encounter, then, would not be on the semiotics of meaning and language but on the relationship itself which precedes the symbolic and forms the foundations of emotion, cognition, and consciousness.

Undoubtedly, the first and most important alteration is a diminished emphasis on the “correctness” of interpretation, perhaps a lessening of the urgency to interpret altogether. Instead, the focus moves forwards, as it were, into the interaction, the relationship

from which interpretive ideas emerge. The model of container-contained places a new value on receptiveness and the holding of the dynamic situation of transference-counter-transference in the mind (Meltzer 1986, p. 208).

The encounter with the aesthetic object is the encounter with what is other in all its forms - the encounter with desire. One can withdraw into one's own world or face the enigma of difference. One can fight anxiety with rigid "neurotic" symptoms or push forward with courage into the unknown. Lacan claims guilt and neurosis result not from enacting one's desires, but from not enacting them and instead allowing one's destiny to be determined by the imperative of the Other. In becoming conscious of how our subjectivity has been constructed, we can return to the encounter with the aesthetic - return to our jouissance - in order to apprehend beauty beyond the safety of familiar forms.

6. Transitional Phenomena - Donald Winnicott

Paradox is the essence of human subjectivity - in splitting, in ambivalence, in ambiguity, in symmetry, and in the usage of the object. In the pragmatic approach of Donald Winnicott, the field of human experience becomes the facilitating environment in which the usage of the object leads to the creation of the subject. Winnicott's illustration of circles within circles sketches the concentric holding environments in which the infant is contained by the mother who is contained by the family which is contained by the community and so on. This map parallels the nested hierarchies of levels of organization from the molecule to the individual organism to the galaxy. The newborn human being is more dependent and vulnerable than any other such organism, but it is precisely the long incubation and learning period which will endow it with such complexity. During this process, holding must be neither too little nor too much. Without the basic level of stability, every impingement will send the subject inward seeking protection. Too much will smother him. The holding which is like a life jacket - constantly present yet nonintrusive - allows the subject to move outwards and to explore the external world.

I should like to put in a reminder here that the essential feature in the concept of transi-

tional objects and phenomena (according to my presentation of the subject) is the paradox, and the acceptance of the paradox: the baby creates the object, but the object was there waiting to be created and to become a cathected object (Winnicott 1971, p. 89).

For Winnicott the journey from birth is one of transitional phenomena in which the subject replaces his dependence on the womb with a successions of more mediated objects, from the mother to the plaything to the symbolic realm of language and culture. This is why the psyche is both individual and social, and why the symptoms of the individual subject can never be separated from the community or society as a whole. The play of transitional phenomena takes place in an intersubjective field of meaning which holds the psyche as it manifests itself in individual, collective, and momentary subjectivities. In this process the initial object relations of primary splitting are eventually transformed into the active usage of the object.

In the sequence, one can say that first there is object-relating, then in the end there is object-use; in between, however, is the most difficult thing, perhaps, in human development; or the most irksome of all the early failures that come for mending. This thing that there is in between relating and use is the subject's placing of the object outside the area of the subject's omnipotent control; that is, the subject's perception of the object as an external phenomenon, not as a projective entity, in fact recognition of it as an entity in its own right (Winnicott 1971, p. 89).

The active usage of the object endows the subject with the ability to master the creation and transformation of the external world and to understand it within the province of the mind. What is required for this to take place is the working through of forces of desire, love, and hate in the destruction and rebirth of the object. Similar to Meltzer's process of trust, Winnicott's destruction of the object allows the infant to find the limitations of the unknown and unthought forces which play through him. The drive to possess, to control, and to destroy what is other or outside remains uncertain and unprocessed unless the subject experiences the other who does not retaliate but rather holds and contains these forces, allowing himself to be attacked and surviving such drives. At this point, Winnicott claims, the other is recognized outside of the domain of the self and this recognition initi-

ates the subject's ability to think at a more complex level.

This change (from relating to usage) means that the subject destroys the object. From here it could be argued by an armchair philosopher that there is therefore no such thing in practice as the use of an object: if the object is external, then the object is destroyed by the subject. Should the philosopher come out of his chair and sit on the floor with his patient, however, he will find that there is an intermediate position. In other words, he will find that after "subject relates to object" comes "subject destroys object" (as it becomes external); and then may come "object survives destruction by the subject". But there may or may not be survival. A new feature thus arrives in the theory of object-relating. The subject says to the object: "I destroyed you", and the object is there to receive the communication. From now on the subject says: "Hullo object!" "I destroyed you" "I love you" "You have value for me because of your survival of my destruction of you" "While I am loving you I am all the time destroying you in (unconscious) fantasy." Here fantasy begins for the individual. The subject can now use the object that has survived. It is important to note that it is not only that the subject destroys the object because the object is placed outside the area of omnipotent control. It is equally significant to state this the other way round and to say that it is the destruction of the object that places the object outside the area of the subject's omnipotent control. In these ways the object develops its own autonomy and life, and (if it survives) contributes-in to the subject, according to its own properties (Winnicott 1971, p. 90).

At this point the projection and introjection of schizoid object relations become assimilated into the more cognitive, less emotional perceptual organization of the world. Perception/creation becomes in a sense more "objective" and less "subjective" in its interaction with the world through the intersubjective recognition of other subjectivities. If the object does not survive the forces of desire and destruction which are unleashed through the subject, a feeling of guilt and hopelessness pervades relationships and stifles creativity. On the other the hand, the repeated destruction and resurrection of the object strengthens the confidence of cognitive operations of the "self" in the world and its emotional cathexes of desire and love.

If it is in an analysis that these matters are taking place, then the analyst, the analytic technique, and the analytic setting all come in as surviving or not surviving the patient's destructive attacks. This destructive activity is the patient's attempt to place the analyst outside the area of omnipotent control, that is, out in the world. Without the experience of maximum destructiveness (object not protected) the subject never places the analyst outside and therefore can never do more than experience a kind of self-analysis, using the analyst as a projection of a part of the self (Winnicott 1971, p. 91).

The analytic process sets up a facilitating environment by which this process of object-usage will be worked through. The focus is not so much the past reality or cathexes as the field of transitional phenomena itself which might come to exist anywhere. For Freud the individual myths of the family had replaced a dying cultural space of ritual and play. Increasingly the analytic or therapeutic environment is called upon to replace other realms of collective play previously providing environments for transitional phenomena. Winnicott perceives the cultural realm as surrounding and interlocking with the familial and intersubjective transformation of the human psyche, but we now exist in a world in which the social forms are increasingly breaking down and leaving a chaotic schizoid social environment of forces without security, stability, or faith.

There is in many a failure in confidence which cramps the person's play-capacity because of the limitations of the potential space; likewise there is for many a poverty of play and cultural life because, although the person had a place for erudition, there was a relative failure on the part of those who constitute the child's world of persons to introduce cultural elements at the appropriate phases of the person's personality development. Naturally, limitations arise out of the relative lack of cultural erudition or even the lack of acquaintance with the cultural heritage which may characterize those actually in charge of a child (Winnicott 1971, p. 109).

Winnicott moves away from the analytic process by which interpretations lead to consciousness of one's particular life history and the identification with the ideal ego of the analyst and toward the field of multiple subjectivities deconstructed and reconstructed through play with rituals, relations, objects, and semiotic and symbolic creations. In this

scenario, the analyst no longer enacts the holding of the mother or the law of the father, but rather becomes a guide in a complex field of unfolding possibilities and continual reorganizations of chaos.

The potential space between baby and mother, between child and family, between individual and society or the world, depends on experience which leads to trust. It can be looked upon as sacred to the individual in that it is here that the individual experiences creative living.

By contrast, exploitation of this area leads to a pathological condition in which the individual is cluttered up with persecutory elements of which he has no means of ridding himself.

It may perhaps be seen from this how important it can be for the analyst to recognize the existence of this place, the only place where play can start, a place that is at the continuity-contiguity moment, where transitional phenomena originate (Winnicott 1971, p. 103).

Without stable forms of holding in family, community, or society or even in cultural symbolic myths, transitional phenomena become increasingly persecutory, resulting in psychic symptoms manifesting at a social level in the form of bizarre explosions of violence and destruction to which people only turn a blind eye - and in the name of which they call for further punishment, persecution, and confinement. At the level of individual and intersubjective relations, feelings of depression, confusion, and derealization abound in a world in which too many choices - too much novelty - finally implodes into an experience of inertia in the absence of the singularity of any specific event, process, or subjective moment. When all things are quantifiable and exchangeable according to some general equivalent, the sovereignty of the subject disappears into the objectification of life.

7. The Emotion Processing Mind - Robert Langs

Robert Langs has attempted to enlarge the scope of metapsychology and psychotherapeutic practice by placing the psyche within the nested hierarchy of interacting adaptive sys-

tems coevolving throughout the universe. In focusing on the nexus of mind and body in the interaction of human biology and psyche, Langs remaps the architecture of the mind as an adaptive system which operates simultaneously at conscious and unconscious levels. Langs's metapsychology is very much a return to Freud's attempt to unite a scientific understanding of the energetics of body, brain, and mind with an aesthetic understanding of their interaction through story, myth, and language. It is through the stories we tell of ourselves that we reveal the operation of the bi-level psyche and its attempts to process emotional experience.

Human adaptation takes place on two planes - one with actual or potential awareness, and the other without such a possibility. . . .

Human verbal communication (an observable of great importance to our efforts to fathom the design of the mind) is two-tiered - especially when it is conveyed in narrative form. Storied communication is a means of conveying double messages, in that it consistently embodies two sets of meanings that reflect two distinctive levels of adaptation - conscious and unconscious (Langs 1995, p. 13-14).

Langs recenters our understanding of the psyche on the adaptation of the conscious - and unconscious - organism which is the human being. Everything begins with adaptation to the immediate environment. What becomes dislodged and stored as the residue of the unconscious grows alongside the ongoing immediate "attention to life" of our perception/action in the world as it satisfies basic needs and drives. What Bergson (1896) calls spirit or memory is this psychic part of our existence which is cut loose from immediate perception/action and deepens our emotional and cognitive faculties - the realm responsible for higher-level (self)consciousness, desire, and mental fractures. Despite the growth of the cognitive and emotional depth of the mind, Langs believes that our responses are always geared toward dealing with immediate encounters which include events that trigger unconscious residues and symmetrically related events from other time-space configurations.

The evolved design of the adaptive capacities, physical and mental, of all living organisms centers on coping efforts that are responsive to immediate stimuli or triggers. This

concentration on dealing first and foremost with contemporaneous stimuli applies to human mental adaptations, despite the highly developed capacities of humans to remember the past and to anticipate the future, to deal with past traumas for long periods of time and anticipate and respond to future emotional issues far ahead of their occurrence.

While unresolved adaptive issues, past and future, may therefore evoke conscious - and, under selective conditions, unconscious - responses, coping with one's current environment, interactions, and impinging stimuli takes precedence adaptively. The most common configuration is one in which the present situation is the primary cause for adaptation, while related experiences, past and future, activate secondary coping responses largely because the present situation resembles or in some way calls forth experiences from other time-frames (Langs 1995, p. 14-15).

The response to the reconfiguration of our understanding of the human mind is the transformation of therapy or analysis from a sterile practice based on dogmatic principles to an open-ended pragmatics with various possibilities at its disposal. The relationship between belief and the transformation of the real in terms of both psychic and physical symptoms has hardly been examined. Rather, psychoanalytic practice has been buried under ideologies passed down like religions to which followers are indoctrinated. These laws of practice and theory precede the practical truth of the complexity and uncertainty of the psyche which outstrips and eludes all existing metapsychologies and metaphysics in the same way that the working of the brain outstrips the most elaborate computers. Langs maps out the positions of a variety of therapies with respect to the psyche and their attempts to deal alternatively with deep unconscious residues of the mind or with the more immediately adaptive conscious realm.

Until now, the issue of the kind of psychotherapy a therapist chooses to practice has been seen as an intellectual choice with some vague psychodynamic underpinnings. The key issue has been defined as whether or not one decides to pursue the realm of unconscious meaning as in dynamic forms of psychoanalysis and psychotherapy or, instead, opts for a more cognitive approach such as retraining, conditioning, and the like, as in cognitive and gestalt therapies (Langs 1995, p. 115).

For Langs it is essential to undertake the nearly impossible task of reconstructing the bi-level subjectivity of the adaptive mind. Behavioral reconditioning may be able to alter the patterned responses of the unconscious, but they simply replace one set of programs with another. Cognitive therapies aim to increase conscious adaptation, but they ignore the power of unconscious processing to dominate human experience. Only a therapy which works with the deep unconscious system that determines so much of human functioning and attempts to bring to consciousness the very workings of this system for any particular individual will endow the subject with the power to reconstruct his own subjective experience of the world within the limitations of the mental or psychic apparatus through which he operates.

Animals adapt instinctively to any immediate danger in favor of survival. The evolution of the human mind into a complex consciousness beyond immediate time and space has brought with it the emotional experiences of fear and anxiety which initiates responses to avoid such unpleasant experience. Consciousness of death as the end of one's subjective consciousness is not perceived without the accompanying fear of the unknown and sadness at the loss of oneself introjected into one's inner world and projected outwards into the world of others. According to Langs the psyche responds to such fear with denial and defenses of various forms.

Secured-frame anxieties are closely linked with death anxiety - the claustrophobic qualities of the secured frame are experienced deeply as the claustrophobia of life as it is surrounded and encased by death. The human mind has evolved only one basic mechanism to cope with and handle death anxiety - the use of denial in its myriad of forms. One form of denial involves modifying frames in order to deny one's entrapment in a life that ends with death. This means that by design, the minds of both patients and therapists are unable to cope with death and death-related anxieties through insight; they therefore opt for maladaptive, action-oriented, frame-deviant solutions and forms of treatment that in the long run are very costly and harmful (Langs 1995, p. 117).

Paradoxically, the human subject cannot find security in either rest or movement. It is obvious that the human being seeks security and stability in repetition and the familiar,

but as Langs makes clear the more subtle form of denial acts through modifying secure frames which would otherwise bring on the unmediated encounter with death, absence, and presence itself. While we grasp on to stable forms, objects, and truths as security blankets, and fear the chaos of change and becoming that takes these away, we fear even more the conscious encounter with the limitations of our becoming and the recognition of our being. The process of analysis in individual, collective, and institutional forms invokes a double process: first to deconstruct those stagnant form of subjectivity constructed for us and forced upon us by the Other and second to increase consciousness of our own forms of stagnation and distraction which avoid the encounter with the real of chaos and uncertainty and the limitations death, loss, and nothingness.

As opposed to this, most therapists and analysts participate in the reconstruction of oppressive forms of order through reorganizing subjectivities according to already mapped out imperatives and ethics or more subtly through encouraging identification with the analyst. Fearing chaos and the secured-frame anxieties evoking entrapment, analysts themselves are rarely equipped to accompany the subject into this territory and instead proliferate further distractions under the rubric of various models of success in healing.

Indeed, deep unconscious meaning and secured frames are two sides of the same coin - embracing one goes with embracing the other, much as avoiding one goes with avoiding the other. Given their own unresolved secured-frame anxieties, therapists are loath to work within secured frames or to trigger-decode their patient's frame-evoked narratives lest they be faced with powerful encoded directives to establish or maintain secured frames (Langs 1995, p. 118).

Langs's recommendation that therapy proceed through the analysis of triggered adaptive responses to the immediate threat of secured-frame anxieties does not wait for regression and holding to be established as a return to infancy, but makes conscious the ever-present ongoing element of our movement between stability and change, difference and repetition, order and chaos in search of a general economy (Bataille 1949, 1967, 1976) or ecology of mind (Bateson 1972, Guattari 1992). The focus on the semiotic triggers and symbolic

narratives of the subject which reveal the unconscious psychic agenda underlying consciously asserted intention elegantly unites important elements of Freud, Lacan, and Bion while stripping the analytic process of its sectarian claims.

The new forms of psychotherapy will fully recognize the central role played by ground-rule impingements for the deep unconscious experience and emotional lives of both patients and therapists. Psychotherapy will become frame-centred and will stress the need to offer patients as secured a frame as possible. Rectification of frame deviations at the behest of the patient's derivative or encoded narratives and the trigger-decoded interpretation of all frame-related transactions will be among the most frequent interventions made by therapist.

This kind of work will be recognized as the essence of cure. Such work provides patients (and therapists) with an optimal healing setting and background experience. It allows for the insightful working-through of foreground frame issues as they become activated by actions of either party to therapy. It also enables the therapist to connect the patient's unconscious experience to the patient's life history and psychopathology. The secured frame is also the best setting for the resolution of pathological forms of death anxiety (Langs 1995, p. 121).

Freud's initial effort to integrate mind and body through a metapsychology of matter, energy, and drives and ethical-aesthetic, symbolic-noetic myths was augmented in practice by Bion's transformation of mental space through the containment of secure frames and Lacan's repeated encounter with the real beyond symbolic and imaginary diversions. Langs has a similar project but uses a language of objectivity and cybernetics in the hopes of preventing the return to myths which permeate the poetics of processes turned into beliefs. The pragmatics of frame analysis and the transformation of structurally-coupled systems moves the understanding and healing of the psyche out of the specific realm of individual therapy and into new spaces of social, collective, and transpersonal formations of human subjectivity.

8. Psycho-Semiotics - Alfred Silver

Psychoanalysis has always been concerned with a semiotics of expression in human experience. Alfred Silver's integration of Charles Peirce's semiotic practice with the psychoanalytic theories of Freud, Klein, and Bion constitutes a theory and practice of the "psycho-semiotics" of mental space and the development of symbol formation through emotional-cognitive learning. Peirce's idea of "firstness" evokes the pure point of indivisible oneness experienced by the undifferentiated infant in the womb and by the subjectivity of autistic isolation and the fall into psychotic chaos. "Secondness" begins to develop in human subjectivity with the schizoid splitting of objects and forces and the mirroring of self and other. But it is only through "thirdness" that distance and mediation develop, allowing human subjectivity to free itself from immediate episodic consciousness and to plan, think, and organize at the complex level of space-time representation which forms the basis for the pragmatics of survival from everyday life to advanced technology. Thirdness also frees us from the seizure of passion in forces of attraction/repulsion which play themselves out in the realm of secondness or mimetic desire experienced in love, hate, war, group trance, and Freud's "mass-psychology". Third-level abstract symbol formation provides the distancing from immediate seizure which constitutes the fundamental and unconscious belief of any symptom - psychic, social, or physical. Through the symbolic we gain distance by moving from the "emotional" to the "mental" or "cognitive."

In the psycho-semiotic view, "symptom-formation" may be translated as concrete proto-symbol formation, i.e., one-dimensional identification: a pseudo-conceptualization due to an experience of extremely narrow perspective. This in turn is associated with a primitive semiotic whose sign is so poorly evolved that it is indistinguishable from its primal object which contains primitive preconceptions; it may even be a likeness of some bizarre fragment of a primal object (mirrored back as a bizarre identification) rather than having evolved through bonafide triadic symbol formation. In other words, Bergson's "intuition," Freud's "symptom-formation," and Klein's "projective identification" have essentially the same psycho-semiotic structure: a narrowed triad that functions cyclopically and which is experienced phenomenally in "secondness" (in one-dimension) as a con-

cretistic brute actuality - an ineffable signal, an immediate symptom, or a confused identification (Silver 1981, p. 298-299).

Silver likens Peirce's secondness to Freudian "symptom-formation" and Kleinian "projective identification" as a form of primitive mediation which may not fully develop into the smooth abstraction of language. He also compares it to Bergson's method of "intuition" in which primitive semiotic reading looks beyond the surface of logical-deductive language. But Bergson's and Peirce's semiotic-philosophical method has the ability to move back and forth between primal semiotics and more abstract symbolics, whereas certain subjects may become stuck in a specific symptom-formation which not only cannot partake of abstraction and distancing but always returns to the same cycle.

Thirdness develops a triadic relationship between subject, object, and sign - or self, other, and symbol. Signs do not signify or represent things in the world in an objectively true sense - they represent something for someone. Every event, system, or organism is a subject to the extent that it has its own internal horizon, but each subject organizes or perceives other subjects as objects represented through sign-symbol-signifier. This thirdness is objectivity - not the objectivity of truth - for the real is inaccessible to any subject - but the pragmatic objectivity of scientific distance which functions to manipulate the real for survival and alters our subjective dependence on the immediate seizure of primitive mirroring relations of mimetic desire which can lead to hysterical and schizophrenic traps.

It is important to make clear the vital phenomenological distinction between the "mirroring" which occurs in the narrowed triads of mania, intuition, and pseudo- or proto-symbol formation from the "reflections" characteristic of conceptual thinking. The mirroring refers to the effect produced prototypically in paranoid identification when hostile predispositions are felt to emanate from even inanimate objects, but scientific interpretation leads to a realization that these hostile signs emanate or are projected out to the object and mirrored back without further significant development. They are falsely identified as belonging to the accused and blamed object which is the recipient of the projection. On the other hand, true reflective thinking occurs as a critique of the understanding and is the manifestation of pure reason. It occurs when the empirical self and the empirical

object of scrutiny are observed and their relationship judged by the (un-manifest) self of pure apperception (the I-in-itself) which acts as "third" in this triadic object-relation. The basic distinction consists in the fate of the preconception (Silver 1981, p. 299).

The space from dyad to triad is developed differently in human subjectivity, and it is always fluctuating. Dyadic relations not only give us our initial cognition, they provide the depth of emotional experience found in love, mysticism, art, and the sacred. The point is not to replace the dyadic subjectivity with the triadic subjectivity of reflective thought, but to extend both and to integrate them into an emotional-cognitive richness where desire and consciousness coexist.

Our attention to life and immediate being in the world finds us organizing, translating, containing, and embodying forces of matter and energy from the beginning of life. What are symptoms but a form of psychic metabolism by which we attempt to digest such experience? The whole complex map of human subjectivities including physical and psychic symptoms, character, style, art, design, rituals, religions, ideas, theories, laws, thoughts, and feelings can be read as the semiotic translation of embodiment and the transmutation of energy, matter, and form.

In distinction to the unfolding of sophisticated spirals of thirdness, an experience may be signified only by some inexpressible feeling. The sign of such an experience may only be manifest in some physical action, perhaps only inside a primitive autonomic or kinesthetic system. However, I would take as an irreducible principle that a subjective experience must be manifested by some sign of embodiment, otherwise the experience could not be said to be actual. This is true even if the embodiment is only known by the signs of its denial in the form of some symptom such as depersonalization or alexithymia. This principle is of great importance in that it establishes the phenomenological necessity that an experience, to have any actuality or even potential quality, must be contained or embodied (Silver 1981, p. 300).

What is this "inexpressible feeling" other than what Bataille (1954) calls the sacred. But we can only contain so much, and the ethic of psychoanalysis is that one responds simply

to the request of suffering as too much or too little of such feeling - to reintegrate the emotional-cognitive subjectivity through a practice of reorganization based on the psycho-semiotic system which makes up each particular subject. The “objectivity” of thirdness is not true - it is necessary. It is functional for survival and pragmatic for reworking the complexity of beliefs and drives in a world in which collective and institutional forms of rituals and religions no longer provide such a service.

Thought, cognition, and consciousness constitute that part of human subjectivity which contests or questions immediate experience - feeling, desire, and intuition. This doubt or skepticism frees us from the binds of “superstition” and circular traps and leads to the foundation of new forms of thinking, feeling, and being and to pragmatic transformations of the real which provide easier and more pleasurable means of survival. At the same time, however, this scientific doubt can in itself lead to an infinite questioning which divorces us from our immediate experience - the foundation of faith in our perceptual organization of the universe as what is real. In the end absolute philosophical and scientific consciousness leads back to the infinite chaos of the possible, which is why Lacan called science a kind of absolute hysteria or purified psychosis capable of leading any subjectivity - including humanity in general - into delusion.

Emerging into full space-time dimensionality from the one-dimensionality of the boundary line are the transitional oneiric and ludic phenomena characterized by iconic and indexical signs, but they are also characterized by the emergence of symbolism. Symbol formation is marked by the inhibitory constraints imposed on phantasy by the demands of truthful space-time representation and structural rules of proper conceptualization. The penalty to be paid for multi-dimensionality and perspective is the increasing “scientific” doubt which accompanies one’s experience - which in the absence of these constraints associated with symbol formation would have the full reign of unchecked delusional certainty (Silver 1981, p. 302).

Abstract symbol formation does not necessarily lead to reflective rational thought or social cohesion. The thirdness of the symbolic may be used to embody the richness of primal dyadic subjectivity outside the implicit social contract of any symbolic communi-

ty. What is called hysterical, perverse, or psychotic experience not only eludes the order of normal reality, but it does so in such a way that the brilliance of such individual myths often eludes analytic understanding and healing. Providing a subject with a culturally accepted character-formation or with a strong ego with which to identify may be as useless for embodying the drives of the subject as was the family and culture in which he grew up. This symbolic may in itself be “normotic” or “normopathic” - simply the collectively agreed upon symptom formation which is never challenged (Freud 1930, Reich 1949, Laing 1967, Guattari 1992, Bollas 1987).

But just as dreaming, playing, and thinking capitalize on concrete phantasy, so may the reverse, regressive situation develop and prevail. For in the interest of disavowing and escaping from dependency on the symbolic object world of representational but separate reality, and in order to regain the transcendental paradise of the primal world, the subject may capitalize on already acquired conceptual and symbolic experience and the mimicry so natural in the boundary line world of analogical iconic signs. Here verbal symbols may be employed concretely as substitutes or symbolic equations for primal objects. An autistically devised pseudo-code of analogical significance may be surreptitiously substituted for or imposed upon the culturally dictated code of abstract symbols (Silver 1981, p. 303)

Here the lines between sane and insane, healthy and ill become blurred - as does the relationship between the individual and the social psyche. Again, laws, rituals, and rules are pragmatic - not true or moral. They serve the function of mediating among a complex web of interacting systems of desire and their embodiments through meaning and action. At this point, any practice of analysis in the form of individual therapy or social change must be united in working toward a pragmatics of complexity which fully recognizes the general economy of such systems and the absolute jouissance, sovereignty, and free will possessed by each system of subjectivity - be it individual, collective, symbolic, noetic, or machinic to assert its choice - its leap of faith against the pragmatics of the law of the symbolic. The artist or mystic not only rejects the symbolic embodiment of collective subjectivities and replaces it with his own, he is able to transform this collectivity itself by breaking down sterile forms and transforming the collective itself which will recon-

struct a new symbolic narrative of order from the chaos into which the mystic plunges it (Bergson 1932, Bion 1970, Derrida 1992).

The analysis of psycho-semiotic structure may provide a basis for renewed investigation of so-called "reality testing." Peirce's pragmatic logic establishes a basis for testing which demands more than formal deductive validation. The pragmatic logic demands a structure by means of which the actuality of experience through concrete phantasy is truly and properly linked by symbol formation to conceptualization or identification. This should properly be called "truth testing" rather than "reality-testing" since the soundness of the symbolic structure is a matter of consistency with cultural convention on an internal basis of con-sensual or common-sense consistency. This is related to truth in the pragmatic sense by which is meant a belief consistent with the beliefs of the community of so-called scientific thinkers; those qualified to doubt. This criterion allows for the emergence of creative departures from the previously accepted hypothetical consequents (interpretants). This concept of truth contrasts greatly with the pragmatic concept of the real. In a pragmatic sense, that which is brute, actual and directly experienced, is the most real. In this sense a delusion is most highly qualified to be defined as "real" for its realness is not challenged by other possible consequents given in the understanding provided by other perspectives in the representational space-time of true symbol formation (Silver 1981, p. 313).

What Silver calls "reality" is an experience of Lacan's "real" whereas the "truth" for Silver is what Lacan calls the "symbolic" - the pragmatic establishment of a collectively agreed embodiment or psycho-semiotic translation of the real. What is it that we call "reality?" Reality is engineered by the construction of subjectivities - by the organization of chaos - by the programming of one's experience of the real. The real is "brute, actual and directly experienced," provided that we understand that we only approach the real - we never actually know or experience it apart from the way our organizing or perceiving of it has been created - apart from the engineering of our reality by ourselves or by others (Von Glaserfeld 1987). But if we free ourselves from the programming of the Other - if we take responsibility for the creation of our reality - the construction of our own subjectivity - what will we "choose" to believe - what will we desire? For desire is the faith, the

seduction, the fall into belief, the willingness to be seduced, hypnotized, and programed which in a flash obliterates all objectivity and reflective consciousness and steps forward without question. Desire is the limit of thought.

9. The Subject of Analysis - Jacques Lacan

Jacques Lacan's transformation of psychoanalysis traces the sovereignty of the subject of desire against the symbolic web of meaning intersubjectively constructed in the social. In mapping the world he posits three realms. The "real" constitutes the totality of the possible in its concrete form including the effects of the psyche itself in its attempt to translate and give form to its experience in this real. The "imaginary" forms the proto-semiotic formation of the real in the iconic image of the other which binds subjects through primal drives of attraction/repulsion and the mimetic desire of master-slave relations in the struggle to the death for recognition as sovereign. The "symbolic" describes the triadic development of abstract semiotic, noetic, and linguistic embodiments of our experience in the real. The interaction of these interlocking realms of real, imaginary, and symbolic forms a knot - as do all structurally coupled systems - which cannot be cut but only untied. To analyze is to untie - as in the Greek roots of the word. To untie is to grasp the concrescence of events and organisms - to divide things into components - and to pragmatically rework the complex interaction among them through splitting, dissolving, linking, and reframing.

While many analysts have added important components to the metapsychology of emotion and cognition, it was Lacan who grasped the full nature of the subject and its implications beyond a truth or ethics of practice. While psychoanalysis as a practice and theory was being lost in dogmatic theologies, Lacan had already grasped its wider scope for human subjectivity outside of individual therapy, and in fact his whole project can be seen as an analysis of analysis itself - that psychoanalysis of civilization which Freud (1930) had called for at the end of his life.

The omnipresence of human discourse will perhaps one day be embraced under the open

sky of an omniconnunication of its text. This is not to say that human discourse will be any more harmonious than now. But this is the field that our experience polarizes in a relation that is only apparently two-way, for any positing of its structure in merely dual terms is as inadequate to it in theory as it is ruinous for its technique (Lacan 1956, p. 56).

Lacan's critique of cultural morality and scientific subjectivity and their attempts to suppress the individual sovereignty of the subject's *jouissance* through the true, the rational, and the good recalls Nietzsche's project. The escape from confronting the essence of life in its fleeting concrescence bound by death and loss in time is for Lacan an avoidance of the real and a cowardice of which most are guilty - and which modern society as a whole encourages through its own denial. And it is exactly guilt which is the result according to Lacan - the guilt and neurotic symptoms resulting from the sacrifice of *jouissance* as the drive beyond good and evil in exchange for "the good" - of truth, morality, and economy.

But a way out is offered to the subject for the resolution of that impasse when his discourse is delusional. Communication can be validly established for him in the common task of science and in the posts that it commands in our universal civilization; this communication will be effective within the enormous objectification constituted by that science, and it will enable him to forget his subjectivity. He will make an effective contribution to the common task in his daily work and will be able to furnish his leisure time with all the pleasures of a profuse culture which, from detective novels to historical memoirs, from educational lectures to the orthopaedics of group relations, will give him the wherewithal to forget his own existence and his death, at the same time to misconstrue the particular meaning of his life in false communication (Lacan 1956, p. 70).

Lacan's practice of analysis follows an ethic of embodying the object of the other for the subject in order to lead him to the consciousness and practice of his desire - or *jouissance*. What the subject says he desires may only be determined by the construction of his subjectivity through the imperative of the Other in the form of mother, father, community, and society and may be at odds with the unconscious desires which determine his feelings, thoughts, and actions with which the imperatives of the Other are bound up.

In order to know how to reply to the subject in analysis, the procedure is to recognize first of all the place where his ego is, the ego that Freud himself defined as an ego formed of a verbal nucleus; in other words, to know through whom and for whom the subject poses his question. So long as this is not known, there will be the risk of a misunderstanding concerning the desire that is there to be recognized and concerning the object to whom this desire is addressed (Lacan 1956, p. 89).

After the stripping away of the determinant layers of imperatives demanded by the Other, the subject is left with nothing - with the truth of nothing against which all thinking, feeling, and being must be measured. Consciousness is objective consciousness of the subjective nature of the human organism: the concrescence of any event or organism is its unique, temporal, and limited nature. Humanity constitutes a concrescence of concrescences in which each individual subjectivity participates in the subjectivity of all and is yet conscious of its sovereign difference from others. Simultaneously the event which is the individual subject's life is made up of an endless series of irreducible events each of which can unite itself with the totality of all of these moments by losing itself in the essence of itself - by communicating transversally across the breach which separates subjects.

This is the only life that endures and is true, since it is transmitted without being lost in the perpetuated tradition of subject to subject. How is it possible not to see how loftily this life transcends that inherited by the animal, in which the individual disappears into the species, since no memorial distinguishes his ephemeral apparition from that which will reproduce it again in the invariability of the type. In fact, apart from those hypothetical mutations of the phylum that must be integrated by a subjectivity that man is still only approaching from the outside - nothing, except the experiments to which man associates it, distinguishes a rat from the rat, a horse from the horse, nothing except this inconsistent passage from life to death - whereas Empedocles, by throwing himself into Mount Etna, leaves forever present in the memory of men this symbolic act of his being-for-death (Lacan 1956, p. 104).

If it is the thirdness of the symbolic which mediates between subjects and objects and

allows an abstract reflection and communication, then it is this same symbolic which can alienate the subject from his desire by capturing his drives in the web of language and law. Desire continues to erupt through the very breakdown of the symbolic and this eruption momentarily puts us in touch with the real in all its ecstasy and horror. For Lacan the psychoanalytic process is a journey toward the real which remains for the subject after decontextualizing the contexts in which he has come to experience the world. What remains as the irreducible object of desire integrates itself with consciousness of this desire through the enjoyment of one's symptom.

The subject says "No!" to this intersubjective game of hunt-the-slipper in which desire makes itself recognized for a moment, only to become lost in a will that is will of the other. Patiently, the subject withdraws his precarious life from the sheeplike conglomeration of the Eros of the symbol in order to affirm it at the last in an unspoken curse.

So when we wish to attain in the subject what was before the serial articulation of speech, and what is primordial to the birth of symbols, we find it in death, from which his existence takes on all the meaning it has. It is in effect as a desire for death that he affirms himself for others; if he identifies himself with the other, it is by fixing him solidly in the metamorphosis of his essential image, and no being is ever evoked by him except among the shadows of death (Lacan 1956, p. 105).

The desire for death is not a death drive but the incomparable human subjectivity born of consciousness of one's concrescence unique and limited by death. Subjectivity and objectivity are opposing poles through which to view the world. The subjective is the qualitative ethical-aesthetic element of existence which recognizes the irreducible quality of processes, systems, and events - that the whole is not the sum of its parts. The objective matter or substance of any system may be changed at will without changing the relations or ways in which it is organized. It then retains its autopoiesis - its concrescence - its sovereignty. But when the organization of infinitely divisible matter is altered, that organized concrescence ends - that subjectivity dies. Subjectivity experiences itself as subjectivity in the recognition of life and death.

This schema satisfactorily expresses the endless circularity of the dialectical process that

is produced when the subject brings his solitude to realization, be it in the fatal ambiguity of immediate desire or in the full assumption of his being-for-death.

But by the same fact it can be grasped that the dialectic is not individual, and that the question of the termination of the analysis is that of the moment when the satisfaction of the subject finds a way to realize himself in the satisfaction of everyone - that is to say, of all those whom this satisfaction associates with itself in a human undertaking. Of all the undertakings that have been proposed in this century, that of the psychoanalyst is perhaps the loftiest, because the undertaking of the psychoanalyst acts in our time as a mediator between the man of care and the subject of absolute knowledge (Lacan 1956, p. 105).

10. The Game of the Other - Francois Roustang

Freud's work with hypnosis led him to the position of not using the power of suggestion and seduction - *as much as possible*. He perhaps knew - though he did not speak of it - that psychoanalysis could never really do away with the forces operating between mind and body in human communication. Nevertheless his invention of the psychoanalytic method was profound for bridging the gap between such subjective forces and the objective scientific approach to becoming conscious of these forces. Rather than engaging in the forces of desire, love, faith, hypnosis, and trance which invoke real physical and mental transformations - or seeking to dispel them through logical explanations - psychoanalysis seeks to elucidate these processes - to find the objective limits of their subjective effects. Freud and Lacan made this the essence of their ethic and their practice - to bring to consciousness the unconscious forces or desires playing through and determining the subject without replacing them with others. Their aim was to found a science of human subjectivity. They did not resort to the power of the trance to effect a cure, yet they did not - like so many followers - become duped into believing in the possibility of its absolute eradication through consciousness.

Francois Roustang's work seeks to get to the heart of the relationship between the hypnotic powers of seduction and the mediating effects of consciousness and the symbolic.

Many of Lacan's followers have become obsessed with the ethic of detachment and the belief in their ability to avoid the seduction and hypnosis of their clients. But to what degree does this actually occur. Are the members of a community whose symbolic beliefs form a social contract truly free from the group trance of the primal horde, the hysteria of desire, or the faith of religious sects. Roustang poses this important yet untouchable question for analysts who consider their methods free from such uncertainty.

After such a long detour, can analysis avoid this overwhelming regression which would signal at best the uselessness of the treatment, at worst its aberration, but which would perhaps explain the fascination that it exerts? As if each one sought not to understand more clearly the unconscious mechanisms that control him, not to rid himself of his symptoms, but to practice what one could call the game of the other, or the game of death, the most fascinating game because the stakes are at their highest and the game is always unresolved and because there is nothing more dangerous or more sterile (Roustang 1980, p. 97).

What Roustang calls the "game of the other" or the "archaic non-relation" is the dangerous game of seduction which lies at the heart of human subjectivity. Any subject has two choices: to maintain the beliefs which form the foundation of one's subjectivity which are the result of the previous seduction and construction of one's experience of the world - or to risk the deconstruction and reconstruction of one's subjectivity through the seduction of other beliefs. Of course these are not exactly choices - one is either seduced or one is not. Some are very open to suggestion and some are very certain in maintaining their subjectivity. According to Roustang, the analytic setting is a particular place for this process to be played out in which the analyst's consciousness of this fundamental human game itself aids in providing the distance for an opportunity to work through these beliefs with the increased consciousness of how these forces operate for the analysand and possibly for others. What Roustang wants to make clear is that this process cannot be purified from the uncertainties of the outcome of engaging such forces. The analyst has a dual process to his practice: to be able to engage the forces of attraction/repulsion at the heart of human "subjectivity" and to be able to stand back far enough to maintain the mediated "objectivity" which will provide consciousness. He must have one foot inside

and one foot outside the circle of this “game of the other.” He must integrate subjectivity and objectivity in a special way which he can never determine ahead of time.

The analyst's errors are not only inevitable - it is impossible for him to choose the right distance - they are indispensable to the progress of the analysis. As we have seen, if it is not taken, nothing happens (because the patient can not unfold the absurdity of which he dreams), but if it does not slip away again, there is no possibility of analyzing this dream. Faced with a vain reiteration of the game, one must little by little separate the events. If the nonrelation is called archaic or prehistoric, it is only in a limited sense, since by definition it escapes time and cannot properly be made part of a history (Roustang 1980, p. 99).

Neurotic and psychotic symptoms are for Roustang a failure of mediated symbolization in favor of the embodiment or containment of forces through primal modes. The analytic process sets in motion the dyadic enactment of such forces in the hopes of drawing out the affect from the symptoms which are the supposed reason for analysis so that they can be put into play in new ways. Can we consider psychoanalysis a pragmatics in which the forces of drive, affect, or seduction are dislodged from their circular patterns, returned to chaos, and reorganized into new forms of embodiment? Healing, teaching, and spiritual rituals throughout human history have engaged in such transformative practices, but psychoanalysis attempts to give the tools of the process itself to the analysand rather than transforming his subjectivity with an end result in mind.

Let us grant that neurosis is a failure of symbolization. One can then ask what forces are capable of holding language with distortions in which the individual's relation to himself and to others becomes impracticable or is even annulled, as in psychosis? . . . Let us hypothesize that the adversary of language and of sexuality would be located in the game of the other, which is also the passion of the one, for which the condition of mute and masturbatory autism would be the consummate image. From this perspective, the neurotic, that failed autistic, would be someone who, luckily, would always insufficiently resist the necessity to speak and the need for sexual relations (Roustang 1980, p. 100).

In analysis, interpretations are not meant to be correct translations of the subject's experience, but reconstructions negotiated between subject and analyst in the system or event which the analytic setting creates. The thirdness of symbolic language provides the mediated consciousness which makes its form of the translation of drives a powerful method for embodiment and containment with which the subject can embrace/enact his desire without being at the mercy of it. Time, history, and the story form the noetic, ontic, and symbolic foundations of individuation which allow for human subjectivity to organize its experience of the chaos of matter-energy in an active creative way.

Nothing is possible as long as the patient does not make the analyst enter into the battle of devouring energies and hate. Through his "bodily attention" the analyst resists absorption, and after a while his resistance enables the patient to speak his hate and to show the analyst its means and ends. The counter-transference is not, therefore, a mixture of feelings and attitudes. It is first the acceptance of confrontation and at the same time the refusal of the game of the other; afterwards, if the right remark comes from the patient, it becomes the verbal expression of the respective positions in which the patient has placed the analyst and in which the patient himself is placed. It is never a question of more or less emotional outpourings. The moment of detachment is the putting into words of the moment of seizure. Here, truly, saying is doing. The word puts into effect a distance in relation to symbiosis; it emerges from the seizure in proportion to its involvement. The word is released from the grasp of symbiosis because the word is the result of symbiosis, to the extent that the word expresses symbiosis in a singularly adequate way that departs from any well-known generalities. Language can thus effect a separation in the ahistorical if it takes it into account, obviously, but also if it derives its force from that ahistorical state. One could say that words are all the more effective when they struggle against the silence that attempts to suppress them. This silence in psychoanalysis is none other than "the unknowable and non-existent unconscious." It is perhaps in this context that one could interpret Freud's remarks on working-through, which are significant only if we understand them to mean that working-through is necessary in the treatment after the transference has been revealed as the carrier of the ultimate threat (Roustang 1980, p. 112).

For Roustang, psychoanalysis is an art and science of life which has served to investigate that which scientific objectivity has never found a place for. The objective pole of science grasps the essence of events from outside - "etically." The subjective pole of experience grasps them from within - "emically." Somewhere between lies psychoanalysis which - like ethology and ethnography - uses Peirce's method of "abduction" or a form of participant observation in order to understand and affect. It is not that psychoanalysis wanted to become an objective science from the standpoint of induction and deduction - though many analysts and critics have thought as much - but that psychoanalysis sought to create the first science of the human - the one which Bataille (1973) called for which would turn the objective lamp of science upon the subjective limits of the one shining the lamp.

In other words, psychoanalysis produces a myth that does not introduce an alien force into the present system in the hope of overturning it, still less in order to explode it; on the contrary, it produces a myth that in principle domesticates what cannot be integrated into a scientific, techno-logical, rational world and gives it the status of science and logic and thus makes it acceptable. By giving a scientific intelligibility to what was outside the field of science and technology, psychoanalysis at first creates the impression that it is subverting that field, but afterwards it becomes the means of extending science beyond its own limits. In other words, the technological society that rejected dreams, fantasies, and madness into the shadows of superstition, magic, or myth might feel threatened by their reintroduction into its midst. But, because these phenomena, which are constitutive of the human being, have been acclimated to the new formation of society, they can reenforce that society, because they place at its disposal what had, by definition, escaped it and what it therefore risked forgetting, although they were intrinsically necessary to its survival. In a period when science and the society it created risked being enclosed in scientism, psychoanalysis make it tolerable to integrate these foreign and neglected domains into science, but it risked making them dangerous enemies (Roustang 1980, p. 119-120).

Paradoxically, psychoanalysts have forgotten their purpose in the creation of a human science and practice - if they ever knew it. Many have fallen into the same trap as other therapists who seek to reprogram their subjects with their own ends in mind, carrying them out in the name of the good and the healthy. Still others have fallen into the trap of

believing that analysis can be purified by “mathemes” or that it can be made a “falsifiable” experimental science. The point is for the analyst to remain attentive to the nature of suggestion and seduction and to continue to analyze the ends of one’s means while recognizing that the forces at work are irreducible to objective certainty. The forces of attraction/repulsion, drive, the unconscious, or the non-relation are not only irreducible to rational thought and consciousness, they constitute the gap that forms their limits.

To sum up, I propose this formulation: the task of psychoanalysis in modern society is to administer the irrational as scientifically as possible. It is an indispensable task, for no society, not even the most technological, should disregard what is on its borders, what is at its limits, and what risks invading it at any moment. . . . One could say broadly that psychoanalysts as a whole are a marginal group, unable, whether because of their elevated or their lowly condition, to be integrated into the economic circuit of production; at the same time they are marginals who are reconverted to society through the lucrative detour of managing the irrational (in order to avoid speaking of the unconscious in this context). More particularly, they manage the irrational through the dysfunctions of the dominant class (Roustang 1980, p. 120).

At the limits of thought we encounter desire. Along with Godel (1931) and Derrida (1992) we can say that no system of thought, no knowledge, no morality, no ethic, no law can justify itself by appealing to its own internal system. Each is founded on an initial act of faith - an initial desire - upon which the rest of the system is based. These are the “hidden foundations of the law” which Derrida attempts to elucidate. The socially agreed upon symbolic depends not on truth but on belief and the pragmatics of an act of faith in accepting or agreeing to - or being seduced or hypnotized by - this belief. Nevertheless, the individual must confront at every point his own desire, faith, or belief interlocked with - yet often opposed to - the beliefs of others. Similarly the individual subject’s knowledge or conscious actions depend on collections of unconscious, unquestioned, unanalyzed beliefs on which they are founded. To question them infinitely would leave one nowhere. But each action, each belief, each perceptual organization of the world enacts a desire - a moment of faith - of which it is the sole authority. Conscious reflection can prepare one by analyzing the complex web of interdependent factors, and this clari-

fies the many dimensions of opposing forces, desires, and ethics involved in any event, but in the end the event becomes the act which speaks for itself.

11. Primary Seduction - Jean Laplanche

In recent times the debate over Freud's "seduction theory" has returned us to the question of the real and the imaginary in human experience (Masson 1985). It is claimed that Freud first put forward the theory that his female clients had in each case "really" been seduced or abused by their families, but that after meeting with controversy and denial - and his own marginalization - he altered his theory to state that these seductions had been "imagined." More likely, the situation was a complex combination of both. No doubt there were - and still are - extreme cases of abuse, but what Freud discovered was the imaginary element of human subjectivity persisting through dreams and infecting the very "reality" of memory - specifically as it related to the seductive scenario of the family drama.

Jean Laplanche has reworked psychoanalytic metapsychology and the nature of seduction in particular. Laplanche describes the scene of infant and parent as a labyrinth of reciprocal interactions in which seduction is primary or primal and not identifiable with one party. The theory of "primal seduction" describes the event of childhood as the confrontation with "enigmatic signifiers" and the attempt to translate them. The construction of the child's subjectivity - his way of perceptually organizing and emotionally and cognitively experiencing the world - takes place as he is brought through the long state of dependency in the intersubjective world of his fellow human beings. Not only must natural forces and drives be embodied and contained by the infant in proto-semiotic pre-signifying events, but from the beginning these events already take place in a world of signification. The simple acts and objects that are offered to the child are simultaneously accompanied by the enigma of desire, meaning, and language which permeates human relating. The child cannot master or embody or translate these messages, yet he is driven to try. The enigma which exceeds his translating capacity leaves an unknown - or an unthought but known (Bollas 1987) - element which is nevertheless registered unconsciously. Too little

enigma stifles creativity and desire - too much leaves a debilitating trauma.

The point for Laplanche is that seduction is primary in the development of human subjectivity and that enigma of the symbolic is not only necessary but the very basis of human complexity and vulnerability. The fragile state of subjectivity within the realm of the human being in early life leads to the development of emotional and cognitive robustness but also holds great possibility for breakdown and trauma. Real trauma is never just physical. The human being may adapt to “real” physical - and/or sexual - trauma quite easily, but every physical event is already engaged in a psychic attempt to understand or translate the event in terms of signification. In addition the enigma of seduction surrounding attraction/repulsion, desire, love, or affect which unconsciously accompanies all human interrelating is complex, and it is quite possible that unconscious residues or embodiments of enigmatic signifiers which are in no way evidently sexual can - upon later evocation and suggestion - bring back memories of seemingly “real” sexual abuse. Laplanche transforms Freud’s special theory of seduction into a general theory of seduction in the same way that physicists transformed the theory of relativity.

The seduction theory, in its general form, must be reconstructed on the basis of a specific conception of a hierarchy of seductions. This reconstruction will allow us to move from Freud’s “special” theory to a new level, in precisely the same way that physics made the transition from the special theory of relativity to the general theory. The general theory is no longer restricted to pathology . . . it is intended to found the structure of the psychical or soul apparatus in general; and it invalidates the appeal to biology and phylogenesis, though it may justify it at a later stage. The theory must be able to use the mechanism of repression to account for the constitution and continued existence of an unconscious, and for the “drive” effect that is inevitably associated with it. But the model must also be able to take in “treatment” and its effects and limitations.

I have already outlined a general but extremely detailed schema in the context of a discussion of the drives. It represents an encounter between an individual whose psycho-somatic structures are situated predominantly at the level of need, and signifiers emanating from an adult. Those signifiers pertain to the satisfaction of the child’s needs, but they also convey the purely interrogative potential of other messages - and those

other messages are sexual. These enigmatic messages set the child a difficult, or even impossible, task of mastery and symbolization and the attempt to perform it inevitably leaves behind unconscious residues. . . .I refer to them as the source-objects of the drives. . . . The language of the child is not adequate to that of the adult. What is more important, the language of the adult is not adequate to the source-object that acts upon him (Laplanche 1987, p. 129-130).

The ontogeny of human development and adaptation proceeds not simply through the biological mutation of matter-energy but psychically through the primary seduction of enigmatic signifiers. Biological need and instinct is always bound up with the consciousness of language and meaning permeating the environment and transforming what would be immediate need and instinct into a mediated desire. Feeding does not just satisfy hunger but engages a whole symbolic, imaginary, noetic realm of human interaction. The psyche - which is socially constructed - rests on but is not reducible to the biochemical-physical organism. Perception/action is always organized through the social, and the unconscious is not only repression but the untranslatable which human beings continue to experience and - depending on their subjectivity - seek out throughout their lives.

If it were simply a matter of the perception of inanimate objects, perception would at best supply an index. If it were simply a matter of indications, of purely factual traces or of residues devoid of all semiological intentionality how could they suggest even an initial translation to the object? We can therefore state that the first indication of perception, or the first inscription in the psychical apparatus is the enigmatic signifier, and that it is inscribed before any attempt is made to translate it. . . .

The human being is, and will go on being, a self-translating and self-theorizing being. Primal repression is merely the first founding moment in a life-long process (Laplanche 1987, p. 131).

For Laplanche primal seduction does not refer to a stage but to the foundation or core of a field theory of multi-level subjectivity similar to Daniel Stern's (1985) map of the human psyche. The core of primal seduction and the proto-semiotic pre-signifying regimes of Silver's firstness and secondness may be evoked by certain physical and psy-

chic events, and Laplanche presents the analytic environment as a place for engaging with such realms of subjectivity. It is not surprising then, that electromagnetic and psychopharmacological alterations of the nervous system can recall unconscious embodied residues in the form of hallucinatory “schizophrenic” or “paranormal” phenomena or that belief and suggestion in certain affective relationships including amorous, religious, and psychotherapeutic forms can evoke memories of abuse.

It is primal seduction alone which comes into play here, and it does so in a much purer and more essential form than it does in childhood because, in childhood situations, it is always to some extent mediated by sexual gestures or sexual behaviour. This sheds a new light on the notion of the primal: the primal is not essentially that which comes first, but that which is fundamental; it is therefore not surprising that the primal should be at least potentially present in the early stages of life. But it is by no means impossible for a later situation such as analysis to reactivate the very essence of the primal (Laplanche 1987, p. 157).

The analytic process functions between the double movement of belief and consciousness - between the subjective and objective poles - between desire and thought. The enigma is the unknowing of desire which constitutes the uncertain event that is human subjectivity. The analysand “knows” and “believes” in his symptom. Rather than replacing this with another suggestion, seduction, belief, or knowledge, the analyst sets the process itself in motion. Knowledge closes down whereas consciousness opens up and brings awareness of how the process operates. But pure consciousness if it could be attained would only be a groundless void. Instead, the movement of consciousness leads to consciousness of the limits of consciousness in the arbitrary assent, the act of faith, the momentary knowledge which closes down. It is the unknowing of the analyst’s desiring process itself which maintains the enigma that propels the analytic event as a microcosm of the chaosmosis of human being and becoming.

The situation establishes a primal relationship with the enigma and with its bearer who is, to borrow an expression used, if not elaborated upon, by Lacan, “supposed to know”. This brings us to the essential element in the ethics of the psychoanalyst: counter trans-

ference. There is talk of mastering counter-transference, using counter-transference, of counter-transference as affect, participation, implication, and so on. But perhaps that is missing the point, the point being that if the analyst must be in the position of one supposed to know, he must obviously refuse knowledge, but he must also refuse to let himself know. This refusal to know, this refusal of knowledge, is the second form of analytic "refusing", the first being the refusal to adapt. This is the motor, the source of energy, and perhaps it is the source of a new energy, which propels the cure. The search for knowledge both enslaves and propels the analysand, just as it once propelled the small child (Laplanche 1987, p. 158).

Metapsychological and metaphysical theorizing enact at the level of socio-cultural subjectivities what the pragmatics of individual and collective analysis enact for subjectivities of self and other. Art, literature, philosophy, science, and religious and political institutions all engage new subjectivities - new embodiments, translations, or maps of the primal seduction of our desire for the unknown in human experience. Rather than being engaged in discovering truths or rights - and in addition to being engaged in the pragmatics of survival - they are above all engaged in ethical-aesthetic processes of meaning or theorization.

At least two, and probably three, levels of theorization can be identified. Firstly, we have general theory, of which the present text is an example; general theory has to be reconstructed of the basis of new foundations and it is therefore a metapsychology. It would be absurd to claim that I intend to introduce that level of theory into practical analysis. It is not simply that theory must not intrude into analysis; it is there to limit the intrusions of any theory which is alien to the subject. At the opposite extreme, we have the subject's self-symbolization, and that is synonymous with analytic treatment itself. . . . But the human being's self-theorization is not based on nothing; no human being and no analysand invents his life story from scratch. We do not have an infinite number of scenarios at our disposal. Between the two extremes represented by self-theorization (and analytic treatment is a privileged moment within that theorization) and the general theory of psychoanalysis, there is, then room for an intermediary level, or for theoretical schemata which are in part bound up with a cultural milieu (Laplanche 1987, p. 162-

163).

For Laplanche, the practice of analysis as a practice of consciousness is limited by the unconscious. Thought is limited by the desire at the heart of the unknown enigma which forms the basis for seduction. For this very reason, analysis is interminable. Human subjectivity as an autopoietic concrescence is defined by its desiring production or eternal seduction. That which is not constituted by this desire is not human. In Buddhist terms, “nirvana” as the freedom from the illusions of desire is a mutation into another form. The bodhisattva approaches this limit in order to return to the human concrescence and inhabit it differently - with a certain consciousness and ethic of practice. Similarly, the analyst recognizes the knot made up of conscious thought and unconscious desire and each analytic process is an event which engages this knot at the foundation of human subjectivity - an event which also has its end.

Let me introduce three terms: “limited”, “interminable”, and “terminated”. Analysis is limited: it is limited by the unconscious and, even within the unconscious, it is limited by what I call the source-objects of the drive. It is possible to breach this unconscious limit, and to push it back, but it is not possible to abolish it, as Freud hoped. My second proposition is that even though - or perhaps because - it is limited, analysis is also interminable. Fortunately for human beings, self-interpretation is, potentially, an infinite process. It will be a very sad day when that process comes to an end! But the fact that self-interpretation is infinite does not mean that the analytic situation is infinite or that every analysis is interminable. And it is at this point that we have to introduce a third term: the end. In the light of what has been said above, the end cannot mean the “resolution of transference” because transference is a relationship with the enigmatic object. It may simply mean that the process of transference is transferred into one or more different sites, one or more different relationships. The transference of transference is, then, the only conceivable end for a psychoanalysis (Laplanche 1987, p. 163-164).

The analytic process is not limited to what has hitherto been known as psychotherapy or psychoanalysis but forms the basis of a variety of transformative practices. The analytic process of untying the complex knot of the psyche - of analyzing the individuated com-

ponents of any organized concrescence - of dislodging rigid beliefs, forms, or “hung up” quasi-stable organizations - in the pragmatic and cybernetic ecology of subjectivities and systems at the edge of order and chaos takes place in self-theorizing and artistic creation, collective practices of mysticism and consciousness, teaching and healing environments, socio-political institutions, cultural myths, and human relations of all types. Highly “exteriorized” social, collective, and ritual subjectivities of the sacred at one point imploded into individual inner experience and found expression and transformation through the initial psychoanalytic setting, but this setting already lags behind the increasingly rapid transformation of today’s psyche. The increase in consciousness and the interlinking of maps of information and communication gives rise to a hysterical-schizophrenic field of subjectivities in which the individual concrescence of the integrated self or ego is already disappearing along with the ability to believe in or commit to any stable form. In the face of the concrete facts of the real, our option is not to return to the past but to attempt to grasp the implications of the complexity of multi-layered interacting subjectivities unfolding through time-space coordinates, while not losing our ability to arbitrarily assent - to fully inhabit or incarnate - the sovereign singularity and existential essence of each event. This practice which Guattari called “schizoanalysis” is likewise Bataille’s “sovereignty within the general economy,” Nietzsche’s “will to power,” and Lacan’s practice of “enjoying your symptom” all of which elucidate the ends of analysis and the initiation of what lies beyond.

12. Translation and Poetics - Nicolas Abraham

Bergson and Whitehead criticized Western metaphysics for spatializing the temporal, and although Darwin and Freud reengaged with time by grasping human concrescence in its limited, mutating, and decentered nature, there is in almost every case of scientific theorizing an attempt to found the eternal or the structural - to escape from the temporal unfolding of the actual out of the possible. Nicolas Abraham’s phenomenological transformation of psychoanalysis is an attempt to map - not the complex organization of mental space but - the invention of time in human subjectivity. Returning to Freud, Abraham begins with the notion of unconscious wish or desire. Freud claims that the wish lies out-

side of temporal “reality” and also that it is the result of repression by the obstacle of the introjected superego. For Abraham the wish and its obstacle form a complement which creates the time of human subjectivity. This time would not be eternal time but rather Bergson’s “duration” which is the subjective experience of temporality that is unique to each concrescence - the metabolism which creates multiple “times of time” (Boscolo & Bertrando 1993) within and across subjectivities.

Two major psychoanalytic concepts appear to be independent of the process of temporality; the (unconscious) wish - whose extratemporal nature was emphasized by Freud - and the (equally unconscious) superego which, like the wish, cannot by itself bring about any sort of change. To say that the wish endures in the unconscious, that it persists outside time, can only mean that it is an eternally active present and that, by nature, it can never be fulfilled. The wish is meant to remain a simple wish. It cannot single-handedly create time. The wish is not even conceivable on its own. And if the wish is necessarily shielded from fulfillment, it must also imply an intrinsic obstacle that keeps it simultaneously active and unfulfilled. Such in fact is the function of the superego as a complement to the wish. Because they arise together, it is correct to say: to every wish its superego. The specific and respective contents of each are utterly inseparable (Abraham 1985, p. 112).

It is not the wish that lies outside of time but the process of wishing itself - or desire - which remains eternal in its movement: fulfillment, wish, obstacle, fulfillment We do not need to resort to the concept of lack in this case for it is not lack which is desired, but the eternal movement. Desire does not desire lack but desires desire itself which is not lack but the process of desires matched with obstacles which are overcome only to find new desires. We do not have to worry about achieving fulfillment, because absolute fulfillment can never be reached. One *can* “have one’s cake and eat it too.” Here we overcome an important false dilemma, for the dialectical movement found in Hegel and Lacan is in fact already a part of the organic multiplicity of affects found in Spinoza and Deleuze. The dialectic - when followed through to its limits - leads to the multiple durations of time, but a theory of multiplicity threatens to lose sight of the becoming of time if it does not recognize the primary splitting of the dialectic which creates all difference

in the first place.

Abraham transforms Freud's concept of the ego by claiming that it is this process of time-creation or "temporo-genesis" by which obstacles are overcome through desire. The ego is never the completed self, but the story of one's desire-repression complements or circuits which form a historical past that continues to slide toward the present from every direction.

Given that the ego also symbolizes the obstacle from which it emerges, and that every one of its acts is also the negation of an unconscious wish, the fulfillment the ego may provide is necessarily tinged with dissatisfaction. Such is the ego's fundamental ambiguity. This observation is crucial: if the fulfillment of the ego's every desire entails the disappointment of an underlying unconscious wish, if what comes is always something other than what is expected in one's heart of hearts, the present cannot solidify into a definitive accomplishment. It must slide implacably toward another present, itself, of course, tinged with the same inherent ambiguity. The ego, apprised of a world, conquers its own unity through successive repressions and carries within it their imprints. Through the activity of his ego, man implicitly conveys the history of his repressions (Abraham 1985, p. 114).

If repression did not exist we would have to create it. And we do. Physical-material obstacles engage our struggles in a world which is marked by such heroics. But when nothing steps in to play the role of obstacle we supply our own repressions - Freud's superego. We play games with ourselves by setting goals and being seduced into desires that are unattainable. Girard's (1978) idea of "mimetic desire" describes the process by which the struggle to the death for recognition itself leads to neurotic impasses. Similarly when the process of desire ends in failure at every turn - as in Bateson's (1972) "double-bind" situation - the result is learned helplessness, resignation, and depression, or a complete rewriting of the rules as in schizophrenic subjectivity.

These remarks, though incomplete, do make one point clear. The creation of time, understood as both the genesis and the operation of the ego, cannot be described without the Freudian concept of the unconscious. All creations of genuine temporality - the result of

actual conflicts - entail a repression, just as every temporal operation, functioning by the repetition of this creation, specifies this same repression. Man needs repression to such a degree that a complete lack of repressing affections drives him to fabricate them. We cannot live without repressive affections (whatever they may be); they are nourishment for the superego, a means of keeping desire alive (Abraham 1985, p. 115).

Temporo-genesis forms a part of the unfolding individuation of organized concrescences at all levels of the universe. Pattern in adaptation, evolution, and self-organization shows similarities across singular forms which can be tapped into through the intuitive and abductive method of empathy which forms the basis of psychoanalysis, ethology, ethnography, phenomenological semiotics, and other sciences of subjectivity. Even in the natural sciences of biology, chemistry, and physics, this approach has begun to be recognized. If the human being can follow the method of Spinoza's sage - by objectively placing his subjectivity in parallel with other subjectivities without affirming arbitrary assent as much as possible - he may be able to map pattern and organization which communicate throughout the universe in other forms.

These a priori patterns are not only specific and unique; they also lay claim to universal validity. A temporal structure, conveyed through acts, words, or a work of art, speaks to all by revealing its genetic depth. At the core of this universality lies the fact that every human being uses similar instruments of maturation and that these similarities also reflect a common store of original affections rehearsed in our individual childhoods. This is one reason why empathy, in the genetic and psychoanalytic sense, is not mere projection but rather a form of knowledge open to comparison. This is also why there can be criteria, however intuitive they may be, for distinguishing between a genuine work of art and an empty simulacrum (Abraham 1985, p. 117).

The semiotics of translation is a poetic science. All maps are tautologies in that they do not reveal any essential truth but produce truth by translating one concrescent form or system into another - what Bateson (1972) and Rossi (1988, 1993) call "information transduction." Apart from the limited sovereignty of singular events, there is only this transversal communication which bridges such singular essences. Abraham's poetics of

psychoanalytic translation is akin to a kind of detective work in which the process or event is fleshed out by analyzing its organic self-organization so that it can be wrenched from its stagnation and put in contact with the movement of other mutating and evolving forms. The analysis of works of art, of institutions, and of human subjectivities transforms dead symbols into living processes.

We are used to treating symbols like archaeologists who attempt to decipher the written documents of an unknown language. What is given is "something" with a meaning. Many of us live with the convenient misconception that in order to decipher [the document] it is sufficient to add meaning to the "thing" or the hieroglyphs. . . . Yet, in so doing [we] merely convert one system of symbols into another, and this latter system still stops short of laying open its secret. Actually, the reading of a symbolic text cannot be content with registering one-to-one equivalence between two terms. The work of deciphering will be completed only if we restore the entire circuit of functions involving a multiplicity of subjects and in which the symbol-thing is simply a relay.

Here a first distinction must be made between, on the one hand, the symbol-thing considered as a hieroglyph . . . - the lifeless symbol - and, on the other hand, the symbol included in a process, the symbol in operation, endowed with meaning and implying concrete subjects, together considered a functioning unit (Abraham 1985, p. 152).

Meanings are not given - they are created through human subjectivity and translated through individuated symbolic forms only in order to find expression and communication in a route toward the other which dissolves the very barriers which had been set up. The process of desire-repression which creates time, rhythm, and metabolism forms a part of the chaotic movement of all individuation-dissolution - the setting up and breaking down of barriers. Abraham's psychoanalytic practice bypasses the notion of the individual ego or self as an entity of significance along with the notion of adaptation to the order of things. Everything is a matter of the rhythm, of the refrain - of listening for the hidden processes which play through us and seek expression just as in the oral poetry of primitive cultures (Brown 1991). The subject is the poem which is being written on the world, and the analyst is only another translator, midwife, or shaman who brings it to fruition

Psychoanalytic listening consists of a special way of treating language. While normally we are given meanings, the analyst is given symbols. Symbols are data that are missing an as yet undetermined part, but that can, in principle, be determined. The special aim of psychoanalytic listening is to find the symbol's complement, recovering it from indeterminacy. From the beginnings of psychoanalysis to the present, theoretical efforts have been aimed at inventing rules that will permit us to find the unknown missing complement, in other words, the fragment that symbolizes with . . . or . . . co-symbolizes.

It does happen, however, that this type of listening encounters a form of speech that resists the search for a co-symbol and defeats every attempt at completion. In such cases it is as if the sense of the words was shrouded by an enigma too dense to be deciphered by known forms of listening. [We must] not back down from the search for co-symbols no matter how hopeless the task seems. They cannot be lacking even if they are hard to find although their discovery may require breaking the usual rules of listening. . . (Abraham 1985, p. 152-153).

13. Signs of Affect - Julia Kristeva

Psychoanalysis was a response to a change in human subjectivity. Just as the organization and selection of certain interwoven forms in evolution has changed to favor the concentration of certain types - individual, group, species, gene - so too has the human psyche mutated in its organization of subjectivity. The development from collective forms of ritual, religion, and political institutions to the individual subject brought with it new affects, new concepts, and new maladies. Freud's discovery of the implosion of social relations into the individual psyche also served to invent this subjectivity - to give it expression. Yet in a sense, psychoanalysis has always been one step behind. Freud's metapsychology and his psychoanalytic practice took for granted the stable environments of family and society which contained his subjects. In fact it was the intense and stifling stability itself which lead to so many of the symptoms he was mapping out. Over the past century psychoanalysis has been reworking these maps, but meanwhile the psyche has changed. The breakdown of stable forms of containment in the socius has left an increasingly fragmented social life and has lead to an increasingly fragmented psyche.

Julia Kristeva has attempted to understand the current state of the psyche within its environment and the “new maladies of the soul” which have arisen - often to the blindness of analysts and therapists stuck in their outdated maps and practices. Rather than being engaged in the process of meaning which acts previously took on, modern man is disappearing into the act itself - the movement of objects and information which creates links devoid of any sovereignty or soul.

Actions and their imminent abandonment have replaced the interpretation of meaning.

We have neither the time nor the space needed to create a soul for ourselves, and the mere hint of such activity seems frivolous and ill-advised. Held back by his aloofness, modern man is a narcissist - a narcissist who may suffer, but who feels no remorse. He manifests his suffering in his body and he is afflicted with somatic symptoms. His problems serve to justify his refuge in the very problems that his own desire paradoxically solicits. When he is not depressed, he becomes swept away by insignificant and valueless objects that offer a perverse pleasure, but no satisfaction. Living in a piecemeal and accelerated space and time, he often has trouble acknowledging his own physiognomy; left without a sexual, subjective, or moral identity, this amphibian is a being of boundaries, a borderline, or a “false self” - a body that acts, often without even the joys of such performative drunkenness. Modern man is losing his soul, but he does not know it, for the psychic apparatus is what registers representations and their meaningful values for the subject (Kristeva 1993, p. 7-8).

The neurotic symptoms of the past were rituals which required the subjective experience of time - a time which no longer exists. For Kristeva, the symptoms of today are increasingly psychotic in that they evoke the extremely schizoid nature of the socio-cultural environment from which they emerge. The rapid increase of efficiency has not lead to the increase of subjective time for reflection, meaning, and the sacred, but to the disappearance of sovereign subjectivity and its shared communion with the other in favor of the communication of information, maps, and forms for their own sake devoid of a soul. This is easier for us. Without joy there is no pain. We plug in. We abandon the identification with our individual and even momentary subjective experience in order to experience

ourselves as objects free from the illusion of beliefs.

A wide variety of troubles can bring new patients to the analyst's couch: sexual and relationship difficulties, somatic symptoms, a difficulty in expressing oneself, and a general malaise caused by a language experienced as "artificial," "empty," or "mechanical." These patients often resemble "traditional" analysands, but "maladies of the soul soon break through their hysterical and obsessional allure - "maladies of the soul" that are not necessarily psychoses, but that evoke the psychotic patient's inability to symbolize his unbearable traumas (Kristeva 1993, p. 8-9).

Like Bataille (1973, 1975), Kristeva poses contemporary humanity with a dual problem. First, the current state of affairs is in no way equipped to handle the drives of human experience, and what we see are only new outlets - new symptoms which we ignore or pretend are the result of some outside enemy. The increasing number of physical, psychic, and social symptoms renders absurd the idea of technological advances in health and general living conditions. The symptoms simply change form. But second, Kristeva - like Bataille - also confronts the possibility that humanity may find its "solution" through the absolute obliteration of subjectivity. In this case the turn to psychopharmacology, virtual reality, and biotechnology may be able to eclipse everything which constitutes the human concrescence. In this case the autopoietic organization of humanity would have changed to such an extent that humanity would reach the fulfillment of its concrescence - it would die.

We see all too easily, however, that this mutation may be beneficial. More than just a commodity or a new variant of the "opium of the people," the current transformation of psychic life may foreshadow a new humanity, one whose psychological conveniences will be able to overcome metaphysical anxiety and the need for meaning. Wouldn't it be great to be satisfied with just a pill and a television screen (Kristeva 1993, p. 8)?

Of course the position of maintaining the sovereign subjectivity which characterizes humanity is an affirmation of arbitrary assent - a choice. The mutation of humanity to another form of subjectivity without what Kristeva call a "soul" - or what Bataille calls

“sovereignty” - is for many the next step in evolution whether they are conscious of the implications or not. For Kristeva, however, the soul of individual choice and meaning able to distinguish itself from the other and yet to communicate this isolation and bridge the gap between self and other is the essence of humanity. Without it there would be no humanity. Perhaps we can define human subjectivity by its ability to distinguish itself from its fellow beings and to choose for itself - to seize its own singularity and to enact its jouissance. And the evocation of singularity is exactly what Kristeva recommends of psychoanalytic practice. Maps of the psyche may serve as a template, but in the end, each individual subjectivity is a world in itself.

The fact remains, however, that analysts who do not discover a new malady of the soul in each of their patients do not fully appreciate the uniqueness of each individual. Similarly, we can place ourselves at the heart of the analytic project by realizing that these new maladies of the soul go beyond traditional classification systems and their inevitable overhaul. What is more important, they embody difficulties or obstacles in psychic representation, difficulties that end up destroying psychic life. Revitalizing grammar and rhetoric, and enriching the style of those who wish to speak with us because they can no longer remain silent and brushed aside: do such projects not mirror the new life and new psyche that psychoanalysis wishes to unearth (Kristeva 1993, p. 9-10)?

Representations of the psyche which have been supplied for the individual subject by cultural symbolic forms may be used without serving to embody or translate the affectivity of life. Images, signs, and symbols permeate modern social life as the creation of objects through a detached media spectacle without being developed from inner experience outward. Kristeva follows Guattari's path of psychoanalytic practice as a pragmatics of the psyche in which the mobilization of percepts, affects, and concepts is developed through what works in each subjective event. While structures and maps of the psyche may help suggest possibilities, like Bion's "Grid" they should not stifle the construction of new subjectivities by filtering possible experience through rigid categories.

To put it another way, although the psychiatric notions of "structure" (hysterical, obsessional, schizophrenic, paranoid, etc.) can offer an initial and rudimentary outline that the

analyst may find useful, these notions are unable to withstand a microanalysis that is attentive to the diversity and polyvalence of psychic representatives. We have a growing interest in structural interferences as well as "borderline states" that go beyond their status as new clinical occurrences indicating the growth of subjectivity and psychic states, for they also have the advantage of challenging the foundation of traditional classification systems (Kristeva 1993, p. 35).

For Kristeva, the "borderline" state is not a diagnostic category, but the increasingly common vulnerable position into which we are plunged on the edge of order and chaos. Bateson, Guattari, Laing, and other "antipsychiatric" therapists sought to transform the breakdown of schizophrenia into a breakthrough rather than arresting and paralyzing subjectivities in a state of chaos or entropy. Kristeva suggests that the analysand of today - and increasingly the subject of contemporary society - offers such a complex and fragile system which could either mutate toward richness or devolve into a breakdown.

Kristeva's lineage in both Lacanian and more traditional psychoanalytic traditions and in semiotic practices has lead her to develop a full map of human subjectivity and its transformative practices. Despite the importance of Lacan's attention to the symbolic expression of experience and its final necessity for the elaboration of jouissance, Kristeva is not afraid to work with the proto-symbolic forms of affects at the level of the imaginary and real. In fact it may be the symbolic itself in abstract levels of cognitive, conscious, and linguistic development which blocks the depth of emotional affect. Kristeva seeks to break through intellectual impasses by evoking emotion through hysterical-dramatic engagement with the imaginary. This return to chaos can release forces of energy or drives which can then come to be translated and embodied in new semiotic signifying practices which embody the complexity of percept, affect, concept, and act through an expressionism in which the abstraction of the symbolic does not swamp the intensity of the event.

Faced with such problems, analytical technique has two possible solutions:

1. To mobilize affects, without hesitating to encourage the psychodramatic aspect of the treatment that tends to attract hysterics, since this mode enables them to express

affect. The mobilization of affects is an anti-inhibitor of the signifying process. New affects realized in the transference disrupt the intellectualization and the inhibiting function that are characteristic of intellectual acting-out. Analysts mobilize affect by openly presenting themselves during interpretation as a magnet of libido. This emphasis on the analyst's ego is an "imaginary-ization" of the treatment, one that is able to combat the hysteric's sensory autism.

*2. A verbalization of perception and sensation can then free up the signifying process that defensively withdrew itself through intellectualization, that is, in order to restore an image of the eroticized body, to restore sensation and perception by giving them a name. Subjects can only be revived if they endow perceptions and sensations with signifi-
cance. Without signifi-
cance, we are faced with the separation between the I-cogito and an ego linked with incommunicable affects. What is the figure of inhibition? The I-cogito interrupted by the affect-ridden ego blocking the I-cogito. Could the subject be the advent of one in the other, of the I-cogito in the affect-ridden ego, and vice versa (Kristeva 1993, p. 99-100)?*

Kristeva reintegrates the linguistic-mythic element of psychoanalysis with the metapsychological expression of drives and forces through perceptual, emotional, and conceptual organization in a manner which recalls Jung's practice of individuation and psychosynthesis (Rossi 1985). Free association unleashes more than just the symbolic. It brings about a multiplicity of drives and forces through pre-signifying regimes and accompanying uncertainties. The analytic space - whether in private practice or institutional realms - becomes a facilitating environment for the rediscovery and reconstruction of spatio-temporal dimensions for the subject.

The type of memory brought about by free association is a search for the past. This memory enables subjects to confront their traumatic experience with speech, yet we cannot solicit this traumatic memory without opening up the genealogy of cognitive signs. That is, to topple the cogito over into sensation. . . . Time regained is nothing if not the subject, but only insofar as he is able, through cognitive language, to unmask the perception itself (Kristeva 1993, p. 100).

Kristeva's analytic space is a development of Winnicott's facilitating environment in which the whole field of human subjectivity is put into play and reworked. Kristeva is not afraid to expand the field of analysis to include dramatization, semiotic practices, or anything that works. In this sense she follows the direction of recent family and systems therapists in taking a more open and experimental approach to subjectivity embedded in a complex network of relations, yet she never loses sight of the unconscious depth of the psyche revealed through traditional psychoanalytic work (Elkaim 1990, Andersen 1991, Boscolo & Bertrando 1993, Cecchin et al 1992, Watzlawick et al 1974, Simon 1996). The end of human experience remains the *jouissance* of the subject as it mutates through time - the sovereignty of meaning experienced immediately within and beyond the recognition of ecologically integrated systems. Toward this end, Kristeva offers the experience of women, children, and artists who with openness and playing are able to maintain the imaginary realm through the development of semiotic and symbolic forms. In the future the analyst may serve not only as the subject supposed to know, the object to be used, or the container, but as a guide through a series of individual and collective semiotic and noetic practices which reorganize the psyche's experience of the world and transform subjectivity into a multiplicity of forms.

*Women are undoubtedly capable of this transferential plasticity and these adolescent dynamics. What is more, certain subjects attain the symbolic elaboration and the creative transmission of this particularity - I am referring to artists. A "domestication" of perversion follows, which focuses on an ideal father and enables us to adapt of other people by giving our utmost effort within an optimal *jouissance*.*

I am convinced that this sort of specificity is necessary if one wishes to become an analyst (Kristeva 1993, p. 200).

14. Schizoanalysis and Chaosmosis - Felix Guattari

With Felix Guattari, psychoanalysis reaches its absolute transformation and fulfillment as a theory and practice of subjectivity. Guattari's crossing of multiple lines of trajectory as analyst, activist, artist, and philosopher allowed him to rethink the analytic apparatus

again and again. While paying homage to his Freudian and Lacanian roots, he never ceases to develop a pragmatic approach which borrows, exchanges, and puts into play ideas, metaphors, examples, and possibilities from the most disparate fields.

Freud's original map of the psyche has in Guattari's eyes come to find itself increasingly thwarted in any attempt to find a clear answer. Rather, the multiplicity of symptoms which manifest themselves out of the chaotic heterogeneity of the unconscious and form quasi-stable forms reveal the fractal and complex nature of the psyche. At any point what is discovered is simultaneously invented. We never actually perceive - or receive - the real. Rather we create our "reality" within the real. Perception/creation is the organization of events in new forms from the individual moment to the grand theory in varying degrees of passivity and activity.

The Unconscious presented as a universe of non-contradiction, of the heterogenesis of opposites, envelops the manifest Territories of the symptom, whose tendency towards autonomisation, autopoietic, pathic and pathogenic repetition threatens the unity of the self. And this will reveal itself moreover during the history of the analytical clinic to be increasingly precarious, indeed fractalised. Freudian cartography is not only descriptive; it is inseparable from the pragmatics of transference and interpretation. In any event, I would argue that it should be disengaged from a signification perspective and understood as a conversation of expressive means and as a mutation of ontological textures releasing new lines of the possible - and this from the simple fact of putting into place new assemblages of listening and modelisation (Guattari 1992, p. 62-63).

Freudian psychoanalysis does not succeed in completely modeling the psyche - and neither does any theory - but it does create new ways of experiencing the world which can only continue to be transformed through practice. Indeed the psyche always runs ahead of theory. The subject essentialized only becomes trapped or "subjected" by those definitions and imperatives which come from above. Subjectivity itself evokes the sovereign essence of the subjective pole of experience as it is lived through which marks the limits and singularity of each fleeting form. Freudian mapping invented new forms of subjectivity - new ways of experiencing the world - which were lost through his followers the

moment they became objective descriptive factors rather than possible modes to be inhabited. At stake in Guattari is the refusal to define in relation to norms or to lack. The idea is not to make the unconscious conscious - for consciousness destroys alterity - but to enact the heterogeneity of the unconscious. If the unconscious is a chaotic reservoir of the possible, then it is the place not of the other but of otherness itself - alterity. Alterity is the enigma of the unknown, and consciousness, knowing, and signifying mastery always destroy this enigma at the heart of existence.

With the invention of the analytic apparatus, Freudian modelisation brought about a clear enrichment in the production of subjectivity, an enlargement of its referential constellations, a new pragmatic opening. But it quickly encountered limits with its familial and universalising conceptions, with its stereotyped practice of interpretation, but above all with its inability to go beyond linguistic semiology. While psychoanalysis conceptualises psychosis through its vision of neurosis, schizoanalysis approaches all modalities of subjectivation in light of the mode of being in the world of psychosis. Because nowhere more than here is the ordinary modelisation of everyday existence so denuded; the "axioms of daily life" stand in the way of the a-signifying function, the degree zero of all possible modelisation. With neurosis, symptomatic matter continues to bathe in the environment of dominant significations while with psychosis the world of standardised Dasein loses its consistency. Alterity, as such, becomes the primary question. For example, what finds itself fragilised, cracked up, schizzed, in delire or hallucinating when confronted with the status of the objective world, is the point of view of the other in me, the recognised body in articulation with the lived body and the felt body; these are the normalised coordinates of alterity which give their foundation to sensible evidence (Guattari 1992, p. 63-64).

Freud centered his modeling of the psyche around the neurotic symptomatologies which characterized the subjectivities of his milieu, and psychosis has always been defined in relation to these moderately functional symptoms as an absolute breakdown. Most analysts have declined to deal with "psychotic" experience. Guattari's work with schizophrenics lead him to approach such subjectivities without prejudged labeling and to grasp the schizoid or fractalized state of the psyche as the essence of all human subjectivity.

Rather than finding integration for primal splitting like Klein or symbolic expression for the divided subject like Lacan, Guattari invents “schizoanalysis” as a process of mapping and reconstructing the heterogenic nature of human subjectivity proactively. Guattari deconstructs the pejorative label of lack by which the concept of schizophrenia operates, while simultaneously revealing the essentially schizoid nature of human experience inhabited by alterity. The event labeled “schizophrenia” is in no way valorized but presented as one of many possible breakdowns on the borderline of order and chaos which - because of its paralysis and petrification through labels, judgements, and physical and chemical restraint - fails to lead to a breakthrough or reorganization but rather becomes “hung up” in turbulence as Pribram (1991) describes of complex systems. Nevertheless, the object is not to valorize chaos or schizoid experience, but to multiply the possible reorganizations or reconquests of “existential territories” of sovereignty and meaning - subjective moments suffused with their own singularity.

Schizoanalysis obviously does not consist in miming schizophrenia, but in crossing, like it, the barriers of non-sense which prohibit access to a-signifying nuclei of subjectivation, the only way to shift petrified systems of modelisation. It implies an optimal enlargement of pragmatic entrances into Unconscious formations. . . . The psychotic complex is thus not the exclusive concern of verbal communication and individuated transference. The treatment of a psychotic, in the context of institutional psychotherapy, works, with a renewed approach to transference, focussed henceforth on parts of the body, on a constellation of individuals, on a group, on an institutional ensemble, a machinic system, a semiotic economy, etc. (grafts of transference), and conceived as desiring becoming, that is to say, pathic existential intensity, impossible to circumscribe as a distinct entity. The objective of such a therapeutic approach would be to increase as much as possible the range of means offered in the recomposition of a patient's corporeal, biological, psychical and social Territories. . . . Treated as an ensemble of autopoietic and transversalist social machines, the caring institution becomes a field propitious to an ability to discern these vectors which intersect with individuated subjectivity, which work it despite itself (Guattari 1992, p. 68-69).

What is at stake in the transformation of subjectivity is a scene - a scenario - in which

perceptual, affective, semiotic, and conceptual dimensions cross lines of force. The La Borde Clinic which Guattari helped create served as a model for experimentation with institutional approaches to “schizophrenic” experience. Through La Borde, Guattari transferred analytic practice from the private setting of the consulting room to the institutional environment itself in which desires, relationships, and expressions are reworked through a multiplicity of individual and collective practices.

Consider, for example, the institutional sub-ensemble that constitutes the kitchen at La Borde Clinic. It combines highly heterogeneous social, subjective and functional dimensions. This Territory can close in on itself, become the site of stereotyped attitudes and behaviour, where everyone mechanically carries out their little refrain. But it can also come to life, trigger an existential agglomeration, a drive machine - and not simply of an oral kind, which will have an influence on the people who participate in its activities or just passing through. The kitchen then becomes a little opera scene: in it people talk, dance and play with all kinds of instruments, with water and fire, dough and dustbins, relations of prestige and submission. As a place for the preparation of food, it is the centre of exchange of material and indicative Fluxes and prestations of every kind. But this metabolism of Flux will only have transferential significance on the condition that the whole apparatus functions effectively as a structure which welcomes the preverbal components of the psychotic patients. This resource of ambience, of contextual subjectivity, is itself indexed to the degree of openness (coefficient of transversality) of this institutional sub-ensemble to the rest of the institution (Guattari 1992, p. 69).

Without becoming an adherent of theologies of psychoanalysis or deluded by political utopianism, Guattari constantly deconstructs fixed ideas by approaching the pragmatic realities and infinite possibilities of each situation. Individual psychotherapy is not thrown aside but recuperated as one of many possible realms for the reworking of transference affects, dramatizations, rituals, and other proto-semiotic pre-signifying embodiments of drives. Guattari reveals the inherent prejudices and moralities underlying diagnostic categories and therapeutic goals by reformulating therapeutic, pedagogical, and creative practices and dissolving their boundaries. Subjectivities are marked by the autopoietic concrescence of organisms and systems not necessarily individual but rela-

tional, existential, and machinic. For Guattari the focus on regimes and assemblages bypasses rigid categories without losing the essence of the concrete lived situation invoked by Guy Debord's (1967, 1988) political-artistic practices.

The most autistic psychical world is not in itself lacking in alterity. It is simply engaged in a constellation of Universes disconnected from the dominant assemblages of sociality. Lines can be thrown to the psychotic by mediations which will give consistency to certain of these components of Universes, or by the aggregation of other components which did not previously exist. (Through the introduction of materials of expression unknown to the subject, for example, relating to the plastic arts, video, music, theatre, or quite simply . . . cooking!). Schizoanalytic cartography consists in the ability to discern those components lacking in consistency or existence. But it is a question here of an essentially precarious undertaking, of a continual creation, which does not have the benefit of any pre-established theoretical support. The enunciative emergence of the kitchen at La Borde, to stay with this example, can lead it to take on the role of partial analyser, without any guarantee in time. The autopoietic character of such an instance calls for a permanent renewal of the assemblage, a verification of its capacity to welcome a-signifying singularities - unbearable patients, insoluble conflicts - a constant readjustment of its transversalist opening onto the outside world. Only the network of nuclei of partial enunciation - comprising groups, meetings, workshops, responsibilities, spontaneous constellations and individual initiatives - could arguably hold the title of institutional analyser. The work of the psychotherapist in the office is only a link in this complex apparatus; individuated transference is but one element of the generalised transference already evoked. Just as the schizo has broken moorings with subjective individuation, the analysis of the Unconscious should be recentered on the non-human processes of subjectivation that I call machinic, but which are more than human - superhuman in a Nietzschean sense (Guattari 1992, p. 71-72).

According to Nietzsche, "God is dead" and humanity is a bridge to another form. Foucault (1969) augments this by claiming that the individual subjectivity created and lived by a humanity of the past has already left us. Theorists of the "postmodern" herald the death of grand narratives and the flattening of experience in which as Warhol pro-

claimed everyone is “famous for fifteen minutes” (Lyotard 1979). Guattari picks up this thread in order to move beyond the human - not toward the imaginary fantasies of the group mind in cyberspace but toward new subjectivities of infinite finitude. If the finite is that which traps and rigidifies subjective experience in control mechanisms, and the infinite is that which dissolves all condescences into the entropy of non-differentiation, than infinite finitude is the process of chaosmosis itself which characterizes all systems fluctuating between order and chaos, in which sovereign singularities are continually constructed. Finally then, analytic transformative practices must be expanded beyond the private consulting room to include ecological communities, productive organizations, and teaching and healing environments in a whole pragmatics of life engaged in endowing complex systems with sovereign meaning within the multiplication of possibilities.

This novel type of procedure is not reserved for the analysis of psychotics but is also applicable to neurotics, psychopaths, normopaths. . . . It both puts into question future analytical apparatuses in the domain of pedagogy, the life of the neighbourhood, the ecology of retirement - in a whole field of molecular revolutions; and it works towards an escape from contemporary social desertification. The stakes of a metamodelising theoretical recomposition of analysis are accordingly raised. They primarily involve a psychoanalysis which constrain and sterilise the apprehension of incorporeal Universes and singularising and heterogenetic becomings (Guattari 1992, p. 72).

By analyzing the general economy of organic and inorganic functioning, Guattari’s modeling of chaosmosis aligns human subjectivity with the patterning of systems throughout the universe without losing sight of its essential singularity. All systems, events, or condescences engage a process of chaosmosis, though with different metabolisms. In the modeling of Stuart Kauffman (1993), highly ordered “frozen” or “solid” states perform consistently but are unable to interact or communicate with other forms or to mutate into other states. On the other hand, chaotic “gaseous” systems are extremely vulnerable and unable to organize an essence or tradition of any type. Between the two, complex “liquid” systems live at the edge of order and chaos and are liable to go over continually into chaos as a result of communication with other sovereign condescences. This entrance into chaos or entropy makes for a vulnerable entity but also for the ability to adapt,

evolve, and mutate - continually reorganizing new territories.

Human subjectivity holds its own particular place in a complex system of concrescences. The chaosmic nature of the psyche is far more complex than any map available. What is needed is metamodeling - the process of mapping and modeling itself which transforms our perspective and allows us to experience the next higher "logical level" (Bateson 1972, Bandler & Grinder 1982) from which we can choose our fate. For example, the homogenetic reorganization of forms can be passively experienced as rigid control, petrified stagnation, and inescapable repetitive symptomatology, yet it can also be an active creation of ontic, noetic, and symbolic forms. Similarly the complementary heterogenetic pole of chaomosis can be undergone as breakdown, confusion, and disintegration or seized as a plunge into alterity and uncertainty which will lead to the reorganization of subjectivities.

We should be wary of the simplifying and reifying use of categories such as autism and dissociation to describe schizo strangeness, the loss of vital feeling for depression, glischrogeny for epilepsy. . . . Rather than global and standard deficit alterations of normal subjectivity, we are actually dealing with modalities of auto-alterity that are at once plural and singular. I is an other, a multiplicity of others, embodied at the intersection of partial components of enunciation, breaching on all sides individuated identity and the organised body. The cursor of chaomosis never stops oscillating between these diverse enunciative nuclei - not in order to totalise them, synthesise them in a transcendent self, but in spite of everything, to make a world of them. So we are in the presence of two types of homogenesis; a normal and/or neurotic homogenesis, which stops itself from going too far and for too long into a chaosmic, schizo type of reduction; and an extreme pathic-pathological homogenesis leading to a positioning point of worldly complexions, where not only do components of sensibility (fixed in a time and a space) and those of affectivity and cognition find themselves conjoined, but also axiological, ethical and aesthetic "charges" as well. On the passive side of schizo ontology we thus find a reductive homeogenesis, a loss of colour, flavour and timbre in Universes of reference, but on the active side we find an emergent alterification relieved of the mimetic barriers of the self. Being is affirmed as the responsibility of the other (Levinas) when nuclei of partial subjectiva-

tion are constituted in absorption or adsorption with the autonomy and autopoiesis of creative processes (Guattari 1992, p. 83-84).

Despite the infinite possibilities of the pathways he opens up, Guattari never loses sight of the concrete limitations by which we are bound. On the contrary, his mapping of the human psyche is not a theology of theory or practice but an empirical-concrete-pragmatic science of subjectivity which forms the basis for an art of life. This is in some way similar to the practices described by Clastres (1974, 1980) and Baudrillard (1976) in primitive tribal communities, but it is in no way a return. Guattari's chaosmosis maps the complex process of order out of chaos which the human psyche engages through metamodelling, symbol-formation, ritual, and myth despite its genetic, biological, and physical limitations.

It is thus equally from a hotchpotch of banalities, prejudices, stereotypes, absurd situations - a whole free association of everyday life - that we have to extricate, once and for all, these Z or Zen points of chaosmosis, which can only be discovered in nonsense, through the lapsus, symptoms, aporias, the acting out of somatic scenes, familial theatricism, or institutional structures. This, I repeat, stems from the fact that chaosmosis is not exclusive to the individuated psyche. We are confronted by it in group life, in economic relations, machinism (for example, informatics) and even in the incorporeal Universes of art or religion. In each case it calls for the reconstruction of an operational narrativity, that is, functioning beyond information and communication, like an existential crystallisation of ontological heterogenesis. The fact that the production of a new real-other-virtual complexion always results from a rupture of sense, a short circuiting of significations, the manifestation of non-redundant repetition, auto-affirmative of its own consistency and the promotion of partial non-"identifiable" nuclei of alterity - which escape identification - condemns the therapist and mental health worker to an essentially ethical duplicity. On one hand they work in the register of a heterogenesis of bits and pieces in order to remodel existential Territories, to forge transitory semiotic components between blocks of immanence in the process of petrification. . . . And on the other they can only claim pathic access to the chaomic thing - within psychosis and the institution - to the extent that they in one way or another recreate and reinvent themselves as bodies without

organs receptive to non-discursive intensities. Their potential conquests of supplementary coefficients of heterogenetic liberty, their access to mutant Universes of reference and their entrance into renewed registers of alterity, depend on their own submersion in homogenetic immanence (Guattari 1992, p. 86).

If we do not essentialize maps and models - if we do not mistake them for the truth - we can use any one of them. Epistemological and even ontological preeminence is replaced by ethical-aesthetic preeminence: sovereign jouissance marked by its relation to the sovereign jouissance of others. The objective pole of ecosophically integrated complex systems which informs the position of the Spinozist sage shows us the way to the limitations of our objectifying thought and consciousness, and reveals the subjective process of concrete pragmatic knowledge in the expressionistic a-signifying semiotic and symbolic translations of the arbitrary assent - the act of faith - the embracing of the practice of desire which we are.

Nosographic categories, psychiatric and psychoanalytic cartographies, necessarily betray the chaomic texture of psychotic transference. They constitute so many languages, modelisations among others - of delire, the novel, the television serial - which cannot aspire to any epistemological preeminence. Nothing more but nothing less! Which is perhaps already a lot, because they themselves embody roles, points of view and submissive behaviour, and even, why not, liberating processes. Who speaks the truth? This is no longer the question; but how and under what conditions can the best bring about the pragmatics of incorporeal events that will recompose a world and reinstall processual complexity? The idiosyncratic modelisations grafted onto one-to-one analysis, self-analysis and group psychotherapy . . . always resort to borrowing from specialised languages. Our problematic of chaosmosis and the schizoanalytic escape from the prison of signification is directed to compensate for these borrowings - towards a necessary a-signifying deconstruction of their discursivity and towards placing their ontological efficacy into a pragmatic perspective (Guattari 1992, p. 86-87).

Forms are deconstructed and then reconstructed. Guattari and Deleuze collaborated (1972, 1980) in a series of works in which they both became others. Guattari collaborated

with activists, artists, and “schizophrenics” through processes where subjectivities were not properly named. Already the freedom evoked by Deleuze and Guattari has become an apology for lines of flight in which those who seek to escape traps deny the essential recapture of territories which create the complement of chaosmosis. Schizoanalysis traces patterns of escape and new possibilities which crack open the striated forms decaying around and within us. But the virtual reality of cyberspace and the altered states of psychopharmacology already lend themselves too well to the reconquest of “capital time” in which everything is reduced to the objective and everyone is made to serve (Bataille 1973, Debord 1988, Alliez 1992). Capitalism itself is schizoanalytic in its methods of withdrawing existence from the processes of production and efficiency: it always gets there first.

Holding a sovereign zone of subjectivity for a moment - or a lifetime - requires an identification which few are willing consciously to endure. The ego has always been a “false self” constructed through a false consciousness of imaginary projection. But the sacred feeling of sovereignty - the essence of subjectivity - manifests a tragic tear over the loss of each singular concrescence which will be born, live, and die uniquely despite its unity with the totality of everything that is. It is this tragic tear which cuts transversally across subjective singularities binding them momentarily through a fire of communication.

After deterritorialization comes reterritorialization. The “nomadic war machine” which escapes determination and signification nevertheless employs an “apparatus of capture” - if only for a moment - to organize its experience: chaos is seduced into order. The dialectical and circular chaosmosis of being and becoming is also an unfolding multiplicity which is both linear and holographic. Nietzsche suggested that where one can no longer love, one should pass by. Schizoanalysis does not stop to judge or to understand, rather it engages, listens, seduces, and activates. The consciousness of not being the thing that you are - of being nothing if not everything - need not lead to nihilism, but to the reinvestment of processes in and around which you become everything you are.

Book III

Mapping the Socius

Ethnopsychology

1. Sacrifice and Magic - Shamanism

Subjectivity is as much social as it is individual. Cultural manifestations of the psyche in myth, ritual, art, and religion give external collective form to what in the individual remains inner experience. While psychoanalysis has succeeded in mapping the divided subjectivity of the modern psyche, its true genius depends on its ability to map other subjectivities which lie outside this realm. As long as psychoanalysis reifies its mapping of modern subjectivity in order to understand the experiences of other civilizations and other states - including, for example, mystical, psychotic, psychic, hypnotic, and psychedelic subjectivities - it will remain but one more form of knowledge or truth. The importance of the analytic method itself lies in its ability to perceive other subjectivities without objectifying them from within one's own subjectivity. Ethnography, ethology, and other abductive approaches use similar methods of participant observation in trying to map animal and human states from within. A "metapsychoanalytic" understanding of experience will only have reached its potential when the delusions of science and the boundaries of specific disciplines have given way to an analytic approach to the other - whether human, animal, cultural, energetic, material, or machinic.

While an analytic or ethnopsychological human science cannot necessarily discover the "facts" about cultural forms, that does not mean that one cannot take a more objective or scientific approach through ethnographic, psychoanalytic, or other abductive methods - perhaps by collecting and comparing as many stories or maps as possible about a particular event - perhaps by returning to the original sources and documents or by collecting the reports of those who have born witness to a certain time and place. The birth of ethology from folklore and the oral tradition has only produced another approach to the knowledge of human experience. In this sense the difference between history and story is similar to the difference Jean Laplanche (1987) describes between theory and fantasy. Of course at one level all theory is fantasy - all history is a story - and this must be kept in mind, but a theory is also something more than a fantasy in the meaning that it takes on for people on a large scale. But it must also be remembered that a fantasy or a story is never "just" a fantasy or a story. They too have real effects at the individual level. The truth then of history and story - of theory and fantasy - is not to be found in their factuali-

ty or fictionality but in their pragmatic effects in the real - in their sense.

No one has done more to question the assumptions of socio-historical research than Michel Foucault (1969). While Foucault certainly did not attempt to be comprehensive in his histories, he did demonstrate another way of seeing history and story by tracing genealogies of the forgotten and excluded documents of the time - of the everyday circulation of language within these documents rather than the history constructed by historians. By taking the statements of language first, as the very way in which truth is created by the dominant ideologies of a certain age, Foucault showed in fact how the very desires, thoughts, and inner experiences of whole peoples come to be formed by the desires of the Other, and how those that think and act differently come to be excluded through the construction of the symbolic.

In addition to this, he made clear for the first time the blurred boundaries between our conceptions of history as fact and the myths of "primitive" civilizations. Obviously those of the past have believed in the truth of their histories just as much as we do - even more so given their willingness to fight and die for them. If there is any advance in our own "objective" perspective, it will not arrive until it achieves the very distance that allows us to see the simultaneous truth and fiction of any (hi)story. Research may allow us to get closer to the "truth" of what really happened, but we will never know for certain.

In a narrativist or hermeneutic view of history, what matters is how the stories come to be told. This does not mean that anything can be invented, but that in any case, all histories on every level will involve the subjective experience of the historian or story-teller in his present milieu. This is also what is important for the analysand. Psychoanalysis is not an excavation into the past in order to discover the facts of a subject's life, but a deciphering of how the subject has constructed the story of his life for himself - or how others have constructed it for him. Trauma is not simply an event but an effect of the impossibility of incorporating a subject's real experience into consciousness and language. Specific traumas only reveal the trauma or the scandal of life and death in each subject - the impossible to symbolize which must nevertheless be symbolized.

The true purpose of the analyst is not to interpret or to construct for the analysand but to give him the space to discover his own self-theorization. If anything, the analyst must deconstruct every self-theorization the subject makes until he recognizes the nature of his - of human - experience as one of continual symbolization and translation of the real, not based on any true facts or knowledge which are in the world or in the possession of any Other: parent, lover, teacher, or analyst.

If what we suffer from is the past in terms of being confined to the “truth” of exact repetition, than what must liberate us is the past as an eternal recurrence. This was the idea of Friedrich Nietzsche and Pierre Klossowski (1969): the science of history as a genealogy of experience and thought enabling us to liberate ourselves for the creation of a future. This socio-cultural psychoanalysis was what Foucault carried out through his genealogies in an attempt to liberate the subject from the weight of a subjectivity determined for him by the milieu into which he is born. We suffer both individually and socially from this stagnation of truth. For Foucault and Lacan, what is most intimate to us is what is most “extimate” - the thought from outside - the forgotten, excluded, and accursed. Remembering not *the* past but all of the pasts - especially those most obscure - is like ethnography what allows us to preserve different practices of *jouissance* - different ways of being. It is what saves us from “the hell of the same.”

According to the ethnographic work of Pierre Clastres (1974, 1980) with some of the last remaining societies untouched by modernity, primitive or ahistoric communities were not based on subsistence economies, as is often supposed by minds dominated by concepts of rationality and efficiency who cannot conceive of a human community which would not be geared toward maximum production alone. Although primitive subjectivities may not have been “conscious” in the sense in which the being of divided subjectivity is, there was an other kind of awareness of the nature of human existence. While work for the production of food and shelter provided survival, this was only the means to an end which was “sacred” in Bataille’s terms. The experience of the sacred in the form of a return to intimacy or *jouissance* took on various forms of collective experience including festival, sacrifice, and myth. For Bataille, the momentary death of the individual subject in the return to the collective went beyond the social to the point of fusion with the cosmos.

Death and violence carry a deeply unconscious judgement based on the preservation of the individual subject and the fear of its dissolution in the return to chaos.

Paradoxically, intimacy is violence, and it is destruction, because it is not compatible with the positing of the separate individual. If one describes the individual in the operation of sacrifice, he is defined by anguish. But if sacrifice is distressing, the reason is that the individual takes part in it. The individual identifies with the victim in the sudden movement that restores it to immanence (to intimacy), but the assimilation that is linked to the return to immanence is nonetheless based on the fact that the victim is the thing, just as the sacrificer is the individual. The separate individual is of the same nature as the thing, or rather the anxiousness to remain personally alive that establishes the person's individuality is linked to the integration of existence into the world of things. To put it differently, work and the fear of dying are interdependent; the former implies the thing and vice versa. In fact it is not even necessary to work in order to be the thing of fear: man is an individual to the extent that his apprehension ties him to the results of labor. But man is not, as one might think, a thing because he is afraid. He would have no anguish if he were not the individual (the thing), and it is essentially the fact of being an individual that fuels his anguish. It is in order to satisfy the demands of the thing, it is insofar as the world of things has posited his duration as the basic condition of his worth, that he learns anguish. He is afraid of death as soon as he enters the system of projects that is the order of things. Death disturbs the order of things and the order of things holds us. Man is afraid of the intimate order that is not reconcilable with the order of things. Otherwise there would be no sacrifice, and there would be no mankind either. The intimate order would not reveal itself in the destruction and the sacred anguish of the individual. Because man is not squarely within that order, but only partakes of it through a thing that is threatened in its nature (in the projects that constitute it), intimacy, in the trembling of the individual, is holy, sacred, and suffused with anguish (Bataille 1973, p. 51).

Paradoxically, it is these violent practices of the sacred which have served to preserve life itself. The human organism being a volatile system existing at the edge of chaos partakes of this chaos in order to transform and evolve its complexity. But this "death drive" car-

ries a high risk that the organism will not emerge from its encounter with the real. For Bataille, all practices of the sacred served to collectively structure the rhythmic cycles of subjectivity - to maintain order through chaos.

For the Aztec Indians, the purpose of war was not the defense of borders or the conquest of land, but the capture of members of the other tribe for the purposes of sacrifice. War among these tribes was something like gambling - a fundamental throw of the dice in which lives would be put at stake with the prize being the capture of sacrificial victims. Something like an animal instinct made it clear that victims must come from the outside in order to preserve the fundamental survival of the group. But there was no vengeance or punishment implied in these rituals. It was all in the game. For days before the victim was to be sacrificed, he was given the most sublime pleasures and treated with the utmost respect as if he were a king, thus rendering the drama more tragic for all and bestowing upon him the sacred sovereignty deserved by one on his way toward death.

Among the Native American tribes of the Pacific Northwest, the practice of potlatch served a similar purpose. In an environment in which nature had blessed them with an overabundance of available resources, work was reduced to a minimum. The great chiefs of each tribe amassed huge amounts of wealth which they would bestow upon each other in the form of gifts. But these gifts constituted a raising of the stakes as in gambling which required the recipient to return even more in order to save face. Once again this practice of the sacred puts forth the challenge to risk the voluptuousness of life in the realm of loss, destruction, and death. Whole fortunes of food, pelts, and jewelry would be thrown into the sea in a game in which not just one's status but one's very survival was put on the line.

Freud would have recognized something like the "death drive" in these practices. But in the context of primitive subjectivity, the idea of the death drive loses its pejorative value. For these tribes, the gravity of life was rendered sacred by staying close to its dissolution in death - but in a majestic way in which the whole of the community was involved in the death of any of its parts. Death was a part of life, and these practices enabled human subjectivity to experience the sovereignty of the event of life in its limited concrescence. The

death drive in the life of the individual subject of today may only be the unconscious form of this inevitable fact of human existence. For although history and civilization have brought the human subject to higher forms of consciousness in terms of the ability to abstract and to distance himself from the immediacy of drive in order to plan, think, create, and endure in an unprecedented way, he has become distanced from his own death - and perhaps from the very meaning of his life. The discovery or the positing of the unconscious may be the result of this distancing. In fact the unconscious itself may only be the repressed nature of our drive toward death as a desire to return to the immediacy of everything which conscious calculation and rationality has taken away from us: dream, myth, memory, fantasy, spirit, sexuality, intoxication, consumption, celebration.

Psychological or spiritual healing within primitive communities was a collective event. Individual subjectivity was not separated from the tribe as a whole, so any symptom was considered to be a result of and a problem for the community. The shaman was both a mystic and a healer, responsible for the guidance and functional balance of the community and its members. Called to his position by his own breakdown - his own dis-ease - the shaman as wounded healer possessed knowledge of the dark side or the shadow of chaos and evil which haunted every aspect of life, and he maintained balance by drawing on his own experience of immanence or intimacy with the universe - an experience which has been excluded, ignored, and persecuted by modern science, medicine, and therapy as much as by the medieval church.

Undoubtedly, the violent nature of this intimacy or immediacy is antithetical to survival, but primitive man maintained a social ecology of the psyche without experiencing the divided subjectivity of individual self-consciousness and reflection which characterizes our subjective experience. A place was set aside for the time when everything of order, stability, and law would be turned on its head. The time of the festival - if it was not prescribed - nevertheless would find its way through the killing of the king. According to Bataille and George Dumezil (1940) in many communities there existed sacred dualities in the form of gods and their human representatives: one of order, law, and survival, and another of destruction, transgression and chaos. This sacred general economy guided the movement of humanity through its need to produce and to survive, and through its long-

ing to return to the immediacy of life at the edge of chaos debased by the absolute adherence to order and stability in which man loses his essential meaning and becomes only a thing.

The principle of sacrifice is destruction, but though it sometimes goes so far as to destroy completely (as in a holocaust), the destruction that sacrifice is intended to bring about is not annihilation. The thing - only the thing - is what sacrifice means to destroy in the victim. Sacrifice destroys an object's real ties of subordination; it draws the victim out of the world of utility and restores it to that of unintelligible caprice. When the offered animal enters the circle in which the priest will immolate it, it passes from the world of things which are closed to man and are nothing to him, which he knows from the outside - to the world that is immanent to it, intimate, known as the wife is known in sexual consumption (consumation charnelle). This assumes that it has ceased to be separated from its own intimacy, as it is in the subordination of labor. The sacrificer's prior separation from the world of things is necessary for the return to intimacy, of immanence between man and the world, between the subject and the object. The sacrificer's prior separation from the world of things is necessary for the return to intimacy, of immanence between man and the world, between the subject and the object. The sacrificer needs the sacrifice in order to separate himself from the world of things and the victim could not be separated from it in turn if the sacrificer was not already separated in advance. The sacrificer declares "Intimately, I belong to the sovereign world of the gods and myths, to the world of violent and uncalculated generosity, just as my wife belongs to my desires. I withdraw you, victim, from the world in which you were and could only be reduced to the condition of a thing, having a meaning that was foreign to your intimate nature. I call you back to the intimacy of the divine world, of the profound immanence of all that is" (Bataille 1973, p. 43).

If the growth of consciousness and the individual subject has given us anything - as opposed to simply removing us from the sublime experience of the sacred jouissance once available to whole communities - then it must be to somehow enrich this drama of sacred jouissance through the details and delays of its further elaboration and to extend this drama in the lengthening of life. But modern man cannot see the forest for the trees.

In his attempt to improve the means of life in order to extend the survival of his own flesh, he has lost the end or purpose of this life. But this end, this sacred, this *jouissance*, this impossible, this unknown returns anyway - indestructible as physicists claim of energy - to the unconscious practices of *jouissance* found in psychic and somatic symptoms, and even in the socio-cultural symptoms of crime, murder, and mass exploitation. At this point what rituals - social or individual - do we still possess to balance the tenuousness of our human psyche? What myths and practices can we still believe in?

2. Beyond Enlightenment - Pantheism

As opposed to the history of master-slave relations and collective fantasies which have dominated Western Civilization, the East has been influenced to a greater extent by various forms of mysticism offering an escape from these social fantasies through practices of enlightenment or self-consciousness. Buddhism, Taoism, Sufism, and Tantrism can all be seen as precursors to psychoanalysis in their attempts to allow the subject to traverse the social fantasy of the Other which has determined his being and to become conscious of the illusory nature of his own desires. Slavoj Žižek has elucidated the experience of the Buddhist bodhisattva and the Taoist sage as illustrations of the Lacanian notion of the psychoanalyst's position in the world.

In Taoism, the choice is ultimately a simple one: we either persist in the world of illusions or "follow the Way" (Tao) - leave behind us the world of false oppositions - whereas the basic experience of bodhisattva concerns precisely the impossibility of such an immediate withdrawal of the individual from the world of illusions - if an individual accomplishes it, he thereby ascertains his difference from other human beings and thus falls prey to his selfishness in the very gesture of leaving it behind. The only escape from this deadlock is for the bodhisattva to postpone his own bliss until all mankind has reached the same point as he; this way, the Taoist sage's indifference passes over into ethical heroism: the bodhisattva performs the act of supreme sacrifice by postponing his own entry into Nirvana for the sake of the salvation of mankind (Žižek 1991 p. 25).

In reality the story of the bodhisattva is even more complex. It is not that the Taoist takes the path of ethical heroism by attempting to attain impossible purity in withdrawing from the illusions of the world in desire and following the way, whereas the bodhisattva recognizes the impossibility of escaping from being contaminated by mundane illusions. This would amount to saying that the bodhisattva - and the analyst - have some sort of higher ethical idea in the traditional sense of a judgmental moralism. On the contrary, at the point of reaching nirvana, the bodhisattva "recognizes his desire" as the desire to remain in the world and (perhaps) to play the role of the bodhisattva - to bring others to this same point. The bodhisattva has realized that perfection, balance, and complete (self)consciousness are synonymous with death - with entropy - with the return to the inorganic and the completion of one's concrescence. If this were his desire then he would cease to exist - he would die. Otherwise he would accept that his desire brought him into the illusions of the mundane cycle of the world in the first place - from the immanence of chaos or nirvana - and that his place, his desire, is there.

Similarly, the analysand at the end of analysis recognizes his specific desire in the world - which may or may not include playing the role of the psychoanalyst for others - one who helps others to find the way to their desire. If this "desire" or "enlightenment" consists of death in the form of suicide, accident, or the willed death of many a mystic, then so be it - this is not to be judged or pitied. And in order to recognize that the experience of the true Taoist sage is the same as that of the bodhisattva and the analyst, it is enough to grasp the meaning of the Taoist adage: "if one hears the Tao in the morning, one may well die that night."

What the Buddhist bodhisattva, the Taoist sage, and the Lacanian analyst make clear is that the experience of absolute knowledge, (self)consciousness, or enlightenment includes its own lack. This is not to say that we can accept this at face value as a given. Rather we have to go through the process of believing we are climbing to the attainment of some complete lucidity and upon reaching it see it dissolve before our eyes. Perhaps this must even happen several times before we can experience - not just know or understand - that knowing includes unknowing - that all systems or ways are only set in motion by an arbitrary assent which cannot be guaranteed. But rather than leaving us in a state of

cynicism or nihilism, this experience can bring about the ecstasy of unknowing - the richness of faith - the “arbitrary” force or choice which grounds our illusions - and the very understanding that this failed or incomplete knowledge is the impossible real itself which we can never approach directly. Nowhere is all of this - and the links among psychoanalysis and mysticism - summed up better than in the work of George Bataille.

A.'s lucidity depends on a lack of desire. Mine is the result of an excess - undoubtedly it is also the only true lucidity. If it is only the negation of delirium, lucidity is not completely lucid, is still a bit the fear of going all the way - transposed into boredom, that is into contempt for the object of an excessive desire. We reason with ourselves and we tell ourselves: this object doesn't have in itself the value that desire gives it. We don't see that mere lucidity, which we also attain, is still blind. We must see at the same time the delusion and the truth of the object. No doubt we have to know that we are deluding ourselves, that the object is first of all what is perceived by a desireless being, but it is also what a desire perceives in it. B. is also what is only attained by the extremity of delirium and my lucidity would not exist if my delirium were not so great. Just as it would not exist if the other, ridiculous sides of B. escaped me (Bataille 1962, p. 53).

What Bataille makes clear - what is not recognized by most practices of enlightenment - is that, whether conscious or not, every human being sustains himself by some form of jouissance. Only in certain practices of Zen is this made clear. For example, Suzuki (1949-53) tells the tale of how humble Buddhist monks, who survive on only the rice they can beg from the townsfolk, when given a gift of large cuts of beef, immediately consume to the point of delirium. And the story is told of how one day upon receiving a gift in the monastery of very rich rice candy, the normally ascetic master proceeded to gorge himself on one after another, while his disciple looked on in horror and exclaimed: “But master, what about asceticism?” “Shut up!” cried the master. He who is not enlightened but only follows the ways or fantasies of his masters does not realize that his silence, his cell, and his piety are his practice of jouissance - different from - but in another way no different from - that of another. True enlightenment grasps this, however, from head to toe.

The practice of the Yaqui Indian nagual or teacher as presented by Carlos Castaneda (1987) offers another perspective of jouissance freed from the domination of moralism or cognition. The nagual Don Juan uses what often appear as cruel tricks to bring his pupil to consciousness, but these methods must be seen in light of the care, devotion, and containment, which the teacher provides in his undying dedication to his student Castaneda. Just as the analyst uses his own (counter)transference to transform the analysand through the relationship, so Don Juan describes how each nagual uses his style or character in his teaching method. There is no particular method or practice to be followed. William Burroughs compares the ethic or jouissance of Don Juan to that of the artist, but it also evokes that of the analyst - who mediates and helps to "polish" the relationship between two worlds for the subject.

The warrior's state is achieved with the aid of a teacher and a benefactor. To understand the respective roles of teacher and benefactor, one must consider the concepts of the tonal and the nagual, which are basic to the warrior's path. The tonal is the sum of any individual's perceptions and knowledge, everything he can talk about and explain, including his own physical being. The nagual is everything outside the tonal: the inexplicable, the unpredictable, the unknown. The nagual is everything that cannot be talked about or explained, but only witnessed. The sudden irruption of the nagual into the tonal can be lethal unless the student is carefully prepared. The teacher's role is to clean up and strengthen the tonal, so that the student is able to deal with the nagual which the benefactor will then demonstrate. The teacher and the benefactor show the student how to reach the unknown, but they cannot predict what will happen when he does reach the nagual. The nagual is by its nature unpredictable, and the whole training is extremely dangerous. While the tonal, the totality of conscious existence, shapes the individual being, the tonal is in turn shaped by the nagual, by everything it is not, which surrounds it like a mold. The tonal tends to shut out and deny the nagual, which takes over completely in the moment of death. If we see the nagual as the unknown, the unpredictable and unexplainable, the role of the artist is to make contact with the nagual and bring a part of it back into the tonal in paint or works, sculpture, film, or music. The nagual is also the area of so-called psychic phenomena which the Buddhists consider as distractions from the way of enlightenment. Buddhism and the teachings of Don Juan are simply not

directed towards the same goals. Don Juan does not offer any final solution or enlightenment. Neither does the artist (Burroughs 1984, p. 190).

Like the nagual, the analyst also offers not a solution but a practice of jouissance as the relation between the tonal and the nagual realms particular to each subject. Castaneda's description of the tonal and the nagual is very much like Freud's conscious and unconscious, but it is even closer to Lacan's formulation of the imaginary-symbolic and the real, for while the real is - like the nagual - the unknown totality of what is, each person's experience of it will be unique as it becomes translated and enacted into their particular symbolic or tonal consciousness. One who comes to analysis has suffered an eruption of the nagual - or the real - into the tonal - or the imaginary-symbolic. This practice of life as the relationship between the tonal and the nagual which the nagual practices and teaches is what Lacan calls rendering the real. The nagual as poet, scientist, or mystic is one who is engaged in the practice of rendering the real for others - translating the unknown into "knowledge" in order to produce pragmatic effects of material survival and spiritual or psychic meaning. The nagual as psychoanalyst or healer is one who is engaged in working with the subject's particular experience of the real - helping him to practice his jouissance as the art or science of life.

3. From Tragedy to Dialogue - Paganism

As a scholar of classical philology, Nietzsche was drawn to what he perceived was the repressed prehistory of Western Man. In the Dionysian cults, the presocratic poet-philosophers, and the spirit of tragedy, Nietzsche rediscovered an unconscious life force which he considered to be the "truth" of humanity and which he opposed to the notion of an objectively definable truth or morality.

It is a very remarkable moment: the Sophists verge upon the first critique of morality, the first insight into morality: - they juxtapose the multiplicity (the geographical relativity) of the moral value judgments; - they let it be known that every morality can be dialectically justified; i.e., they divine that all attempts to give reasons for morality are necessarily

sophistical - a proposition later proved on the grand scale by the ancient philosophers, from Plato onwards (down to Kant); - they postulate the first truth that a "morality-in-itself," a "good-in-itself" do not exist, that it is a swindle to talk of "truth" in this field (Nietzsche 1968, p. 233).

What Nietzsche rediscovers is geographical relativity - the multiplicity of moral value judgments - an ethnographic understanding of various practices of *jouissance* and their symbolic justification. But what Nietzsche also finds in these presocratic pagans is that they needed no justification - they had no need to impose their own practices or to justify them to themselves or others in the name of the good or the true. Rather one enacted one's faith in the immediacy of *jouissance* - through a "will to power."

Before Socrates, the dialectical manner was repudiated in good society; one believed it compromised one; youth was warned against it. Why this display of reasons? Why should one demonstrate? Against others one possessed authority. One commanded: that sufficed. Among one's own, inter pares, one possessed tradition, also an authority: and, finally, one "understood one another"! One simply had no place for dialectic. Besides, one mistrusted such public presentation of one's arguments. Honest things do not display their reasons in that way. There is something indecent about showing all one's cards. What can be "demonstrated" is of little worth. (Nietzsche 1968, p. 235).

Above all Nietzsche wants to know how this could have happened - how man could have come to mistake the apparent world - that by which we must (re)present the unapproachable real - with the true world - that mistaken notion that we have seized hold of this real once and for all - that it is permanent. Pagan formations of subjectivity worked through ethical-aesthetic paradigms - even the sciences were constituted an art of life. "Techne" had not yet become the mechanistic approach of technology found in the realm of scientific subjectivity but included the art of concrete practices in the integration of complex relations of self and polis.

This antithesis of the Dionysian and the Apollinian within the Greek soul is one of the great riddles to which I felt myself drawn when considering the nature of the Greeks.

Fundamentally I was concerned with nothing except to guess why precisely Greek Apollinianism had to grow out of a Dionysian subsoil; why the Dionysian Greek needed to become Apollinian; that is, to break his will to the terrible, multifarious, uncertain, frightful, upon a will to measure, to simplicity, to submission to rule and concept (Nietzsche 1968, 539).

The answer that he gives is similar to the one Bataille gives about the disappearance of the destructive and immanent side of the sacred duality. In the duality of sacred deities and their human representatives, an externalized social form of psychic organization guaranteed both the order or stability necessary for survival, and the transgression of this order with its ensuing return to chaos in the intimacy and destruction of the sacrifice and the festival. This sacred duality remains in Greek paganism in the form of Apollo and Dionysus: the Apollonian sustaining everything of beauty, permanence, and perfection, and the Dionysian bringing forth tragedy, intoxication, and revery. Nietzsche called for a return to the lost or repressed side of the Dionysian though he knew this was a superhuman task: "are we up to it?" Nietzsche asked. Are we up to facing our unconscious - that which contains no negation but only affirms, as Freud said?

The two types: Dionysus and the Crucified. - To determine: whether the typical religious man [is] a form of decadence (the great innovators are one and all morbid and epileptic); but are not here omitting one type of religious man, the pagan? Is the pagan cult not a form of thanksgiving and affirmation of life? Must its highest representative not be an apology for and deification of life? The type of a well-constituted and ecstatically overflowing spirit! The type of a spirit that takes into itself and redeems the contradictions and questionable aspects of existence!

It is here I set the Dionysus of the Greeks: the religious affirmation of life, life whole and not denied or in part (Nietzsche 1968, p. 542).

As Bataille has explained, it is inevitable that we will try to escape from this darker side of our human fate - we will try to sneak out the back door, seeking only what is stable and safe and what preserves our survival. Nevertheless this darker side - the shadow for Jung, the death drive for Freud, the sacred, the impossible, the real, the unconscious,

chaos - always returns. Jouissance as an experience beyond good and evil - beyond rational description - is another name for this drive. And with the concept of jouissance we discover the truly paradoxical nature of this drive. For that which brings the greatest pleasure brings the greatest pain - and that which makes us suffer may be the very thing which sustains us. It is this very paradox which Lacan believes the Greeks also discovered in the form of Stoicism.

To desire involves a defensive phase that makes it identical with not wanting to desire. Not wanting to desire is wanting not to desire. This discipline which, in order to find a way out of the impasse of the Socratic interrogation, was practised by people who were not only specifically philosophers, but, in their own way, some kind of practitioners of religion - the Stoics and the Epicureans. The subject knows that not to want to desire has in itself something as irrefutable as that Moebius strip that has no underside, that is to say, that in following it, one will come back mathematically to the surface that is supposed to be its other side (Lacan 1973, p. 235).

But the Stoics only made a practice of what was already present in Socrates. And Lacan indeed calls Socrates the first psychoanalyst - or a precursor to the analyst. So, following Nietzsche and Lacan, Greek paganism begins with the vestiges of a sacred dualism of psychic ecology in the form of Apollonian form and Dionysian revelry. Soon however this degenerates from the Dionysian Cult to the tragedy of the stage. The jouissance of the body is transformed more and more into a mimesis - a (re)presentation of the flesh - until the event of theatre - or art - becomes one of catharsis for Aristotle - one of release. Indeed, Plato and Aristotle become increasingly suspicious of music, poetry, and all those forms of art which incite the passions. In other words, these academics attempt to strip life of all Dionysian elements and leave only a completely sublimated, distanced, or repressed form of jouissance.

The place of Socrates however is enigmatic, for who is he apart from Plato's stories. If Socrates is the first analyst, then he is the first one not to give answers but to question the other. But to what end? As the philosopher of the dialogue, Socrates remains the maieutic teacher, the guru, the master: questioning away the unconscious prejudices of his sub-

jects. But Lacan claims that Socrates goes one step further - the step towards the analyst - in revealing for the first time the desire which drives man through the love of the other in the transference. And in the preciously unique and unknown "agalma," Lacan finds his "other" as the object (a) of desire.

He [Alcibiades] asks Socrates for something, without knowing what it is, but which he calls agalma. Some of you will know the use that I made of this term some time ago. I will go back to this agalma, this mystery, which, in the mist that clouds Alcibiades vision, represents, something beyond all good.

How can one see anything other than a first adumbration of the technique of the mapping of the transference in the fact that Socrates replies to him, not what he said to him when he was young, Look to your soul, but something more suited to the florid, hardened man he now is, Look to your desire, look to your onions (Lacan 1973, p. 255).

But if Socrates is the first analyst-practitioner, then the Stoics are those who fulfill Lacan's dream of a community of analysts - the analyzed or enlightened who experience their jouissance as a general economy of desire - with the recognition and acceptance of how desire is determined by the Other.

*Is it not strange, that echo that we found - though, of course, we are not going to stick our noses into this for long - between the ethic of analysis and the Stoic ethic? What does the Stoic ethic really amount to other than the recognition of the absolute authority of the desire of the Other, that **Thy will be done!** that is taken up again in the Christian register (Lacan 1973, p. 254)?*

The guarantee of the Other in God or Truth having collapsed and one's own object of desire having been mapped and identified, one becomes a Stoic. Beyond analysis lies a practice of jouissance which is a game of believing and being believed - of seducing and being seduced - made all the more ecstatic and all the more dangerous for being elucidated. The will to ignorance never gets us anywhere - our jouissance manifests itself nevertheless. It is here that the interminable side of psychoanalysis takes over - as the never-ending attempt to maintain a practice of jouissance - as an ethic of desire sustained by

what is other in the face of our subjective destitution. But in the present age we may have already moved beyond analysis as a specific practice and reached the place which Jean Baudrillard describes where irony and seduction reign, just as the dialogues of the Sophists and Socratics eventually gave way to the Stoics.

Once again, what is the point of saying that the world is ecstatic, that it is ironic, that the world is objective? It is those things, that's that. What is the point of saying that it is not? It is so anyway. What is the point of not saying it at all? What theory can do is to defy the world to be more: more objective, more ironic, more seductive, more real or more unreal, what else? It has meaning only in terms of this exorcism. The distance theory takes is not that of retreat, but that of exorcism. It thus takes on the power of a fatal sign, even more inexorable than reality, and which can perhaps protect us from this inexorable reality, this objectivity, from this brilliance of the world, whose indifference would enrage us if we were lucid.

Let us be Stoics: if the world is fatal, let us be more fatal than it. If it is indifferent, let us be more indifferent. We must conquer the world and seduce it through an indifference that is at least equal to the world's (Baudrillard 1987, p. 100).

4. The Sacrifice of the Sacrifice - Monotheism

At the end of his life, Freud (1939) recounted a story of the Jews as the chosen people - those people chosen by a one and only Father God - those people who chose to hear the message. To hear, to accept, to act before understanding: this is the structure of faith. Between the self and the other is the third. In the realm of the imaginary - of the mirror of doubles, of mimetic desire - insanity and destruction reign. It is through the intercession of a third element - what Lacan calls the "Name of the Father" or the symbolic - that one is spared the psychosis of immediate jouissance. But with Judaism we pass from the realm of law to the realm of faith. Emmanuel Levinas interprets the experience of Judaism as the encounter of the face to face: not the dialectical projection of the other as the same, but the recognition of the other as the unknown - the unthought - the unconscious. To understand the other is to persecute him. To listen is to take the radically

ethnographic position - to place oneself in the "you" position as the addressee of the other's message.

It will bring out the unique nature of an event such as the giving of the Torah: one accepts the Torah before one knows it. This shocks logic and can pass for blind faith or the naivete of childish trust, yet it is what underlies any inspired act, even artistic, for the act only brings out the form in which it only now recognizes its model, never glimpsed before (Levinas 1968, p. 41).

The emergence of faith is the emergence of consciousness as "ek-stasis" - distance. No longer is there a given - an object - a law - which one can either follow or transgress. With the emergence of faith and monotheism, there is the respect of the face to face: the birth of the individual ego and the other. Paradoxically in order to experience the other we must first be separated. The birth of the self arises with the experience of the other in a process of individuating subjectivity - though it does not in any way guarantee an ethical relation to the other. Rather the self can easily be created and experienced for its own sake as an isolated and omnipotent ego if not as a completely autistic subjectivity.

Neither the separated being nor the infinite being is produced as an antithetical term. The interiority that ensures separation (but not as an abstract rejoinder to the notion of relation) must produce a being absolutely closed over upon itself, not deriving its isolation dialectically from its opposition to the Other. And this closedness must not prevent egress from interiority, so that exteriority could speak to it, reveal itself to it, in an unforeseeable movement which the isolation of the separated being could not provoke by simple contrast. In the separated being the door to the outside must hence be at the same time open and closed (Levinas 1961, p. 148).

For Levinas the other precedes being, and ethics precedes ontology. This was already present in Judaism, but it had been forgotten. In transforming philosophical speculation from truth to the very possibility of a human knowledge - a self-consciousness - Heidegger moved beyond Greek epistemology to the ontology of being, but for Levinas this is still not enough. Taking one step further - and one step further back - Levinas moves beyond

the “essence” of ontology to the “other” of ethics - the “otherwise than being.” This act is radically human. For to speculate about the nature of things - to claim to discover or present a truth of the objective - is to forget the human subject who is speculating - and the human subject who is being addressed. If there were an objective nature to things outside of human subjectivity it would not be accessible to us “as it is” as long as we are human. In a sense, then, not only are the human sciences unable to become objective, but the natural sciences are within the realm of the subjective human sciences. This is the lesson of Niels Bohr’s physics of complementarity. But even the radical ontological perspective of Heideggerian philosophy, Buddhism, quantum physics, and the principle of undecidability remain mistakes as long as they try to formulate anything like a new description of - or prescription for - the world. This remains persecution - speaking one’s own jouissance and defining the other by attempting to understand him. Here we are very close to Lacanian psychoanalysis as a science of the human - that which gives up attempting to form a cosmology and looks to the truth of subjective jouissance and desire as it is transmitted by the other.

That is the perpetual ambiguity of the term unconscious. Obviously the unconscious presupposes that in the speaking being there is something, somewhere, which knows more than he does, but this can hardly be allowed as a model for the world. To the extent that its possibility resides in the discourse of science, psychoanalysis is not a cosmology (Lacan 1982, p. 159).

Levinas’s ethics and Lacan’s psychoanalysis are both based on a radically social foundation: the other which precedes the self - in the form of the father, the mother, the lover, the object, the symbolic, or God. Levinas uses the plural term others. The jouissance of the individual - his very reason for being - is that which brings him anxiety. While the jouissance of the self is derived only from the outside - the other - it is constantly being introjected in order to maintain the strength and stability of the autonomous self. But the self closes in on itself in its isolated narcissism if it does not remain open to the outside: with the death of desire, the subject too dies. It is this tenuous balance between self and other which is the subject of jouissance and which can never be resolved once and for all.

To this singular requirement jouissance does indeed answer, by the insecurity troubling its fundamental security. This insecurity is not due to the heterogeneity of the world with respect to jouissance, which would allegedly bring the sovereignty of the I to naught. The happiness of jouissance is stronger than every disquietude, but disquietude can trouble it; here lies the gap between the animal and the human. The happiness of jouissance is greater than all disquietude (Levinas 1961, p. 149).

It was Freud who re-initiated the ethics of listening in order to understand the truth of the subject. And it was the subject of suffering - the analysand - which led him to the understanding of the suffering and desiring nature of humanity. What Levinas presents is what psychoanalysts bear witness to: that desire is the desire of the other - that our dependence on the other brings our greatest joy and our greatest sorrow. The enigma of sacrifice - which includes suicide - evokes that which defines human subjectivity beyond the principle of the survival of the individual or the species as an act of love and of life.

Suicide appears as a possibility to a being already in relation with the Other[s], already elevated to life for the Other[s]. It is the possibility of an existence already metaphysical; only a being already capable of sacrifice is capable of suicide. Before defining man as the animal that can commit suicide it is necessary to define him as capable of living for the Other[s] and of being on the basis of the Other[s] who is exterior to him. But the tragic character of suicide and of sacrifice evinces the radicality of the love of life (Levinas 1961, p. 149).

This sacrifice brings us back to the question of the death drive - and of jouissance. For jouissance is not simply one's own jouissance as in the pleasure of the self, but the sacrifice of this jouissance: for another - for oneself. There is a sacrifice of jouissance and a jouissance of sacrifice. And even a sacrifice of the sacrifice of jouissance. Where does it end? Certainly not in a moral determination. Only in a play of difference - a dialectic of self and other - of jouissance and sacrifice - of life and death . In a practice - a pragmatics - an art and science of life.

For Rene Girard, Christ is the example of this sacrifice of the sacrifice - the bringing to

consciousness of jouissance within sacrifice. In his call for a non-sacrificial reading of the Gospels, Girard puts forth the example of Christ as the coming to consciousness of mimetic desire and the end of the "victimage mechanism." According to Girard, Christ's death has become one more myth of the sacrificial victim who dies as the accursed part which guarantees the functioning of the law itself, whereas instead Christ should be seen as the coming to consciousness of this victimage mechanism by which truth and law are upheld to preserve order in the face of chaos.

Obviously, the revelation that they bring about cannot be dissociated from the dynamic, anti-sacrificial current running all through the Judeo-Christian scriptures. We were able to detect a series of stages in the Bible that invariably pointed toward the attenuation and later elimination of the practice of sacrifice. Sacrifice must therefore appear in the light in which the great biblical thinker, Moses Maimonides, placed it in his youth: not as an eternal institution that God genuinely wished to found, but as a temporary crutch made necessary by the weakness of human kind. Sacrifice is an imperfect means, which humanity must do without (Girard 1978, p. 412).

Throughout history, that which is excluded, sacrificed, and destroyed serves as a scapegoat for the inevitable "scandal" of humanity - its divided nature in the coexistence of joy and sorrow - meaning and nonmeaning - love and hate. But the scandal of the divided subject is denied through a will to ignorance, and the laws of truth, morality, rationality, and punishment only serve to maintain order and stability by allowing the excluded shadow side - the death drive - to return in the form of a scapegoat in which responsibility is deflected to the outside. Girard's Christian ethic - like psychoanalysis - requires each man to take responsibility for his own jouissance and the impossible scandal of the real. We are driven outside of ourselves - towards difference. The other is our desire. But in interacting with the other, we want to see ourselves. We are scandalized by that which shows us what we are and that which refuses to think, feel, and act as we do. Racism and sexism at the social level derive from the same experience as the lover's quarrel: we fear and hate the other's jouissance. Girard's theorization of the game of doubles and mimetic desire at the social level is related to Lacan's elucidation of the mirror stage and the imaginary realm of the subject.

Let me once again restate the mechanism of mimetic repetition. The subject who is not able to decide for himself on the object that he should desire relies upon the desire of another person. And he automatically transforms the model desire into a desire that opposes and frustrates his own. Because he does not understand the automatic character of the rivalry, the imitator soon confers the very fact of being opposed, frustrated and rejected into the major stimulant of his desire. In one way or another, he proceeds to inject more and more violence into his desire. To identify this tendency is to recognize that, in the last resort, desire tends towards death, both the death of the model and obstacle (murder) and the death of the subject himself (self-destruction and suicide). This dynamic of mimetic desire does not operate only in those who are "sick", in those who push the mimetic process too far to be able to function normally; it is also, as Freud acknowledged, a feature of the people we call "normal" (Girard 1978, p. 440).

For Girard, the historical means of mediating between the identificatory doubles of mimetic desire have been provided by the law and sacrifice, but he finds this an imperfect means - and one which can no longer satisfy the present state of mankind. The collapse of the Other - the inability of modern man to believe in any truth, law, ritual, or religion, has brought us to the ultimate crisis of mimetic desire and to the tendency toward entropy and chaos which - through the perpetuation and acceleration of media images and technology - allows the imaginary - or secondness - free reign with no possibility of a third to mediate between self and other.

As the result of our analysis, not only the Old Testament but all the religions of mankind appear as intermediate stages between animal life and the crisis of the present day, when we must place our bets either on the total disappearance of the human race or on our arriving at forms of freedom and awareness that we can hardly imagine, swaddled as we are in myths that now have become, paradoxically, myths of demystification. We think we can bring these myths to a positive conclusion through our own means but they are actually leading us straight to destruction, now that there are no more Others to demystify, now that naive confidence in science and humanism have given way to the terrifying presence of a violence that is completely unmasked. (Girard 1978, p. 440).

For Levinas and Girard, the answer to the current crisis of mimetic desire is to be found in the Judeo-Christian tradition of conscious faith: the intercession of a third element in the form of an ethic of respect for God or for others. But this only assumes life and peace as an unquestioned element to be elevated. Despite bringing to light the movement of desire and jouissance, this approach still attempts to mediate by suggesting a principle - a morality. For Lacan and Bataille, there is no escaping desire - no way, finally, to purify desire by renouncing it through consciousness.

Ignorance, indifference, an averting of the eyes may explain beneath what veil this mystery still remains hidden. But for whoever is capable of turning a courageous gaze towards this phenomenon - and, once again, there are certainly few who do not succumb to the fascination of the sacrifice in itself - the sacrifice signifies that, in the object of our desires, we try to find evidence for the presence of the desire of this Other that I call here the dark God.

It is the eternal meaning of the sacrifice, to which no one can resist, unless animated by that faith, so difficult to sustain which, perhaps, one man alone has been able to formulate in a plausible way - namely, Spinoza, with his Amor intellectualis Dei (Lacan 1973, p. 275).

Bataille and Lacan also reveal the essential movement of desire and jouissance which plays through the human subject, but without elevating order, stability, and life above death and chaos. For them, closing off all avenues to jouissance in a society based exclusively on the rational ego and capitalist production and efficiency not only impoverishes human experience but is impossible: jouissance will break out anyway in the form of wars, disease, and murder. While Lacan sought to evolve psychoanalytic practice as a means of responding to the victims of this mismanaged jouissance, Bataille sought to provide alternatives in a similar fashion through a transformed experience of desire, love, and faith existing beyond the highest levels of consciousness. What they were developing was a new form of conscious mysticism as a practice of jouissance.

As regards the Hadewijch in question, it is the same as for Saint Theresa - you only have

to go and look at Bernini's statue in Rome to understand immediately that she's coming, there is no doubt about it. And what is her jouissance, her coming from? It is clear that the essential testimony of the mystics is that they are experiencing it but know nothing about it (Lacan 1982, p. 147).

According to Lacan, while poets, mystics, and women were able to experience this jouissance, they were not conscious of what was happening to them. They did not know what they knew. If conscious thought and language is itself a block to this experience of jouissance, then a practice derived from Bataille's atheological mysticism and Lacan's psychoanalysis is a way not to obliterate consciousness but to push it to its limits where it will again reveal the truth of the human subject as desire and thought. To embody jouissance through thought and language rather than allowing their disjunction to produce symptoms of suffering.

The analyst enables others to experience this transformation. He becomes the sacrificial victim, but he does not accept this role. He allows himself to be used by the subject - to be hated and loved - to be attacked and sacrificed. But he is not complicit in this game. Rather he returns the message to the subject - he shows him what he is - what he is for the subject. Through this circular process the dialectical trap of self and other - of master and slave - will be broken, and the subject will free himself from the imaginary and symbolic Other which has determined his desires, thoughts, and actions - which has constructed his subjectivity - from birth.

5. From Knowledge to Madness - Nihilism

Descartes' intuition founds discursive knowledge. And no doubt discursive knowledge once established, the "universal science" of which Descartes undertook the project, and which today occupies so much place, can ignore the intuition which is found at the outset (it does without it, wanting, if possible, to avoid being more than it is). But this knowledge - about which we are so vain - what does it mean, when its foundation is removed? (Bataille 1954, p. 105).

Modernity is characterized by a scientific subjectivity in which the philosopher comes to question and to contest that which is given in God, tradition, and law - to the point where nothing remains. Whereas the divided subject of self-reflection can be traced back centuries, it is only in recent times that scientific subjectivity has brought us to a confrontation with nihilism in the void opened up by such radical philosophical and scientific speculation. From his position at the point of a transformation in mankind's experience, Georges Bataille was able to reveal the movement of modern subjectivity evident in the philosophical line which stretches from Descartes and Newton to Hegel and Nietzsche. It would be impossible to situate Bataille specifically at the culmination of modernity's nihilism or at the birth of a "postmodern" age, for what Bataille reveals in the movement from Descartes to Hegel is an experience which even now has not penetrated the whole of humanity, though its effects are more than evident nevertheless.

In returning to Descartes, Bataille elucidates how the birth of the *cogito*, of causality, of the individual ego of modern rationality and science which is so taken for granted is - like all systems of thought - set in motion by an initially ungrounded assertion. This is revealed in Godel's theory of undecidability: no system can ground itself in anything other than an initial arbitrary positing. This positing could derive from nowhere other than the *jouissance* of the individual and/or collective psyche which seeks ever to translate its desire into conscious thought - into language - and to have its *jouissance* be taken for the truth by others. Derrida, Foucault, and Girard all extend these ethnopsychological lessons of Bataille by tracing how the socio-political constructions of rituals, religions, ideologies, and moralities come to be based on an initially repressed and excluded other which serves to create the very foundation of each new system.

But this "arbitrary assent" is the very truth of the subject: the fact that thought takes place in us like desire - that we are animals made up not of instinct but of desire-thought, and that the symbolic fictions we construct are necessary, though not "true". The truth of the subject, however, is not only this rendering of the impossible real. What reveals to us the truth of our experience is not the creation of ourselves as fictional subjects through subjectivization, but the fall from these fictions into subjective destitution. This is the

unbearable truth which Bataille stumbles onto - that the very movement of rational thought - of philosophical speculation and scientific objectivity - inevitably reveals to us what we are: creatures of *jouissance*. For questioning and the search for knowledge eventually contest the very way in which truth and knowledge are formulated in the speculating subject: the lamp of science seeking to illuminate the world through conscious thought is finally directed at the subject himself revealing the very experience of desire and thought within the subject.

It is easy for each one of us to perceive that this science, of which he is proud, even complete with answers to all the questions which it can regularly formulate would leave us in the end in non-knowledge; that the existence of the world cannot in any way cease being unintelligible. No explanation of the sciences (nor, more generally, of discursive knowledge) would be able to answer for it. No doubt the aptitude which was given to us to understand this or that from all sides, to bring numerous solutions to various problems, leaves us the impression of having developed in us the faculty of understanding. But this spirit of contestation, which was the tormenting genius of Descartes - if it animates us in our turn, it no longer stops at secondary objects: it is henceforth less a question of the well or poorly founded nature of accepted propositions than of deciding, once the best understood propositions are established, if the infinite need for knowledge implied in the initial intuition of Descartes could be satisfied. In other words, the spirit of contestation manages now to formulate the final affirmation: "I only know one thing: that a man will never know anything" (Bataille 1954, p. 106).

Of course this experience of self-consciousness is no different in a certain sense from Zen, Sufism, and other practices of enlightenment. What is different is for this experience of consciousness to have passed through the movement of rational thought itself, given that - although it is not *the* truth - it has a truth for the subject. Buddhists are correct in elucidating the illusions of truth, rationality, and causality and even the illusions of every desire. What they miss is the truth of these illusions: that the human subject is subject to thought, language, knowledge, and consciousness - and to desire, love, faith, and meaning.

*To know means: to relate to the known, to grasp that an unknown thing is the same as another thing known. Which supposes either a solid ground upon which everything rests (Descartes) or the circularity of knowledge (Hegel). In the first case, if the ground gives way . . . in the second, even if assured of having a well-closed circle, one perceives the unsatisfying nature of knowledge. The unending chain of things known is for knowledge but the completion of oneself. Satisfaction turns on the fact that a project for knowledge, which existed, has come to fruition, is accomplished, that nothing (at least nothing important) remains to be discovered. But this circular thought is dialectical. It brings with it the final contradiction (affecting the entire circle): **circular, absolute knowledge is definitive non-knowledge**. Even supposing that I were to attain it, I know that I would know nothing more than I know now (Bataille 1954, p. 108).*

Conscious and distanced as we have now become, it is easy for us to think of primitive savages, pagans, and Christians as naive or deluded in their beliefs - like children. But our conscious rationality remains but one more delusion if we do not follow its experience to the limit - and the most impoverished of all in that it transforms jouissance into increasingly objectivized forms. If the movement of conscious thought means anything, it is that this experience of humanity which denies its immediacy and separates itself from animality only allows us to see clearly - through this faculty of thought which we have - what we are doing: following our desires and sacrificing them - perpetuating our survival through work and technique so that we can live on. But why live on - what is our reason for being - what is the end of this life as opposed to the means? The answer to this question comes not in a single answer for all but in the revelation of the structure of human experience as the perpetuation of the means of life for the experience of a jouissance in continual creation which takes on an infinite variety of forms for each subject.

According to Bataille, Hegel followed thought to its limit, but held back before the unbearable revelation. He could not walk through the doorway he had opened and he even turned away. He could not accept his subjective destitution in the face of the void - in the collapse of the Other. Instead he constructed the story of "absolute knowledge" - which he himself completed - in which human subjectivity becomes conscious of what it is only to enter into a logical system of nirvana.

Hegel, at the moment when the system closed, believed himself for two years to be going mad: perhaps he was afraid of accepting evil - which the system justifies and renders necessary; or perhaps linking the certainty of having attained absolute knowledge with the completion of history - with the passing of existence to the state of empty monotony - he saw himself, in a profound sense, becoming dead; perhaps even his various bouts of sadness took shape in the more profound horror of being God. It seems to me, however, that Hegel, shrinking back from the way of ecstasy (from the only direct resolution of anguish) had to take refuge in a sometimes effective (when he wrote or spoke), but essentially vain attempt at equilibrium and harmony with the existing, active, official world (Bataille 1954, p. 110).

For Bataille, Hegel had failed. Although he performed an invaluable service by tracing the very limits of conscious thought and knowledge to the point where it dissolves into unknowing, he had reinstated an unconscious truth at the last minute: “absolute knowledge” and the “science of logic.” Nietzsche, on the other hand, was not so lucky. Having made the same journey, Nietzsche could not however find solace in any fictional stability - be it a philosophical system or productive work. Nietzsche did not turn away from the void opened up by the collapse of all values and the death of God and truth, but revealed this truth in the clear light of day and persevered to find a solution to the unbearable weight of this revelation for himself and for others. Nietzsche’s answer to the *fiction of truth* was the *truth of fiction*: not withdrawing from the illusions of the world into the state of the living dead of the enlightened ones of the East, but hurling oneself forward into the affirmation of life. The “will to power” has nothing to do with the protected ego or the domination of others, but seeks the strength and courage necessary not to turn away from the consciousness of the illusory and fleeting nature of every belief, every moment - and yet to believe - to live.

At this point, “desire” and “faith” in their traditional conceptions collapse into one another: conscious desire requires - or is - faith. Desire considered unconsciously is something like the instinct of animals. But in human experience, what would be instinct is always already mediated through conscious thought and language: that which is unconscious

already implies a partial consciousness. But consciousness is distance, contestation, and mediation and so threatens the immediacy of desire. Hence subjects seek to deny or repress desires so that they are not destroyed by consciousness. Repression is primary and human beings maintain a stubborn will to ignorance, but the modes of desire or *jouissance* erupt through dreams, physical disease, neurotic symptoms, war, crime, or any number of unconscious experiences. This was Freud's fundamental psychoanalytic discovery, empirically demonstrated again and again in his practice.

But Bataille goes even further to elaborate a metapsychology or metapsychoanalysis of the human subject as a subjectivity caught in a knot of unconscious desire and conscious thought. Thought is not something we can use to discover the truth of existence out there in the world - thought is what we are - and if we follow its lesson to the end we discover this. Absolute knowledge reveals to us the closure of knowledge and the fact that we are creatures of knowing - but also of unknowing. This knowing can serve either to imprison us in a false permanence or to translate and elucidate the details of this impossible experience of desiring. Somewhere among desiring and knowing is *jouissance* - an experience beyond good and evil which never fails to emerge. For Bataille, this experience of the dissolution of knowledge into unknowing was the ecstatic experience of the mystics, and it was here that he located the fundamental truth of human existence which was open to all those who did not undergo their *jouissance* unconsciously in the form of symptoms, but made the journey - whether in analysis or not - through rational thought and self-consciousness toward desire.

My existence, of course, like any other moves from the unknown to the known (relates the unknown to the known). No difficulty; I believe I am able, as much as anyone I know, to surrender to operations of knowledge. This is, for me, necessary - as much as for others. My existence is composed of steps forward, of movements which it directs to points which are suitable. Knowledge is in me - I mean this for every affirmation of this book; it is linked to these steps forward, to these movements (the latter are themselves linked to my fears, to my desires, to my joys). Knowledge is in no way distinct from me: I am it, it is the existence which I am. But this existence is not reducible to it; this reduction would require that the known be the aim of existence and not existence the aim of the known

(Bataille 1954, p. 110).

The usage of conscious thought allows us to distance ourselves from the immediacy of animal instinct - or human desire - long enough to produce practical means of survival in the form of technology. But we do not live in order to produce the means to live in order to produce the means There must be an end - which might be called meaning - or desire - or jouissance. In the search for this end, rational thought is misdirected - each one of us experiences it differently. If there are no longer rituals and myths on a grand scale - if "God is dead" - there are nevertheless rituals and myths for each individual whether he is conscious of them or not. What Lacan called the "individual myth of the neurotic" is none other than jouissance as it had come to be experienced in modernity.

'So you can reduce the traffic on the roads that you strive so hard to radiate from the consciousness, and which constitute the pride of the ego, crowned by Fichte with the emblems of transcendence. The trade route of truth no longer passes through thought: strange to say, it now seems to pass through things: riddle, it is through you that I communicate, as Freud formulates it at the end of the first paragraph of the sixth chapter, devoted to the world of the dream, of his work on dreams and what dreams mean' (Lacan 1966, p. 122).

What is this jouissance which is beyond good and evil - beyond truth and knowledge: unknowing - the experience of the mystics. For Lacan, the word jouissance became a signifier for an impossible to define experience. Jouissance dissolves the distinction between Freud's pleasure principle and death drive. We are not only creatures of thought or of instinct but of jouissance which already includes both. Jouissance includes thought to the extent that immediate drive is already experienced through conscious thought and signification.

And yet it is, surely, unequivocal that, as against the being upheld by philosophical tradition, that is, the being residing in thought and taken to be its correlate, I argue that we are played by jouissance.

Thought is jouissance. What analytic discourse brings out is this fact, which was

already intimated in the philosophy of being - that there is a jouissance of being (Lacan 1982, p. 142).

Martin Heidegger (1971) proclaimed the end of philosophy and the beginning of the task of thinking. But this attempt to seek being beyond the closure of absolute knowledge is a mistake to the extent that it remains caught in thought. Heidegger was only returning to the experience of the presocratics, the oriental sages, and the poets - to the art of thinking. Yet he stubbornly maintained the question at the level of consciousness and thought: his philosophy became a mysticism without admitting such. Heidegger's thought remains for this very reason within the closed circle of absolute knowledge: he prepares again and again to leave the circle - elucidating Hegel's lesson ever more clearly - but he never does. Though he did not turn away from the doorway opened beyond our scientific subjectivity like Hegel, neither did he walk through.

Where Heidegger only points the way, Bataille finds the way out. Already marked by an excessive jouissance through his own life experience, Bataille does not succumb to his symptoms but transforms them through "the practice of joy before death." He comes to live his jouissance to the fullest and to glorify his excess through literature, politics, and mysticism. Finally driven to philosophical speculation, he makes the journey through absolute knowledge only to reveal its limits.

If action ("doing") is (as Hegel says) negativity, then there is still the problem of knowing whether the negativity of someone who "doesn't have anything more to do" disappears or remains in a state of "unemployed negativity." As for me, I can only decide in one way, since I am exactly this "unemployed negativity" (I couldn't define myself with more clarity). I admit Hegel foresaw this possibility, but at least he didn't situate it as the outcome of the process he described. I think of my life - or better yet, its abortive condition, the open wound that my life is - as itself constituting a refutation of Hegel's closed system (Bataille 1961, p. 123).

At the limits of conscious thought, Bataille finds the truth of jouissance which he already knew without knowing it. He also finds the emergence of another question: what to do

with this truth. For as long as man was deluded, life went on: he experienced the jouissance of life which was his reason for being while not questioning or contesting this jouissance or the fictions of the symbolic order which sustained survival. But Hegel's mapping of the movement of humanity through thought and desire was the equivalent for mankind as a whole of the analytic act in which the subject experiences the collapse of the Other. The interpreting self - the speaking and thinking subject - closes the tautological circle of absolute knowledge only to reach subjective destitution - which can take the form of cynical *resentiment*, madness, depression, or ecstasy. Bataille suggested that all anxieties, all neurotic symptoms were but the result of a resistance to confronting this void of the impossible real, just as all neuroses - including "normality" - are a defense against the confrontation with schizoid and depressive states.

This immediately poses the problem of the sovereignty of man: Lacan's ethic of not ceding one's desire in relation to the Other. In Spinoza's elucidation of ethics, no concept of rights can found the power to act on the other. If the relations of power, knowledge, and truth have been revealed to be based on the constructions and seductions of jouissance - of arbitrary assent - than this consciousness signals the end of exploitation through master-slave relations and the beginning of mutual recognition in post-Hegelian subjectivity. Communism as an ideal state is opposed the sovereignty of kings and masters which for Bataille is the essential lesson of Hegel and Marx. But Bataille was intent on elucidating and maintaining the importance of the structural experience of sovereignty once found in the master but now open to anyone able to transform the domination of rationality and production into the jouissance of the moment where nothing serves.

The communists are opposed to what seems sovereign to them. But for Nietzsche, a world deprived of what I call sovereign would no longer be bearable. With respect to traditional sovereignty, he had the same attitude as the communists. But he could not accept a world in which man - in which each man - would be a means and not the end of some common endeavor (Bataille 1976, p. 367).

For Bataille, the communitarian or communist project was essential as a socio-political organization, but the institution in practice had only served to enslave man even more by

reproducing the master-slave dialectic within the individual psyche where jouissance had to serve the will of rational productive thought. Sovereignty, on the other hand, seizes the singularity of each concrescence - whether it be the individual's life history or the unique moment - and withdraws it from the system of limited economy.

In fact, today there are only two admissible positions remaining in the world: communism, reducing each man to the object (thus rejecting the deceptive appearances that the subject had assumed), and the attitude of Nietzsche - similar to the one that emerges from this work - free the subject, at the same time, of the limits imposed on it by the past and of the objectivity of the present (Bataille 1976, p. 368).

Bataille's answer to this dilemma is the community of sovereign beings who find their connection not through the survival of the group or adherence to a pre-set code, but through the mutual recognition of the collapse of the Other, shared anguish, and the truth of jouissance. This community cannot be prescribed or described - only witnessed in examples such as Sade's libertines, Duras's community of lovers, or Blanchot's unavowable community - the community of those who have nothing in common. Communism is then rediscovered through the communication of sovereignty - the communion of shared jouissance in which the distinction between self and other - between subject and object - dissolves. Rather than sovereign subjectivity dissolving in the utilitarianism of the group, it attains its conscious form while recognizing that of others, and it "communicates": it bridges the gap between singular subjectivities while maintaining the irreducibility of limited concrescence.

There is nothing that I do not follow in the overall movement that Hegel's thought represents in my eyes. But the autonomy of Hegel's "absolute knowledge," the discourse in which the subject and the object become identical, itself dissolves into the NOTHING of unknowing, and the vanishing thought of unknowing is in the moment. On the one hand, there is an identity of absolute knowledge and this evanescent thought; on the other, this identity is encountered in life. "Absolute knowledge" closes, whereas the movement I speak of opens up. Starting from "absolute knowledge," Hegel could not prevent discourse from dissolving, but it dissolved into sleep. The vanishing thought of which I

... speak is the awakening and not the sleep of thought: it is reencountered in an equality - in the communication - with all the sovereign moments of all men, insofar as the latter do not want to take them for things (Bataille 1976, p. 368).

Bataille's idea of communication is the momentary deconstruction of boundaries which puts isolated events back into play with one another before they return to their essential state. This is similar to Guattari's concept of transversality which links the sovereign subjectivity of each organized event or organism without replicating identity or dissolving into homogeneity and the entropy of chaos, but rather preserving the heterogeneity and multiplicity of difference. On the level of large-scale political organization, however, this has never worked, which is why psychoanalytic political theorists have come to proclaim social democracy - despite its manipulations and exploitations - as the best thing which exists. For if manipulation and exploitation are the inevitable result of the relations among individuals who are not conscious of their *jouissance*, then democracy at least institutes an "analyzed" form of political power and social relations by recognizing the theoretical "equality" or "sovereignty" of all individuals - even if this cannot be maintained in practice.

The Lacanian definition of democracy would then be: a sociopolitical order in which the People do not exist - do not exist as a unity, embodied in their unique representative. That is why the basic feature of the democratic order is that the place of Power is, by the necessity of its structure, an empty place. In a democratic order, sovereignty lies in the People - but what is the People if not, precisely, the collection of the subjects of power (Žižek 1989, p. 147)?

At this point we are again very close to the structure of anarchic primitive tribes described by Pierre Clastres (1974, 1980) in which the chief holds no real power but only serves to fill a place in the structure. Though the structural position of the chief or head is necessary to guarantee a certain order and to preserve the survival of the tribe, his power is only mimed or enacted as faith. If he were to mistake his position for truth and exercise power over others in the form of his misguided *jouissance* or desire to control, then he would be laughed at - faith in his authority would be withdrawn.

For Claude Lefort (1986) and Slavoj Žižek (1991), democracy maintains the social forms of a general economy of the psyche found in primitive communities in that it includes the structure of the eruption of the real into the symbolic fiction of laws and leaders. It enacts the “time of the festival” or the “killing of the king” which was in primitive experience guaranteed by the malific deity in the form of elections which eject the leader from his position and throw everything open to chance and chaos once again.

It is against the background of this emptying of the place of Power that we can measure the break introduced by the ‘democratic invention’ in the history of institutions: ‘democratic society’ could be determined as a society whose institutional structure includes, as a part of its ‘normal’, ‘regular’ reproduction, the moment of dissolution of the socio-symbolic bond, the moment of irruption of the Real: elections (Žižek 1989, p. 147).

Of course, those who hold the place of power often identify with it covertly if not overtly - and this is even encouraged by a population which still seeks sovereignty outside of itself despite the decline of kings and leaders. If mutual recognition of sovereign subjectivity was glimpsed for a moment through the communist project - or even partially through the social democracy of modern times, then it has appeared to have been forgotten. After a time in which social welfare and the levelling of unequal living conditions had improved steadily throughout most of this century, inequality and the master-slave struggle to the death for recognition have returned once again with hardly a resistance. In the midst of the failure of sovereignty for all, the possibility nevertheless remains for any subject to refuse the eclipse of sovereign subjectivity by the forces of production and the object through the seizure of singularity in the practice of jouissance.

6. Enjoying Your Symptom - Chaotism

The void revealed by the infinite questioning of philosophers and scientists was for primitive man simply the chaos which accompanied and preceded any form of substantiality and its creative organization. The end of modernity is marked by the experience of artists,

poets, and revolutionaries contesting form and content to their limits in the absence of any guarantee - challenging God, truth, and morality to exist and succumbing to madness and nihilism. The “postmodern” era is characterized by the collapse of this guarantee in any form of the Other and the return to chaos, and it is ushered in by the analytic practice and theory of *jouissance* as both an answer to - and a facilitator of - this crisis.

*The lesson of modernism is that the structure, the intersubjective machine, works as well if the Thing is lacking, if the machine revolves around an emptiness; the postmodernist reversal shows the thing itself as the incarnated, materialized emptiness. This is accomplished by showing the terrifying object directly and then by revealing its frightening effect to be simply the effect of its place in the structure. The terrifying object is an everyday object that has started to function, by chance, as that which fills in the hole in the Other (the symbolic order). The prototype of a modernist text would be Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*. The whole futile and senseless action of the play takes place while waiting for Godot's arrival when finally, “something might happen”; but one knows very well that “Godot” can never arrive because he is just a name for nothingness, for a central absence. What would the “postmodernist” rewriting of this same story look like? One would have to put Godot himself on stage: he would be someone exactly like us, someone who lives the same futile, boring life that we do, who enjoys the same stupid pleasures. The only difference would be that, not knowing it himself he has found himself by chance at the place of the Thing; he would be the incarnation of the Thing whose arrival was awaited (Žižek 1992, p. 155).*

The postmodern story then, would be to fill the empty void left by the death of God - the collapse of the Other - with *jouissance*. Beckett's Godot survives the death of God and waits in the enigma which has been revealed by such a death. In the hesitation in which life waits to find its way, existential reflection and uncertainty are born - along with sovereign subjectivity itself. But while the subject may be conscious of the sovereignty - and the responsibility - which has been bestowed upon him, he cannot yet embrace this experience. This is what is at stake in Nietzsche, in Kierkegaard, in Dostoyevsky, in Beckett - in modernist existentialism. In the postmodern version of *Godot*, the subject would embrace his position as having filled the place of sovereignty left by the abdication of

God and king. And what is this postmodern story of God(ot) but Bataille's *Madame Edwarda*, in which a prostitute finds herself on stage as God - conscious to the extreme limits of her jouissance and yet living it to the fullest - to the point of dying of it.

Let me explain myself. No use laying it all up to irony when I say of Madame Edwarda that she is GOD. But GOD figured as a public whore and gone crazy - that, viewed through the optic of 'philosophy,' makes no sense at all. I don't mind having my sorrow derided if derided it has to be, he only will grasp me aright whose heart holds a wound that is an incurable wound, who never, for anything, in any way, would be cured of it . . . And what man, if so wounded, would ever be willing to 'die' of any other hurt (Bataille 1956, p. 155)?

And this is what all of Bataille's stories - and his whole life and work - are concerned with: to enable man to traverse his fantasies, to reveal the void in the Other, to accept his fall into subjective destitution, and to enjoy his symptoms as the practice of jouissance - no longer needing false symbolic justification, but nevertheless simultaneously recognizing the fictional nature of all beliefs and desires and the truth of these fictions.

Freud witnessed the individual myths of neurotic symptoms and family dramas that served to fill the gap left by the collapse of all values and the death of God, but nevertheless he did not recognize that his own scientific aspirations and bourgeois temperament served to reinstate another judgmental Other which his followers would make increasingly rigid. He did not traverse his own fundamental fantasy completely. Unintentionally Bataille followed in Freud's footsteps through a "heroic" self-analysis, but took the process even further. Bataille's experience provided a basis for a new human science - a new (post-Lacanian) psychoanalysis - as he was able to pass through the experience of the collapse of the Other without either succumbing to madness or reinstating another Truth. Instead he passed through the extreme limits of (self)consciousness and speculative philosophical thought revealing, identifying, and glorifying his own jouissance.

The object of my desire was illusion first of all and could be the void of disillusion only in the second instance.

Questioning without desire is formal, immaterial. About it we cannot say, "It's the same thing as man."

Poetry reveals a power of the unknown. But the unknown is only an insignificant void if it is not the object of a desire. Poetry is a middle term, it conceals the known within the unknown: it is the unknown painted in blinding colors, in the image of the sun.

Dazzled by a thousand figures composed of worry, impatience, and love. Now my desire has just one object: the beyond of those thousand figures and night (Bataille 1961, p. 164).

Here, in a few lines, Bataille reveals his journey through the confrontation with the impossible real - a journey which Lacan made into *the* journey of the psychoanalytic process as a revelation of the workings of desire and seduction. The human is born into the world of the symbolic from the beginning. Even before he is born, the child is determined by the jouissance of the other through the language that comes to signify him for the other, and through the unconscious seduction by which parents and others solicit his desire and imitation. There is no immediate experience. Everything for the individual - or the self - is always already mediated by the social, the symbolic, the "Other". Subjectivity - one's experience of the real - is constructed.

The analytic act reveals this fundamental seduction by seducing the subject one more time: the transference is only the ubiquitous and inevitable desire, love, and faith that permeates human relations through cathexis, trance, and hypnosis. But the lover and the believer are unconscious of what is happening to them, and as a result, their desire, love, and faith - their unconscious jouissance - may cause them mental or physical suffering. The analyst does not use the hypnotic power of transference in order to seduce the subject into another way of experiencing jouissance as do most teachers and therapists. He uses the structure of this transference to enable the analysand to become conscious of the way in which he believes or is seduced - the way in which he practices his jouissance. Which is why the essential characteristic of being an analyst is to have passed through this experience in which the Other collapses and the void - the ontological impossibility of being - is revealed, and in which one maps out one's own fundamental beliefs and seductions, one's own "symptoms," one's own jouissance.

The symbolic order - or Other - once served to provide a kind of externalized social form of psychic balance through a mediation of mimetic desire. God, ritual, and law were not true or false - they were simply given - unquestioned - and they provided the intercession of distance from the violence of immediate desire. As Jean Baudrillard elucidates, all that we have retained of this experience is the false *ideas* of truth and morality which dominate us, but we do not even really believe in them. We do not have the courage to live up to either the fiction of our truths or the truth of our fictions.

It's true that etiquette and politeness (and ceremony in general) are no longer what they once were. But it's because we want to give etiquette meaning that we give it affectation. It's because we want to substitute the necessity of the Law for the arbitrariness of the rule that the signs of etiquette become arbitrary conventions. We could - we might as well - saddle the rules of chess with moral reprobation. Now etiquette and politeness - what there was of them in a ceremonial order that is no longer our own - do not even have as a purpose, any more than rituals do, to temper the initial violence of rapports, to dispel threats and aggressiveness (holding out one's hand to show that one is not armed, etc.). As if there were some finality in the civility of mores: this is our hypocrisy, imputing everywhere and always a moralizing function for exchanges. But the law inscribed in heaven is not at all one of exchange. It's rather the pact of alliance and seductive connections (Baudrillard 1983, p. 172).

Seduction - jouissance - is the "death drive" to the extent that it is risk - the risk of a life of pure production and efficiency for what we enjoy. But jouissance is more than this - not just the willingness to risk survival for our pleasure, but the challenge of fate - against all rationality. For Baudrillard, we do not really want to win when we gamble - we do not do it in order to gain wealth. We seek to challenge the impossible to reveal itself against all odds. We seek to overturn the stagnant and dead objective nature of the rational order we are imprisoned in by our thought - by our desire to survive. We seek to be amazed by the return of the real in the form of chance - in the return of chaos to a subjectivity which has become dead through routine. This fatality is not some ineradicable death drive, but the very foundation of a singular and complex concrescence - human subjectivity - which

lives at the border between order and chaos and maintains itself there even as it mutates into higher forms of complexity.

We are all gamblers. What we desire most intensely is that the inexorable procession of rational connections cease for a while. That there be installed, even for a short time, an unheard-of unravelling of another kind, a marvellous escalation of events, an extraordinary succession, as if predestined, of the smallest details, to the point where we think that things - until now maintained artificially at a distance through a contract of succession and causality - suddenly find themselves, not delivered over to chance, but converging spontaneously, concurring through their very connection in selfsame intensity.

That gives us pleasure. Those are our real events. This obvious fact that nothing is neutral or indifferent - that all things converge if only we can eliminate their "objective" causal contract - this is the very evidence of seduction. To circumvent the circuits of causality, arbitrary signs must be projected, some kind of arbitrary codes, which is what the rules of a game are. These are the temptations that are going to upset the causal system and the objective way things proceed and re-engage their fatal linkage. These are the real challenges that we commonly throw down, just like the player in the game (Baudrillard 1983, p. 153).

The essence of jouissance - of sovereignty - is the dissolution of the rational confines of the order of things into the unknown, the impossible, the miracle, the absolute other. In our postmodern era, all grand narratives - all versions of the Other - all forms of truth and order - have collapsed, and there is nothing left for us to transgress. The game of taboo and transgression - necessary to our survival and essential to our being - has imploded to the point where each individual suffers the movement of jouissance through his own desire, love, and faith. But only the forms have changed. Psychoanalysis was a response to a change of climate - to new forms of subjectivity - to a new way of mediating the practice of jouissance and the technique of survival. No single theory or therapy that we can dream up will save us. Like a virus which becomes stronger when faced with a weak cure, the symptoms of our unconscious jouissance have only learned how to hide better through our rational thought. We may be cynics and nihilists when it comes to the Other, but we each believe in our jouissance which - without resorting to the techniques of mod-

ern psychopharmacology - is indestructible.

What more is there to say? Nothing is closer to this delicious, vertiginous, insoluble sensation of being the decisive element in some situation without willing it, than pleasing someone with a single glance. A tiny cause, an extraordinary effect: it's the only proof we have of the existence of God. Incalculable connections are the stuff of our dreams, but also of our daily bread. We like nothing more than this crazy imbalance of cause and effect - it opens fabulous horizons on our origins and on our potential power. They say that seduction is a strategy. Nothing could be more wrong. Seduction is a matter of these unexpected connections that any strategy can at best only attempt to reproduce. (Baudrillard 1983, p. 155).

And why not say it clearly: we seek fatality. There is a drive in us for order and rationality and the reduction of tension: this is the pleasure principle and the life instinct. But we desire even more the dissolution of that order and the return of the fatal, the (im)possible, the chaotic. It is not a matter of getting rid of the death drive or entropy - which would be impossible - but of finding a place for it within the preservation of life. Primitive subjectivities "knew" this, though they were not "conscious." And whether we face up to it or not, the facts of jouissance are evident everywhere. We could try to do away with humanity by numbing ourselves or by creating a psychic landscape which expunges desire (we may be on our way) or we could seize the courage to confront the real, become conscious of our symptoms, enact our desire, and practice our jouissance.

We would like there to be chance, senselessness, and therefore innocence, and for the gods to continue their game of dice with the universe, but we prefer sovereignty, cruelty, fatal interconnection to be all-pervasive, we prefer events to be the radical consequences of thought. We like this, but we prefer that. Likewise we like events to link up according to their causes, but we prefer chance and pure coincidence to pervade the world. Above all I believe that we prefer the fatal connection. Determinism will never abolish chance. But no chance will ever abolish fate (Baudrillard 1983, p. 161).

According to Bataille, Sade's work revealed to modern man his blind spot - the manner in

which he was determined by the Other - the neurosis by which his energetic life process was blocked. By negating any prescribed form or mode which might serve as a blockage to immediate drive, Sade followed the path of ecstasy. But this too ends in an impasse, for pure desire - like pure formless chaos - is nothing. The constant transformation, construction, and reorganization of forms within the chaos of destruction depends on a certain harmonics or general economy which can never be prescribed. Perhaps it is only the Sadian path of jouissance which can lead us to the point where conscious harmonics sets in.

From an esoteric perspective, Sade's path is what Rudolph Steiner (1911) called "Luciferian" - not the path of evil but that of ecstasy. As opposed to the Luciferian path of jouissance which had tempted past forms of human subjectivity, Steiner described humanity's increasing domination by the "Ahrimanian" force marked by control, fear, repression, and blockage. Wilhelm Reich (1949) believed this "emotional plague" was responsible for psychological and physical illness as well as for social repression in bureaucracy and oppression. It appears however that in order to escape from Ahriman and reach Steiner's third path of "Christ" as a form of balance within chaos, one must pass through the Luciferian journey of jouissance, chaos, and destruction. Rene Girard describes this as a conversion process - or "metanoia" that can be witnessed in writers such as Augustine, Dostoyevsky, and Proust in which the purity of self-absorbed desire and jouissance leads one out of the mimetic desire of competition, control, and the master-slave dialectic and into the recognition of the other - out of sacrificial and cathartic rituals (including the "sacrificial interpretation of Christ") and into mutual recognition or "Christ consciousness." Steiner (1925) even describes physical illness and the destruction of the body as a necessary process for the liberation of consciousness and the further transformation of mind and spirit through matter. It is only pain and dis-ease which bring on the initial consciousness or splitting of mind and body that differentiates human from animal. From this point a journey ensues in which psyche or subjectivity attempts to maintain balance through the expression of its physical vehicle of the body long enough to learn from, enjoy, and express this particular manifestation or sovereign event.

Consciousness unleashes a confrontation with the void which can lead in different direc-

tions. The response of nihilism is to turn away in fear and to seek to return to sleep through the maintenance of stagnant forms of truth, morality, and control of self and other. The choice of jouissance is to pursue the path of ecstasy born of the awareness that "nothing is true, all is permitted." This path reveals not the void but a chaosmic process in which life and death are simply the mutation of virtual forms of organization in endless transformation. In Lacanian terms only the ethic of pursuing one's desire can free one of the neurosis born of negating this desire in favor of the determination of the Other. But the psychoanalytic journey leads beyond the specific fantasy of one's own particular desire and to the process of Desire itself as it operates chaosmically. The analyst lives in and for this Desire. Yet just as the pursuit of one's sovereign subjectivity leads to objective consciousness of process throughout the social and universal environment in which this subjectivity is embedded, so to does this consciousness recognize the holographic essence of its particular limited sovereign event as simultaneously all that is. The moment lived for itself alone requires the underlying harmony of survival to sustain it. Yet this survival itself is nothing other than its creative expressive moment. It remains to be seen where the sovereign event which is humanity - like any individual life-story - will lead.

Book IV

Schizoanalysis

Clinical and Cultural Practice

1. Life and Death - Chaosophy

The process of life and death is the story of individuation and the unfolding of the virtual into the actual. Life is division and capture - the striation and stagnation of forms escaping or detaching themselves from the infinite chaos of atemporality. At the quantum level, physicists cannot determine the position of the fundamental particles of matter - they can only map their probability to manifest in a measureable space-time continuum out of the wave form of pure energy. A wave of pure energy is organized into particles of matter which we take for "solid." Light is warped into photons. Classical physics and mathematics constitute an art and science of life - as do shamanism, magic, and psychoanalysis - which depend first on what can be conceived. The relationship between what we call mind and body - or psyche and matter - cannot be grasped by logico-bivalent thinking alone.

Death puts an end to life. Death is our word for the end of an individuated form which had at one time been born into the actual out of the possible. This concrescence dies when the sovereign singularity of its particular organization ceases to be. Whether a concrescence will return to the entropy of nondifferentiated chaos or recognizably mutate into another organized concrescence through its momentary journey into chaos and thus transmit or communicate transversally something from one form to another depends on a number of factors. The virtual totality outside of time-space configurations is chaos. But neither life nor death exist as essences - and neither do order or chaos. They are rather two poles of a movement of chaosmosis which evokes the being and becoming of all forms living, dying, mutating, and recurring in the actually becoming yet virtually existing.

Subjective and objective are similarly two poles which can be approached asymptotically yet never attained. To experience death as the end of a concrescence and possible mutation is to experience it objectively. But our subjectivity responds differently. Immediately, faced with death, we believe in it. We fear it. We fall prey to the anguish of loss that is the flip side of our joy in this sovereign existence - this life story which is ours. We could through consciousness learn to detach ourselves from this belief which leads to our ecsta-

sy and our anguish. We could recognize that - yes - all desire is illusion. We could - were we capable - cease to glorify our story - cease to identify with the concrescence which we are and view it objectively as a thing which happens. In a sense this consciousness leads toward the destruction of the physical body. As it decontextualizes the momentary traps and territorializations of life forms, it brings about deconstruction, transformation, and change. But infinite questioning is formlessness and the absence of belief itself which - were it possible to attain absolutely - would be nothingness - nirvana. Evidently being also is becoming - the unfolding of limited forms and beliefs unaware - unconscious - of the homogeneous indivisible totality which is nothing and out of which they arise.

The search for knowledge - for absolute consciousness - leads to an impasse. Most often it is only false consciousness which remains propped up by unconscious - unquestioned - beliefs. The true discovery of groundless consciousness can lead to mystical states of ecstasy or to madness depending on the circumstances. Those who do not pass over entropically into the chaos of death or madness bring back a map of the movement of life and death - a map of psyche and matter being and becoming - which forms a pragmatics - an art and science of life. Returning to chaos or mutating into another form may be one's choice - one's arbitrary assent - one's act of faith. If the choice is to live the particular set of concrescences forming humanity and one's own singular existence, then the art and science of life is a pragmatics of chaosmosis which is both conservative and radical. The deconstruction and reconstruction of new forms of subjectivity - especially those imposed from outside - takes place against the preservation and optimalization of singular subjectivities and organized concrescences which have developed a sovereign richness through time and tradition. Across these isolated sovereign concrescences - each of which invokes infinite possibilities - links of communion or communication can be established transversally - either through the objective pole of consciousness or through the subjective pole of empathy, seduction, and belief - desire, love, and faith.

Paradoxically the realm of cognition and consciousness and the realm of emotion and belief lead - in different ways - to similar transversal linkings - the ultimate of which would be non-differentiation. But the immanent interlinking and omni-communication resulting from belief or consciousness is always offset by the stubborn individuation of

isolated concrescences - sovereign forms, beings, events, and processes which - self-organizing and autopoietic - refuse to give up their measure of singularity and dissolve into “the anonymous mass of the irrevocable.”

2. Ecosophy and Sovereignty - A General Economy

In the end, desire and thought do not exist. What exists is our way of organizing or experiencing chaos or the homogeneous indivisible totality. Desire and thought organize order through dividing and mapping - they are part of our subjectivity. Drive, perception, sensation, affect, emotion, cognition, consciousness, and meaning are bound up in complex relations which construct “reality.”

A variety of theories within philosophy, psychoanalysis, psychology, neuroscience, and ethnology add complementary elements to a complex map of the psyche. Transformative practices of a therapeutic, pedagogical, mystical, ecological, or physical nature serve to reorganize our subjectivity - our experience of the world within the complexity of these maps - which is always initially constructed for us through our phylogenetic and ontogenetic development as embodied beings in the world.

An ethics of *jouissance* advocates an action of sovereignty, autopoiesis, and non-intervention. The experience of sovereignty frees one from the need to control others or to manipulate the organization of reality for the purposes of production itself. It recognizes the sovereignty of each entity, system, event, or concrescence to organize its experience of the world according to its own metabolic mutations and limitations. It also however recognizes the mutually-limiting interdependence of all systems and the impossibility in the end of absolute non-intervention. Sovereignty within multiplicity is something to be striven for, but obviously all entities and their subjectivities are interwoven at certain points. Sovereignty within complex ecology - or general economy - is an uncertain process in itself - a pragmatics maintaining awareness of the relations between order and chaos.

Transdisciplinary transformative practices surpass the role of specific indoctrinations in teaching, healing, and sacred experience by offering the very tools for reconstructing and reorganizing meaning and reality. The construction of subjectivities takes place among a multiplicity of possibilities drawn from other space-time configurations in history, mythology, and ethnography, while initiating the invention of new as-yet-unconceived forms. By gathering as many examples of subjectivity as possible, we can avoid the impasse of unity which denies difference. Concrescences emerge, live, and die, but their events can be recuperated in new combinations. Despite the hierarchy of stability, vulnerability, and functional optimization, each form is in itself incomparable - irreducible to any general equivalent. Respect for subjectivity can extract the sovereign essence from each event regardless of its objective limitations in the complex web of nested hierarchies.

The sovereignty of any subjective concrescence denies the larger systems within which it is embedded by seizing its *jouissance* at the expense of others, yet the broader complexity of structurally coupled systems denies sovereignty through the continual movement of *chaosmosis*. Thus sovereign subjectivity limits ecosophic objectivity just as objective ecosophy limits subjective sovereignty in a circular refrain which mutates eternally while remaining constant in a process which - like imaginary topological forms - cannot be measured or grasped by classical models but nevertheless can be understood by the complex psyche.

Throughout human history individual and collective subjectivities have organized their experience in disparate ways. It is only recently that human science has come to recognize these experiences within their subjectivity rather than evaluating them as if they were objective. Through quantum physics, the most "objective" of sciences have come to recognize the subjective limitations of all objective measurement in which the absolute predictability and determinacy of classical science is only a probability which appears for our practical purposes to be a certainty.

The next step in the recognition of the subjective "state-dependent" knowledge of quantum physics, psychoanalysis, hypnosis, ethnography, ethology, spiritual science, and

bioenergetic medicine is the reintegration of transdisciplinary subjective “state-specific” sciences including the science of subjectivity itself in which the complementary objective and subjective poles will become part of a self-reflexive and self-conscious lucidity (Tart 1975, Rossi 1993, Gerber 1996).

3. New Maps of the Psyche - Psychoanalysis and Science

The human psyche is a complex system which has barely begun to be modeled by the many maps of it which currently exist. Scientific knowledge usually has ignored the dynamic temporal nature of systems. Even the human sciences - in which the subjectivity of the observer is paramount in affecting the mapping of knowledge - have focussed primarily on devising static maps of human experience. While psychoanalysis has differed from this by orienting its research and theory on the empirical clinical observation and analysis gained from processes, the subjective differences of human experience are often confined to atemporal categories. The increased understanding of complexity and complementarity within the natural sciences should aid in modeling the dynamic nature of psyche and subjectivity in full recognition of the process-oriented nature of human events.

A time-space oriented “field” theory of the psyche can help us understand human experience more fully - including the many integrated levels of our subjectivity which can be tapped into as well as the symptoms they might give rise to if such psychic systems become paralyzed in a particular area. At the core of subjectivity is an experience of fusion and original unity which evokes and perhaps precedes the biological event of being in the womb, and which can be evoked in religious and group-trance experiences of an “oceanic” type. Becoming “hung up” at this level can result in extremely isolated autism or in various types of narcissism.

Evolving out of this phase and building on it, human subjectivity develops its primary individuation from fusion through splitting, projection, introjection, and other pre-signifying object relations. With any human being, this level of subjectivity continues to oper-

ate and form the basis for cathexes with friends, partners, and loved ones as well as for judgments and values. What is termed a paranoid-schizoid phase or position by Klein only demonstrates the degree to which these immediate relations and connections - without the benefit of stable structures of distance and mediation which come from rituals, rules, language, and the symbolic - are experienced with feelings of fear and danger. Paranoia is often described as heightened awareness and indeed the consciousness of multiple connections which plunge one into oceanic unity accompanies reports of both schizophrenic and religious experience. Even at the physical level, those who take large amounts of stimulants to heighten awareness often suffer from "chemically-induced schizophrenia" (Snyder 1996). Psychological or physical traumas can induce a schizophrenic breakdown in those who were seemingly stable before, and subjectivity can become stuck at this level irreversibly.

The depressive position which resolves the primitive schizoid splitting of human subjectivity depends on integrating contradiction and embracing ambivalence. This may be the highest achievement of the human psyche, and it may be that few are able to resolve this ambivalence before entering into the symbolic realm of weaning. Lacking certain rites of passage to adulthood found in communities of the past, the individual of modernity has relied on identification and competition within the family to develop a "normal" or "neurotic" relation to others. But the breakdown of the nuclear family and other social institutions and the increase of communication through the growth of technology and the media has left the symbolic realm as an increasingly uncertain and chaotic experience which is currently in the process of fundamentally altering human subjectivity and its symptoms.

Freud's "neuroses" were somewhat stable character types, but the symptomatology of today reveals an increase in borderline states of derealization, depression, and delusion. Traditional therapeutic methods are increasingly abandoned as ineffectual in comparison to pharmacology. Yet the current state of the individual and collective psyche may be able to reveal the truly complex nature of human subjectivity poised vulnerably between order and chaos. If we free ourselves from outdated approaches to the psyche, we may be able to grasp the complexity of subjectivity and to develop new methods of teaching and healing which in a generative and preventive mode will decrease the need for ineffectual and

time-consuming methods of treating symptoms which are only the outward manifestation of a deeper imbalance.

4. Thinking and Feeling - Abstract Expressionism

The link between emotional and cognitive processes has not been adequately mapped out. Questions of desire, love, and affect are dealt with by psychoanalysts, but they usually steer clear of cognitive concerns. Those who study thought, cognition, and consciousness usually ignore the affective element of such functioning. The separations between emotional and cognitive realms is taken for granted, yet human subjectivity is a complex system in which no fine line can be drawn.

We could consider human subjectivity to be a form of abstract expressionism. All art and language is a re-presentation - an abstraction from immediate action or instinct. But abstraction can reach a level in which the element of desire or affect is no longer embodied. That does not mean that it is not there, and it is this emotional plague or unrecognized unconscious desire which accounts for much confusion in human relationships. Many psychotherapeutic approaches aim to bring to consciousness the unconscious affective or emotional forces which operate in determining human experience. They seek to integrate emotional and cognitive experience - desire and thought - in the way that abstract expressionist art seeks to integrate the immediate drive to act and to create with the abstract conceptual forms which will express, embody, and contain these drives.

Contemporary neuroscientists describe the relationship between emotion and cognition as the juxtaposition and linking of our of perceptual mapping of the world with the somatic states that accompany it. The satisfaction of need and drive which requires cognitive mapping, discrimination, and memory brings about somatic sensorial attraction and repulsion through pleasure and pain which are stored, linked, and recalled through further cognitive reorganization. This is the foundation of conditioned learning. Higher-level learning and consciousness - self-consciousness - in human beings is the result of the robust complexity of its ability to map and reorganize perception/action in the world.

Rather than concentrating on the neurological foundations of emotional-cognitive experience, psychoanalysts have focused on the affective and un-conscious aspects of our subjectivity which elude a purely objective rational approach to understanding the psyche. The ontogenetic development of the individual is interlinked with his social development in the world of meaning and signification. The subject moves through a journey in which he comes to translate or abstract his immediate experience through symbolization. Along this journey any number of aberrations can occur as a result of either differences in physical bodily processing or differences in the social construction of one's subjective experience of the world. Physical development is somewhat predetermined by genetic codes, but even this can be altered by physical and environmental conditions of ontogeny. And even given the optimum biological development, the differences in the social construction of the psyche are profound - especially across different cultures.

The primitive secondary proto-semiotic object relations of "mirroring" or "mimetic desire" create an intensely "expressionistic" form of subjectivity which in the contemporary society of rationally mediated behaviour is seen to be aberrant and may or may not cause suffering for the subject depending more on his social relations - the way he is perceived and received by others - than on any internal state. On the other hand, what is accepted as normal behavior in contemporary society through the development of "abstract" tertiary symbol-formation may mask a deeply dissatisfied psyche despite its ability to provide optimum functional survival, success, and even pleasure. An introduction into the symbolic world of others may offer only a false sense of community with no emotional intensity. The evocation of core levels of intensity found in the oceanic-autistic fusion state of amorous and religious rituals are as necessary as the abstract embodiments which we inhabit to function pragmatically. While most civilizations have provided rituals for the integration of emotional-cognitive experience, our society has become so dominated by rationality and abstraction that the emotional core only erupts in the form of murder, abuse, and oppression. Without understanding the larger picture of individual and collective subjectivities integrated within complex systems, clinical and cultural practice cannot hope to transform these processes.

5. The Social Psyche - Subject, Object, and Other

The distinction between subject and object in Lacanian psychoanalysis parallels the distinction between subject and substance in Hegelian philosophy as well as evoking the quantum self-reflexive approach to scientific measurement. The subject is a part of the substance, but in the process of substance removing itself from itself in order to become conscious of itself, it changes itself. The scientist who measures the world is a part of that world. To map the substance through science, language, or any form of “knowing” is to re-present it. Thinking or mapping homogeneous indivisible totality - or substance - carves it up and organizes it in a way which alters it. The act of thinking, knowing, and mapping is a perception/creation.

Both the Hegelian and the Lacanian notions of the subject are profoundly social in that they demonstrate the inseparability of subject, object, and other. Alfred Korzybski's (1921, 1933) rules of distinction between map and territory apply equally well to the Hegelian-Lacanian notion of the subject divided from the world and from himself. *The map is not the territory* indicates that the subject is not the substance. Substance is symbolized or expressed by the subject - which is why the subject is always determined by the Other. *The map is (some but) not all of the territory* expresses the fact that even though every map maps some of the territory, the map can never represent all of the territory. Every subject is a part of the substance, but there will always be some substance left over. This leftover is what drives the subject. Subjectivity is radically social. Even if the subject can free himself from having his subjectivity constructed by the Other of truth, morality, or abstraction - he will never free himself from being determined by the other of desire. Finally, *the map is self-reflexive* indicates that the mapmaker is included in the map he is making, and thus there will always be a vanishing point or blind spot which cannot be mapped. Similarly the subject will always contain a blind-spot or “unconscious” which cannot be seen by himself - only by another.

Lacan maps out the social construction of the subject by describing how the symbolic social world comes to construct the way in which the subject will experience the world

from the beginning. But Lacan goes even further by considering the recognition of this self-reflexive blind spot to be the true nature of the subject. For even when we have freed ourselves from the fundamental construction of our subjectivity by the Other, there remains the fact that our subjectivity is essentially divided, unfulfilled, and unconscious by virtue of the self-reflexive blind spot which only the other can see for us. We need one another. This is the radically social and and radically psychoanalytic nature of human experience.

Psychoanalysis does not concern itself with cure. To analyze is to untie the knots of an autopoietic organism - to listen to that which determines subjectivity. For the analyst, the symptom - and the demand for a cure - contains a message which the desire to cure would eradicate. Freud built the psychoanalytic approach around the fact that the treatment of the symptom would simply convert it into another symptom - the core process would remain out of balance and unconscious. The process of analysis - like various pedagogical and mystical practices - is a journey of transformation toward consciousness of unconscious processes. It gives the subject the pragmatic tools to organize his own psyche and to enjoy his symptoms. The transformative practice of analysis is an art and science of life in which the construction and expression of subjectivities serve as an ongoing ecology of mind which is in itself a generative and preventive therapy. Pathology is no longer judged as lack with respect to a norm - rather difference is celebrated. Desire no longer revolves around lack but becomes desiring production - the active creation of ways of experiencing life - of subjectivities. This is not to say that the request to relieve suffering is ignored. On the contrary, to simply treat a symptom from a predetermined diagnostic category would be to ignore the call from the other which is the subject. Instead this call initiates a pragmatic process of transformation within a general economy of subjectivity composed of biological, social, symbolic, and noetic matrices.

Drawing on the techniques of a variety of analytic practices, we can develop a complex ecosophical approach to analysis in which the questions of desire, *jouissance*, and sovereignty are confronted by the structural coupling of autopoietic systems. Within a transformative practice of analysis, the reconstruction of subjectivity finally leads to the consciousness of this construction by the Other which has been determining subjectivity all

along. A full transformative practice consists of several integrated components:

1. The engagement of desire, cathexis, and communication in the transference
2. The dialectical, dialogical, and narrative process of consciousness.
3. The containing-holding environment of transference and community.
4. The interventions of deconstruction, reframing, and transcontextualization.

All therapeutic and pedagogical practices actively engage in some form of containing and/or intervention, but few consciously integrate elements of both. However, while all such practices serve to transform the psyche in some way, only a full process of consciousness unfolding over time can endow the subject with the ability to practice his own analysis. The elucidation of psychoanalysis as such a total transformative practice in line with ancient techniques of consciousness and the sacred was the essence of Lacan's project. Bion, Winnicott, and Laing introduced and elucidated the full nature of the holding environment through the care of the practitioner within the collective psychotherapeutic community as an alternative to unwanted treatment. Finally, the recent approach of cybernetic and systems therapists has added a series of interventions and techniques which move beyond traditionally stagnant models of therapy and confront the unconscious assumptions implicit in all transformative practices and within therapists themselves.

The process of transformative pragmatics sets up a multi-dimensional field or grid by which the intersubjective event of intimate dialogical therapy takes place within a complex web of past, present, and future. In this dynamic process, the analyst is a guide within a field of multiple subjectivities balanced tenuously between order and chaos. Interventions are employed to break down stagnant routines and rigidities and to return them to the state of fluid processes, while holding environments act as a sanctuary or shelter within which to engage with such chaos and reorganize new subjectivities.

We never escape from our symptoms - we only transform them and/or embrace them. At the core of our existence is the arbitrary assent upon which all actions, justifications, and symptoms are based: "style is the man." The ethical and symbolic elements of our life are based on the the aesthetic element of jouissance. The only true ethic is to act in accordance with this sovereign jouissance in full recognition of its implications with and for others. The recognition of consciousness which allows the embracing and enacting of desire requires the passage through a void of chaos in which all truths, morals, and forms which serve to embody drives and maintain order and stability are dissolved. In Rudolph Steiner's (1911) language, only a passage through the Luciferian realm of ecstasy will lead one out of the neurotic control and repression of the Ahrimanian and into the harmonics of Christ-consciousness through metanoia. In order to pass from breakdown to breakthrough and to transform schizophrenic disintegration into the reorganization of multiple subjectivities of limited finitude, the subject must forgo the neurotic symptoms which provide relative stability and must seize the courage to confront the schizoid core of primal splitting as well as the depressive horizon of the real in which the ambivalence of life and death marks the limits of human experience.

6. Wild Analysis - The Clinic of Everyday Life

Freud's new practice of psychoanalysis was invented outside of institutional dogma and fueled by a coterie of devoted explorers whom he initiated informally - sometimes in a matter of a few visits. The dogmatic institutionalization of psychoanalysis has betrayed the open exploration of a truly human science as well as the pragmatics of singular clinical events. Innovations which are at first radically rejected eventually become the very rigid norms which rejected such difference in the first place. Lacan's attempt at experimentation within analysis was met with his excommunication. Through the formation of his own school, he extended analysis beyond the scope of a closed circle. He engaged poets, artists, philosophers, and scientists and extended the boundaries of analysis and its transmission into the culture at large.

Meanwhile the post-war decades saw the initiation of increasing numbers of experimen-

tal therapeutic communities both inside and outside official institutional frameworks. “Antipsychiatric” approaches spread through Europe and America, and teaching and healing practices from other civilizations were integrated with modern techniques. While these movements have primarily been abandoned in favor of increasingly rational and efficient methods of symptom treatment - most often through chemicals - there exist more possibilities than ever before for the integration of biological, social, and spiritual elements of mind and body in the understanding, healing, and sacred transformation of the psyche.

“Wild analysis” originally referred to the practice of analysis outside of conventional boundaries - whether it was a case of unwanted application or of open speculation. But to engage in analysis outside of the consulting room is to take the fruits of its lessons and integrate them into the ecology of everyday life. Guattari’s analytic practices in the experimental La Borde clinic included creative, dramatic, political, and material processes and an analytic approach to multiple fields of subjectivity which exist and insist themselves at every moment. His own political and ecological activism extended the analytic enterprise into the cultural, social, and functional subjectivities which are as much a part of the psyche as individual forms.

Grasping the nature of the psyche in emotional-cognitive processing, object relations, projection, introjection, jouissance, splitting, symmetrizing, translating, containing, and other elements of chaosmic dynamism can lead one to approach life in new ways. The rituals and relations of everyday life surround our every move. What is the purpose of transformative practices if not to reinvigorate the lived situation and to reinvent new subjective experiences of the sacred by any means possible? Human life is not a process solely determined by survival. Life is made up of desire and meaning and the shared experience of its communication. The collective communion of a life of meaning within consciousness depends on the transformation of the psyche from within the deepest levels of the individual, just as the possibility of individual and momentary sovereignty depends on the transformation of collective, social, and institutional embodiments of subjectivity.

Baudrillard's challenge to subjectivity is that psychoanalysis itself has already passed into the cultural psyche. We have already passed the time when the psychoanalytic event with its foundations in the separation between real, imaginary, and symbolic can affect us. There is no real, for the apparent world of the imaginary-symbolic - of virtual reality - has taken over. Baudrillard calls this a return to the primitive form of the sacred - seduction without the delusion of truth. But a part of the seductive nature of any form is its truth - the truth of faith and belief that the one who is seduced experiences.

The return to primitive forms of seduction is not a regression, but Bataille's "animal night" - the point at which absolute rational thought becomes what it always sought - the return to immanence of the animal in the world like water in water - yet with lucid self-consciousness intact. The practice of "apathy" in Sade is the absolute "objectivity" of the one who places himself at the level of the movement of matter and energy - organic and inorganic - organizing, individuating, transforming, adapting, evolving, dissolving. By this method, the Spinozist sage captures empathic understanding of the complex ecologies of the universe - a practice which is ultimately futile unless the limits of this objectivity in the subjectivity of singular concrescence are recognized. Sade seeks to free the energy of drive itself - before or beyond desire - as it plays through him, but this too is a futile goal in that the real is always organized into matter and its expression through forms which include the imaginary realm of the human psyche. But as Bataille and Blanchot have pointed out, it is only Sade's plunge into pure *jouissance* which shows us the impasse of unconscious blockage and leads the way to the objective consciousness of the movement of matter, energy, and form throughout the universe.

This chaosmosis which describes the interplay of the real and the apparent is ineradicable. The real has not disappeared, but we have reached a state in which human subjectivity is split between the real and the virtual in a dual fashion - and where the virtual dominates. The imaginary may be perceived as the realm of the sacred in which the inner experience of affect and concept deepens the subjectivity of humanity in relation to the real. The virtual is not the triumph of the imaginary, but the denial of both imaginary and real in favor of a "spectacle" of hypnotic forms which only obliterates self-reflection and puts us to sleep rather than increasing subjective-objective consciousness of each event-

conrescence within a complex ecology.

The symbolic faith or social contract which maintains order among the primal embodiments of sovereign subjectivities reaches an impasse before it is plunged into chaos. We seek a final realm beyond indexical, iconic, and symbolic which maintains lucid consciousness and yet approaches the chaomic flow of the psyche. This would be the realm of the trace. Beyond index, icon, and symbol, lies the trace - the form which contains its own dissolution. The poetics of the trace constructs a semiotics which immolates itself leaving the ashes of memory free to be reconstructed again and again in the refrain. Free from the prison of exact repetition, we create and recreate within a tradition. Each manifestation will be different - and yet the same. This is Nietzsche's eternal recurrence in which faith and the will to live are not undercut by the lies of truth but enacted through the truth of lies. Our energy to live is enacted in the faith of each moment free to be and to become in an endless process where the perception/creation/manifestation of each moment of individual and collective subjectivity is sovereign.

Mysticism - inner experience - the sacred - was for Bataille the end of life which the means served to make possible. For Bataille and Lacan the *jouissance* which already determines our beliefs, words, and actions was but an impoverished mysticism unless it could become consciously and fully embraced. We can - with Bataille - claim that each subjectivity is capable of experiencing the state of the mystic when *jouissance* reigns free of the calculating mind which fears death and denies immanence. There is in fact no other end than the dissolution of thought in the sovereignty of the lived moment. A restricted economy of survival, rationality, and efficiency eradicates such sovereign experience. A general economy recognizes the interplay between productive survival and the expenditure of excess. If this general economy is not acknowledged it will operate anyway leaving physical, social, and psychic symptoms which are misconstrued and treated as if they had come from outside. Without returning to the myths and rituals of the past, we can seek a communication of sovereignty within a consciousness of general economy - a communion and a community bound by mutual recognition and shared sovereignty - an inner experience in which what is sacrificed is the very calculating conscious mind which submits subjectivity to strategy and production. The experience of the chaomic

psyche which is lived to the fullest in the mystic and which awaits each one who seizes the moment of sovereign subjectivity is that of living desire at the limits of thought.

References

- Abraham, F. (1995). *Chaos Theory in Psychology*. CT: Greenwood.
- Abraham, N. and Torok, M. (1976). *The Wolf-Man's Magic Word*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1986.
- Abraham, N. (1985). *Rhythms*. Stanford: Stanford University, 1995.
- Abraham, N. (1987). *The Shell and the Kernel*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1994.
- Abraham, R. (1994). *Chaos, Gaia, Eros*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Alliez, E. (1995). *Capital Times*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Andersen, T. (1991). *The Reflecting Team*. New York: Norton.
- Anzieu, D. (1989). *The Ego-Skin*. New Haven, CT: Yale University.
- Assagioli, R. (1965). *Psychosynthesis*. New York: Penguin.
- Bailey, A. (1936-42). *Esoteric Psychology*. New York: Lucis.
- Bailey, A. (1953). *Esoteric Healing*. New York: Lucis.
- Balint, M. (1968). *The Basic Fault*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University.
- Bandler, R. (1993). *Time for a Change*. Capitola, CA: Meta.
- Bandler, R. & Grinder, J. (1982). *Reframing*. Moab, UT: Real People.
- Bataille, G. (1945). *On Nietzsche*. New York: Paragon House, 1992.
- Bataille, G. (1954). *Inner Experience*. Albany, NY: SUNY, 1988.
- Bataille, G. (1961). *Guilty*. Venice, CA: Lapis, 1988.
- Bataille, G. (1962). *The Impossible*. San Francisco: City Lights, 1991.
- Bataille, G. (1967). *The Accursed Share I*. New York: Zone, 1988.
- Bataille, G. (1973). *Theory of Religion*. New York: Zone, 1989.
- Bataille, G. (1976). *The Accursed Share II & III*. New York: Zone, 1991.
- Bataille, G. (1986). *Visions of Excess*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Bataille, G. (1956). *Madame Edwarda*. in *My Mother/Madame Edwarda/The Dead Man*. London: Marion Boyars, 1989.
- Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. New York: Ballantine.
- Bateson, G. (1979). *Mind and Nature: A Necessary Unity*. New York: Bantam.
- Baudrillard, J. (1976). *Symbolic Exchange and Death*. London: Sage, 1993.
- Baudrillard, J. (1979). *Seduction*. Montreal: New World, 1990.
- Baudrillard, J. (1983). *Fatal Strategies*. New York: Semiotexte, 1990.
- Baudrillard, J. (1987). *The Ecstasy of Communication*. New York: Semiotexte, 1988.
- Bergson, H. (1896). *Matter and Memory*. New York: Zone, 1991.

- Bergson, H. (1907). *Creative Evolution*. New York: Macmillan, 1944.
- Bergson, H. (1932). *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion*. Notre Dame: Notre Dame University, 1935.
- Bion, W. (1970). *Attention and Interpretation* in W. Bion *Seven Servants*. New York: Jason Aronson.
- Bion, W. (1977). *Two Papers*. London: Karnac.
- Bion, W. (1990). *A Memoir of the Future*. London: Karnac.
- Bion, W. (1994). *Clinical Seminars and Other Works*. London: Karnac.
- Blanchot, M. (1941). *Thomas the Obscure*. Barrytown, NY: Station Hill, 1988.
- Blanchot, M. (1969). *The Infinite Conversation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1993.
- Bollas, C. (1987). *The Shadow of the Object*. New York: Columbia University.
- Bohm, D. (1980). *Wholeness and the Implicate Order*. London: Routledge.
- Bohm, D. & Hiley, B. (1993). *The Undivided Universe*. New York: Routledge.
- Borch-Jacobsen, M. (1982). *The Freudian Subject*. Stanford: Stanford University, 1988.
- Borch-Jacobsen, M. (1991). *Lacan: The Absolute Master*. Stanford: Stanford University.
- Boscolo, L. and Bertrando, P. (1993). *The Times of Time*. New York: Norton.
- Brown, P. (1991). *The Hypnotic Brain*. New Haven, CT: Yale University.
- Burroughs, W. (1984). *The Burroughs File*. San Francisco: City Lights.
- Calvin, W. (1996). *Mosaics of the Mind*. Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Castaneda, C. (1987). *The Power of Silence*. New York: Pocket Books.
- Cecchin, G. et al (1992). *Irreverence*. London: Karnac.
- Chertok, L. & Stengers, I. (1989). *A Critique of Psychoanalytic Reason*. Stanford: Stanford University, 1992.
- Clastres, P. (1974). *Society Against the State*. New York: Zone, 1987.
- Clastres, P. (1980). *The Archeology of Violence*. New York: Semiotexte, 1994.
- Cioran, E. (1990). *A Short History of Decay*. London: Quartet.
- Cioran, E. (1981). *The Trouble with Being Born*. New York: Seaver.
- Cohen, L. (1966). *Beautiful Losers*. Montreal: McClelland & Stewart.
- Cooper, D. (1974). *The Grammar of Living*. London: Penguin.
- Cooper, D. (1978). *The Language of Madness*. London: Penguin.
- Damasio, A. (1994). *Descartes's Error*. New York: Avon.
- Debord, G. (1967). *Society of the Spectacle*. New York: MIT.
- Debord, G. (1988). *Comments on the Society of the Spectacle*. London: Verso.
- Deleuze, G. (1983). *Cinema I: The Movement-Image*. Minneapolis: University of

Minnesota.

Deleuze, G. (1984). *Cinema II: The Time-Image*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1972). *Anti-Oedipus*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1983.

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1980). *A Thousand Plateaus*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1987.

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1992). *What Is Philosophy?* Chicago: University of Chicago, 1994.

Derrida, J. (1967). *Of Grammatology*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Derrida, J. (1973). *Disseminations*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.

Derrida, J. (1980). *The Post Card*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1987.

Derrida, J. (1976) *Fors*. in N. Abraham. *The Wolfman's Magic Word*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, 1986.

Derrida, J (1992). *The Mystical Foundations of the Law*. in D. Cornell. *Deconstruction and the Possibility of Justice*. New York: Routledge.

Dumezil, G. (1940). *Mitra-Varuna*. Cambridge, MA: MIT.

Duras, M. (1964). *The Ravishment of Lol V Stein*. New York: Pantheon, 1966.

Duras, M. (1969). *Destroy She Said*. New York: Grove, 1970.

Duras, M. (1982). *The Malady of Death*. New York: Grove, 1986.

Duras, M. (1991). *The North China Lover*. New York: New Press, 1992.

Eccles, J. (1993). *How the Self Controls Its Brain*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Edelman, G. (1992). *Bright Air, Brilliant Fire*. New York: Basic Books.

Eigen, M. (1987). *Steps Towards Life*. New York: Oxford, 1992.

Eigen, M. and Winkler, R. (1965). *Laws of the Game*. New York: Knopf, 1971.

Elkaim, M. (1990). *If You Love Me, Don't Love Me*. New York: Basic Books.

Erickson, M. (1980). *The Collected Papers*. New York: Irvington.

Erickson, M. & Rossi, E. (1981) *Hypnotherapy*. New York: Irvington.

Foucault, M. (1961). *Madness and Civilization*. New York: Vintage, 1973.

Foucault, M. (1969). *The Archeology of Knowledge*. New York: Vintage, 1972.

Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and Punish*. New York: Vintage, 1977.

Foucault, M. (1976). *The History of Sexuality*. New York: Vintage, 1978.

Freud, S. (1900). *The Interpretation of Dreams*. New York: Avon.

Freud, S. (1920). *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*. New York: Norton.

Freud, S. (1930). *Civilization and Its Discontents*. New York: Norton.

Freud, S. (1938). *An Outline of Psychoanalysis*. New York: Norton.

- Gell-Mann, M. (1994). *The Quark and the Jaguar*. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Gerber, R. (1996). *Vibrational Medicine*. Santa Fe, NM: Bear & Co.
- Girard, R. (1978). *Things Hidden Since the Foundation of the World*. Stanford: Stanford University, 1987.
- Godel, K. (1931). *On Formally Undecidable Propositions*. NY: Basic Books, 1962.
- Goodwin, B. (1994). *How the Leopard Changed Its Spots*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Grinder, J. & Bandler, R. (1981). *Trance-Formations*. Moab, UT: Real People.
- Grinder, J. & DeLozier, J. (1987). *Turtles All the Way Down*. Scotts Valley, CA: Grinder & Associates.
- Grof, S. (1975). *Realms of the Human Unconscious*. New York: Viking.
- Grof, S. (1980). *LSD Psychotherapy*. Pomona, CA: Hunter House.
- Grof, S. (1985). *Beyond the Brain*. Albany, NY: SUNY.
- Grof, S. (1988). *The Adventure of Self-Discovery*. Albany, NY: SUNY.
- Guattari, F. (1992). *Chaosmosis*. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1995.
- Hameroff, S. (1987). *Ultimate Computing*. Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Hameroff, S. & Penrose, R. (1996). *Conscious Events as Orchestrated Space-Time Selections in Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 3.1, p. 36-53.
- Harth, E. (1993). *The Creative Loop*. New York: Addison-Wesley.
- Hegel, G W F (1807). *Phenomenology of Spirit*. New York: Oxford University.
- Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and Time*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Heidegger, M. (1971). *What Is Called Thinking?* New York: Harper & Row.
- Jacob, F. (1982). *The Possible and the Actual*. New York: Pantheon.
- James, W. (1890). *Principles of Psychology*. New York: Dover.
- Jung, C. (1954). *The Psychology of the Transference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.
- Jung, C. (1956). *Mysterium Coniunctionis*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.
- Kauffman, S. (1992). *Origins of Order*. New York: Oxford.
- Kauffman, S. (1995). *At Home in the Universe*. New York: Oxford.
- Khan, M. (1983). *Hidden Selves*. New York: International Universities.
- Khan, M. (1989). *The Long Wait*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Klein, M. (1932). *The Psychoanalysis of Children*. London: Virago.
- Klein, M. (1961). *Narrative of a Child Analysis*. London: Virago.
- Klossowski, P. (1967). *Sade My Neighbor*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University, 1991.
- Klossowski, P. (1969). *Nietzsche and the Vicious Circle*. Chicago: University of Chicago,

- 1997.
- Korzybski, A. (1921). *Manhood of Humanity*. Englewood, NJ: Institute of General Semantics.
- Korzybski, A. (1933). *Science and Sanity*. Englewood, NJ: Institute of General Semantics.
- Kristeva, J. (1987). *Black Sun*. New York: Columbia, 1989.
- Kristeva, J. (1993). *New Maladies of the Soul*. New York: Columbia, 1995.
- Lacan, J. (1956). "The Function and Field of Speech and Language in Psychoanalysis." in *Ecrits*, New York: Norton, 1977.
- Lacan, J. (1966). *Ecrits*. New York: Norton, 1977.
- Lacan, J. (1973). *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*. New York: Norton, 1977.
- Lacan, J. (1974). *Televison*. New York: Norton, 1987.
- Lacan, J. (1982). *Feminine Sexuality*. New York: Norton.
- Laing, R. D. (1967). *The Politics of Experience*. New York: Pantheon.
- Laing, R. D. (1982). *The Voice of Experience*. New York: Pantheon.
- Langs, R. (1992). *Science, Systems, and Psychoanalysis*. London: Karnac.
- Langs, R. (1993). *Empowered Psychotherapy*. London: Karnac.
- Langs, R. (1995). *Clinical Practice and the Architecture of the Mind*. London: Karnac.
- Langs, R. (1996). *The Evolution of the Emotion-Processing Mind*. London: Karnac.
- Langs, R. et al. (1996). *The Cosmic Circle*. Brooklyn, NY: Alliance.
- Laplanche, J. (1987). *New Foundations for Psychoanalysis*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1989.
- Laplanche, J. (1992). *Seduction, Translation, Drives*. London: ICA.
- LeDoux, J. (1996). *The Emotional Brain*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- LeFort, C. (1986). *Political Forms of Modern Society*. London: Polity.
- Levi-Strauss, C. (1962). *The Savage Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Levinas, E. (1961). *Totality and Infinity*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University, 1969.
- Levinas, E. (1968). *Nine Talmudic Readings*. Indianapolis: University of Indiana, 1990.
- Lilly, J. (1967). *Programming and Metaprogramming in the Human Biocomputer*. New York: Julian.
- Lilly, J. (1972). *The Center of the Cyclone*. New York: Julian.
- Liotard, J.-F. (1974). *Libidinal Economy*. London: Athlone, 1993.
- Liotard, J.-F. (1979). *The Postmodern Condition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1984.
- Liotard, J.-F. (1983). *The Differend*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1988.

- Masson, J. (1992). *The Assault on Truth..* New York: Harper & Row.
- Matte-Blanco, I. (1975). *The Unconscious as Infinite Sets*. London: Duckworth.
- Matte-Blanco, I (1988). *Thinking, Feeling, and Being*. London: Routledge.
- Maturana, H. and Varela (1987). *The Tree of Knowledge*. Boston: Shambhala.
- McKenna, T. and McKenna, D. (1993). *Invisible Landscape*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Meltzer, D. (1986). *Studies in Extended Metapsychology*. Strath Tay: Clunie.
- Meltzer, D. (1988). *The Apprehension of Beauty*. Strath Tay: Clunie.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1945). *The Phenomenology of Perception*. London: Routledge, 1962.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1964). *The Visible and the Invisible*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University, 1969.
- Milner, M. (1969). *The Hands of the Living God*. New York: International Universities.
- Milner, M. (1988). *The Suppressed Madness of Sane Men*. London: Routledge.
- Monod, J. (1972). *Chance and Necessity*. New York: Knopf.
- Muller, J. (1996). *Beyond the Psychoanalytic Dyad*. London: Routledge.
- Nicolis, G. & Prigogine, I. (1989). *Exploring Complexity*. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Nietzsche, F. (1885). *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. New York: Viking.
- Nietzsche, F. (1886). *Beyond Good and Evil*. New York: Vintage.
- Nietzsche, F. (1887). *On the Genealogy of Morals*. New York: Vintage.
- Nietzsche, F. (1968). *The Will to Power*. New York: Vintage.
- Ott, J. (1993). *Pharmacotheon*. Kennewick, WA: Natural Products.
- Ott, J. (1994). *Ayahuasca Analogues*. Kennewick, WA: Natural Products.
- Penrose, R. (1994). *Shadows of the Mind*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Perls, F. et al. (1951). *Gestalt Therapy*. London: Souvenir.
- Peirce, C. S. (1903). *Harvard Lectures on Pragmatism*. In *The Essential Peirce*. Indianapolis: Indiana University, 1998.
- Piaget, J. (1974). *Adaptation and Intelligence*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1980.
- Piaget, J. (1981-83). *Possibility and Necessity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1987.
- Pribram, K. (1971). *Languages of the Brain*. Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Pribram, K. (1991). *Brain and Perception*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Prigogine, I. (1980). *From Being to Becoming*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman.
- Prigogine, I. and Stengers, I. (1984). *Order out of Chaos*. New York: Bantam.
- Pynchon, T. (1966). *The Crying of Lot 49*. NY: Bantam.
- Pynchon, T. (1973). *Gravity's Rainbow*. NY: Viking.
- Reich, W. (1949). *Character Analysis*. New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux.

- Reich, W. (1951). *Cosmic Superimposition - Ether, God, and Devil*. New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux.
- Rossi, E. & Cheek, D. (1988). *Mind-Body Therapy*. New York: Norton.
- Rossi, E. (1993). *The Psychobiology of Mind-Body Healing*. New York: Norton.
- Roustang, F. (1980). *Psychoanalysis Never Lets Go*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1983.
- Sade, D. A. F. De (1791-95). *Justine, Philosophy in the Bedroom.....* New York: Grove, 1965.
- Scott, A. (1995). *Stairway to the Mind*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Sebeok, T. (1981). *The Play of Musement*. Indianapolis: University of Indiana.
- Seem, M. (1988). *Bodymind Energetics*. San Francisco: Thorsons.
- Shulgin, A. & Shulgin, A. (1991). *PIHKAL: A Chemical Love Story*. Berkeley: Transform.
- Shulgin, A. & Shulgin, A. (1997). *TIHKAL: The Continuation*. Berkeley: Transform.
- Sheldrake, R. (1988). *Presence of the Past*. Rochester, VT: Park Street.
- Simon, F. (1996). *My Psychosis, My Bicycle, and I*. Northvale, NJ: Aronson.
- Silver, A. (1981). *A Psychosemiotic Model*. in J. Grotstein *Do I Dare Disturb the Universe*. London: Karnac.
- Snyder, S. (1996). *Drugs and the Brain*. New York: Scientific American.
- Spinoza, B. (1670). *A Theological-Political Treatise*. New York: Dover.
- Spinoza, B. (1675). *The Ethics*. New York: Dover.
- Stapp, H. (1995). *Mind, Matter, and Quantum Mechanics*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Steiner, R. (1911). *Occult Science*. London: Rudolf Steiner Press.
- Steiner, R. (1920). *Spiritual Science and Medicine*. Blauvelt, NY: Steinerbooks.
- Steiner, R. (1925). *Fundamentals of Therapy*. London: Rudolf Steiner Press.
- Stern, D. (1985). *The Interpersonal World of the Infant*. New York: Basic Books.
- Suzuki, D. (1949-53). *Essays in Zen Buddhism*. London: Rider.
- Tansley, M. et al. (1977). *Dimensions of Radionics*. Santa Fe, NM: Brotherhood of Life.
- Tart, C. (1975). *States of Consciousness*. New York: Dutton.
- Thom, R. (1975). *Structural Stability and Morphogenesis*. Reading, MA: Benjamin.
- Varela, F. et al (1991). *The Embodied Mind*. New York: MIT.
- Virilio, P. (1977). *Speed and Politics*. New York: Semiotexte, 1986.
- Virilio, P. (1980). *The Aesthetics of Disappearance*. New York: Semiotexte, 1991.
- Virilio, P. (1991). *The Lost Dimension*. New York: Semiotexte.
- Virilio, P. (1993). *The Art of the Motor*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1995.
- Vithoulkas, G. (1980). *The Science of Homoeopathy*. London: Thorsons.

- Vithoulkas, G. (1991). *A New Model for Health and Disease*. Berkeley: North Atlantic.
- Von Foerster, H. (1982). *Observing Systems*. Seaside, CA: Intersystems.
- Von Glaserfeld, E. (1987). *Construction of Knowledge*. Seaside, CA: Intersystems.
- Watzlawick, P. et al. (1967). *The Pragmatics of Human Communication*. New York: Norton.
- Watzlawick, P. et al. (1974). *Change*. New York: Norton.
- Whitehead, A. N. (1967). *Science in the Modern World*. New York: Free Press.
- Whitehead, A. N. (1969). *Process and Reality*. New York: Free Press.
- Whitmont, E. (1980). *Psyche and Substance*. Berkeley, CA: North Atlantic.
- Wilden, A. (1986). *The Rules Are No Game*. New York: Routledge.
- Wilden, A. (1987). *Man and Woman, War and Peace*. New York: Routledge.
- Winnicott, D. (1965). *The Maturation Process and the Facilitating Environment*. Madison, CT: International Universities.
- Winnicott, D. (1971). *Playing and Reality*. London: Routledge.
- Zizek, S. (1989). *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. London: Verso.
- Zizek, S. (1991). *For They Know Not What They Do*. London: Verso.
- Zizek, S. (1992). *Looking Awry*. New York: MIT.
- Zizek, S. (1992). *Enjoy Your Symptom*. London: Routledge.
- Zizek, S. (1993). *Tarrying with the Negative*. Durham: Duke University.