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# **Introduction**

## The Context of the turn and the Debate

In the last ten years, many texts have been released about the Philosophy of Gilles Deleuze. Most of these texts explicate Deleuze’s work in multi-cultural and interdisciplinary frameworks. The recent trend has been to elaborate how these concrete concepts interact in the world. This has been a successful endeavour in various fields belonging to the Humanities. The academic enterprise, in theory, has given Deleuze studies a more prominent role in the world of cultural and critical theory. It is now possible to attach Deleuze’s work to theories of cinema, philosophy, post-colonialism, artwork, and literature and gender studies. However, there has also been a backlash against Deleuze’s work. For example, Alain Badiou released ‘Deleuze and the Clamour of Being’ in 1997, which criticized Deleuze’s philosophy for being too tied to the abstract. According to Badiou, Deleuze’s philosophy is centered on the ascetic thinker. Badiou was extremely frustrated with the idea that Deleuze had replaced the logic of truth with that of sense. In essence, the real job of sense and non-sense was to give birth to multi-faceted events. Badiou makes three essential claims about Deleuze’s philosophy I) it is organized around a metaphysics of the one, II) it contains the dispossession of the subject; III) it requires a creative ascetic exercise. These claims have been virtually ignored by the academic community, even though Badiou was starting to make a name in French post-modern thought. It wasn’t until Peter Hallward’s text *‘Out of this World’* in 2006 that things finally got stirred up. Badiou’s text only surveys Deleuze’s solitary work; it excludes his co-authored works with Felix Guattari whereas Hallward’s critique contains all of Deleuze’s oeuvre.

Badiou’s initial critique of Deleuze lies more on the grounds of interpreting Deleuzian Metaphysics. Hallward’s maintains a radical thesis, that initially Deleuze holds onto a mediaeval and theological project, which cuts off all relations with the world and asks its material subjects to get rid of their human essence. Overall, Hallward holds onto the notion that Deleuze’s philosophy is dangerous and that it distracts all actual creatures from their world: It culminates in a philosophy of indifference. Hallward states, “Those of us who seek to change the world and to empower its inhabitants will need to look elsewhere for it is not found in Deleuze” *(*Hallward Out of this World 186*).* Although the academic community did not respond well to Hallward’s critiques, there were few critical responses to Hallward’s text. Initially, only a handful of critics responded. However, the debate does not start here. The fundamental attack on Deleuze was that Deleuzian politics was meaningless, singular and has no effect on the world. The recent trend in Deleuze studies is to compare Deleuze’s philosophy to theology. Therefore, the debate that starts with Hallward is perpetuated by most people working in favour of Deleuze, who limit their studies of his work to its theological dimension.

Deleuzians have not adequately answered Hallward’s challenge. Instead, they have ignored his claims and proceeded to use theological apparatuses to explain his concepts. Works such as, ‘*Deleuze and the Secretion of Atheism’*, *‘The Hermetic Deleuze’*, ‘*Deleuze and Theology*’ are now the most used secondary literature on the French philosopher. This gesture not only accepts Hallward’s thesis indirectly, it cuts off creativity in a field open to interdisciplinarity. The new literature has been fragmented; it is no longer diverse, but is restricted to solve one function, the theological. While there are still some works being written on Deleuzian politics, it has been virtually abandoned. Our present mission is to explicate Hallward’s position and subsequently defend Deleuze’s philosophy from Hallward’s critique. In addition to defending Deleuzian politics, the target of this critique is aimed at Hallward’s logic, which inaccurately interprets the relationship between the virtual and the actual. Hallward misappropriates the real context of what creation is to Deleuze and above all, makes a category mistake between the definitions of immanence and eminence.

# **Chapter 1 - An Introduction to Hallward’s Deleuze**

## Evacuation, Subtraction and the Singular Subject of Deleuze

The singular subject, according to Hallward’s Deleuze, is defined by its own power to eliminate its specific limits, both internal and external. Deleuze’s subject must evacuate itself from all forms of identity and thus escape all formal relations with the material world (Hallward, Gilles Deleuze and the World without Others 535). This process is called *‘becoming-other’*; and it involves dissolving oneself. Beneath the fractured ‘I’ there is nothing but a field of depth, an internal dynamic activity that escapes the material self. Thus, by dissolving the self, one can achieve the exact point of pure virtual creating and free this dynamic activity from isolation. This *‘becoming-other’* essentially means one is no longer their self. In essence, one becomes a plurality of selves, or singularities, called ‘larval selves’ (Hallward, World without Others 535). In this sense, the subject is truly another. Therefore, the singular subject, according to Hallward’s Deleuze, must become *impersonal*, *anonymous*, *unconscious*, and *inorganic*, in order for it to be suitable for the creating that must flow through it.

According to Hallward, there are three ways of *‘becoming-other’* and dismantling and evacuating the subject. The subject must be smoothed out, as opposed to being a subject imposed by striation. This involves the de-stratified subject, pealing the layers back off of what makes it a human. An example of this stripping down, for Hallward is Deleuze and Guattari’s use of the Body-Without-Organs: “The BWO is the virtual, unformed body-potential that sustains any actual body. It is a body as an event, a body that can become anybody. It is a body subtracted from any bodily shape or norm, and any organic species” (Hallward, Out of this World 34). Hallward claims that “as a virtual intensity, the BWO has nothing to do with space or place and everything to do with pure potential or becoming (Hallward, Out of this World 98). What the quotation identifies is this a-subjective entity that Deleuze privileges over the specific self through the process of *‘*becoming-other’ordisappearing.

Becoming anonymous entails the impersonal coherence of the singular subject. This amounts to abandoning the material subject and according to Hallward, Deleuze calls on a form of transcendence which removes the subject from its essential syntactical link with the world (Hallward, World without Others 531). This becoming involves an impersonal event or individual which passes through all other individuals and extracts a unique event, like a wound or a death (Robinson Crusoe and the de-populated island that passes through him or Riderhood’s death that gives birth to a singular and impersonal pure event [near death experience]) (Hallward, Out of this Word 25). In this sense, philosophy merges with ontology, but ontology is already a part of the univocity of being.

Becoming-unconscious, is due to the fact that Deleuze sees consciousness as a fundamental error. Deleuze is striving for a kind of science of what can be known as the unconscious. This task involves the singular subject forgetting its own self and thus, over-come the bounds of its own nature. Hallward sees this move as typical: - our consciousness gives us awareness of our material reality. Yet, to become unconscious means we are no longer limited to all oppositions posed to us by the propositions of consciousness. We must essentially produce movements that become one and immediate and blur the distinct relations between man and nature (Hallward, World without Others 533).

Becoming-inorganicblurs all relations, and creates immediacy, between man and nature. This involves a body that is vibrant and alive without organs. The organic self must dissolve and purge itself of all materiality, into a pre-organic state called ‘larval selves’, which are always underneath. This threefold movement, for Hallward, celebrates the death and evacuation of the positioned person. Death, according to Deleuze, frees the individual from both the form of an ‘I’ and a ‘self’ in which both positions are imprisoned in the material world. Hallward argues that Deleuze’s philosophy is a philosophy of difference only within the singular, which only becomes active and dynamic through its own extinction. The singular privileges processes of self-differing over forms of specific being that are understood as co-differing (Hallward, World without Others 533).

Singular difference applies only to **I)** what differs, **II)** equates differing and different, and **III)** makes difference the very form of immediacy, a pure time in-itself that is immanent to itself. This Radical immanence is conceived as only one entity. Radical singular difference is self-constituting and is known as a sovereign force. Its coherence obtains a level beyond the human, history, and the world, which to Deleuze is the ‘cosmos-brain’. The singular subject is therefore that which eliminates all possible mediation between the specific, the particular and the universal. The singular can only been seen in a God/substance who exists necessarily in himself and produces himself and the whole cosmos in a single self-differentiating flow. Deleuze calls this infinitely large singularity all of the following: *will to power*, *expression*, *vital force*, *desire*, *pure thought*, the *unconscious* and the *élan vital*. Hallward’s elusive point is that Deleuze is seeking creative ways by which we can escape the world (Hallward, Out of this World 7).

This same solitary singularity, is considered to have an infinite variety of attributes. Hallward finds Deleuze’s philosophy problematic at its core because it is difficult to sustain a vital philosophy based on the extinction of all human subjects. What can be grasped, perhaps is a subtractive vitalism (Hallward, Out of this World 9). How is it possible that Deleuze’s vitalist philosophy of life affirmation is paradoxically centred on the destruction of the human subject? What Hallward sees in Deleuze’s philosophy is a fundamental hostility towards our own given particularity in a world. Deleuze dismantles the subject in order to generate creative apparatuses to escape the fixed and mundane nature of our world. Hallward sees this gesture as transcendence par excellenceand such a gesture of transcendence is, in a sense, applied to creative ways to aid the subject in getting out of its specific worldly condition. The escape out of the world is Deleuze’s own formula of positing ‘the Real’; and annihilating the subject, in order to replace it with an otherworldly, singular, impersonal and inhuman condition. We can explicate this thesis in three parts. We must always have **I)** a creator/God/substance, **II)** a virtual/creating/expression and **III)** the creature/actual (Hallward, Out of this World 13). Hallward notes that this process occurs through our evacuation from our actual creatural status back to a virtual/creating expression. In this example, we witness the moment of evacuation to attain a higher relation with the one. In order for the creature to have full reflexivity and freedom it must evacuate itself from all worldly content to let the immanent creating move through it. This, in essence, is the movement back from the actual/material/fixed subject towards an immaterial virtual field of life. Hallward adds that this is what Deleuze means by *becoming-imperceptible.*

Becoming-Imperceptible entails that the creature will become directly animated by the real. The real will always be immediate but never a part of our world. Our humanly condition is given over to us in a worldly context that is commanded by pluri-vocal relations that are grasped in a dualist relationship between perceptions and perceived moments. What replaces our complex notion of relations within the world is this united singularity that is interwoven with the multiple: - a formula Deleuze calls the ‘one-all’. But kind of multiple can really exist in this oneness? According to Hallward, it is only the ‘one’ that is seen as an uninterrupted expression of this singular principle. And the ‘one’ has no room for variable degrees among entities that are within its unity (Hallward, Out of this World 29). This means that human beings are only modifications or facets of the expressive nature of this oneness. A feature of Deleuze’s philosophy that demands a continuous alignment with the oneness (One-all) which always creatively asks to return back to itself (The digression from actual creature to virtual creating/counter-actualization). Hallward’s true fear is once one aligns with the purity of the one they are in a sense already cut off from the material world and enjoined in a world from above; that is always out-of-this-world (Hallward, World without Others 537).

This evacuation partakes in the cancelation of difference and yields the singular notion of difference-in-itself. This essentially presents us with a disinterested model of real difference, which discloses the indifference of difference, a real (‘difference without-others’). Hallward’s point, which I reiterated earlier, is if the ‘real’ is known as a totalizing, self-sufficient, self-expressive and self-constituted force, then our knowledge of this world and this creative force is subordinated by its own self-expression. That is, we are ‘always-only’ a second feature or second ordered function of this univocal totality. We are nothing but ‘the all’ in this one (One-all) that entails absolutely everything.

Hallward states that this evacuation and subtraction can be found throughout Deleuze’s work. Deleuze’s corpus paints the same picture numerous times and the moral of each story is as follows: By engaging in all things, and moving back to the moment of virtual-creating, one can become part of the expression, part of this one univocal and creative power. This movement separates the individual and evacuates the interests of the creature. Now, the creature is no longer stuck in sad passions but allowed to participate in a moment of joy that involves disinterestedaction. This move negates all autonomy of the subject by aligning it with an ultimate sovereign, an ultimate one.

## The Theophany of Deleuze; and the Logic of Redemption

Peter Hallward states that Deleuze writes a redemptive philosophy in conjunction with its artistic allies: Spinoza, Saint Paul, and Suhrawardi. This redemptive logic is designed to ‘save’ its readers from a situation contaminated by consciousness, representation, analogy, repression, lack and above all else ‘the other’. Redemption from the aforementioned provides immediate access to a different kind of situation, one that can be defined as a form of radical self-sufficiency and its literal inclusive immanence to itself. The meaning of immanence is as follows: remaining within, indwelling and inherent. This means there is no effect outside of any immanent form (<http://dictionary.reference.com/>).

Hallward notes that Deleuze’s oeuvre explicates our passage from our given contaminated situation (material life) to purer and more primordial situation. Deleuze’s corpus begins with an all-determining ontological principle, or ‘God’ (Hallward, Gilles Deleuze and the Redemption from Interest 6). Yet, this all-powerful force is somehow repressed through its own power of creation. The logic of redemption that Hallward puts forward is one aligned with both mediaeval and Islamic theology. Spinoza, Saint Paul and Suhrawardi attack our human, specific and worldly forms of difference, in favour of another-worldly redemptive force (Hallward, Redemption from Interest 7). If redemption means an act of redeeming or atoning for our mistakes and our sins, Deleuze’s philosophy seeks to ‘rescue’ us from the material world and deliver us to an immaterial and uncontaminated state. According to Hallward, Deleuze’s radical philosophy of immanence must entail a rigorous attack of transcendence and refuse all forms of negation.

However, Hallward points out that this very critique of transcendence, posited by Deleuze, obtains its movement ‘only’ through a preliminary transcendence. This transcendence is the move away from our contaminated situation, which could be called ‘the given’ and this contains our worldly specific and human significance. According to Hallward, Deleuze’s ‘God’ asks us to leave behind our humanly material reality, for a singular, inhuman and impersonal, a-subjective and a- significant position (Hallward, World without Others 6). This transcendence is the propelling gesture of Deleuze’s entire project; and one that Hallward feels is also its ultimate incoherence (Hallward, Redemption from Interest 8). For Deleuze, Spinoza and Suhrawardi, being is defined by its singularity or univocity. Univocity means only having one expression.

For Deleuze, being is univocal and the one expresses everything of the multiple (Humans, dogs, plants, stars) in a single same way. What this amounts to is that *‘the real’* creates everything it perceives and conceives. There is only one kind of production for Deleuze:-the production of the real. Humanity is produced and must, in some way, determine the differences between the real and unreal. However, as we have seen, the real is a part of the self-sufficient, self-expressive and immediately determinate reality. The real must be immediate and not a part of the given world.

For Deleuze, as Hallward notes, Spinoza, Saint Paul and Suhrawardi conclude that our greatest task is to over-come all of these obstacles. This contaminated status I had briefly stated earlier is an obstacle to life. One must over-come all such obstacles, which consist of our worldly and material existence and interest in this world. Our true goal in life is to return to a different situation, one that has succumbed to the dangerous escapism that is thrown into an immanent and immediate whole. For Hallward, it is a dangerous escapism for someone to give him/herself up for such salvation. This is something that we shall investigate further.

If the real is immediate and primordial, then by definition, it must subsist in all creation. There is nothing in all creation that can separate us from the intellectual love of God. Yet, interestingly enough, we live separate from God. We live as interested and positioned subjects in a world. How we relate to God, in this scenario, is imagined through a form of transcendence that conceives God through the law; and this only brings us a form of consciousness marked by ‘sin’. Deleuze’s solution like his redemptive allies, is to escape the world; we must get past the specific, the (as-if) and become immediate to God (Hallward, Redemption from Interest 9). This amounts to us being ‘remade’, as if our minds and our whole being were transformed to an adequate medium for God’s creations. Only then will we be able to comprehend the will of God. Hallward sees Deleuze’s philosophy in the same light. An analogy can also be drawn Suhrawardi’s philosophy of illumination, which consists of thought being aided by magic. In this model, light operates at a level of all reality and produces divine, metaphysical sources of knowledge. The human is divided into two formal bodies: one tainted by the material world and the other the soul, which is aided by the light. A light that shelters these intellects in a collective oneness. Thus, it is thought through the light that survives as the reviver and resuscitator of life. The same is produced in Saint Paul, wherein the material world is in constant flux of sin, and one must align oneself in the body of Christ in order to escape the material (Hallward, Redemption from Interest 10).

According to Hallward, Deleuze uses the term ‘the un-thought’ or ‘non-sense’ to describe the same otherworldly body. The multiple is an expression of the one, yet to variable degrees that are determined by a relative proximity to God. All creatures aim to return to the movement towards the light. Like Suhrawardi, we must move towards the one-light/one-all, which spring in all forms of life. This is the utter liberation of the creation. Hallward feels that Deleuze’s notion of freedom in its purest state is a form of obedience. The greater the right, of the one or sovereign, the more perfect unity there will be to establish one united body or substance, directed by one mind or nature (one-all) (Hallward, Redemption from Interest 13).

These aforementioned points, Hallward states, direct us to the elements of Deleuze’s real philosophy which is an exclusive ontology of univocity. Hallward claims that Deleuze does not offer us a critique of representation. What he gives us, at best, is a critique of misrepresentation. A focus on atonement and a process of escaping the world (Hallward, Redemption from Interest 6). All of the following shows how Deleuze monotonously breaks out of all given situations, locations and figures in order to jump into a situation where everything is contained in an ultimate monism. This is what Hallward states is the absolute ‘monarch’ or sovereignty (Hallward, Redemption from Interest p.13). According to Hallward, Deleuze, gives up our worldly existence for a theophany and salvation. We have no sense of the real nature of things; they have been blocked and concealed from us by our deep rooted human disposition. What Hallward sees continuously in Deleuze is this redemptive move to save the creature.

The ‘real’ for Deleuze is a form of repression, which makes ‘the real’ desire its own repression. This repression is what the philosopher, the scientist and the artist are struggling against. Each struggle with a task that reduces their being to a clinical function, to cure their own worldly ‘sicknesses. The cure, from repression and worldly sickness, is God. However, one cannot just begin with the idea of God. Hallward stresses the fact that although the divine is quite real for Deleuze, the only true way to excel in this form of nature, is to become in thought (Hallward, Redemption from Interest 15). However, at this point, we must question why thinking is so important. To clarify this viewpoint, Hallward posits three points:

1. Thinking in no way represents an innate feature or faculty because our own existence is cut off from the power and understanding of the one. We are always already born in a state of powerlessness and slavery, the point is to return to God or to the virtual-creating that flows through the one.
2. The notion of creating is paramount to our singular endeavour. We must always be creating and forming creative expressions in order to build creative encounters. In turn, these can free us from our contaminated and isolated state through the idea of God. This expressive state allows all of us to think, feel and simultaneously experience an infinite variation of creating through the one.
3. The most important point is this process of merging the sequences of God and the self or the given and the real. This synthesis is a part of the true creative process. This so called creating is consequently reduced to a continuous cycle of reproducing and expressing the entirety of nature as a whole. Our mission is to evacuate our subjective identity in order to move back to the most purest and expressive form of being. The dynamic immaterial virtual creating (a body without Organs, or Larval selves, that all subsists in God). Creation and the creating must always be an expression of its creator (Hallward, Redemption from Interest p.16).

## Actual Creatures, Virtual Creating’s, Confinement, Escapism and the Logic of Creation

Hallward states that Deleuze’s philosophy is centered on the idea that being is creation. Creation embraces all features of reality and is the pivotal centre of all of Deleuze’s works. We can now continue our investigation into the logic behind such creation. If being is creation, being is also essentially differential. This process of being differential is precisely what it means to be creative. Since being is part of the absolute creativity in all there is, it must be able to differentiate itself in an infinite amount of ways. This means that the most basic element of being consists, in part, in the process of creating (Hallward, Out of this World 24).

Creating, in essence, serves as the sufficient reason behind all states of affairs, individuals and events. This makes ‘being’ the ultimate form behind the proliferation of unlimited events and creating that become one with creation and nature; forming one ‘thought-nature’ that encompasses every possibility in the universe (Hallward, Out of this World 27). Every distinct creation creates a new organism, personality, object or experience. According to Hallward, we can describe creation as one act but it proceeds as two movements, through creations and creatures. Hallward states that “Creare is one, we might say it involves both the active creans and the passive creaturum. The creating is implied or implicated within its creator; the creature is an explication or unfolding of the creating” (Hallward, Out of this World 27). As Hallward explains, Deleuze’s logic of creation applies each case of creating and creation. Deleuze attempts, through the production of creation, to construct the real in and of itself (Hallward, Redemption from Interest 27). However, the modality of these apparent creatings in their inherent being remains different and unique.

Differentiated creatures are a part of actual extended forms of being. Yet, their existence is contingent, based upon the material constraints of the world (Bodies, organs, situations). These differentiated creations are virtual and intensive rather than extended. Creation retains a primordial, self-differing essence and this self-differing essence can only be conceived in terms of a virtuality which actualizes itself. Hallward’s main point is that the real productive/creative and differential force between these two facets is only virtual creating alone. The creating does not occupy an external position to the creature, but relies on the immanent relation internal to creation and creating. This immanent relation between creature and creating arises internally through the creating to the creature. Hallward insists on showing us the relation between creating and creation. There is only one form of *active* being that is truly active, and that stems from the virtual creating. It is only the virtual creating that can differ and produce the new and the novel.

According to Hallward, no matter how much effort is put into creating a work of art, a scientific function or a philosophical concept, the only thing that matters is the process of creating. This philosophy privileges verbs over nouns: to create, to act, to build. Therefore, this creating is more pure than an actual living person, place or thing. A creating is not just a novel concept; it is entirely new in itself and eternal. What makes creating new is precisely this immanent and internal power/spark that creates and manifests change, transformation, disruption and difference. In reality creatural identity- the actual creature- is only a simulation of its ‘real’ identity. The material self is only an optical illusion or effect of what is produced. It is only the virtual-creating that can produce the ‘new’ or novel. The real essence of a creature is its de-actualized state or the moment of its virtual-creativity (Hallward, Out of this World, 36).

Creation only exists through the form of creatures, and only creatures can think the necessary process in which they are actualized. However, the reality of the situation is quite different. The actualization and individuation of the actual person is always-only the essential product of a production that is itself necessary and primary to the creature. According to Hallward the real destiny of the actual creature is to create and invent new ways of dealing with its own material reality. This inventive apparatus of dealing with its materiality is precisely the moment where the creature empties everything that constitutes the self, thus dissolving it into an adequate means of letting the creating flow through it (the removal of the ‘I’ and the ‘I Think’ in place of a dynamic activity to be de-actualized) (Hallward, Gilles Deleuze Out of this World 38).

As stated earlier, creation is a solitary action but proceeds through an inherent dualism-the creating/creature and virtual/actual- and all transformation occurs internally, in the expression which intensifies it in an immanent monism. Monism is defined as an all-inclusive reality in only one form of substance. Deleuze ascribes to this kind of formula what he calls *pluralism=monism*. Essentially, all singular creations exist as multiple entities in one united body (the One-all). The singular is self-sufficient. Creating retains a virtual and ideal self-sufficiency that can only be deemed creative if, and only if, it can be incarnated in an existent creature, which then expresses and inhibits its own actualization. According to Hallward, “The existence (and resistance) of the creature is itself an internal necessity of creation; and creatural opacity is an immanent and unavoidable obstacle to the expression or development of being itself” (Hallward, Out of This World 39). The obstacle to which Hallward refers is the constraint of the material world (our bodies, organization of organs, and our habits). Deleuze’s philosophy is constantly at odds with the material and creatural world. According to Hallward, Deleuze’s real work, is devoted to creating concepts and any other means to loosen the grip of conditions on the creature.

It is important to note that Deleuze dedicated two books to Spinoza; and Hallward thinks there is a specific reason for this: Deleuze’s philosophy occupies the Spinozist worldview, with some subtle modifications. For example, there is no distinction of the virtual and actual in Spinoza, but Hallward points out key similarities to both thinkers’ metaphysics. The term ‘naturans’ implies an active, creative feature, while ‘naturata’ implies a passive, created substance. We have seen that only the ‘virtual’ is active while the ‘actual’ creature is passive. Spinoza, like Deleuze, seeks to construe nature as a self-creating reality. Every individual creating is precisely an active modifying facet of this univocal, expressive of substance. Each singular creating in this model maintains the divine, eternal spark from the nature of God/substance.

To understand this process of a singular creating contained in God/substance, is to comprehend how all modifications are a part of the adequate means of expressing this divine essence. Actual creatures are not ‘modes’ contained in God, but can only refer to certain times and places, which relate to themselves based on their own representation. These actual creatures are clearly not active creations but passive selves. They cannot be a part of the adequate means for creating, because they cannot express this one univocal power, they are stuck and caught in their material and interested lives. What exactly does this mean? Individuated/differentiated/actual creatures suffer from ‘inadequate ideas’ which are precisely the aforementioned affects. They live material and interested lives. This implies that they cannot take part in nature’s divine essence. Materiality implies worldly bondage, limited to temporary existence. For Deleuze, virtual creating is the only way that the production of the new can occur. It is only through this type of production that this novel creation has eternal existence; it is the active ‘naturans’ which expresses the entirety of this infinite substance, and it is only the virtual-creating that is expressive of the cosmos, or God. A problem arises: an actual person or creature is governed by the material world, this consists of a series of interests and needs that befit an organic being. Deleuze is trying to move away from this image of representation that misrepresents the kind of beings that we are capable of being the only way to free us from this imprisoned life is to evacuate the mediation that make us a subjective self.

Henri Bergson, according to Hallward, devoted his entire work to the nature of the virtual. For Bergson and Deleuze, the actual represents the passive subject; its habits, needs, and wants. Yet, at the core of this subject, the actual represents the *present*. The misrepresentation of reality, here, is that although the actual may seem quite solid to us, in reality, it is blurred by a materiality that falsely shapes the creature. The virtual is reduced to memory, and it represents the past that fills in the present. According to Peter Hallward, the actual/creature, is always guided by an illusion of its real self, the virtual-creating. The virtual is both immaterial and non-present, but it is seemingly the only real, lasting dimension of reality. It is the only real creative apparatus, while the actual is stuck to a limited perspective of the organism, preoccupied with its own interest (Hallward, Out of this World 41).

If the actual represents an organized body, the virtual represents an inorganic body that is disorganized and stripped of its creatural coherence. The virtual is aligned with memory and it has no action, sensation or extension. Memory only proceeds by an uncontaminated, non-mediated and non-sensuous flow. Memory, represents a pure form of immediacy and intuition. Thus, memory is disinterested in all present action. It catapults us towards the middle of a pure past or pure recollection of a virtual image. The pure past need not strive, to preserve itself; it remains whole within itself. When we reflect on the past, we are not actualizing or representing a memory to ourselves. What is occurring is a moment where we are actually delving deep into the past (Hallward, Out of this World p.43).

Hallward insists on [this] repeatedly: Deleuze is strives for a privileged position that produces its own de-actualization and de-materialization to empty the subject. The empty subject evacuates the known creature in order to create and this model can only be maintained correctly, in its momentum, as a *theophany*. Pure memory is powerless and intensive. It shares no feelings or sensations and it contains no self-interest for the creature. Although the actual/virtual cannot be considered separately, the real task of every creature is to counter-actualize and reverse its own creatural state confining it to a de-materialized form.

Actualization belongs to the virtual and the actualization of a virtual singularity is constituted by the plane of immanence. This plane is where the creature is properly dissolved and annihilated. The virtual is the subject of actualization and **the plane of immanence** is nothing but a process which converts objects into distinct subjects. The ‘actual’ denotes an existing human being who can think, feel, have sensations, qualities, and embody a life story. The virtual describes characteristics that are not presentable or measurable: - virtual/creations are never present or presentable. Hallward’s example of this is taken from Deleuze’s last work *‘Pure Immanence: An Essay on a Life’*, in which Deleuze invokes Charles Dickens’ character Riderhood, who has a near death experience. Hallward states that…

“The virtual life that lives in Riderhood, remember is not the actual subject who is incarnated in the midst of things [and] who made things, good or bad; it is the anonymous spark of life within him, with whom everyone emphasizes in a sort of immediate intuition or sympathy. Such living is our only genuine subject to be equal with the events that befall it; to the creatings that transforms it” (Hallward, Out of this World, p. 46).

Virtual differentiation creates what it actualizes and this is because what it really actualizes never resembles the singularities that they bring to life.

A creation is a kind of pre-existence that ignores all activity and is the resemblance of real life. As Hallward notes, the actual is always constituted, while the virtual is wholly constituent. This is key to understanding Deleuze’s philosophy. The virtual is always creative and the actual is always created or the virtual is the act of composing, while the actual is that which is composed. Virtual-creating is a pure form of creativity in and of itself. It can be seen as a pure primordial energy, which is both the constituent force of its power to create, along with its inexhaustible need for transformation and change. The Virtual can only be thought of as a kind of unthinkable abstraction. The force of transformation that is possessed within it is none other than a pure intensity that aids both difference/being; and the virtual creating that incarnates all things.

As stated earlier, the actual is no more than an illusion or ephemeral result of our true immaterial self. The virtual is ‘the real’ and exists more actually then our material form, and this is predicated on the fact that virtual-creations are fully intensive, while the actual is material and extended. In a manner of speaking, the virtual-creating is intensive, immaterial, unlimited and is always individuating pure forces. The actual is material, extensive, limited and individuated, it is always in a fixed state.

Virtual creations can be conceived as events linked to quasi-causes. Interestingly enough, Hallward states, that an event to Deleuze, is free of all normative and personal causality. This means that all events are virtual and as incorporeal entities, they distance themselves from actual corporeal action. Creation and events are the same. An event is actualized in a body or a state of affairs. However, they also consist of a shadowy, secret form that is eventually subtracted and then added to actualization. The virtual can be real without being ‘actual’. An event exists as a kind of dead time, where what lies at the heart of it, is a non-presentable immaterial, unmoving essence or spark. Such events exist as empty floating entities or ‘*mean-whiles’* where nothing ever takes place. This means that the virtual-event can only be grasped by escaping any privileged perspective. This involves a kind of suspension and dissolution of all actual activity. Hallward recalls Deleuze’s example of a battle in which the real event hovers over the battlefield and can only be realized in its pure imperceptible state. An event that occurs cannot be *part* of our world; it must be *out* of this world. All identity disappears from the self and the world in these virtual events. What replaces ‘real’ material life is a power to intuit this impersonal reality, which is presented to us, as a new world, beyond the given. This given is material life in flux. However, we must somehow block this flux in its movement and align with the singular.

All creatures that are able to create and to think, must find the necessary means to escape the world; in order that they continue to be creative and thoughtful. Philosophy is obliged to lead us from actual to virtual; or from our world it must then lead us *out of this world*. The goal of this philosophy is not just to leap out of the world into *another* realm. Since, as actualized material beings, we are alienated and confined to a false identity of ourselves, our escape entails us, de-actualization or ‘deterritorialization which brings us back to the point of virtual-creating previously discussed. This virtual-creating is an impersonal, a-subjective, immaterial existence.

The ‘real’ layers of human form, including needs, wants, desire and habits, are part of stratification. To stratify means, building layers of materiality that form our representation of this world. Deleuze asks us to de-stratify ourselves, to remove the layers of humanity, dismantle the actual creature and destroy the ‘organized organism’. We must become a ‘body-without-organs’ and a body-without-others. Our material body must attain a state where it can remove and de-populate itself from the world. For Robinson Crusoe (deserted on the island), the creative aspect of his existence is the moment where he no longer functions as a human, but as the virtual spark of the island that connects all life to one immanent form. Our creatural confinement has to do with our actual existence and our material presence. These obstacles are imposed on the creature by our worldly material constraints. Our task, as creators, is to loosen the grip of the material world and let out the virtual-creating that has been imprisoned inside of us. A creative body is never an actual entity, but is a wholly virtual one. Like Robinson Crusoe, we must learn to annihilate ourselves in order to let ‘the event-island’ live thorough us.

**Chapter 2 - An Introduction to Deleuze:**

## Singular Difference and the Active Subject.

For Deleuze, a subject is never an isolated individual. A subject is the habits that embody a human organism. Deleuze bases his idea of the subject on the thought of Scottish empiricist David Hume. Hume did not believe that the human organism could locate the idea of ‘the subject’ in themselves. According to both Hume and Deleuze, a subject is nothing other than the passive flow of sense impressions, which are synthesized together in a bundle of experiences that are conditioned by resemblances. In essence, the human organism has no control over its personal growth. Life is determined by the flux of powers and forces emitted by individuals and structures. What we call a subject is nothing other than a passive screen that contracts these sense-impressions and images. These images form our sensory motor-schema. Unfortunately, society is built upon a false representation. According to Deleuze, society is built upon a plastic reality, formed by spaces of enclosure, blockages, segmentation, negation and analogous formations. All of the following work together to cut off real relations within the world. Deleuze insists on the creation of a new subject, which no longer adapts to hierarchies and compartmental spaces. This new line of flight freely acts and one is no longer limited to the frame-work of passive experience but is actualized as a dynamic and active subject. In order to move from passive to active, Deleuze grounds this formal subjectivity on pure difference. The ‘difference’ that can creatively represent all beings in a single substance is called a singularity. There is a key difference between Peter Hallward’s notion of singularity and Deleuze’s singular concept mainly: **1)** the Singular is that which encompasses all reality and life, **2)** it is contingent on ‘the differentiation’ of others **3)** these different perspectives are equally spread throughout the singular totality.

## The Differentiation of Difference.

Our current state of reality is built on false forms of representation. Representative ideology shatters our sensory perception. How exactly does this occur? In Deleuze’s texts on cinema, he devotes the founding principle on the pursuit of building a new subject on difference. The differential-subject is someone who can believe in the world again, a world that is not cut off from life. Deleuze states “The question is no longer does cinema give us the illusion of the world, but to direct us towards a new question, how does cinema restore our belief in this world” (Deleuze, Cinema 2, 182). This is the real project of Deleuze and the concept of difference. It posits: how can we make the *passive* subject, who is caught up in the illusion of a world which no longer believes in-itself, produce an *active* subject who can begin to think outside of the degradation of representation. To accomplish this, Deleuze needs to build a new form of difference that can perceive all of reality. We now need to conceive the difference between the ground of representation and Deleuze’s necessary form of difference in-itself.

For Deleuze, real difference carries in itself all intermediary differences within a single determination (Deleuze, Difference and Repetition 90). This single determination is one by which all species are accounted for. Our society has been formed by the illusion of representation that blurs the distinct function of difference. In stating that apples are different from oranges, the method of differentiation cuts off the relation between both objects. Deleuze asserts that our basic knowledge of difference is always inscribed by roles, which constantly make us separate, and correlate between specific objects based on an analogous-difference.

Deleuze singles out a dangerous point, that we do this with people, and our analogous thinking immediately describes ‘the other’ as an object. This gesture was Aristotle’s mission to get at the fundamental cause of reality (Deleuze, Difference and Repetition, 33). However, Aristotle’s secret reality is determined by a knowledge that categorized all living things into a series of groups. These groups of ‘things’ are then arranged by what is predicated of a particular object and then categorized by their powers of action. This may not seem dangerous to us at all in examples like rational-animal, which refers to mankind and it does not hurt anyone. Yet, Aristotle never referred to both the sexes as ‘rational-man’. This is always a limitation to Aristotelian analogy. Analogy is problematic in that it reduces all things to predicates, and explains life in terms of superficial qualities. An apple is round and an orange is oval, the apple is red and the orange is *not* red. Analogical difference is grounded on a fundamental limitation, for it can only give us determinate characteristics and traits that are crudely predicated of an entity.

Negation and opposition also play a part in how we understand ourselves and reality. However, oppositional thinking reduces reality to representation. According to Deleuze, if representation and analogy are seen as an Aristotelean gesture, then negation, lack and opposition are founded on Hegelianism. Hegel identified a method of negation, the only way to differentiate two objects or two individuals was through the process of opposing traits by a ‘lack’ of their elements. All reality is based on a fundamental negation. In order to get at an absolute understanding of the world and its subjects, we must ground our representation of the world in the negative. In *‘Phenomenology of Spirit’*, Hegel starts off with the concept of sense-certainty, which is proto-object, searching to understand it-self. In order to do so, sense-certainty must see itself as an object. An object that lacks its fundamental subjectivity and relies heavily on negation to determine its understanding of the world.

Let us to return to the previous example of the apple. An apple is known as an apple because it is *not*an orange. The same differential process occurs in a subject. This is dangerous to Deleuze: the process of blurring our understanding of the subject and object. As well as knowing that our individuality is bound to the ground of the negative and only this infinite lack can tell us who we are. Thus, the individual, according to Hegel, is always in the process of fulfilling this lack because of its negative starting point. Subject X can only affirm its existence only by realizing that it is not Subject Y. It is this radical form of Hegelian opposition that actualizes the necessary individuality to Hegelian self-consciousness. Deleuze is suspicious of the process of subjectivity being actualized by the negative, because its false repetition is stuck in the process of always trying to fill in this infinite lack or debt.

If Hegel grounds the subject on the foundation of the negative, then only the ground of this negation, and its internal lack, can distinguish what we are and what separates us in the world. We know analogous-difference reduces life to categories and predicates, and differential-negation and opposition can only disclose the attributes of life according to a determinate lack. The question, then, is how these theories explicate the passing flow of life and its movement? This is a fundamental problem today: a world which no longer believes in-itself because of Aristotelian categories/analogies and Hegelian polar identities. All of the following gives us a theory and system of objects, but the aforementioned theories do not pertain to ‘a life’. They merely reduce difference to an object-like state. Only an adequate account of pure-difference or difference-in-itself can free us from false forms of representation. This system of objects or reality is known as ‘simulacra’.

The ‘simulacra’ is a model or copy of an entities real form. Only a form of pure-difference can shatter the simulacra and aid us in to the universal construction of becoming a subject. If we understand difference in terms of representation, then we dilute difference. The methods of analogy, opposition and negation, modify ‘real’ difference. These only produce a fraction of what characterises difference/singularity and these isolating processes make the differential-singularity a second ordered function. They are contingent upon another entity forever limiting it to an epiphenomenon. Epiphenomenal existence is applied to attributive analogies that can only solidify existence based on another entity. The apple can only know of what it is by realizing what it is not.

## Univocity and Equality.

For Deleuze, this idea of becoming-subject involves a rupture. We must fundamentally break the ties that bind a subject to all formal representation. A subject and an apple can only individuate themselves based on an internal form of difference, an expressive, dynamic form. In order to ground difference in an expressive and dynamic form of comprehension, Deleuze needs to disclose a form of difference that is not created through the mediation of representation but understood through an absolute immediacy, a pure contemplation. This form of immediacy or pure contemplation is misrepresented by Hallward. The fallacy of Hallward’s critique of Deleuze lies in the fact that we are presented with a Deleuze who embraces all forms of representation, who grounds difference on the negative and who takes advantage of the notion of life. Hallward’s critique presents us with man as the center of all life and our mission is to become anonymous, imperceptible and de-materialize. If man is to become the center of all life then why would Deleuze demand the destruction of the subject? The destruction of the subject would then signal the removal of man in the world. These two claims do not coincide. Hallward’s far from the picture that Deleuze paints of life. According to Deleuze, Difference can only be understood as difference once it can ‘differentiate’ what pertains to it. What is needed for this process is a singular individuating difference. This may sound peculiar, but what Deleuze has in mind is an entirely differential ontology that invokes the creation of a subject outside of our sensory-motor schema. He aims to present us with subjects who can formally oppose this representational-schema on a new ground, that of repetition. What does this mean? We still have no answers regarding repetition, difference and the dynamic. In order to prevent us from falling into Hallward’s trap of an ‘a-subjective’, ‘a-specific’ being, we need to recognize how Deleuze uses Duns Scotus’ model of univocity. Since difference cannot be understood through negation and opposition, this newly created ‘difference-in-itself’ has no formal predicates standing behind it. The shadow of difference will only be repetition, which is the production of the new; the production of new difference. In essence, this means that difference must be its own ‘differentiator of difference’ or what Deleuze calls ‘a dark precursor’ that is always in-between the forces of life, pulling them together and creating unities.

It is easy to get caught up in a thinker’s jargon and most of the problems that stem from accounts of Deleuze are due to misrepresenting these subtle processes. Hallward for example, creates the notions of creator, creating and creation in order to understand all the alterations of difference. Yet, by doing this, he often misses steps and blurs the distinctions between fundamental aspects of the philosophy. For now, what we need to do is familiarize ourselves with univocity and Scotus’ model of being. The principle of univocity holds that all being is singular and that all entities are unique and resonate the same being within all of reality. Deleuze states “Being is univocal and it only has one single voice” (Deleuze, Difference and Repetition, 35).

This singular ontology doesn’t mean that all objects and entities are thrown into the same melting pot. Deleuze sees this position as the only affirmative account of being/difference. Once being is understood as singular, and this univocal principle is actualized, it posits a radical thesis: all individuals, objects and entities should be comprehended as pure intensities. Deleuze sees pure difference as a formal intensity that lies behind difference. When we as individuals are actualized in activities, this intensive stream of individuality is turned into an extensive force. We can call this intensity ‘a pre-personal’ form of difference. It takes the shape of a potential which is then actualized and individuated. This form of individuation takes a pure potential and turns it into an extensive reality. This means there are two forms of pure difference: one is a virtual structure behind an entity and the pre-personal. This is what Deleuze calls differentiation and it deals with intensity and the intensive. The other form of pure difference is known as the actual. It is the individuation of being. We shall return to this dynamic dialectic later on when we discuss the virtual and the actual. What is important to note, is that this notion of intensity, lies behind the relationship of both difference and repetition, a difference that creates the new and the extensive. Both of these forms of difference are based on a univocal model. Deleuze states that “univocal being is at one and the same time a nomadic distribution of crowned anarchy” (Deleuze, Difference and Repetition, 36). It is easy to misinterpret Deleuze’s conception of a crowned anarchy. Essentially, this conception will be understood as a set of multiples being expressive of this singular difference that makes up all of reality. Deleuze will posit the theorem of monism=pluralism; what he has in mind is a theory of monism that stresses more importance on a pluralism. Each and every individual is essentially made up of this one totality. Each individual is expressive of this whole. Deleuze sees this monism in a different light than the history of monism in philosophy. What he ideally formulates is a monism with a unique variation of the multiple, each multiple possesses its own fundamental perspective of the whole. This is precisely why difference must produce the intensive. We must first be acquainted with life in order to be able to express it. Intensity is understood as a depth of the world, that opens a new space around us, that once it is actualized it can be extensive or extended to be part of this whole. Hallward does not see the model in this way. He presumes that this crowned anarchy must be viewed like Thomas Hobbes’ political model of a Leviathan standing over all beings. Since the state of nature is dangerous, it is the Leviathan, a giant that keeps everyone in their place working towards society.

This model makes all individuals fall prey to the rules and regulation of the one, but this one is a determinate totality. Meaning, everything fixed in their place. Hallward’s-Deleuze and ‘his’ monism is a prison for actual creatures. Their mission is to de-actualize and become part of this Leviathan. Notice here, it is the Leviathan that gives us a reality. It is what centers our ‘representation’ of the world. Thus, Hallward’s comparison of the Leviathan and its sovereign reign does not align with the Deleuzian singular and its perspective based Monism. Hallward is still presenting Deleuze’s philosophy in the realm of opposition, analogy and negation.

These errors of representation form what Deleuze calls the ‘black nothingness of difference’. Deleuze differentiates between the colour black and white to express the difference between intensity and representation. The colour black denotes the absence of all colours. All we have to do is think of the concept of a black whole which swallows all forms of light. If we cannot think of these colours outside of the black background that they are individual intensities or individual differences, than all of them would melt into this black nothingness. What representation, analogy, negation and opposition present us with is a model of the same and the similar. Once we have melted into the same blackness, we are no longer individuated, actualized and grounded on our own unique perspective. All is lost in this ubiquitous self-same law of how things are supposed to appear to us.

This is the negation of difference and the individual. This is how Hallward’s argument depicts Deleuze: Deleuze, for Hallward, wants to melt everything into the same substance. In this melting of all things there is no room for difference, because difference is negated. Hallward’s position misrepresents Deleuze, and depicts an internal form of representation. This creates the space to move difference, the singular and the individual into nothingness. This destroys the model of uniqueness, expression and individuality. It reduces all particulars to the same. It also depicts our current societal state. We have a society of unique differences that are molded according to how the ‘one’ imposes its structure. Either all individuality is reduced to the same in order to make each of these individuals a profitable outlet who gives back to the system; or they are not conducive to the system as a whole and their differences are not welcomed. The whole is fragmented on the schism of how the multiple should relate to the one. This forced conception blurs the distinction between who produces and who is seen as ‘wholly other’, creating and fragmenting a system of others that are never visible in the societal whole. Yet, Deleuze’s univocal model is better described as an ‘undifferentiated white abyss’. In this model, Deleuze makes room for every differential equation. If we look at the colour white as the elemental that exists in all colours, its dynamic spark or expressive intensity, is contained in all visible reality. All colours possess a degree of whiteness in their constitution. The fundamental element of difference is what links the multiple with the whole. However, we are taught through the history of philosophy that to differentiate between two things we must not base this knowledge on a creative intensity that everyone possesses. Rather, we are taught to exclude and see reality through the eyes of opposition and negation. The method of equal intensity is how we are to understand univocity, the process of differentiation is what preserves all individual being.

Crowned anarchy is therefore, not a sovereign, medieval deity, which stands guard over us and makes us obey the rigid laws of the one. This result fragments difference. Crowned anarchy is like a giant white wall. Now, this white wall is entirely made up of several degrees of intensity that form the concept of white. Yet there are unique variation and degrees of white that make up the wall. It is this multiple variation of intensity that differentiates between other degrees and forms a cohesive and singular reality. Notice here that each variation of white that makes up the one. Each variation has its own unique perspective of the whole. The Black nothingness isolates and cuts all the degrees of intensity, and severs difference and the subject. It melts them into the absorption of the one. These multiple perspectives of the one make reality; they add to it, they are part of the dynamic flow and flux of life. When life is cut off and severed from its activity, it is no longer active, but a passive subject who is melted into the framework of a false reality. We no longer believe in the world because we are cut off from its relations. The world in which we do believe in again is this world built upon a univocal framework. This ‘undifferentiated-difference’ is the white abyss, where each subject is seen as an ‘equal quality’ of its infinite expression. This white wall has an infinite amount of attributes and an infinite amount of degrees; each individual reverberates and allows multiple sensations that can grasp all of reality. What univocity can offer us is a fundamental model of difference that is unaffected by representation. The real method behind the univocity of being and the differentiation of difference is to show how: singular difference can differentiate among differential entities ‘only’ when, all objects, subjects, animals and entities are seen as an equal part of reality. This essential equality allows the space for all beings to express of themselves in all of ‘life’. Deleuze’s differential ontology is first and foremost a philosophy of life. This is the real method behind Deleuze. Hallward is right that Deleuze devoted two texts to Spinoza. However, Deleuze’s fundamental pursuit, in his Spinozist analysis, is the hidden element of reality, the hidden element behind difference, ‘intensity’ and how this intensive-difference could become dynamic and expressive. Deleuze’s texts on Spinoza are not about a God who can redeem us from the poison of the world, nor is there any logic of salvation built in this framework. It is the concept of *expression* that Deleuze devotes these two books to. How can we become expressive again? How can we believe in a world that we ourselves cannot express. And so the leading question of the text is the following: “We still do not know what a body can do” (Deleuze, Expressionism in Philosophy: Spinoza, 210). The real question behind these texts is how can a body become an adequate expression of itself and all reality (Deleuze, Expressionism in Philosophy: Spinoza, 210). The real thinker that Deleuze models his metaphysics after is Leibniz. He devoted an entire text to Leibniz’s conception of how reality is built by layers, or folds. Each layer or fold is like a line, a reality built upon a never ending series of lines. Each one of these lines or layers forms the identity or perspective of each unique differential being.

When a line of intensity converges or is forced to converge on any kind of representational assemblage, this singular line deteriorates and is blocked from expressing its unique perspective on the whole. This process is what Deleuze will call ‘reterritorialization’. If a line can diverge away from the series, if it is allowed to fold and enfold, creating a new series amongst the whole, this process is called ‘deterritorialization’. This is the real process behind life; to create new assemblages and form new series of differential beings. Life must create expressive outlets for these continued processes of divergence. This divergence is called a ‘line of flight’, and once it frees itself from the convergence of the series, a new difference is produced through the repetition that embodies the series. This is the continued cycle we live in. Difference is first thrown into the face of a converging series, wherein it is blocked, cut off and reduced to representational ambiguities. Or, it can produce differential-being by diverging away from the series, thus repeating the expressive-dynamic flow of life. Difference and repetition are the basis of reality.

This is the model of being that Deleuze imports from Leibniz. We don’t need to go to in-depth into Leibniz’s theory, but it is important that we see the close connection between Leibniz’s monad and Deleuze differential-Singular being. According to Leibniz, a monad is a simple substance that is encased in ‘the one’ of reality or the universe (Deleuze, The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque 26). If we return think to the example of the white wall, each monad, like the degrees of intensity that constitute it, form all of reality. Each of these simple substances differentiates themselves in the whole by dynamically adding in their own perspective. When a line diverges away from the series, the repetition of its movement and its divergence creates ‘a new difference’, an ‘extensive difference’. Subsequently, this extensive difference is what adds its perspective on the whole. A newly created perspective ‘singular-differential extensive’ creates the dynamic whole; a pluralism that makes up a monism.

Where representation demands recognition, univocity implies an inherent equality that is the base of all human reality. All living beings are ‘a part’ of this organic one-all. Each monad, as a subject, animal and plant, is conceived of as a *differend.* Each monad must actively animate itself from passive difference to active difference, from representation to univocal singularity, from intensive to extensive, the move from the convergent series to a divergent actuality. Hallward completely misrepresents Deleuze. Instead of portraying an immediate ‘white undifferentiated intensive’ that is affected and expressive of an ‘immanent’ reality, he presents Deleuze bound to forms of representation, melted into the black nothingness. The underlying message of this black nothingness to Hallward is categorized by a God who demands that his subjects become non-living entities, and to transcend every human assemblage. Once a univocal conception of difference is actualized and divergent deterritorialization is affirmed,

*“The body is no longer the obstacle that separates us from thought itself. But it is the movement that we overcome, a false sense of thinking that we shatter, once this is realized, we are plunged into the depths of reaching the unthought that is life, not that the body thinks but now it is free from the obstinate and stubborn world of identity, it is difference which forces us to think what is concealed from thought and reality”* (Deleuze, Cinema 2, p.189).

The following quote shows what life is for Deleuze, a life without categories and a body-without hierarchies. Hallward confuses this conception of the singular. He misunderstands that all life is creation, for Deleuze, and the novel and the new are a part of the dynamic between the convergent and divergent series.

## The Active Subjective and the Three Synthesis of the Singular.

We know that Deleuze’s subject, and all intensive subjects, are equal. We also know that each singularity is not a deity but a being that exists among multiple beings in one reality. This model is best explicated and activated in an immanent framework. Immanence, for Deleuze, is a system of life, a system of reality that encompasses everything within the entire totality. Yet, this immanent totality is also univocal, which means everything that exists within it is equal with one another: - a series of multiple perspectives. These are the changes that Deleuze feels is necessary. However, we still have not got to the bottom of what exactly this subject is and how it is supposed to express the whole.

We know that Deleuze characterizes the subject by a singular difference and that at the very base of the subject is a form of intensity. Nevertheless, this is still a difficult concept to grasp. According to Deleuze, the subject is part of a tripartite dialectic. Now, Deleuze never uses the word dialectic. We are going to invoke this terminology because these three syntheses of the subject are asymmetrical, meaning they are always occurring at each moment. Each multi-dimensional layer involved in this synthesis is interacting with several stimuli and being affected and re-producing a new effect. This dialectic is staged between the past, the present and the future.

As stated earlier, the Humean subject is an empty screen. Like a movie theatre, it is empty until a projector passively shines images upon it. This passive screen lets in these sense impressions, forming a bundle of experiences. This sensuous bundle is what Deleuze defines as a habitual experience of sense data that affect us in our daily lives, forming our day-to-day moments. These moments of habit, or contracting a habit, is what Deleuze calls the process of ‘habitus’ and this denotes all present experience. Habit becomes the constitutive root of the passive subject but in order for this present to pass or be filled in with context, the past must be able to actively integrate and substitute a complete consciousness.

Deleuze invokes the Bergsonian ‘pure past’ as that which conditions the present, for the present could be nothing without a past that has not passed (Deleuze, Bergsonism, 61). The pure past is a transcendental feature for Deleuze and it is this transcendental feature that gives content and depth to the passive subject. Interestingly enough, this form of pure past, is what Hallward describes as empty and what causes friction between the material and the immaterial. However, what Hallward does not grasp is that this pure past is not in some immaterial realm. Time grounds the subject. Time is also the feature that aids repetition and meaning. Time is part of the virtual structure that pushes the convergent series into a divergent series. Deleuze calls this ‘recollection-subjectivity and contraction-subjectivity (Deleuze, Bergsonism 53). The present will always be part of the actual subject, but an actual subject without intensity and extensity is nothing other than an empty shell. Yet, something is still required of the subject and there is a missing step. If Deleuze is trying to map out the free flowing line of flight from passive to active subject, then what is it that animates these polar identities? What is it that connects the potential with the actual? This problem has caused many rifts in Deleuzian thought. What we need to remember is that Deleuze is not *emptying* out the subject in order to bring forward some dynamic immaterial force. What activates these two forces is the most ambiguous and problematic feature in all of Deleuze’s philosophy. This feature is the death of the subject. What we have to keep in mind is that, for Deleuze, thought really maps onto the body and each decade of thought changes the milieu of peoples. We have seen the Humean paradigm and the Bergsonian, but to truly understand the death of the subject we have to jump backwards into the Kantian paradigm. We should keep in mind that death for Deleuze is not how we perceive of death today. It is not the end or the destruction of the subject. We need to establish some background in the history of philosophy first before we can begin to understand this idea of a death of the subject.

For Descartes, time is held in place by the divine and the mechanistic world is created by God. The world worked like clockwork and every part of the body had its place and role. In answering the question of subjectivity, Kant starts off with the same Cartesian problematic. Kant used the ‘Cogito’ as the sole condition that solidified the subject. Kant explains that this new cogito was a transcendental feature, meaning that it helps the human organism conform to its awareness. This ‘I’ that helps condition the subject is the main synthesis of all of our experience. It is best described by Kant as the faculties. What we call ‘the self’ today was part of the transcendental illusion, the illusion that we have a self. Kant agreed with Hume that we are just passive subjects. These faculties that consist of the ‘I’ merely synthesized all of our experience, although, its function was not really part of the subject. Kant had two functions of subjectivity: the ‘I’ and the ‘self’. However, the ‘self’ was aided by reason to uphold this illusion, this thing-in-itself. This moment in Kant’s philosophy between these two identities is what creates the schizophrenic subject for Deleuze.

This rupture in all passive experience forms a fundamental dualism. Notice here that both Bruce Baugh and Hallward attribute this dualism with Deleuze (Baugh, Deleuze and Hegel, 84). Deleuze affirms that this sequence in thought creates a global unrest in the universal subject. The schizophrenic ‘I’ is never consolidated and Hegel’s solution to this problem between the world of phenomena and noumena is to create dialectic of representation, which further fragments the subject even more. According to Deleuze, both Kant and Hegel uphold this ironic gesture of death. In order to free our judgments from being passive and empty, Kant creates the notion of practical reason, which makes this illusion of self have the power to create judgments. As well, Hegel’s gesture is to formulate a negative ground to solve the problem of this inherent lack.

Deleuze is willing to accept this moment between the schizophrenic ‘I’ and the illusion of the ‘self’, but only if another solution is able to fix the problem. Practical reason as judgments cannot help condition the subject. Neither can the negative ground, if habits fundamentally form the constituency of the subject and the past is our access to filling in these experiences with depth. Deleuze is in the same position as Kant and Hegel; something must be able to ground the unconditioned conditions. In other words, Deleuze needs a fundamental synthesis to conjoin this moment of schizophrenia. The Kantian route is to make this empty subject believe in the illusion of the self and the soul, by giving them judgments. However, judgments depend upon the false kind of representation that forms convergent blockages. This form of representation creates an indifferent-difference. The Hegelian path leads to controlling the subject, by letting them be guided by the ground of the negative. Since this ground does nothing but give the subject an objective lack, Hegel’s answer is that transcendence must be posited in order to align self-consciousness with a form of absolute knowing. The key to answering this solution, according to Deleuze, is that all humans exist among these processes of Humean habits, Bergsonian time and Kantian illusions. However, Deleuze’s solution is to dissolve these representational habits, and illusory judgments of self, difference must peel back the layers of its passivity. This becoming-intensive is Deleuze’s solution.

What Deleuze calls the ‘death drive’ is the moment of freeing these forced representational sedimentations on the body. Judgments, opposites and habits create hierarchies on the subject. Since we go through this continual process between the ‘I’ and the self, Deleuze states that Nietzsche’s eternal return will be our saving grace. Every time we reach this point of tension between the schizophrenic I and the self, repetition creates the production of the new, a new difference, the dissolving of the self. This brings us closer to what really makes the subject, its real actions and real potential, a real new difference.

This stripped down subject is the virtual-body: it is a body-without-organs, a non-hierarchized, non-sexualized subject. What is left of the subject is nothing but a series of active larval selves beneath our habits and representations. These larval selves represent the pre-individual singularities and activities that we possess. It is a dynamic self, a real configuration of difference, because we go through this process constantly when the cycle is repeated we go back to this state of pre-individual activities. Our goal is to affirm our absolute intensive actuality, we are more than just our habits and this is why Deleuze calls on Nietzsche’s idea of becoming and the eternal return.

These Larval selves are pure affirmation. They create the multitude that makes us an active being. What makes ‘you’ you is not your habits, or the way the world is represented to you, but how you actualize your dynamic power, your creative spark, and this is the solution to the dualism, between the I and the self; beneath the crude materiality of everything, there is another self an ‘other-self’, a multiple of selves that make up the unity of all of our activity. Deleuze claims that “Underneath the self which acts are little selves which contemplate and which render possible both action and the active subject” (Deleuze, Difference and Repetition, p.75). Action is greater than judgments. Life outweighs illusion and simulacra. This statement by Deleuze means that the ‘self’ is not based on its level of passivity or a crisis of illusion. Rather, it is the essential and dynamic, the intensive and the active self. When we act, and affirm all of the potential living beneath us, this chance, this ‘role of the dice’ hands us back over to our lives (Deleuze, Nietzsche and Philosophy 25).

## Immanence, Emanation, Constructivism and the Actual and the Virtual

Partly what makes Peter Hallward critique so strong is the logic of theophany that he invokes on Deleuze. Hallward states that Deleuze partakes in a one-all logic. One couldn’t really deny this framework but there are two points we must address: **I)** the one-all does not refer to a unifying totality but too the plane of all thought and life, because Deleuze invokes a philosophy of constructivism and it is centered on ‘a logic of creation’. **II)** In order to pass off this logic, Hallward makes a category mistake between immanence as the plane of all thought and emanation a medieval theological concept. For Deleuze, concepts represent fundamental events and literally all events, and concepts, are part of this pre-philosophical plane. Even concepts go through the process of differentiation. Differentiation represents a virtual structure for Deleuze; we must not understand the virtual in terms of virtual reality, but as a moment of a structure or pre-individual singularity awaiting actualization. These presupposed moments are called problems/structures. The problematic is an intensive field of differentiation: meaning it consists of several pre-individual singularities. Like our larval state the pre-individual activities have not been actualized and individuated. The real process is to actualize these problematic structures and turn them into life solutions.

These potentialities have the necessary means to germinate into life cycles. Deleuze’s philosophy maps out these onto-genetic and morphogenetic processes. We must return to the world, return to life, and thus, Deleuze’s philosophy is an ontology of life. Hallward is correct that Deleuze is a vitalist, but his one-all does not refer to a God and his creatures, but to multiple processes that involve these pre-individual potentials in their virtual structure; their convergent state and the movement to their actualization into real a solution, a real life. The actual signals the divergent series and the production of the new. These Virtual/actual multiples make up all of our reality and can be defined as simple problems and solutions. They cannot be reduced to a deity, for a deity is a representation of how the world works. If we look at simple vegetal life: plants form a virtual structure with the earth, there are pre-individual singularities that make up their constitution, what photosynthesis produces in plant-life is the process of intensity, which takes sunlight and turns it into simple sugars feeding the plant. The plant then takes the nutrients and actualizes it all over its body and then returns what is left to the soil. This active genesis or ‘differenciation’ in the plant, is what Deleuze calls becoming-intense ( Deleuze, A Thousand Plateaus p. 197).

This differential ontology starts off with ‘differen**t**iation’ (Virtual structure) and then moves to ‘differen**c**iation’ (The genesis of actuality). This to Deleuze is life solving problems and creation and novelty working at every second. So the structure of the virtual-actual is not the fundamental dualism posited by Hallward, but is an asymmetrical synthesis of life. Concepts are formed in the same manner, a problem is posed in a pre-individual state and the concept is created out of thought and actualized as a solution. Descartes created the Cogito as a solution to radical subjectivity, and in doing this he solved the problem of medieval subjectivity.

Any time this dynamic logic of creation is used virtual/actual, convergent/divergent, differentiation/differenciation, the outcome is always an *event*. An event is the individuation and actualization of differenciation (the incarnation of the actual) Deleuze’s point is that we are always-already in a problem. Life is about these fundamental encounters and solving each moment. It is not just the human organism that encounters problem solving, the forces of life works in this exact way. This is something that Hallward is not able to accept. A thunderstorm states Deleuze, is a virtual structure, the tension in the ground and the surge of electrical energy in the clouds, creates the process of differentiation, this is the moment of pre-individual singularities that create the potential that causes this influx of intensity. The actualization or genesis of the storm is the bolt of lightning; this is the process diffren**c**iation or the actual individuation of the storm. Life works through the logic of creation, and our means of problem-solving are created through concepts elaborated through philosophy, art, science, and politics. Hallward is not able to accept this kind of creation of the new because he sees Deleuze’s philosophy based on a false ground of immanence.

Immanation is marked by the immediate relationship between a cause and effect. While the effect is certainly something distinguishable from the cause, it remains in and of itself. The effect can always be seen as the cause’s own production, it is here where we can relate the real immanent relationship between cause and effect with that of Difference and Repetition and virtual and actual (Deleuze, Difference and Repetition 115). Both the modal power of the effect and the cause are within the same immanent force (intensity). Once differential-singularity is seen through immanent causation, it is aided by the univocity of being that equalizes all being (Deleuze, Expressionism in Philosophy 53). Thus, this process is immanent, univocal and asymmetrical. The effect is always contained in the cause, as difference is always conceived of through its immediate intensity and then produced as the new through repetition and extension. It is always expressed and then re-expressed as a new expression that still contains the pre-potential of the previous expressivity. This is Deleuze’s system: a system that encompasses all life, life feeding on life, producing life, and causing and effecting life (Deleuze, Expressionism in Philosophy 170).

Emanation refers to a nature that gives and establishes an eminence of a giver to recipient. The effect is still born out of the cause but it is separated from it (Deleuze, Expressionism in Philosophy 170). This is the medieval explanation of emanation, which Hallward uses to explain Deleuze’s concept of immanent life. Notice, here, that the effect is still born out of the cause but it is essentially separated from it. Just as Hallward depicts the singular, as that which is alive and must dematerialize itself and subtract itself from life to move back into the one. The creator is always separated from its creatings and the creature must counter-actualize itself to move back into God. None of this reflects Deleuze’s philosophy; Hallward produces a fundamental error; and creates a category mistake between immanence and emanation and transcendence and Univocity

# **Conclusion: ‘A Part’ of this world**

In conclusion, Peter Hallward’s critique of Deleuze exploits, the concept of life. Deleuze’s philosophy is one that is based on ‘a logic of creation’. A vital and dynamic expression of how we as subjects can believe in the world again. The world, for Deleuze, is comparable to an egg. It is an egg that always puts us into a problem and an ‘encounter’ with life. If the world is embryonic it is because among its endless possibilities there contains these pre-individual potentialities awaiting our indefinite actualization. If we are always-already in a problem, it is because we are always ‘in the world’, a world that is bound to logic of creation, where intensity and difference are united in all activities of life. The production of the new, creation and novelty are occurring at every second, from thunderstorms to photosynthesis, to procreation. Deleuze’s philosophy is a system that maps our becoming-germinal, and this process is not in some other-worldly realm or held together by a God. It is ‘we’ that determines the flux and flow of all of our actions. Deleuze thinks that by changing the configuration of our understanding, by getting rid of false hierarchies and representations, we can have another chance at becoming a subject and becoming ‘the other’.
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