

7. LEARNING WITH BODYMIND

Constructing the Cartographies of the Unthought

Addressing the significant role of post-formal, cultural, education in the process of identity-formation, Joe Kincheloe (2005, 2008) conceptualized bricolage as drawing from multiple theoretical and methodological resources, including hermeneutics, phenomenology, and narratology, while retaining the rigor of the best critical thought. For Kincheloe, *doing bricolage* involves marginalized practices and the development of transgressive conceptual tools as well as exploring the breadth and wealth of typically underestimated human cognitive capacities. The term bricolage originally belongs to Claude Lévi-Strauss (1966) who posited it in the context of structuralism defined as the search for the underlying patterns of thought in all forms of human activity.

Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari (1983) referred to bricolage as a “schizoanalytic” and transgressive mode of production. While research in education continues to be informed largely by a dualistic paradigm with its separation between subject and object, educational theory informed by Deleuze’s philosophy makes such dualism highly problematical, especially with regard to the *a priori* self-conscious Cogito grounded in the certain and indubitable “I think”. In this chapter, such a transgressive mode is applied to the problematic of the production of subjectivity as the process of becoming, in which consciousness and the unconscious – or unthought – dimension are mutually enfolded.

Deleuze and Guattari relate participation in the reality of what is produced to the figure of the schizophrenic, that is, a person whose condition is considered pathological in the context of a rational discourse which posits a dualistic separation of subjects from objects, and the method of which is detached objective observation. But a schizophrenic lives within the very interface with the natural world because of his intense connection to the unconscious. His subjectivity is a mode of intensity, which is capable of expressing itself in its present actuality neither by means of progressive climbing toward the ultimate truth or the highest moral ideal, nor by “looking for origins, even lost or deleted ones, but setting out to catch things where they were at work, in the middle: breaking things open, breaking words open” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 86). As a method which is at once “critical and clinical” (Deleuze, 1997), schizoanalysis enables the integration of the unconscious or the unthought into rational thinking in the process of collecting together the “fractured I of a dissolved Cogito” (Deleuze,

1994a, p. 194). An important parameter of such integration is the notion of the fold.

Deleuze conceptualized the fold as “the inside *of* the outside” (Deleuze, 1988a, p. 97) wherein the “outside is not a fixed limit but a moving matter animated by ... movements, folds and foldings that together make up an inside” (Ibid.). The fold serves as a powerful metaphor for overcoming the dualism between rational and non-rational – or conceptual and aconceptual – thinking, or any of the binary opposites for that matter exemplified in Cartesian substance dualism between mind and matter. The deep layer of inner knowledge buried in the unconscious mind expresses itself amidst the folds of experience comprising dynamic matter permeated by fluid forces that form “a field ... wedded to nonmetric, acentered, rhizomatic multiplicities” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 381). Thus the process of subject-formation in the context of post-formal education is a function of the differential dynamics of unfolding and cannot be reduced to a pre-existent identity.

“Being as fold” (Deleuze, 1988a, p. 110) exceeds the conscious conceptual representations of common sense but focuses on the “interiorization of the outside. It is not a reproduction of the Same, but a repetition of the Different. It is not the emanation of an ‘I’ but something that places in immanence an always other” (Deleuze, 1988a, p. 98). The complex conceptualization of the repetition of the different might seem to be a contradiction in terms if not for the epistemic role of the unconscious existing over and above the intentional, phenomenological consciousness or the ego-consciousness of psychoanalysis. Following Nietzsche, Deleuze replaces Apollonian rationality and the centrality of the Self with the processes of individuation as becoming-other, becoming-Dionysus.

Because the production of subjectivity includes the realm of the unconscious, it is specifically “the cartographies of the unconscious [that] would have to become indispensable complements to the current systems of rationality of ... all ... regions of knowledge and human activity” (Guattari, original French, in Bosteels, 1998), among which education is paramount!

For Deleuze, rational Cartesian consciousness as the sole constituent of thought is insufficient because what is yet unthought is equally capable of producing practical effects at the level of human experience. Deleuze considered “*an unconscious of thought* just as profound as *the unknown of the body*” (Deleuze, 1988a, p. 19; italics Deleuze’s). The quality of profundity is significant and relates schizoanalysis to analytical or depth psychology informed not by Freud but by Jung (cf. Kerslake, 2007; Semetsky, 2011; Semetsky & Delpech-Ramey, 2012). The unconscious is a multiplicity that exceeds the scope of traditional psychoanalytic thought, which reduces everything to a single master-signifier, the Oedipal complex. Over and above personal consciousness that has been repressed, it is conceptualized by Deleuze and Guattari as anti-Oedipal and irreducible to familial dramas. Reminiscent of the Jungian *collective*

unconscious, it is “a productive machine ... at once social and desiring” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 144).

Jung’s dynamic process of the individuation of the Self as the goal of the analysis of the unconscious is akin to Deleuze’s notion of becoming-other as a process of learning by virtue of immersing oneself in intense bodily encounters with uncanny and yet unthought of experiences that can produce a shock to conscious thinking. Rather than attempting to learn by being instructed to do so, for Deleuze to learn means “to constitute this space of an encounter with signs, in which the distinctive points renew themselves in each other, and repetition takes shape while disguising itself” (Deleuze, 1994a, p. 23). We apprehend experience not by grounding empirical particulars in abstract universals but by experimentation, by extending mind to the level of the body when a novel concept becomes created in practice

as object of an encounter, as a here-and-now, ... from which emerge inexhaustibly ever new, differently distributed ‘heres’ and ‘nows’. ... I make, remake and unmake my concepts along a moving horizon, from an always decentered center, from an always displaced periphery which repeats and differentiates them (Deleuze, 1994a, pp. xx–xxi).

It is not our isolated and non-extended Cogitos but the multiple parameters of the unconscious implicit in experiential encounters that create novel relations in our real experience, because as dynamic forces they are capable of affecting and effecting changes, thus contesting the very identity of subjects on the road to individuation. The unconscious perceptions are implicated as subliminal, or micro-, perceptions (Deleuze, 1993); as such, they become part of the cartographic microanalysis – schizoanalysis – of establishing “an unconscious psychic mechanism that engenders the perceived in consciousness” (Deleuze, 1993, p. 95).

Deleuze’s method for putting the fractured pieces of the dissolved “I” together, that is, integrating the unconscious into consciousness, is empirical, as embedded in the multiple contexts, situations and events representing the wealth of human experiences; yet it is radically transcendental because the foundations of empirical principles are left outside our common faculties of perception so that we have to transcend them in practice. It is at the interstice between body and mind amidst the aforementioned movements, folds and foldings that we become capable of perceiving the seemingly imperceptible.

Deleuze wants to achieve the means to “show the imperceptible” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 45), that is, become capable of bridging the gap between the sensible and the intelligible, matter and mind. His method of transcendental empiricism affirms “the double in the doubling process” (Deleuze, 1988a, p. 98). “Doubling” is taken in the sense of unfolding that presupposes a necessary existence of the extra – outside – dimension, without which the concept of fold is meaningless. This extra (outside) dimension becomes internalized, enfolded. Therefore the

“other in me” (Deleuze, 1988a, p. 98) is always implicit in the unconscious, in the unthought, the subtle language of which is to be made explicit so as to effectuate the process of becoming-*other*.

The imperceptible and as yet unthought affects are shown in practice at the level of the body as the visible, perceptible, sensible and material; rather than being simply “thought” at the level of the rational mind. Perceiving something essentially imperceptible is made possible by laying down the plane of immanence. This is how Deleuze and Guattari defined the plane of immanence which, for them, was not limited to just a rational mind or immediate conceptual understanding:

Precisely because the plane of immanence...does not immediately take effects with concepts, it implies a sort of groping experimentation and its layout resorts to measures that are not very respectable, rational, or reasonable. These measures belong to the order of dreams, of pathological processes, esoteric experiences, drunkenness, and excess. We head for the horizon, on the plane of immanence, and we return with bloodshot eyes, yet they are the eyes of the mind (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 41).

The eyes of the mind can see with this extra, as if sixth, sense, which demonstrates “the genesis of intuition in intelligence” (Deleuze, 1991, p. 111) as the implicit presence of the unthought and the unconscious in cognitive thinking. Together they form what semiotician Floyd Merrell calls “bodymind” as an integrated mode of thought that enables one to *live to learn*, and to *learn to live* (Merrell, 2002).

The construction of the plane of “immanence [which] is the unconscious itself” (Deleuze, 1988b, p. 29) implies the affective awakening of the inner eye (Noddings & Shore, 1984) as opposed to the cold, dispassionate and unblinking gaze of the conscious Cogito. Affects are not subjective feelings but “becomings that spill over beyond whoever lives through them (thereby becoming someone else)” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 127): becoming-other. Becoming-other is described as “an extreme contiguity within a coupling of two sensations without resemblance or, on the contrary, in the distance of a light that captures both of them in a single reflection. ... It is a zone...of indiscernibility.... This is what is called an *affect*” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 173). Deleuze and Guattari say that “affects ... traverse [one’s universe of being]... like the beam of light that draws a hidden universe out of the shadow” (1994, p. 66); this hidden, invisible, universe becoming known – as if visible to the inner eye – in the form of deep knowledge (cf. Semetsky, 2011), even if as yet unthought of consciously, that informs our immediate practical actions. Indeed, according to Lévi-Strauss’s (1966) definition, bricolage reflects spontaneous human action grounded in the characteristic patterns of mythological – that is, non-rational but what he called savage – thinking.

Deleuze purports to show the imperceptible by means of cartography which lays down a visible “map” of the invisible “territory”, thereby creating the

conjunction in our actual practical experience between what are customarily considered the dualistic opposites (“without resemblance”) of matter and mind, *psyche* and *physis*. The conjunction *and* is the principal characteristic of the logic of multiplicities behind the dynamics of becoming described by a process in which any given multiplicity “changes in nature as it expands its connections” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 8). Subjectivity, as embedded in the process of becoming, differs from the traditional notion of the self looked at, and rationally appealed to, from the macroperspective of theory; instead Deleuze recognizes the micropolitical dimension of culture as a contextual, circumstantial and problematic site where subjects are situated and produced. Hence subjectivity is always already “a being-multiple” (Deleuze & Parnet, 1987, p. viii), that is, not an individual but a relational entity.

The exteriority of relations puts into action the experimental and experiential logic of multiplicities, which is not “subordinate to the verb to be.... Substitute the AND for IS. A *and* B. The AND is...the path of all relations, which makes relations shoot outside their terms” (Deleuze & Parnet, 1987, p. 57). It is the conjunction *and* that enables a relation between the opposites and connects them in a rhizomatic network, thereby defying the dualistic split of *either* sensible *or* intelligible, *either* rational thought *or* lived experience, *either* cognition *or* emotion, *either* material *or* spiritual. Rather than being “either-or” separate categories, body and mind form a “both-and” integrated pair conducive to experimental and experiential, *bodymind*, learning.

Rhizome is a biological metaphor used by Deleuze and Guattari to describe a model of thinking irreducible to the single stable foundation represented by Cogito as a principle for certainty of theoretical knowledge. As embedded in practice, a rhizomatic network constitutes the relational dynamics that comprises multiple transversal lines leading to the creation of novel meanings for experience. Yet, because the rhizome’s life proceeds underground, its growth appears imperceptible or invisible to our ordinary sense-perception. It is intuition or insight that reaches out “to the deepest things, the ‘arcana’” (Deleuze, 1990, p. 322) implicated in the folds of being.

Says Deleuze, “I undo the folds...that pass through every one of my thresholds...‘the twenty-two folds’ that surround me and separate me from the deep” (Deleuze, 1993, p. 93). Quoting Henri Michaux, he says that children are born with the twenty-two folds which are to be unfolded. Only then can human life become complete, fulfilled, individuated. The conscious “intentionality of being is surpassed by the fold of Being, Being as fold” (Deleuze, 1988a, p. 110) in which the unconscious or unthought is implicated. It is due to an experiential, embodied, unfolding as the explication of the unconscious (*le pli* in French means the fold) that “the individual [becomes] able to transcend his form and his syntactical link with a world” (Deleuze, 1994a, p. 178).

The syntactical link produced by verbal language expressing propositional thought that describes objects in the world does not include *Sens*, which in French means both meaning and direction, or our *ethos* as practical self-creation

and self-education irreducible to formal schooling under instruction. This impoverished syntactic link is transformed into a meaningful connection enabled not by verbal expressions of the conscious mind alone but by a different regime of signs reflecting the depth of the unconscious that may elicit spontaneous action within unexpected, bordering on uncanny, experiences as affective encounters. It is an assemblage of relations that are capable of constructing the unpredictable experiential world, which unfolds in an uncanny manner, resembling a bricolage as

a Harlequin's jacket or patchwork, made up of solid parts and voids, blocs and ruptures, attractions and divisions, nuances and bluntnesses, conjunctions and separations, alternations and interweavings, additions which never reach a total and subtractions whose remainder is never fixed.... This geography of relations is particularly important.... one must make the encounter with relations penetrate and corrupt everything, undermine being.... The AND as extra-being, inter-being (Deleuze & Parnet, 1987, pp. 55–57).

It is both mind AND body connected with each other through the geography of relations that form the practical cartography that ensures bodymind learning. It is not solely the power of our consciousness but the multiple and varying effects of the unconscious that create novel patterns in our real-life experience. They represent the problematic instances embedded in spontaneous bodily actions. In our experiential encounters such problems appear at first only as subliminal or subconscious (as yet imperceptible or micro-perceptible) elements that cannot be immediately recognized but need schizoanalysis that employs the cartographic method.

Deleuze reconstructs a powerful story, based on the classic example used by Leibniz (that reflects his idea of the sea as a system of differential relations), of a novice athlete who learns to swim through a becoming: herself in the water within intense bodily encounters with waves. The swimmer struggles because she is facing the unknown and unthought that includes her not-yet-knowing-how-to swim, and the swimmer's movement does not resemble the movement of the wave. Nor would it imitate the instructor's movements given not in the water but on the shore. Learning happens when a body actualizes in practice the multiplicity of its virtual potentialities.

Learning cannot be based on an *a priori* representation; this would be the reproduction of the same, denounced by Deleuze. Instead Deleuze emphasizes the "sensory-motivity" (1994a, p. 23) of the genuine learner, exemplified in the image of the athlete, who tries to co-ordinate her own sensor-motor activity with an intense, and opposing, force of water, as if evaluating her present mode of existence – sink or swim! Such an evaluation is an effect of the encounter with the unknown, therefore as yet unthinkable. The swimmer becomes an apprentice immersed in the practice of swimming. Deleuze insists that

we learn nothing from those who say: ‘Do as I do’. Our only teachers are those who tell us to ‘do with me’, and are able to emit signs to be developed in heterogeneity rather than propose gestures for us to reproduce.... When a body combines some of its own distinctive points with those of a wave, it espouses the principle of a repetition which is no longer that of the Same, but involves the Other – involves difference, from one wave and one gesture to another, and carries that difference through the repetitive space thereby constituted. To learn is indeed to constitute this space of an encounter with signs (Deleuze, 1994a, p. 23).

It is in the real-life experiential singularity within an encounter with actual waves, in which the virtual idea of swimming subsists, that we can experiment with this idea and comprehend its meaning not by means of a theoretical contemplation but through practical encounters, by means of bodymind learning. Experience is thus paramount for learning, for creating new modes of existence. Such informal pedagogy “would have to analyze the conditions of creation as factors of always singular moments” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 12). Becoming-other is established via “diversity, multiplicity [and] the destruction of identity” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 44) so that the integrated Self can be created. Individuation presupposes breaking out of old habits and into new territories.

Yet our old habits die hard, and individuation depends on “the harshest exercise in depersonalization” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 6) within the transformational pragmatics that originates “among a broken chain of affects” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 9) enfolded in life experiences. Subtle affects and sensations inhabiting the unconscious have “the irreducibly synthetic character” (Deleuze, 2003, p. 33). The synthetic, and not solely analytic, quality of schizoanalysis is oriented to the creative emergence of new meanings. The unfolding of the unconscious in the process of individuation presents “life as a work of art” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 94) that we actively create. The swimming example presents the sea as the epitome of the unconscious Nature, a literal presentation of fluid uncontrollable forces that produce a shock to thought and make this new experience a struggle for a novice athlete.

Thinking, for Deleuze, is “not just a theoretical matter. It [is] to do with vital problems. To do with life itself” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 105). This life that embodies vital problems is a life as pure immanence (Deleuze, 2001) concealed in its virtual mode of existence in the transcendental field of the collective unconscious. We can (re)create such a life in our actual practice under the condition of bodymind learning which can “bring this assemblage of the unconscious to the light of day, ...select the whispering voices, ...gather the tribes and secret idioms from which I extract something I call my Self (*Moi*)” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 84). Such an emergent Self (who has learned to swim and not to sink!) is the practical outcome of holistic, bodymind, education situated in nomadic spaces (cf. Semetsky, 2008b).

Nomad is a mobile, dynamic element; according to Deleuze, nomads are always “becoming ... they transmute and reappear” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 153) by consistently becoming-other. The integration of the unconscious into consciousness necessarily leads to the “intensification of life” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 74) by virtue of the affective “experimentation on ourselves [that] is our only identity, our single chance for all the combinations which inhabit us” (Deleuze & Parnet, 1987, p. 11). This experimentation constitutes post-formal bodymind learning. We can become “filled with immanence” (Deleuze, 1997, p. 137) therefore necessarily fulfilled by *Sens* – meaning and direction – that we ourselves create in our embodied experiences.

For Deleuze, learning is “infinite [and] of a different nature to knowledge” (Deleuze, 1994a, p. 192): it is a creative process of assigning meanings and values to experience, partaking as such of self-creation and transforming one’s identity. Individuation cannot proceed without a means to both express and transform oneself, and Deleuze and Guattari (1987) referred to *metamorphosis* with regard to Jung’s theory of the transformation of the libido as spiritual or psychic energy irreducible to Freud’s limited definition of the libido as a sex drive. Deleuze considered transformation, or change in nature, to be a precondition for becoming-other.

It is multiple interpretations and revaluations of experience by means of which “we rediscover singular processes of learning” (Deleuze, 1994a, p. 25) and become creative and fruitful in our endeavors. We become able to bring novelty to life; only thus our life “reconquers an immanent power of creation” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 140). Novelty comes into being, or becomes, along lines of flight. Novelty is created in experience when some potential, as yet “non-localizable connections” (Deleuze, 1994a, p. 83), such as the connection between body and mind, between a swimmer and the sea, meet each other along the lines of rhizomatic becomings.

The creative, transformative, and evaluative element embedded in experiential learning defies the reductive approach to education as merely formal schooling. Post-formal education embedded in real life has an ethical dimension as its intrinsic value. This type of education is genuinely ethical because it “does ... challenge deeply held beliefs or ways of life” (Noddings, 2006, p. 1). Bodymind learning is necessarily characterized by “new percepts and new affects” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 164) created in our experience, in practical life. Deleuze’s philosophy presents concepts, meanings and values as future-oriented and yet-to-become when we ourselves create them in the process of learning from experience, from the depths of the collective unconscious.

Our ideas are often so enveloped or enfolded “in the soul that we can’t always unfold or develop them” (Deleuze, 1993, p. 49) by means of our cognitive tools alone, unless experience itself becomes saturated with affective, almost numinous, conditions for their unfolding, because this deep inner or Gnostic (Semetsky, 2011) “knowledge is known only where it is folded” (Deleuze, 1993, p. 49). It is cartography that can “map” the multiple parameters of the

unconscious. Yet it does not reproduce a pre-existent “territory” limited to conscious Cogito but engenders a newly integrated subjectivity.

Everything, according to Deleuze, has “its geography, its cartography, its diagram. What’s interesting, even in a person, are the lines that make them up, or they make up, or take, or create.... What we call a ‘map’, or sometimes a ‘diagram’ is a set of various interacting lines (thus the lines in a hand are a map)” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 33). Such “topological and specifically cartographic” (Bosteels, 1998, p. 146) being (or, rather, becoming) is to be evaluated not in terms of the rigid value-judgments pronounced by Cogito but by means of spatial metaphors such as cartography or geophilosophy (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994) as the locus of situations and events. Subjectivity constitutes itself via the cartographic method; it engenders itself through multiple connections by mapping both “the psychic and the social” (Bosteels, 1998, p. 150), that is, the dimensions constituting the fold of both inside and outside: the inside *of* the outside.

A map or a diagram, in its function of linking discursive (conscious) and non-discursive (unconscious, bodily) modes of expression, acts as an unorthodox connection, the purpose of which is to “pursue the different series, to travel along the different levels, and cross all thresholds; instead of simply displaying phenomena or statements in their vertical or horizontal dimensions, one must form a transversal or mobile diagonal line” (Deleuze, 1988a, p. 22). The line of flight between binary opposites establishes “a bridge, a transversality” (Guattari, 1995, p. 23). These creative lines of becoming defy the universality of dualistic thinking; the latter becomes subsumed by transversality which establishes the conjunction *and* between Cartesian isolated substances.

It is in this respect that philosophy gives way to cartography. Linear reasoning is replaced by the processes of becoming, enfolding and unfolding. The supposedly substantial stable self – the rational and static, finally beyond-doubt, *subject* of the Cartesian method, yet forever separated from the equally static world of *objects* – is transformed into a machinic multiplicity in the dynamic process of organic relations between “the semiotic machine, the referred object and the enunciative subject” (Guattari, original French, in Bosteels, 1998, p. 167). There is no return to the subject, to the old self, but invention and creation of new possibilities of life by means of going beyond the play of forces. The world is an enfolded network of relation; as such we

can endure it, so that everything doesn’t confront us at once. ... ‘Children are born with twenty-two folds. These have to be unfolded. Then a man’s life is complete’¹.... It’s not enough for force to be exerted on other forces or to suffer the effects of other forces, it has to be exerted upon itself too.... There’s no subject, but a production of subjectivity: subjectivity has to be produced, when its time arrives.... The time comes once we’ve worked through knowledge and power; it’s that work that forces us to frame the

new question, it couldn't have been framed before" (Deleuze, 1995, pp. 112–114).

It is the specific "*power to affect itself, an affect of self on self*" (Deleuze, 1988a, p. 101; Deleuze's italics) that not only leads to a production of subjectivity but also ensures the emergence of the Self at a new level. What is *implicated* in a fold is not only *explicated* but also, in the process of becoming-other, involves *complication*. At this level there is neither room for the old set of concepts or values, nor are eternal ones stored there. Deleuze's philosophy partakes of creative art and

always speaks of values that are to come.... [T]he artist and philosopher do not conjure things out of thin air, even if their conceptions and productions appear as utterly fantastical. Their compositions are only possible because they are able to connect, to tap into the virtual and immanent processes of machinic becoming (there are no points on the map, only lines), even if such a connection and tapping into are the most difficult things to lay hold of and demonstrate.... One can only seek to show the power, the affectivity, the ...alienated character of thought. One...is drawn to the land of the always near-future, ...readings the signs, ...and decoding the secrets of intelligent alien life within and without us" (Ansell-Pearson, 1997, p. 4).

The aforementioned tapping into the virtual means the possibility of it becoming-actual. Because "subjectification is an artistic activity" (Deleuze, 1995, pp. 112–114) oriented to self-creation and is a function of connecting, "tapping", and mapping, it cannot be *a priori* intentional or volitional but depends on our learning from unfolding experience that includes the unthought and the unconscious. We become able to frame a new question precisely because of becoming-other by becoming conscious of the unthought and the unconscious.

Through the cartographies of the unthought a specific problem – that, as Deleuze points out, "couldn't have been framed before" – is brought to our awareness. Deleuze's post-structuralism presents a hidden (unthought-of) "structure [as] part of objects themselves [hence] allowing its positivity and its specificity to be grasped in the act of *learning*" (Deleuze, 1994a, p. 64; Deleuze's italics). Learning to live and living to learn is the form of post-formal ethical education that takes us to future territories that are implicated in the virtual field of multiple becomings.

The actualization of virtual potentialities is "always a genuine creation" (Deleuze, 1994a, p. 212). We learn not by virtue of being instructed, but because of our engagement with, and our embodiment in, the objective world, so that learning is equated with creation, with creating new meanings for our experiences. We do not learn "from those who say: 'Do as I do'" (Deleuze, 1994a, p. 23); instead we learn by unfolding the experiential folds of the unconscious in our practical experiences, thereby creating our Selves as whole integrated personalities by means of a genuinely artistic activity that can draw

“a hidden universe out of the shadow” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 66). This hidden universe of knowledge becomes explicated and brought to light through the shadows of the unconscious whenever an intensified learning experience, that always involves the other, creates in us the power of thinking the unthinkable.

The process of discovering our real, yet always dynamic, identity is a process of meaning-making and is a function of living and learning. Therefore the unconscious is the necessary – and quite often, as Deleuze would say, *dark* – precursor for learning, for individuation, for becoming-other. Deleuze’s philosophy of transcendental empiricism, which is “patterned after Bergson’s intuition” (Boundas, 1996, p. 87), is equivalent to bodymind learning, to integrating the unconscious into consciousness. As “the presentation of the unconscious, [and] not the representation of consciousness” (Deleuze, 1994a, p. 192), it is intuition that constructs the plane of immanence aiming “to bring into being that which does not yet exist” (Deleuze, 1994a, p. 147) but only subsists in its virtual mode. It is in practical experience that we become capable of traversing a “fundamental distinction between subrepresentative, unconscious and aconceptual ideas/intensities and the conscious conceptual representation of common sense” (Bogue, 1989, p. 5).

The play of affects may reach “a point of excess and unloosening” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 134). At this crucial turning point there are two options: a subject must “either annihilate itself in a black hole or change planes. Destratify, open up to a new function, a diagrammatic function” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 134), such a diagram or a map being an intrinsic element of cartographic microanalysis. In the example of swimming, a novice athlete struggles so as not to sink – hence annihilate – but so as to destratify her very being by becoming-other. Destratification involves the unfolding of experiential folds so as to construct a map of an unknown territory, analogous to the philosophical *outside* as the conglomerate of natural affective forces.

Incidentally, Jung, defying Freud’s reducing the unconscious to just its personal dimension, commented that Freud “was blind toward the paradox and ambiguity of the contents of the unconscious, and did not know that everything which arises out of the unconscious has...an inside and an outside” (Jung, 1963, p. 153) – quite in accord with Deleuze’s (non)philosophy. It is the realm of as yet unthinkable that constitutes the outside leading to a swimmer’s de- and re-territorialization whenever she becomes able to traverse her own spatio-temporal boundaries by “plunging...into the depth of Nature, or of the Unconscious” (Deleuze & Parnet, 1987, p. 91).

The bodymind learning combines “the objects of an aleatory outside [that] impress themselves in the form of ‘ideas’ upon the body, which infolds the effects of those objects in the form of thoughts” (Wolfe, 1998, p. 120). The outside has its own pragmatics, and in this cartography a swimmer creates her as yet unknown territory anew by integrating the unconscious into consciousness, by learning how to swim in practice. Indeed, a theoretical “know that” is of little

assistance to a novice athlete in her practical experience of struggling with the waves. The breakthrough is established by a line of flight that “upsets being” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 44); yet it connects body and mind so that “things come to pass and becomings evolve” (1995, p. 45). One is not consciously passing through the line of flight; just the opposite, Deleuze insists that “something [is] passing through you” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 141) and the conjunction *and* is established in practice, acting as such as a distributed marker of a new breakthrough, “a new threshold, a new direction of the zigzagging line, a new course for the border” (1995, p. 45).

A swimmer is a *bricoleur* embedded in lived experience who must act as the first explorer to discover new territories, try new strategies, and open new avenues while restructuring her mode of existence. A *bricoleur* who “thinks” through affects and percepts demonstrates “the possibility of the impossible” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 60) in her embodied experience, thereby putting into practice “the supreme act of philosophy: not so much to think *the* plane of immanence as to show that it is there, unthought in every plane, and to think it in this way as the outside and inside of thought, as the non-external outside and the non-internal inside – that which cannot be thought and yet must be thought” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, pp. 59–60).

It is on the basis of the reality of the outside, of the unthought and the unconscious, that all existence, including ourselves, is produced. The outside has its own style as a means to communicate, to bring into existence that of which we were scarcely aware. The intensity of experience is such that it “brings together... the stutter, the tremolo, or the vibrato and imparts upon words the resonance of the affect under consideration” (Deleuze, 1994b, p. 24). A swimmer both affects and is herself affected; such resonance marking the passage between the experiential states of the body, which is defined by Deleuze, following Spinoza, as both physical and mental, corporeal and incorporeal; *bodymind* in short! Accordingly, the body’s power is being changed.

Deleuze specifies the body’s power as the capacity to multiply and intensify connections. The Deleuzian philosophy is “not a question of intellectual understanding...but of intensity, resonance, musical harmony” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 86). It is guided by the “logic of affects” (Guattari, 1995, p. 9) that was employed by a swimmer unconsciously when she tried to coordinate her own movements with the movements of the waves. There is no other logic than one immanent to life and survival! Its rationale is pragmatic (Semetsky, 2006) and the thinking it produces over the background of affects is experimental and experiential. Existing in “essential and positive relation to non-philosophy” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 140), it is such a creative logic of education (Semetsky, 2008a) that can establish a dialogue between Apollo and Dionysus, between consciousness and the unconscious.

While acknowledging Lacan’s critique of Jung because of the general hostility of structuralism towards “the methods of the imaginary” (Deleuze, 1968/1998, p. 269), Deleuze, similar to Jung, presents structures as “unconscious, [and]

necessarily overlaid by their products or effects” (p. 270). For Deleuze, anything can possess a structure insofar as this “thing” maintains even a *silent discourse*. Nature “speaks” albeit silently, and we can perceive these imperceptible “voices” at the level of the body in the form of affects; thus enter into a dialogue with nature by creating a bodymind assemblage that combines “two inseparable planes in reciprocal presupposition” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 109).

That is how the swimmer learns! The swimmer and the sea are defined “by their mutual solidarity, and neither of them can be identified otherwise” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 45) while engaged in bodymind learning and becoming able to “free life from where it’s trapped” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 141) by creating new meanings and concepts “for unknown lands” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 103) and yet unthought of situations. Whenever the real-life forces are “seized *in actu* [and] liberated from substances that function as their support and vehicle, [they] do seem better candidates for a diagrammatic mapping out of becoming” (Boundas, 1994, p. 105) and constructing cartographies in experience.

The unthought and the unconscious are embedded in an “Outside [which is] more distant than any exterior, [and] is ‘twisted’, ‘folded’, and ‘doubled’ by an Inside that is deeper than any interior, and alone creates the possibility of the derived relation between the interior and exterior” (Deleuze, 1988a, p. 110). This relation forms a unified bodymind assemblage that includes the unconscious, as yet aconceptual, dimension. As a method of diagrammatic mapping of the unconscious, cartography creates a nomadic space of possibilities, something yet to come. The cartographic map serves as a pragmatic tool to “*read*, find, [and] retrieve the structures” (Deleuze, 1968/1998, p. 270, Deleuze’s italics) that are enfolded in the outside of conscious thought and become unfolded in the process of bodymind learning.

NOTES

- ¹ Deleuze’s quotation on the twenty-two folds is from *The Space Within* by Henri Michaux, in *The New Directions Series*, printed in France by Henri Marchand & Company. Michaux’s book was first published by Gallimard in Paris in 1944 under the title *L’Espace du Dedans* and then appeared in English as *Selected Writings: the space within* (translated, with an introduction by Richard Ellmann).

REFERENCES

- Ansell-Pearson, K. (1997). Deleuze Outside/Outside Deleuze. In K. Ansell-Pearson (Ed.), *Deleuze and Philosophy: The Difference Engineer* (pp. 1–22). London: Routledge.
- Bogue, R. (1989). *Deleuze and Guattari*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Bosteels, B. (1998). From text to territory: Félix Guattari's cartographies of the unconscious. In E. Kaufman & K. J. Heller (Eds.), *Deleuze and Guattari: New Mappings in Politics, Philosophy and Culture* (pp. 145–174). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Boundas, C. V. (1994). Deleuze: Serialization and Subject-Formation. In C. V. Boundas & D. Olkowski (Eds.), *Gilles Deleuze and the Theater of Philosophy* (pp. 96–116). London: Routledge.
- Boundas, C. V. (1996). Deleuze-Bergson: An ontology of the virtual. In P. Patton (Ed.), *Deleuze: A Critical Reader* (pp. 86–106). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Deleuze, G. (1968/1998). How do we recognize structuralism? In (M. McMahon & C. J. Stivale, Trans.) C. J. Stivale (Ed.), *The Two-Fold Thought of Deleuze and Guattari: Intersections and Animations* (pp. 251–282). New York, London: The Guilford Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1988a). *Foucault* (S. Hand, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1988b). *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy* (R. Hurley, Trans.). San Francisco: City Lights Books.
- Deleuze, G. (1990). *Expressionism in Philosophy: Spinoza* (M. Joughin, Trans.). New York: Zone Books.
- Deleuze, G. (1991). *Bergsonism* (H. Tomlinson, Trans.). New York: Zone Books.
- Deleuze, G. (1993). *The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque* (T. Conley, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1994a). *Difference and Repetition* (P. Patton, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1994b). He Stuttered. In C. V. Boundas & D. Olkowski (Eds.), *Gilles Deleuze and the Theater of Philosophy* (pp. 22–29). London: Routledge.
- Deleuze, G. (1995). *Negotiations, 1972–1990* (M. Joughin, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1997). *Essays Critical and Clinical* (D. W. Smith & M. Greco, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G. (2001). *Pure Immanence: Essays on a Life* (A. Boyman, Trans.). New York: Zone Books.
- Deleuze, G. (2003). *Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation* (D. W. Smith, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1983). *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (R. Hurley, M. Seem, & H. R. Lane, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1994). *What is Philosophy?* (H. Tomlinson & G. Burchell, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G., & Parnet, C. (1987). *Dialogues* (H. Tomlinson & B. Habberjam, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Guattari, F. (1995). *Chaosmosis: An Ethico-aesthetic Paradigm* (P. Bains & J. Pefanis, Trans.). Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1963). *Memories, Dreams, Reflections* (R. Winston & C. Winston, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Kerslake, C. (2007). *Deleuze and the Unconscious*. New York: Continuum.

- Kincheloe, J. L. (2005). On to the next level: Continuing the conceptualization of the Bricolage. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 11(3), 323–350.
- Kincheloe, J. L. (2008). *Knowledge and Critical Pedagogy: An Introduction*. Dordrecht, London: Springer.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1966). *The Savage Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Merrell, F. (2002). *Learning Living, Living Learning: Signs, Between East and West*. New York, Toronto: Legas.
- Noddings, N. (2006). *Critical Lessons: What our Schools Should Teach*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Noddings, N., & Shore, P. J. (1984). *Awakening the Inner Eye: Intuition in Education*. New York & London: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Semetsky, I. (2006). *Deleuze, Education and Becoming*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Semetsky, I. (2008a). Re-reading Dewey through the lens of complexity science, or: On the creative logic of education. In M. Mason (Ed.), *Complexity Theory and the Philosophy of Education* (pp. 79–90). Blackwell-Wiley.
- Semetsky, I. (2011). *Re-Symbolization of the Self: Human Development and Tarot Hermeneutic*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Semetsky, I. (Ed.). (2008b). *Nomadic Education: Variations on a Theme by Deleuze and Guattari*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Semetsky, I., & Delpech-Ramey, J. A. (2012). Jung's psychology and Deleuze's philosophy: The unconscious in learning. In I. Semetsky (Ed.), *Educational Philosophy and Theory, Special Issue: Jungian Currents in Education* (Vol. 44, pp. 69–80).
- Wolfe, C. (1998). Critical environments: Postmodern theory and the pragmatics of the outside. In S. Buckley, M. Hardt, & B. Massumi (Eds.), *Theory Out of Bounds 13*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.