Introduction

Roderick Main, Christian McMillan, and David Henderson

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

While reflection on the concept of the whole and its relations to the elements that constitute the whole has been a staple of Western philosophical and cultural traditions since the ancient Greeks (Dusek 1999: 19-22; Esfeld 2003: 10), such reflection has had, from the beginning of the twentieth century, several moments of particular salience. The significance of wholeness was much discussed, for example, in the life and mind sciences as well as in the physical sciences of the first half of the twentieth-century, especially within the German-speaking world (Harrington 1996) but also more broadly (Lawrence and Weisz 1998). Ideas about wholeness were later a prominent influence on the countercultural movements of the 1960s and 1970s (Wood 2010), and continue to be so in the alternative spiritualities, therapies, and

work practices that have proliferated since the 1980s (Hanegraaff 1998, Heelas and Woodhead 2005). Concern with how to think in terms of wholes also underpins much of the current preoccupation with complexity theory (Cambray 2009), transdisciplinarity (Nicolescu 2002, 2008; Rowland 2016), and, certainly not least, ecology (Marietta 1994; Fellows 2019).

In most of these contexts, concern with the concept of the whole has been both epistemological and ethical. On the one hand, scientists and researchers have been taxed with how to acquire adequate knowledge and understanding of phenomena, such as those relating to life, consciousness, or culture, whose complexity does not readily lend itself to the kind of reductive analyses that have proven so successful in physics and chemistry (Phillips 1976). On the other hand, cultural commentators have argued that many of the environmental, political, economic, social, and psychological problems besetting the modern world have their deep roots in forms of thinking that embed divisive and fragmenting dualisms — for example, between humans and nature, spirit and matter, Creator and creation — and have advanced concepts of wholeness as means to foster a greater sense of interconnectedness, reconciliation, and unity (Berman 1981; Hanegraaff 1998: 119).

Perspectives giving central importance to the concept of the whole have also acquired, especially in the English-speaking world, an influential new moniker: holism (Smuts 1926). Coined by Jan Smuts in 1926, the term ‘holism’ and its adjectival form ‘holistic’ are now used, with varying emotional loading and varying degrees of clarity and emphasis, in practically every area of contemporary life, including academic as well as popular contexts (Main, McMillan, and Henderson

2020: 1-6). Reflecting this widespread usage, the terms ‘holism’ and ‘holistic’ are also used at many points in the present work, even though Jung seems never to have employed the German translation of holism (*Holismus*) nor Deleuze its French translation (*holisme*) – they wrote instead in terms of the German and French words for ‘the whole’: *die Ganzheit* (and its cognates) and *le Tout*, respectively.

Whether dubbed holism or not, thinking in terms of the whole has a presence in recent and contemporary academic and popular thought that could benefit from being more fully examined. Despite the salience their ideas have achieved in some quarters, advocates of holistic thinking have been charged with unrealisable epistemological ambitions, with misrepresenting reductionism, and with logical absurdity (Phillips 1976), as well as with claiming desirable outcomes, such as environmental outcomes, that are attributable to other factors (James 2007). Again, contrary to the claims that holistic thinking has beneficial ethical and political implications because of its reconciliation of deleterious dualisms, other commentators have charged holism with fostering ‘totalitarian intuitions’ (Popper 1957: 73). Again, the irony has not gone unnoticed that Smuts himself, for all that he promoted unity and wholeness on the highest international stage through his involvement in establishing both the League of Nations after the First World War and the United Nations after the Second World War, nevertheless was a proponent of segregation between whites and blacks in his home country of South Africa (Shelley 2008: 103). Although attempts have been made to address these epistemological and ethical criticisms (Harrington 1996, Bailis 1984-85), there continues to be deep intellectual suspicion of holistic perspectives.

With these and related issues in mind, the present book is a contribution towards clarifying the status of holistic thought through comparing relevant aspects of the work of Jung and Deleuze.[1] In focusing on Jung and Deleuze we have selected two influential twentieth-century thinkers whose work has in crucial respects been governed by the concept of the whole. For Jung, psychological wholeness, signified by the archetype of the self, was the goal of individual development, abetted where necessary by therapy (1928, 1944). Furthermore, in his later work he theorised that the wholeness whose realisation was aimed at was not just psychological but included also the world beyond the individual psyche: psyche and matter were considered two aspects of a single underlying reality which he referred to as the *unus mundus* or 'one world' (1955-56: §662). The process of realising wholeness was for Jung central not only to therapy and individual development but also to addressing many social, cultural, and political ills, which he considered largely to stem from thinking in a one-sidedly conscious (usually materialistic and rationalistic) way, without taking due account of the unconscious (1957). In his early work, the concept of the whole was an implicit concern for Jung, inasmuch as his work at that time was devoted to understanding what could be considered the opposite of wholeness, namely, psychic fragmentation that manifested as pathology (Smith 1990: 27-46). However, from the time of the experiences that led to his writing *The Red Book* (2009), wholeness became increasingly explicit as the central focus of Jung's psychological model and psychotherapy, and in the guise of the concepts of individuation and the self pervades all of his mature writing.

Compared to Jung, Deleuze had a more conspicuously ambivalent relationship to the concept of the whole. On the one hand, he was relentlessly critical of

organicistic thinking – often taken as synonymous with holism – in which the parts of a system are all considered to work towards the ends of the whole, like organs within an organism (Deleuze and Guattari 1972: 43). On the other hand, his entire opus was driven by the attempt to articulate a philosophy of pure immanence in which being was considered 'univocally', that is, not to be 'realer' in some expressions (e.g., as thinking, as consciousness, or as the Creator) than in others (e.g., as extension, as matter, or as creatures) (Deleuze 1968b, 2001). Within such a philosophy, reality could be conceptualised as an open and ever changing whole in which the parts, even though not all internally related as in an organism, are, by dint of their involvement in a single 'plane of immanence', capable of being endlessly interrelated externally, horizontally, or, in the term Deleuze (and his co-writer Félix Guattari [1930-1992]) may have borrowed form Jung, 'rhizomatically' (Deleuze and Guattari 1991: 35-60; Somers-Hall 2012: 6-7). For Deleuze, such a conception of the open whole removed the need to conceive of an organising principle (e.g., mind, God) that is transcendent to what it organises (e.g., matter, the world). This had wide-ranging ethical and political implications for Deleuze, since he considered transcendence – the conception of a dimension of reality that was separate from and superior in being and value to the rest of reality – to be the root of totalitarian and other forms of exclusionary thought through providing a locus where privileged values and aspects of identity could order the rest of reality while themselves remaining shielded from criticism (1968a). The concept of the whole as such appears episodically in Deleuze's publications. It is explicit in *Bergsonism* (1966), the two cinema books (1983, 1985), the revision of *Proust and Signs* (1972), and in *Anti-Oedipus* (1972) and *What is Philosophy?* (1991), the latter two co-authored with Guattari. But expressed or at least implicated in other terms, such as 'the virtual', 'univocity of being', 'the plane of immanence', or

the ‘Body without Organs’, the concept of the whole is arguably ubiquitous in Deleuze’s writings.

Bringing together the work of Jung and Deleuze is by no means an easy or obvious task. In the first place, neither the ideas of Jung nor those of Deleuze can be easily or stably assimilated to established mainstream systems of thought that might provide secure reference points for comparison. Jung was avowedly not a systematic thinker (1939: ix), he acknowledged that he purposely wrote in an ambiguous style (1976: 70), and he regularly both drew on and expressed himself in the language of obscure esoteric currents of thought such as Gnosticism and alchemy (1929-54, 1944, 1946, 1951, 1955-56). Deleuze, for his part, when he drew on earlier philosophers, tended to give their ideas creative new interpretations, as in his treatment of Spinoza’s concept of substance (1968b) or Nietzsche’s doctrine of eternal recurrence (1962, 1968a). Even more challengingly, when he wrote in his own voice (or collaboratively with Guattari), he seemed often to overhaul his entire conceptual language from one publication to the next (Somers-Hall 2012: 1). In the second place, it is not obvious that the intellectual trajectories of the two thinkers should significantly intersect. Where Jung was a psychologist working in Switzerland in a predominantly German-speaking intellectual environment, Deleuze was a philosopher working in France in a predominantly Francophone milieu. Moreover, Jung was fifty years Deleuze’s senior and thus of a different era, the pair never met, and the intellectual influence between them, such as it was, ran only one way, somewhat stealthily (Kerslake 2007: 70), from Jung to Deleuze.

However, the parallels and overlaps between Jung and Deleuze are nonetheless notable. Although a psychologist, Jung read deeply in philosophy, including thinkers and traditions that were also important to Deleuze, such as Kant, Nietzsche, and Western esotericism. Conversely, Deleuze, although a philosopher, explored deeply and commented critically on the concept of the unconscious and the field of psychoanalysis, including the work of Freud, Lacan, Klein, and Jung (Deleuze and Guattari 1972; Holland 2012). Both Jung and Deleuze worked athwart the mainstream in their respective disciplines, both were concerned with the relationship between personal transformation and knowledge ('gnosis'), and both were deeply critical of contemporary Western culture and politics.

Only a few prior works have explored the connections between Jung and Deleuze in any detail. Of seminal importance among these is Christian Kerslake's *Deleuze and the Unconscious* (2007), which meticulously uncovers the substantial influence of Jung on Deleuze's development of a conception of the unconscious that had more affinity with symbolist and occultist thought and the work of Janet and Bergson than with Freud's psychoanalysis. Although Deleuze was not explicit about this Jungian influence, Kerslake shows that it continued 'to shape his theory of the unconscious right up to *Difference and Repetition*' (ibid.: 69). Nor, arguably, is Kerslake's book important only for enriching understanding of Deleuze; it has also recently been hailed as '[t]he real turning point for a more comprehensive understanding of Jung's theorizing' (Hogenson 2019: 692).

Also significant, in this case for demonstrating the productivity of jointly applying the ideas of Jung and Deleuze, are works by Inna Semetsky and Barbara

Jenkins. Semetsky, in a series of books going back over a decade, has applied concepts from Jung and Deleuze in developing a theory of 'edusemiotics', on the role of signs and their interpretation in education. Her focus has been sometimes on Deleuze (Semetsky 2007), sometimes on Jung (Semetsky 2013), and sometimes on both (Semetsky 2011, 2020). No less insightfully, Jenkins (2016) has drawn on both thinkers to offer a highly original exploration of how the 'social relations between things' can illuminate the role of desire and sexual difference in culture and the economy.

Kerslake's, Semetsky's, and Jenkins's books touch on many issues germane to the concept of the whole, but it is not their main focus. The same can be said of the various shorter discussions of connections between Jung and Deleuze that have been slowly increasing in number over the past couple of decades (e.g., Hauke 2000: 80-83; Kazarian 2010; Pint 2011; Holland 2012; Semetsky and Ramey 2013; Henderson 2014: 113-18; Cambray 2017; Hogenson 2019). There have also been several substantial works that have addressed the concept of the whole and/or holism either in Jung (Smith 1990; Kelly 1993; Huskinson 2004; Cambray 2009) or, albeit often via implicated terms rather than directly, in Deleuze (Ansell-Pearson 1999, 2007; Badiou 2000; Hallward 2006; Ramey 2012; Justaert 2012). However, these works have not brought the two thinkers together.

Most relevant to the present book are several works that were either a prelude to or part of the same overall project. The prelude was a study by McMillan (2015), which undertook a Deleuzian critique of Jung's concept of the whole and compellingly flagged some potential ethical problems with Jung's formulations,

raising the question of whether and how these problems might be addressed. In a later work, focusing on late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century debates about vitalism that were of interest to both Jung and Deleuze, McMillan identified the importance of relations of interiority or exteriority in determining different kinds of holism and their ethical implications (McMillan 2020). The relations of interiority in organicistic holism imply that the whole is pre-given and closed, which could potentially give rise to forms of totalitarian and exclusionary thought. In Deleuze's criticisms of organicism and postulation of relations of exteriority, McMillan argues, it is possible to identify an alternative form of rhizomatic or 'transversal' holism, as well as a corresponding 'material vitalism', in which the whole remains always open and creative (ibid.: 122-23). Despite Jung's affinity with a range of pre-modern organicistic thinkers, his own dynamic concept of the whole can, McMillan argues (2018, 2019), also be understood as open and creative, with concepts such as psychic reality (esse in anima), the psychoid archetype, and synchronicity providing openings onto relations of exteriority. These studies show how an encounter between Jung's psychology and Deleuze's philosophy can foster an enhanced reflexivity in both, ensuring that any holism ascribed to these thinkers is a critical holism, one that challenges rather than reinforces the boundaries of systems.

In a paper complementary to his chapter in the present volume, Main (2017) has argued that, contrary to disenchantment, which is rooted in the metaphysics of theism whereby nature and the divine are considered ontologically separate, much holistic thought, including Jung's, has its roots in panentheistic metaphysics, in which nature is considered to be an expression or aspect of the divine. This metaphysics underpins, usually implicitly, many of the positive claims made for holism in relation

to, for example, ecology, healthcare, education, social and political relations, and spirituality. It also, negatively for some, associates holism with heterodox traditions of Hermetic and mystical thought. In this context, both Main (2019) and McMillan (2018) have discussed the relevance for holism of Jung's concept of synchronicity — which is also a feature of several essays in the present volume (Semetsky, Hogenson, and Atmanspacher).

Also complementary to the present book is the same team of editors' *Holism: Possibilities and Problems* (McMillan, Main, and Henderson 2020). This companion volume focuses specifically on the concept of holism, and it encompasses a wider range of theoretical perspectives than just those of Jung and Deleuze, although the latter are well represented. The present book, however, is the first to focus specifically and in depth on the problem of the whole as it jointly figures in the works of Jung and Deleuze.

The contributors to the present book, as already noted, are all experts on the thought of either Jung or Deleuze, if not both. All are, or have been, academics, while some are also practitioners (Henderson, Hogenson, Semetsky, Ramey). Between them they represent a significant array of disciplines: philosophy (Ramey), psychotherapy/analysis (Henderson, Hogenson), education (Semetsky), physics (Atmanspacher), German studies (Bishop), and psychosocial and psychoanalytic studies (Main, McMillan). Some of the contributed essays explore the tensions between Jung's and Deleuze's different concepts of the whole and their respective ethical implications (Main, McMillan, Bishop). Others use the two authors primarily to amplify each other's thought (Henderson, Semetsky, Atmanspacher). Others again

focus on contexts or topics equally informed by or equally relevant to both authors (Ramey, Hogenson). Among the epistemological, ethical, and methodological questions relating to the concept of the whole that are raised by the essays are the following:

- What is the relationship between a particular concept of ultimate wholeness and the multiplicities of experience?
- Can unitary reality be experienced directly?
- What is the status of symbolic knowledge of the whole?
- What are the ethical (including social, cultural, and political) implications of different concepts of the whole?
- Is there an intrinsic relationship between concepts of the whole and totalitarian thinking?
- Is it possible to avoid totalitarian dangers of holism by developing a form of critical holism based on the concept of an open whole?
- What is gained for the thought of Jung and Deleuze by staging an encounter between them?
- Can psychotherapeutic concepts such as Jung's be usefully appropriated by a philosophy such as Deleuze's, and can philosophical concepts such as Deleuze's be usefully appropriated by a psychology such as Jung's?
- How do the preoccupations of Jung and Deleuze in relation to the whole connect with other thinkers (such as Kant, Bergson, Klages, and Pauli) and other fields (such as complexity theory, physics, political economy, esotericism, and cultural history)?

Considering the magnitude of the questions being posed, the answers given to them are inevitably partial and provisional, and each essay refracts the questions through the author's own specific preoccupations and expertise. Nevertheless, there are many convergences among the essays. Important points that connect several of the contributions, even if they do not explicitly connect them all, include, far from exhaustively: that for both Jung and Deleuze wholeness is important because it helps to keep thought open to creativity and relationship; that wholes, or even the ultimate whole, can be creatively expressed through symbols (including symptoms, signs, and images); that these symbols are generated by estranging 'encounters', whether with art, exceptional experiences, or expressions of otherness or the unconscious more generally, each of which disturbs static patterns of thought; that knowledge of the whole can be direct (through immanent experience) as well as symbolic; that in either case knowledge of the whole is transformative, making ethical demands on the knower; that symbols of the whole are not just conscious constructions but are expressions of a natural process; that attempts to reify symbols of the whole result in one-sided or static representational thinking, and attempts to capture the practice of generating symbols are vulnerable to institutional control; and that many paths lead back from thinking about the whole to traditions of esoteric and mystical thought.

There are, of course, many aspects of thinking in terms of the whole that this book, largely for contingent reasons, has not been able to address as fully as we would have liked. The two most significant omissions are probably gender issues (useful resources would be Jenkins 2016 and Rowland 2017) and issues relating to environmentalism and the Anthropocene (see, for example, Fellows 2019). Another neglected topic is the relation between holistic thinking and Eastern thought (see,

however, Yama 2020 and Main 2019: 67-68). Additional work could be usefully undertaken in each of these areas, as well as many others. Meanwhile, we hope that the following essays will, each in its way, spur further reflection both on the problem of the whole and on the thought of Jung and Deleuze, especially as the two thinkers creatively connect with each other.

In the opening chapter,[2] Roderick Main examines the disputed ethical status of holism through comparing aspects of the thought of Jung and Deleuze on the concept of wholeness. He first highlights relevant holistic features of Jung's psychological model, especially the concepts of the self and *unus mundus* (one world), and traces the cultural and social benefits that are claimed to flow from such a version of holism. He then confronts Jung's model with Deleuze's more constructivist way of thinking about wholes and totality in terms of difference, multiplicity, and pure immanence, which aims to ensure that his concept of the whole remains open. The Deleuzian perspective arguably exposes a number of questionable philosophical assumptions and ethical implications in Jung's holism – especially concerning the notions of original and restored wholes, organicism, and internal relations, with their implicit appeals to transcendence. In order to assess whether this Deleuzian critique is answerable, Main focuses attention on the understanding of transcendence and immanence within each thinker's model. Distinguishing between theism, pantheism, and panentheism, he proposes that the metaphysical logic of panentheism can provide a framework that is capable of reconciling the two thinkers' concepts of the whole. In light of this, Jung's position turns out to be an ally of the Deleuzian critique whose real target is the kind of strong transcendence characteristic of classical theism, which both thinkers eschew.

Focusing more explicitly on political issues, Christian McMillan (Chapter 2) also explores conceptual affinities between Jung's work and that of Deleuze together with his co-writer Guattari. McMillan draws extensively from one of Jung's final essays, 'The undiscovered self (present and future)' (1957), which was first published after the two world wars and in the immediate aftermath of the Red Scare in the United States. Jung's essay is noteworthy for its critique of the role of the State in modern times. It analyses the ways in which the State organises and orientates thought in a one-sided, ethically deleterious manner that excludes alternative forms of organisation. McMillan parallels this with Deleuze's critical focus on the organisation and distribution of relations within thought systems, of which the State is one variation. In the first half of the chapter McMillan examines various concepts that Jung presents in his essay: positive concepts such as 'individual' and 'whole-man' and negative concepts such as 'mass man', 'statistical man', and 'State'. In the second half of the chapter McMillan relates Jung's analysis of the ways in which thought is orientated by the abstract idea of the modern State to Deleuze's critique of the image of thought, which formed a crucial part of his *Difference and Repetition* (1968a).

The uncanny internal resonance between Jung's psychological theory and Deleuze's philosophy receives further scrutiny from David Henderson (Chapter 3). Through a discussion of Deleuze's concepts of symptomatology, percept, and minor literature, from his *Essays Critical and Clinical* (1993), Henderson demonstrates the rich potential of Deleuzian thought for amplifying elements of Jung's psychology. According to Deleuze, 'Authors, if they are great, are more like doctors than patients. We mean that they are themselves astonishing diagnosticians or symptomatologists'

(1969: 237). Jung can be read in this way as a symptomatologist, a 'clinician of civilization', who discovered the collective unconscious and prescribed a renewed relationship with wholeness as a remedy for the personal, cultural and collective 'dis-eases' of modern life. The percept is a type of *vision* or *hearing*, and Henderson uses this concept of Deleuze's to reflect on Jung's capacity to *see* the unconscious. Finally, Henderson shows how Deleuze's concepts of minor literature and minority politics throw light on the corpus of Jung's writing and on the role of analytical psychology within the wider field of psychoanalysis.

Inna Semetsky (Chapter 4) continues the discussion of how symptoms, symbols, and signs can paradoxically express the unconscious or irrepresentable dimension of reality and thereby promote wholeness. She draws parallels between the axiom of the third-century alchemist Maria Prophetissa ('One becomes two, two becomes three, and out of the third comes the one as the fourth'), which Jung refers to as a metaphor for the process of individuation, and Deleuze's paradoxical logic of multiplicities (problematic Ideas) – both of which are based on the notion of the *tertium quid*, the included third. Semetsky argues that the reading of signs is an experiment that involves experiential learning (self-education or apprenticeship) and, ultimately, self-knowledge in the form of deep gnosis. Only through such knowledge can we become *in-dividual*, 'whole' selves. Semetsky's chapter also addresses ethics as the integration of the Jungian shadow archetype that may manifest in events of which, according to Deleuze, we must become worthy. To conclude, Semetsky presents an example of a transformative, healing ('making whole') practice that demonstrates the actualisation of the virtual archetypes via their 'dramatisation' in the esoteric yet 'real characters' of a neutral language, such as envisaged by Wolfgang

Pauli, Jung's collaborator on the concept of synchronicity. By means of such a practice, for Semetsky, Deleuze's call to retrieve and read the structures immanent in the depth of the psyche is answered: we self-transcend by becoming-other.

Complementing Semetsky's appeal to esoteric thought, George Hogenson (Chapter 5) also explores the relationship between certain mathematical patterns and symbols of wholeness, but within a more scientific framework. He compares formally constructed mandalas and other geometric forms associated by Jung with the notion of wholeness with the iterative elaboration of the equations associated with Mandelbrot's fractal geometry. Hogenson argues that these symbols of wholeness are manifestations of fundamental mathematical structures that manifest throughout the natural world and connect psyche to the rest of nature in a fundamental form. Additionally, his analysis illustrates how the breakdown of psychic wholeness can be modelled in the breakdown of unity into chaotic states, thereby providing an argument for Jung's model of the psyche moving from the individual complex to the *unus mundus* and the unity of the self.

In an argument also thoroughly grounded in science, in this case physics and consciousness research, Harald Atmanspacher (Chapter 6) explores relational and immanent experiences in relation to what he has called the Pauli-Jung conjecture, which is a coherent reconstruction of Pauli's and Jung's scattered ideas about the relationship between the mental and the physical and their common origin. It belongs to the decompositional variety of dual-aspect monisms, in which a basic, psychophysically neutral reality is conceived of as radically holistic, without distinctions, and hence discursively inexpressible. Epistemic domains such as the

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

Paul Bishop (Chapter 7) is also concerned with ideas and experiences that express a holistic and enchanted view of reality. He argues that for Friedrich Nietzsche — a key influence on Jung and Deleuze alike — the world is both disenchanted and enchanted. From a transcendental perspective (associated with Judeo-Christianity), the world is disenchanted; it is 'the work of a suffering and tormented God'. Yet from an immanent perspective the world is in fact enchanted — or potentially so, and the means by which Nietzsche proposes to re-enchant (or rediscover the primordial enchantment of) the world is the doctrine of eternal recurrence. In *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, his animals proclaim Zarathustra to be 'the teacher of the eternal recurrence', and this passage has caught the attention of numerous commentators, including Heidegger and Deleuze. Another critic of Nietzsche's doctrine of eternal recurrence is Ludwig Klages, himself deeply invested in the challenges of disenchantment and re-enchantment. Central to Klages's philosophy are his doctrine of the 'reality of images' and his related notion of 'elementary similarity'. Elementary similarity informs the kind of perception he associates with *die Seele*, that is, with the soul or the psyche, and which he regards as

essentially *symbolic*. Can the concepts of identity, similarity, dissimilarity, and difference, Bishop asks, help us to relate and coordinate the thought of Klages, Jung, and Deleuze — and not just in relation to Nietzsche?

The volume concludes with Joshua Ramey's highly original perspective on the relationship between divination and financial markets (Chapter 8). Ramey explores how extreme variants of neoliberal ideology about the power of markets, particularly as articulated in the late work of Friedrich Hayek, produce illusions about the kind of meanings that can be construed on the basis of chance or random processes. Randomness poses an interesting problem for holism in general, but here Ramey focuses on the specific power that uncertainty (linked to the basic fact of extreme contingency, or chance) is supposed to display, within 'correctly' functioning markets, to generate meaning. In Ramey's book *Politics of Divination: Neoliberal Endgame and the Religion of Contingency* (2016), he has argued that the extreme version of neoliberal market apologetics holds that markets can function as divination processes — that is, as inquiries into more-than-human knowledge. The complex and unstable relation between chance and the Whole is figured here in an equivocation over whether chance means everything or nothing, and helps to explain the particular relation between neoliberal ideology and nihilism.

Notes

[1] The present volume is one of the outputs of a research project examining the logical and ethical implications of holism through comparing relevant aspects of the work of Jung and Deleuze. The project, run by the present editors, was titled '"One world":

logical and ethical implications of holism' and was funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council, UK, between 2016 and 2018 (grant number AH/N003853/1). In brief, we wished to understand better why holism attracts such strong positive and negative valuations, and whether the positive or the negative point of view, if either, is the better warranted. We attempted to probe the underpinning concepts of ultimate wholeness at work in different models, such as those of Jung and Deleuze, and to trace how those concepts of wholeness might relate, ethically and politically as well as epistemologically, to the multiplicities of experience. We were especially concerned with the significance and impact of these issues in the field of psychotherapy. As part of the project, an invited group of experts in the thought of Jung and/or Deleuze presented and discussed papers in an intensive two-day workshop at the University of Essex, and it is those papers which in revised form are the basis of this book. One of the participants at the workshop, Christian Kerslake, was unfortunately unable to contribute an essay, but the volume has nevertheless greatly benefited from his comments during the workshop, as well as from the inspiration provided by his ground-breaking book, *Deleuze and the Unconscious* (2007). The workshop was followed by an international conference, also at the University of Essex, with a broader remit on holism more generally and much wider participation. Some of the papers from that conference, as well as our more general findings about holism, have been published in a companion volume to the present book (McMillan, Main, and Henderson 2020; Main, McMillan, and Henderson 2020).

[2] The following summary of the chapters is based on abstracts provided by the contributors.

References

(In the citations and reference list, dates within parentheses refer to the date of original publication. The date of edition consulted, if different, appears after the publisher in the reference list.)

Ansell-Pearson, K. (1999). *Germinal Life: The Difference and Repetition of Deleuze*. London and New York: Routledge.

Ansell-Pearson, K. (2007). Beyond the human condition: An introduction to Deleuze's lecture course. *SubStance #114 36*(3): 57-71.

Badiou, A. (2000). *Deleuze: The Clamor of Being* (L. Churchill, Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Bailis, S. (1984-85). Against and for holism: A reply and a rejoinder to D. C. Phillips. *Issues in Integrative Studies 3*: 17-41.

Berman, M. (1981). *The Reenchantment of the World*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Cambray, J. (2009). *Synchronicity: Nature and Psyche in an Interconnected Universe*. College Station, TX: Texas A and M University Press.

Cambray, J. (2017). The emergence of the ecological mind in Hua-Yen/Kegon Buddhism and Jungian psychology. *Journal of Analytical Psychology 62*(1): 20-31.

Deleuze, G. (1966). *Bergsonism* (H. Tomlinson and B. Habberjam, Trans.). New York: Zone books, 1991.

Deleuze, G. (1968a). *Difference and Repetition* (P. Patton, Trans.). London: Bloomsbury, 2014.

Deleuze, G. (1968b). *Expressionism in Philosophy: Spinoza* (M. Joughin, Trans.). New York: Zone, 2013.

Deleuze, G. (1969). *The Logic of Sense* (C. Boundas, Ed.; M. Lester and C. Stivale, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press, 1990.

Deleuze, G. (1972). *Proust and Signs: The Complete Text* (R. Howard, Trans.). London: Athlone, 2000; original French publication 1964).

Deleuze, G. (1983). *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image* (H. Tomlinson and B. Habberjam, Trans.). London: Athlone Press, 1992.

Deleuze, G. (1985). *Cinema 2: The Time-Image* (H. Tomlinson and R. Galeta, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989.

Deleuze, G., and Guattari, F. (1972). *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (R. Hurley, M. Seem, and H. Lane, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000.

Deleuze, G., and Guattari, F. (1991). *What is Philosophy?* (H Tomlinson and G. Burchell, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

Deleuze, G. (1993). *Essays Critical and Clinical* (D. Smith and M. Greco, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.

Dusek, V. (1999). *The Holistic Inspirations of Physics: The Underground History of Electromagnetic Theory*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Esfeld, M. (2003). Philosophical holism. In *Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems*. Paris: UNESCO/Eolss Publishers [http://www.eolss.net].

Fellows, A. (2019). *Gaia, Psyche and Deep Ecology: Navigating Climate Change in the Anthropocene*. London and New York: Routledge.

Hallward, P. (2006). *Out of This World: Deleuze and the Philosophy of Creation*. London and New York: Verso.

Hanegraaff, W. (1998). *New Age Religion and Western Culture: Esotericism in the Mirror of Secular Thought*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Harrington, A. (1996). *Reenchanted Science: Holism in German Culture from Wilhelm II to Hitler*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hauke, C. (2000). *Jung and the Postmodern: The Interpretation of Realities*. London and Philadelphia.

Heelas, P. and Woodhead, L, with B. Seel, B. Szeszynski, and K. Tusting (2005). *The Spiritual Revolution: Why Religion in Giving Way to Spirituality*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Henderson, D. (2014). *Apophatic Elements in the Theory and Practice of Psychoanalysis: Pseudo-Dionysius and C. G. Jung*. London and New York: Routledge.

Hogenson, G. (2019). The controversy around the concept of archetypes. *Journal of Analytical Psychology 64*(5): 682-700.

Holland, E. (2012). Deleuze and psychoanalysis. In D. Smith and H. Somers-Hall (Eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Deleuze*, 307-36. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Huskinson, L. (2004). *Nietzsche and Jung: The Whole Self in the Union of Opposites*. Hove and New York: Brunner-Routledge, 2004.

James, S. (2007). Against holism: Rethinking Buddhist environmental ethics. *Environmental Values 16*: 447-61.

Jenkins, B. (2016). *Eros and Economy: Jung, Deleuze, Sexual Difference*. London and New York: Routledge.

Jung, C. G. (1928). The relations between the ego and the unconscious. In *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung* (Sir H. Read, M. Fordham, and G. Adler, Eds.; W. McGuire, Exec. Ed.; R. F. C. Hull, Trans.) [hereafter *Collected Works*],

vol. 7, *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology*, 2d ed., 121-241. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966.

Jung, C. G. (1929-54). *Collected Works*, vol. 13, *Alchemical Studies*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1968.

Jung, C. G. (1939). Foreword. In J. Jacobi, *The Psychology of C. G. Jung*, ix. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.

Jung, C. G. (1944). *Collected Works*, vol. 12, *Psychology and Alchemy*, 2d ed. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1968.

Jung, C. G. (1946). The psychology of the transference. In *Collected Works*, vol. 16, *The Practice of Psychotherapy*, 2d ed., 163-323. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966.

Jung, C. G. (1951). *Collected Works*, vol. 9ii, *Aion*, 2d ed. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1968.

Jung, C. G. (1955-56). *Collected Works*, vol. 14, *Mysterium Coniunctionis: An Inquiry into the Separation and Synthesis of Psychic Opposites in Alchemy*, 2d ed. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970.

Jung, C. G. (1957). The undiscovered self (Present and future). In *Collected Works*, vol. 10, *Civilization in Transition*, 2d ed., 245-305. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970.

Jung, C. G. (1976). *Letters 2: 1951-1961* (G. Adler and A. Jaffé, Eds.; R. F. C. Hull, Trans.). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Jung, C. G. (2009). *The Red Book: Liber Novus* (S. Shamdasani, Ed.; M. Kyburz, J. Peck, and S. Shamdasani, Trans.). New York: W. W. Norton.

Justaert, K. (2012). *Theology After Deleuze*. London: Continuum.

Kazarian, E. (2010). The revolutionary unconscious: Deleuze and Masoch. *SubStance 39*(2): 91-106.

Kelly, S. (1993). *Individuation and the Absolute: Hegel, Jung and the Path Toward Wholeness*. New York: Paulist Press.

Kerslake, C. (2007). *Deleuze and the Unconscious*. London: Continuum.

Lawrence, C., and Weiss, G. (Eds.) (1998). *Greater than the Parts: Holism in Biomedicine 1920-1950.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Main, R. (2017). Panentheism and the undoing of disenchantment. *Zygon: Journal of Religion and Science 52*(4): 1098-1122.

Main, R. (2019). Synchronicity and holism. In *Analytical Psychology Meets Academic Research: Avignon Conference 2018*, 59-74. *Revue de Psychologie Analytique* (Hors série).

Main, R., McMillan, C., and Henderson, D. (2020). Introduction. In C. McMillan, R. Main, and D. Henderson (Eds.), *Holism: Possibilities and Problems*, 1-14. London and New York: Routledge.

Marietta, D. (1994). *For People and the Planet: Holism and Humanism in Environmental Ethics*, Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

McMillan, C. (2015). The 'image of thought' in Jung's 'Whole-Self': A critique. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Essex, UK.

McMillan, C. (2018). Jung and Deleuze: Enchanted openings to the Other: A philosophical contribution. *International Journal of Jungian Studies 10*(3): 184-198.

McMillan, C. (2019). Jung, literature, and aesthetics. In J. Mills (Ed.), *Jung and Philosophy*, 269-88. London and New York: Routledge.

McMillan, C. (2020). Kant's influence on Jung's vitalism in the *Zofingia Lectures*. In C. McMillan, R. Main, and D. Henderson (Eds.), *Holism: Possibilities and Problems*, 118-29. London and New York: Routledge.

McMillan, C., Main, R., and Henderson, D. (Eds.) (2020). *Holism: Possibilities and Problems*. London and New York: Routledge.

Nicolescu, B. (2002). *Manifesto of Transdisciplinarity*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Nicolescu, B. (Ed.) (2008). *Transdisciplinarity: Theory and Practice*. Creskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Phillips, D. C. (1976). *Holistic Thought in Social Science*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Pint, K. (2011). Doubling back: Psychoanalytical literary theory and the perverse return to Jungian space. ***S**: Journal of the Jan van Eyck Circle for Lacanian Ideology Critique 4*: 47-55.

Popper, K. (1957). *The Poverty of Historicism*. London: Routledge.

Ramey, J. (2012). *The Hermetic Deleuze: Philosophy and Spiritual Ordeal*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Ramey, J. (2016). *Politics of Divination: Neoliberal Endgame and the Religion of Contingency*. Rowman and Littlefield: London and New York.

Rowland, S. (2017). *Remembering Dionysus: Revisioning psychology and literature in C. G. Jung and James Hillman.* London and New York: Routledge.

Semetsky, I. (2006). *Deleuze, Education and Becoming*. Rotterdam, NL: Sense Publishers.

Semetsky, I. (2011). *Re-Symbolization of the Self: Human Development and Tarot Hermeneutic*. Rotterdam, NL: Sense Publishers.

Semetsky, I. (2013) (Ed.). *Jung and Educational Theory*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Semetsky, I. (2020). *Semiotic Subjectivity in Education and Counseling: Learning with the Unconscious*. London and New York: Routledge.

Semetsky, I., and Ramey, J. (2013). Deleuze's philosophy and Jung's psychology: Learning and the unconscious. In I. Semetsky (Ed.), *Jung and Educational Theory*, 63-75. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Shelley, C. (2008). Jan Smuts and personality theory: The problem of holism in psychology. In R. Diriwächter and J. Valsiner (Eds.), *Striving for the Whole: Creating Theoretical Syntheses*, 89-109. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers.

Smith, C. (1990). *Jung's Quest for Wholeness: A Religious and Historical Perspective*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Smuts, J. C. (1926). *Holism and Evolution*. London: McMillan.

Somers-Hall, H. (2012). Introduction. In D. Smith and H. Somers-Hall (Eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Deleuze*, 1-12. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wood, L. S. (2010). *A More Perfect Union: Holistic Worldviews and the Transformation of American Culture after World War II*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yama, M. (2020). The concept of *kami* in Shintō and holism: Psychotherapy and Japanese literature. In C. McMillan, R. Main, and D. Henderson (Eds.), *Holism: Possibilities and Problems*, 170-79. London and New York: Routledge.