

# Schizoanalysis: Seizing Desire as the First Act of Revolutionary Psychotherapy

HANS SKOTT-MYHRE, Brock University, St Catharines, Ontario, Canada

**ABSTRACT** *The question of psychotherapy and politics for scholars and activists (dare we say revolutionaries?) is set somewhere along its historical trajectory as bourgeois accommodation, reactionary social formation and its latent possibility as a social practice constitutive of revolutionary forms of subjectivity and consciousness. In this, the term “psychotherapy” has some of the same problematic historical 20th-century resonance as words such as communism or democracy. However, it will be argued here that there may be some possibility to rethink psychotherapy as having new capacities within the shifting mode of production of global capitalism within what Marx termed the moment of “real subsumption”. To do so, a proposal for a radical political psychotherapy will be offered through a non-dialectical immanentist reading of the psyche, drawing on Heraclitus and minor Marxism. This reading, it is suggested, opens the door to a re-examination of Deleuze and Guattari’s neglected proposals for schizoanalysis as revolutionary practice that may have much to offer as a response to the appropriations and brutality of global capitalism. Copyright © 2014 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.*

**Key words:** schizoanalysis; Heraclitus; minor Marxism; Deleuze; Guattari; psyche; force; desire; affect; liminal space(s); love

## PSYCHOTHERAPY, CAPITALISM AND REVOLUTION

The question of psychotherapy and politics for scholars and activists – and, dare we say, revolutionaries? – is set somewhere along its historical trajectory as bourgeois accommodation and reactionary social formation, and its latent possibility as a social practice constitutive of revolutionary forms of subjectivity and consciousness. In this, the term “psychotherapy” has some of the same problematic historical 20th-century resonance as words such as communism or democracy. Nevertheless, in this article, it is argued that it is possible to rethink psychotherapy as having new capacities within the shifting mode of production of global capitalism within what Marx (1867/2004) termed the moment of “real subsumption”. To do so, a proposal for a radical political psychotherapy will be offered through a non-dialectical immanentist reading of the psyche drawing on Heraclitus and minor

\*Correspondence to: Hans Skott-Myhre, Brock University, St Catharines, Ontario, Canada.  
E-mail: hskottmyhre@brocku.ca

Marxism. This reading, it is suggested, opens the door to a re-examination of Deleuze and Guattari's neglected proposals for schizoanalysis as revolutionary practice that may have much to offer as a response to the appropriations and brutality of global capitalism.

The contemporary extent of global capitalist rule might well be defined as the historical actualization of what Marx termed "real subsumption". Negri (1996) described this as when "the capitalist mode of production has attained such a high level of development so as to comprehend every even small fraction of social production" (p. 152). Under such conditions, Negri argued, the reach of capitalism extends so deeply within the realm of production as to encompass the very constitutive elements of all social life per se. Within real subsumption, the realms of thought, communication, subjectivity and consciousness are opened to the direct effects of capitalist discipline and exploitation.

In this moment, the concerns, research and practice of psychotherapy become directly engaged in the domination and appropriation of the web of production that is global capitalism. Of course, as Marx (1939/1978a) pointed out, consciousness has always been entwined constitutively within the historical regimes of domination over the mode of production within every age. As Althusser (1968/2006) has made clear, the ideological state apparatus of capitalist production has immense impacts on who we imagine ourselves to be. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) went further to articulate the relation of linguistic coding and what they term apparatuses of capture and control to the highly coded system that is capitalism. However, with the advent of virtual capitalism and the global reach of the media as a highly articulated system of social over-coding, we enter a new world in which the very structures of our desires become open to the virulent recoding of the dollar sign (Baudrillard, 1981; Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Negri, 1996; Guattari, 2005).

It is at this historical juncture that psychotherapy, in all its bourgeois guises, begins to fail. Perversely, we can perhaps note its death throws most obviously in its infinite proliferation and extensions into all aspects of social life. It was Foucault (1977) who noted that the most successful regimes of domination are those that are invisible in their exercise of control and discipline. This is because such systems are seamlessly imbedded within the discourses and logic of a particular historical period and mode of production. As the logic of any given disciplinary apparatus begins to clash with an emerging social logic premised in a new mode of production, the mechanisms of its control become increasingly visible and obvious. As its foundational social purpose becomes questionable, with the inevitable restructuration of the social in the transition to a new mode of production, it must seek out new social functions and new social sources of affiliation to give itself a new genetic foundation.

For psychotherapy in its conventional and dominant forms, the crisis is rooted in its function as a productive vehicle for the production of bourgeois subjectivity and modes of consciousness. From its inception as psychoanalysis and on into its varied forms as psychological and psychiatric practice, the core of praxis has been the regulation of desire and the productions of value through what Deleuze and Guattari (1983) have called the "family theater" or, in its reductive pseudo-scientific applications, in behaviorist, genetic, cognitive, neurological or biological methods of manipulation and control.

What, however, is the role of psychotherapy within an emerging mode of production that, as Negri (1996) proposed, eviscerates and makes irrelevant the bourgeois? What are we to do with a discipline, a set of practices, and a theoretical apparatus that is designed to reproduce a class rapidly fading into history? Is this the end of the relevance of

psychotherapy – and good riddance to it? Or is it a rupture that opens the field of possibility for those edges of psychotherapeutic theory and practice marginalized and discarded as failed or disreputable? After all, Negri (1992) wrote that it is the failed revolutions that hold the greatest potential.

As a parallel case in point, communism, as a series of failed revolutions, is instructive. Guattari and Negri (1990) proposed that, with the fall of the Soviet Union and the advent of global capitalist rule, communism has a new capacity. They suggested that, in the space created by the “failure” of those totalizing forms of governance known by the name communism, we might be freed to rethink what communism has to offer within the emerging economic and political forms of the contemporary mode of production. Indeed, they suggest that it is precisely because of the absolute failure of the “collectivist regimes [that] failed to realize socialist or communist ideals,” (p. 7) that communism can be rethought outside the stifling restraints of the socialist response to industrial capitalism.

In another sense, however, the collapse of what we might call industrial socialism signals what might well be read, through Marx (Negri, 1996), as a significant shift in the mode of production. That is to say, that the ostensible failure of a particular mode of socialist governance may actually be an indication of the emergence of a new form of social organization more in tune with the revolutionary necessities of the contemporary historical moment.

If we are to suggest a similar analysis of bourgeois psychotherapy, we would propose that the existent forms of psychoanalysis, psychiatry and psychology are similarly failed projects, whose radical capacities were rooted in a mode of production now past. Of course, one might argue that there never was a radical capacity for such projects; that they were and are inherently reformist at best and reactionary at worst. Such claims, however, ignore, at their peril, the foundations of these fields of practice and theory in the psyche. The question of the psyche as the generative object for the theoretical frameworks of the practices of psychotherapy is fundamentally related to the historical trajectory of the project as holding radical possibilities or reformist and reactionary tendencies.

## THE QUESTION OF THE PSYCHE

To explore the question of the psyche, as holding revolutionary capacity within the current historical moment, requires that we follow Marx and investigate how the psyche is articulated within a materialist conception of history. The first step in this process is to scission any transcendent reading of the psyche as an ideal form of soul or spirit. This can be done if we constitute a Marxist conception of the psyche informed not by Hegel, but by Spinoza. To read Marx as informed by Spinoza (Holland, 1998) or Spinoza as read through Marx (Casarino, 2011) opens a non-dialectical immanentist reading of historical materialism. A thorough explication of such a reading is beyond the scope of this article, but suffice to say that as Negri (1996) has proposed, in such a reading, history is driven forward not by lack but by the infinite plenitude of living force. In such a reading there is no transcendent outside driving history forward. History is constituted as an ongoing revolutionary struggle to liberate living capacity from what Deleuze and Guattari (1987) called the apparatuses of capture constituted to harness life to the abstract regimes of social and cultural modes of domination.

In this immanentist reading of history, the psyche does not stand either as an ideal outside to the realm of materiality nor as a simple by-product of material production. Instead of the Socratic, Homeric or Platonic reading of the psyche as a form that transcends the body (either as a kind immaterial soul or the foundation of an ideal, moral core self), a reading more amenable to our purposes here might better be found in Heraclitus, who reads the psyche of a living person as having a deep structure (logos) that is “self-augmenting” (Robb, 1986, p. 338).

For Heraclitus, the psyche can be discovered through intensive investigation on the part of an individual. This exploration, Heraclitus suggested, is both a cognitive and a linguistic task. Such a task can only be engaged to the degree that one becomes fully apprehensive of the “cosmos” around oneself and within oneself. To comprehend, in this way, is to become awake. To become awake requires the ability to “learn to listen to and understand a proper language and discourse” (*ibid.*, p. 315).

The psyche, as posited by Heraclitus, is that which structures and produces consciousness and subjectivity as a process of reciprocal autopoiesis. As an immanent field, the generative structural aspects of the psyche can only be known contingently and partially through the co-production of the self as unconscious and conscious. Indeed, the psyche here might well be understood as the unconscious *per se*.

Heraclitus tells us that our access to the psyche is indeterminate, but available through both thought and language. This implies, as Deleuze and Guattari (1987) have proposed, that, while language can provide a structural framework for thought, thought can exceed the parameters of language. For Deleuze (1990) this is the realm of thought as sense. It is in the interplay of thought and language that one can come to apprehend fully the cosmos or, in another term, what Guattari (2005) referred to as the actual material ecology of consciousness, subjectivity and the environment in its totality. However, for this level of apprehension to take place one must be able learn to “learn to listen to and understand a proper language and discourse” (Robb, 1986, p. 315).

In his work on Heraclitus, Robb (1986) made it clear that this latter proposition refers to the misunderstandings that can arise if one is not intimately familiar with the language and customs of a specific context. Put differently, one cannot awaken as long as the socially ordered elements of language capture one within a particular historical moment. To awaken to the infinite capacities of production that is the psyche requires an interrogation of the ideological components or what Guattari (2005) called pre-conscious social investments of one’s historical moment.

This reading of the psyche, as the foundation of the fields of psychoanalysis, psychology and psychiatry, opens them in several important ways. In the first and most fundamental instance, all three become centrally concerned with the question of consciousness and forms of subjectivity that either facilitate what Heraclitus termed “awakening”, or block and distort such capacity. Such consciousness is focused on an ecological apprehension of the constitutive elements of thought and language in the production of who we are. However, who we are is a secondary concern, as it is an effect of the self-augmenting logos of the psyche. This moves those fields interested in the investigation of the psyche, as a field of study or practice, away from any essential or foundational understanding of the individual and into the study of the constitutive capacities of the psyche as what Foucault called force and Deleuze and Guattari desire.

## FORCE AND DESIRE

For Foucault (1977) power is a question of the relations of force. It is the contingent capacity of any given set of convergent elements in any moment; that is to say, force is the capacity and power to be found in the relationship of all things as they converge and compose themselves according to the degree of force each holds. This echoes Spinoza's theories of immanent production, where substance produces itself infinitely through the collisions of bodies that elicit idiosyncratic capacities for thought and action. This is extended in Deleuze and Guattari's (1983) concept of the unconscious as pure desiring production. In their work, desire is not premised in lack but in the absolute virtual capacity to act and to produce. The unconscious is not the field of the imaginary premised in lack, as proposed by Lacan, but a series of connections, flows and breaks in desire as the capacity to produce. For Deleuze and Guattari, the unconscious is not the province of the individual, although it may be involved in the production of such a subject. Instead, the desiring production that is the unconscious operates both collectively at the level of the social and idiosyncratically in the instance of a singular body.

For psychotherapy, this has profound implications for practice and theory. If the work of psychotherapy is the remedy or treatment of a disorder or disease of the psyche, then this cannot be accomplished through intervention at the level of the individual. Indeed, if we follow the line of thought we have been tracing thus far, intervention must be done at a collective level focused on the kind of awakening to the capacities of the psyche proposed by Heraclitus, which is to open the social in such a way as to liberate desiring production; it is to find the royal road to the unconscious, but not through the symbolic order. Instead, psychotherapy must seek a materialist, collective, politically informed psyche analysis.

Such analysis is crucial at this historical moment, where capitalism now functions as a system of code that accesses the unconscious itself precisely at the level of semiotics and the symbolic. To do this, as Marx (1939/1978a) presciently predicted, capitalism must eviscerate the force of desire as creative capacity and induct its subjects into believing that their capacity to think, to act and to imagine is dependent upon belonging to the capitalist global social.

## AFFECT, DESIRE AND CAPITALISM

Of course, no one can belong to an abstract system of code, such as the global monetary system or its infinitely proliferating symbolic representations of value. If one cannot achieve a stable sense of belonging, or any sense that what one does will have a positive social effect (Deleuze, 1997), then it is quite likely that one will experience either anxiety or depression.

Indeed, Deleuze (1997) has proposed that new modes of social control operate at the level of monetary code and dysphoria – see *We Are Plan C* (2014) for an excellent explication of the social control function and political implications of anxiety. These levels of dysphoria are perpetuated across the full array of ideological apparatus available for global dissemination through ever-proliferating forms of media. These new forms of ideology no longer operate at the level of conscious understanding, but now function at the level of affect. It doesn't matter what one knows about the world if one's affective experience is one of debilitating dysphoria. What is important for us here is the recognition that this deployment of affective

manipulation through the deployment of symbolic code is premised on the creative force of the psyche per se or the unconscious. That which is encoded precedes the capitalist system of code. Just as capitalism was dependent primarily upon physically laboring bodies for its mode of industrial production, now it is dependent upon strip mining the unconscious, desire per se – for work on immaterial labor see Negri (1996) and Hardt and Negri (2009), and on the role of affect and women in the workplace work see Skott-Myhre (in press).

This is the realm of global domination that Baudrillard (1981) termed “homo cyberneticus” and that Marx (1932/1978b) predicted in the famous passages referred to as the fragment on machines. Any materialist Marxist psychotherapy with liberatory or revolutionary intent must at some level take account of this shift in the mode of production and modify our approach to treating the ills of our age accordingly. To treat the psyche we cannot refer to a universal constant. Instead, we require an understanding of the psyche as it is engaged in a particular historical period under idiosyncratic and unique geographical and material conditions of production. In our age, this requires that we engage the unconscious not through rational analysis, which will only produce more code for capitalist appropriation. Instead, we must take a far more shamanic approach and produce our work as a collective exploration of the capacities of desire.

## SCHIZOANALYSIS AND MINOR MARXISM

I argue that it is precisely this that Deleuze and Guattari (1983) undertake in their unfortunately neglected approach to psychotherapy: schizoanalysis. This form of therapeutic endeavor holds three qualities that operate precisely in response to the contested space of the psyche within global capitalism. They are, in brief: (1) that there is no binary relation between the individual and the collective – both are parts of the whole; (2) that there is no binary relation between the conscious and unconscious – these are also parts of the whole; and (3) that (psychotherapeutic) work is premised in the productive plenitude of desire rather than the poverty of lack.

To address the question of the psyche as an infinite source of creative force, it is important that we follow Heraclitus in reading the psyche as self-augmenting. That is to say, that there is no outside to unconscious desire, and no binary split between the individual and the social, the conscious and the unconscious, or base and superstructure. Perhaps more controversially, within the Marxist vernacular, we abandon the Hegelian dialectical reading of Marx in favor of a Spinozist reading (Casarino, 2011; Holland, 2013). This is to engage a Marxist reading of psychotherapy through what has been called minor Marxism (Holland, 2013). In this we finally dispense with any utopic vestige of the teleological or foundational tendencies in Marx, and the Marxists that have followed, and investigate the threads of immanent production threaded throughout the Marxist canon. As Holland (2013) put it:

The real motor of history for minor Marxism, then, is not the dialectic of class struggle, nor even the dialectic of forces and relations of production, but the difference and articulation (or the de-composition and re-composition) of labor at the heart of the social multiplicity – the diastole and systole of universal history if you will. (p. 5)

The task then moves from identifying the spaces of lack within our engagements and explorations of desire, the unconscious and social production, to work on the psyche as a space of the actual production in the moment – a literal engagement of labor force that continuously exceeds and extends the contemporary mode of production and all efforts to

dominate and control the creative force of bodies together producing the world. This is the moment in *The German Ideology* where Marx (1939/1978a) defined communism as creative capacity freed from social over-coding and capture:

In communist society, where nobody has one exclusive sphere of activity but each can become accomplished in any branch he wishes, society regulates the general production and thus makes it possible for me to do one thing today and another tomorrow, to hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, criticize after dinner, just as I have a mind, without ever becoming hunter, fisherman, shepherd or critic. (p. 160)

In schizoanalysis, we discover a method consonant with the reading for the psyche we have given thus far, in which the awakening proposed by Heraclitus, as apprehension of the cosmos, becomes the revolutionary understanding of the infinite force of collective creative capacity.

Heraclitus suggested that the exploration of the psyche as the deep auto-augmentative structure of who we are can be investigated by each of us and, indeed, the first task of schizoanalysis according to Deleuze and Guattari (1983) is “discovering in a subject the nature, the formation, or functioning of *his* desiring machines, independent of any interpretation” (p. 322). To put this into practice in psychotherapy, we must remember that, here, desire is not premised in lack. It is not the desire for something we don’t have; rather, it is desire as the very process by which the psyche auto-augments its capacity to become.

To practice in this way entails the contingent production of mutually transformative subjective assemblage. As psychotherapists we must shift our analytic focus away from the “other” as object and extend our analysis to the capacities of the encounter as a political act; that is to say, we would seek the revolutionary force of production as contingent encounter in every interaction. This, of course extends the world of psychotherapy out of the stifling airless enclosures of the office/therapy room and into the lived world of the psychotherapist. This does not mean that one cannot practice in institutional spaces; it is that the logic of such spaces becomes subordinate to the logic of insurrection.

In practice, then, psychotherapy as a remedy for the ills of the psyche becomes a vehicle for the force of the psyche as auto-augmentative desire. Our work is no longer focused on correcting what’s gone wrong, uncovering ideological obfuscation or fomenting class-consciousness. Instead, schizoanalysis investigates the anomalous fractures and ruptures of the unique and idiosyncratic violations of capitalist over-coding.

As we have noted before, in the current mode of capitalist appropriation, desire itself, as infinitely produced through the unconscious as affect, sense and virtual capacity, is being strip mined and turned to the ends of an increasingly abstract system of code premised in the money form. This appropriation of desire, however, is double edged. As the field of the unconscious as desiring production is being opened, as the last great hope for capitalism to exceed its own limits, the capacity of the full immanent material force of the psyche as the radical reinvestiture of the social as a rich ecology of bodies, thoughts and environment is also opened as a field of counter-actualization.

This posits the field of practices related to the psyche as one of the central sites of significant contestation with capital – if we as psychotherapists can bring ourselves fully into the actuality of the contemporary mode of production, domination and revolution. To do this, as schizoanalysts, would mean to return to the encounter with others with new eyes. It would

be to flee the world of interpretation and over-coding that is the province of capitalism and investigate the actual components of every encounter and the ways in which they might come together to do unexpected and unanticipated things that violate the constraints of who we think we are and what we think we are capable of doing.

## CONSTITUTIVE FORCE

To work with each other in apprehending the force of the psyche in its political and revolutionary potential involves rethinking the constitutive elements that make up the psychotherapeutic encounter. For those of us trained as psychologists or psychoanalysts, this means a new understanding of the world of partial objects. In schizoanalysis partial objects compose each moment through an endless profusion of machinic combinations of desiring force. There is no necessity to seek totalities. Each partial object, as fragments, takes up a certain element of force when combined with other objects. These configurations are always partial in that they move desire into certain configuration of flows and blockages, each in turn composing a new world, a new social, a new people to come. In this, our work is not to form totalities premised in social conventions that allow for seamless integration into the dominant social, because totalities can only exist as possibility within a highly over-coded system of abstraction. A psyche that is auto-augmentative has no capacity for totality. It is the logic of the cosmos as pure immanence. The singular desire of each of us has the revolutionary possibility of opening partial objects to the flow of life as creative force and offers the capacity to connect partial objects in new configurations that flee the constraints of social repetition.

In this regard, the practice of schizoanalysis offers us a method where we interrogate the ways in which a sequence of desire is extended by a social series [that has the capacity] to cause the social to take flight through the multiplicity of holes that eat away at it and penetrate it, always coupled directly to it ... ensuring ... a process into an effectively revolutionary force. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983 pp. 340–341)

That is to say, our practice works between the idiosyncratic force of the singular and investigates the ways in which the individual unconscious as desiring production might be amplified through an engagement with those elements of the social most permeable and open to mutation. As psychotherapists, this entails deploying the representations of the currently over-coded social against itself through appropriating those very symbols to the reassembling and disassembling force of desire. This means to ask the question in every psychotherapeutic encounter of how a social sequence can lead to revolution or flight. We cannot refuse our engagement with the social. In our work and our lives we are constantly embedded with the world of global capitalism. As Negri (1996) pointed out, there is no outside to capitalism; it is everywhere. The question then becomes exploring the ways in which it fails to fully encompass the creative force that is desire. In what ways does it not account for or fully appropriate our creative capacities to build relationship and community?

## LIMINAL SPACES

The field of representation that is global capitalism is in a parasitic relation with living force. It produces nothing but code and that code is built on the creative labor of living beings.



There is a gap, then, between the creative force that is life and the speed of appropriation that is the capacity of capitalism to encode what is created. This liminal space is the space of revolutionary politics. In our work, it is the unexpected and unanticipated moments of freedom, when we apprehend that we are operating outside what we know. These are moments of sense, where our way of knowing is operating intuitively towards the creative possibilities of an interaction without regard to the overarching rules, procedures, diagnosis, age conventions, professional identities, but at the same time playing all of these into new configurations that open them up to the field of play rather than work.

Deleuze and Guattari (1983) proposed schizoanalysis as just such liminal play that operates in the space between the dominating rule of the social and the creative force of life. In this way, they are proposing that we open our work into play, but play that is very serious in its revolutionary possibilities. The investment of desiring play, as political, means that we need to acknowledge the first thesis of schizoanalysis, which is that “every investment is social, and in any case bears upon a sociohistorical field” (ibid., p. 342).

There is no possibility of a field of psychotherapy that is not invested in the social. As a result, because the social is always political, i.e. a field of power relations and contestations of force, the work of psychotherapy is derived within a socio-historical field. Any call that attempts to portray our work outside the political is both a farce and a call to complicity with the brutal systems of domination and control. If we are functioning within the theoretical parameters of schizoanalysis, this is complicated by the fact that desire is both producing us and being produced by us. That is to say, our investments, or particularities of social assemblage, are derived in the liminal space between our bodies, thoughts and the impacts and traces of other bodies on ours that give rise to thoughts and then to capacities for action.

Schizoanalysis recognizes that our work as psychotherapists cannot be separated from its socio-historical content and the inevitability of a constant reconstituting of our social world. To the degree we attempt to hold the world still and repeat those investments derived from the dominant social, we will offer little to the world to come. On the other hand, to the degree we seek to discover our investments in the anomalous encounters of bodies and their acts, the world to come is ours to engage.

## PSYCHOTHERAPY AS A LOGIC OF LOVE

In the end, schizoanalysis, as a practice that opens a liminal space for new productions of the psyche, offers a logic of love. However, for our present purpose, such love requires a reconfiguration as force. Love as force might well be read in the vernacular of what Deleuze and Guattari (1983) defined as desiring production and connective flow. Indeed, this seems to be what Deleuze and Guattari (1983) proposed when they stated that:

Schizophrenia is like love: there is no specifically schizophrenic phenomenon or entity; schizophrenia is the universe of productive and reproductive desiring machines, universal primary production as “the essential reality of man and nature”. (p. 5)

The logic of love as force, then, is production through the infinite machinic flow of connectivity and multiplicity. Hardt and Negri (2009) wrote that love, as this kind of political

force and praxis, is not love as traditionally imagined within the dominant sphere of social coding that is capitalism. Instead of romantic and sentimental love, such political love is thoroughly machinic. It is neither nostalgic, nor bounded by social conventions such as family, nation or community. It is love as desire, defined by Deleuze and Guattari (1983) as that which “constantly couples continuous flows and partial objects ... desire causes the current to flow, itself flows in turn and breaks flows” (p. 5). Love, as a liminal space of schizoanalytic desiring production, is a field of action, not something that arrives mystically to envelop us in its sticky embrace. Instead, as desiring production, love calls forth acts that open flows of productive engagement across the ways in which we produce our lives in the idiosyncratic context of each and every particular moment.

Love, then, becomes that which connects thoughts, consciousness and the physical environment. To propose a psychotherapy founded in a logic of love requires what Deleuze and Guattari (1983) referred to as a certain kind of sobriety. A sober positioning of acts is composed of thoughtful reflection and bold experimentation. It is, in an important sense, a call to abandon the outmoded taxonomies and hierarchies of the human and engage psychotherapy as a collective assertion of the capacities of life itself in every unique and idiosyncratic form. To seize desire as love in the practice of psychotherapy is contingent upon the particularities of a historical moment and geography that calls together the specific elements available. Such love is neither predictable nor defined from the outside. Instead, it is love produced out of a collectivity of bodies working together to produce new worlds, new peoples.

## REFERENCES

- Althusser, L. (2006). *Lenin and philosophy and other essays*. Delhi, India: Aakar Books. (Original work published 1968)
- Baudrillard, J. (1981). *A critique of the political economy of the sign*. New York, NY: Telos Press.
- Casarino, C. (2011). Marx before Spinoza: Notes toward an investigation. In D. Vardoulakis (Ed.), *Spinoza now* (pp. 179–234). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1990). *The logic of sense*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1997). *Negotiations*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1983). *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *Thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Guattari, F. (2005). *The three ecologies*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Guattari, F., & Negri, A. (1990). *Communists like us*. New York, NY: Semiotext.
- Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2009). *Commonwealth*. Cambridge, UK: Belknap Press.
- Holland, E. W. (1998). Spinoza and Marx. *Cultural Logic*, 2(1). <http://clogic.eserver.org/>
- Holland, E. W. (2013). *Deleuze and Guattari and minor Marxism*. Retrieved September 30, 2014, from [http://works.bepress.com/eugene\\_w\\_holland/](http://works.bepress.com/eugene_w_holland/)
- Marx, K. (1978a). Grundrisse. In R. Tucker (Ed.), *The Marx–Engels reader* (pp. 221–293). New York, NY: W. W. Norton. (Original work published 1939)
- Marx, K. (1978b). The German ideology, Part One. In R. Tucker (Ed.), *The Marx–Engels reader* (pp. 146–202). New York, NY: W. W. Norton. (Original work published 1932)
- Marx, K. (2004). *Capital: A critique of political economy*. Boston, MA: Digireads.com Publishing. (Original work published 1867)

- Negri, A. (1992). Interpretation of the class situation today: Methodological aspects. In W. Bonefeld, R. Gunn, & K. Psychopedis (Eds), *Open Marxism. Vol. 2: Theory and practice* (pp. 69–105). London, UK: Pluto Press.
- Negri, A. (1996). Twenty theses on Marx: Interpretation of the class situation today. In S. Makdisi, C. Casarino, & R. E. Karl (Eds), *Marxism beyond Marxism* (pp. 149–180). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Robb, K. (1986). Psyche and logos in the fragments of Heraclitus. *The Monist*, 69(3), 315–351. <http://www.themonist.com/>
- Skott-Myhre, K. S. G. (in press). The feminization of labor and the DSM-5. *Annual Review of Critical Psychology*.
- We Are Plan C. (2014). *We are all very anxious*. Retrieved September 30, 2014, from <http://www.weareplanc.org/we-are-all-very-anxious/#.U05yp8e25ly>



**Hans Skott-Myhre** is a Professor in the Child and Youth Studies Department at Brock University. He is cross-appointed to the graduate program in Popular Culture as well as being core faculty for the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. in Humanities and adjunct faculty in the Child and Youth Care program at the University of Victoria. He is the author of *Youth Subcultures as Creative Force: Creating New Spaces for Radical Youth Work* (University of Toronto Press, 2008), co-editor with Chris Richardson of *Habitus of the Hood* (University of Chicago Press, 2012), and co-editor with K. Gharabaghi and M. Krueger of *With Children and Youth* (Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2014). He has published multiple articles, reviews and book chapters.