



# Toward a Theory of Fascism for Anti-Fascist Life

A Process Vocabulary



Brian Massumi

Fascism is not just a historical event – it is a recurring process, adapting and re-emerging in new forms. In *Toward a Theory of Fascism for Anti-Fascist Life* Brian Massumi offers a conceptual framework for understanding fascist tendencies as they unfold in contemporary politics. Moving beyond rigid definitions, this book provides a vocabulary of key concepts that trace how fascism operates, spreads, and takes root in the collective psyche. Drawing on process philosophy and political theory, Massumi challenges conventional understandings of power, personality, and collectivity, inviting readers to think critically about the conditions that enable authoritarianism's resurgence.

Designed as both a standalone primer and a companion to *The Personality of Power*, this book offers a flexible and non-linear approach to political analysis. Readers can enter at any point, following the interwoven concepts as they build a deeper understanding of today's fascist dynamics and counterforces. More than an intellectual exercise, *Toward a Theory of Fascism for Anti-Fascist Life* is a call to action: an invitation to recognize the harbingers of fascism today.

Brian Massumi is a Canadian philosopher and social theorist, and, until recently, Professor of Communication at the University of Montreal. He is the author of many books, including *Parables for the Virtual* (2002), *First and Last Emperors* (1993), and *99 Theses on the Revaluation of Value* (2018).



Minor Compositions

## Minor Compositions Open Access Statement – Please Read

This book is open access. This work is not simply an electronic book; it is the open access version of a work that exists in a number of forms, the traditional printed form being one of them.

All Minor Compositions publications are placed for free, in their entirety, on the web. This is because the free and autonomous sharing of knowledges and experiences is important, especially at a time when the restructuring and increased centralization of book distribution makes it difficult (and expensive) to distribute radical texts effectively. The free posting of these texts does not mean that the necessary energy and labor to produce them is no longer there. One can think of buying physical copies not as the purchase of commodities, but as a form of support or solidarity for an approach to knowledge production and engaged research (particularly when purchasing directly from the publisher).

*The open access nature of this publication means that you can:*

- read and store this document free of charge
- distribute it for personal use free of charge
- print sections of the work for personal use
- read or perform parts of the work in a context where no financial transactions take place

However, it is against the purposes of Minor Compositions open access approach to:

- gain financially from the work
- sell the work or seek monies in relation to the distribution of the work
- use the work in any commercial activity of any kind
- profit a third party indirectly via use or distribution of the work
- distribute in or through a commercial body (with the exception of academic usage within educational institutions)

The intent of Minor Compositions as a project is that any surpluses generated from the use of collectively produced literature are intended to return to further the development and production of further publications and writing; that which comes from the commons will be used to keep cultivating those commons. *Omnia sunt communia!*

### Support Minor Compositions / Purchasing Books

The PDF you are reading is an electronic version of a physical book that can be purchased through booksellers (including online stores), through the normal book supply channels, or Minor Compositions directly. Please support this open access publication by requesting that your university or local library purchase a physical printed copy of this book, or by purchasing a copy yourself.

*If you have any questions please contact the publisher: [minorcompositions@gmail.com](mailto:minorcompositions@gmail.com).*

# Toward a Theory of Fascism for Anti-Fascist Life

A PROCESS VOCABULARY

*Brian Massumi*

<.:Minor.:>

.compositions.

*Toward a Theory of Fascism for Anti-Fascist Life: A Process Vocabulary*

Brian Massumi

ISBN 978-1-57027-438-1

Cover design by Haduhi Szukis

Interior design by Casandra Johns

Released by Minor Compositions 2025

Colchester / New York / Port Watson

Minor Compositions is a series of interventions & provocations drawing  
from autonomous politics, avant-garde aesthetics, and the revolutions  
of everyday life.

Minor Compositions is an imprint of Autonomedia

[www.minorcompositions.info](http://www.minorcompositions.info) | [minorcompositions@gmail.com](mailto:minorcompositions@gmail.com)

Distributed by Autonomedia

PO Box 568 Williamsburgh Station

Brooklyn, NY 11211

[www.autonomedia.org](http://www.autonomedia.org)

[info@autonomedia.org](mailto:info@autonomedia.org)

# Contents

## PRESENTATION 1

ABDUCTION 9 – ABSTRACT GENERAL IDEA 9
ADEQUATE IDEA 11 – ADJUNCTION 12 – AFFECT 13
APPLICATION 13 – ASCRIPTION 13
BARE ACTIVITY 14 – BELIEF 15 – BELIEF IN THE EVENT 16
BODY 16 – BODY WITHOUT ORGANS 17
CHARACTER 17 – CLASS-NAME 18 – CODING 18
COLLECTIVE INDIVIDUATION 19
COLLECTIVE PERSON/COLLECTIVE PERSONING 20
COLLECTIVE SINGULAR 20 – COMMIND 22
COMMON NOTION 23 – CONATUS 23
CONJUNCTIVE SYNTHESIS 23 – CONNECTIVE SYNTHESIS 24
CONTEXT 27 – DECISION 28 – DEMONSTRATION 29
DESIRE 30 – DIFFERENCING 31
DIFFERENTIAL ATTUNEMENT 31
DISJUNCTIVE SYNTHESIS 32 – DIVIDUAL 33
ERROR 34 – FACIALITY 35 – FASCISIZING TENDENCY 37
FASCISM PROPER 37 – FEELING 38 – FIGURE 39
FORMAL DISTINCTION 40 – FREE INDIRECT DISCOURSE 41
FULL BODY 41 – GENERAL 44 – GENETIC ELEMENT 45
HABIT 45 – IDENTIFICATION 47 – IDENTITY 48
IMAGE 50 – IMAGE-OF-AN-IMAGE 51 – IMAGINATION 52
IMITATION 53 – IMMANENCE 53 – IMPORT 54
INADEQUATE IDEA 55 – INDEX 57 – INDIVIDUAL 57
INDIVIDUALIZATION 58 – INFRA-INDIVIDUAL 59
INFRA-PERSONAL 61 – INFRATHIN 61 – INTENSITY 62
INTUITION 63 – LICENSE 64 – LITERAL 64
MACHINIC 66 – MAN-STANDARD 68 – MATTER 71
MEDIA FIGURE 71 – MICRO-SHOCK 71
MODAL DISTINCTION 72 – MODAL METAPHYSICS 73

MUTUAL INCLUSION 73 – NORMOPATHY 76  
OBJECTIVE APPARENT MOVEMENT 76  
OBJECTIVE ILLUSION 76 – OBJECTIVE PERSPECTIVE 77  
OPTIVE MATTER 78 – PASSION 78 – PATHIC 78  
PERSON (PERSONING) 79 – PERSONALITY 81  
PERSONALITY OF POWER 82 – PERSONIFICATION 82  
PLANE OF CONSISTENCY 82 – PLANE OF IMMANENCE 82  
POINT-SIGN 83 POLES 84 – POST-NORMATIVE 84  
POTENTIAL, PURE 85 – POTENTIAL, REAL 87  
QUASI-CAUSE 89 – RACIAL CAPITALISM 89  
REACTION 91 – REACTION, REGIME OF 92  
REAL DISTINCTION 93 – RESENTIMENT 95 – SCHIZ 96  
SIGNIFYING REGIME 96 – SINGULAR 97  
SINGULAR-MULTIPLE 97 – SINGULAR-UNIVERSAL 98  
SPECULATIVE PRAGMATISM 98 – STRANGE INTRUDER 99  
STRUCTURE 100 – STUPIDITY 101  
SURPLUS-VALUE OF FLOW 101 – TENDENCY 102  
THEY 103 – THINKING-FEELING 103 – THOUGHT 104  
TRANSINDIVIDUAL 105 – UMBRAL UNION 106  
UNFELT FEELING 107 – UNSPECIFIED ENEMY 109

# Presentation

The era of the “strongman” has returned. From Russia’s Putin, China’s Xi, Turkey’s Erdoğan, India’s Modi, Hungary’s Orbán, and Argentina’s Milei to America First’s MAGAnificent Donald Trump, leaders with an autocratic bent rule the world, troubling the senescent slumber of late-liberal representative government with fever dreams of a tipping point. Into what? The immediate answer: into “fascism.” But that answer is loath to be voiced. A reluctance to say the f-word out loud, verging on a taboo, has long been in force in mainstream media discourse and polite conversation. A fever dream an effective analytic category does not make, is the attitude. But with the reelection of Trump in 2024, bringing an emboldened and well-prepared far right into the center of power on his capacious coattails, the taboo relaxed. When one of Trump’s own former closest advisors deems him “fascist to the core” and another observes that he fits “the general definition of a fascist,” it makes it hard not to go there.<sup>1</sup> It makes it difficult not to nurse the suspicion that the fever dream is solidifying into our collective reality. Which makes it our urgent task to counter the taboo by mounting an effective concept of it.

Trump may well fit the general definition of fascism. But what is that definition? Traditional theories of fascism revolve around the identification of the “masses” to the person of the charismatic leader, forming a “cult of personality” around the strongman. The “masses” are deluded by their own imaginary projection, to the point that they vote and act against their own interests. This definition is now challenged from a number of points of view.

First of all, there are no longer any masses. The passive masses have been fragmented by social media into an effervescence of

1 Former head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Mark A. Milley, and former White House Chief of Staff, retired Marine General John F. Kelly, respectively.

hyperactive bubbles forming, merging, diverging, and bursting with abandon.

Second, if a “cult” means adhering to a well-defined world-view and a corresponding set of rigid principles of behavior, the word no longer applies. In the United States, since Ronald Reagan, a majority of the “charismatic leader’s” supporters have disagreed with his specific policies if polled on them one by one, and this is still the case with Trump.<sup>2</sup> This is not ideological adherence, in any traditional sense.

Third, the “charisma” of the leader around which supporters rally is so riddled with error, ineptness, puffery, and buffoonery that it can no longer be the case that the leader commands allegiance based on positive personal qualities. Instead, his power is predicated precisely on his lack of leadership qualities as traditionally understood. We are witnessing a form of post-normative leadership where the very disqualification of the leader is what qualifies him for office in the eye’s of his supporters.<sup>3</sup>

This, fourth, deforms the image of the “strongman.” The leader, as preeminent person, is no longer beholden to model the strength of character and attitude of moral rectitude written into the traditional image of the masculine role model. He can break any norm of governance, business practice, and personal conduct (up to and including sexual abuse) with impunity – now enshrined into law as a presidential right by the Supreme Court. Trump is famously thin-skinned, seeking confirmation of his importance in other people. He exudes a vulnerability that always has to be compensated for,

2 Aaron Blake, “Americans Elected Trump. They Might Not Like What Comes Next,” *Washington Post*, 11 November 2024, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2024/11/11/americans-elected-trump-they-might-not-like-what-comes-next/>

3 A phenomenon observed by Michel Foucault in his 1975 comments on “grotesque” or “ubuesque” power. *Abnormal. Lectures at the Collège de France 1974-1975*, trans. Graham Burchell (London: Verso, 2003) 11-13.

and exhibits a distinct cattiness when ruffled. His image does not reflect the self-sufficient masculinity assumed by the strongman theory. It is not only the “strong” part that slackens. Something happens to the “man” part, too. The cattiness is reminiscent of stereotypes about women’s weakness. He can wax unmanly lyrical about romancing Kim Jong Un. He exults in decorative excess, applied to his hair-do and the length of his tie, as well as to the interior of his residences. He oscillates between hypermasculine braggadocio and signalings of stereotypically feminine vulnerability, weakness, and preening.

On all these counts, the charismatic leadership of the strong man is down and out.

All of this complicates the question of what the definition of fascism is. Its scope broadens. There are the traditional questions of how fascism differs from or coincides with authoritarianism and totalitarianism; of what is specific to each of fascisms historical outbreaks and what is common to them; of whether it is confined to or overflows the state; and of what precursor movements prepare its rise to take full-fledged form. In addition to these there are now a range of other questions, no less central.

There is the question of normativity: how can a revengeful return of traditional norms cohabit with a post-normative slackening of personal character? How can a punishing hypermasculinism co-operate with a blurring of gender categories?

Given the variability of the historical forms fascism takes, coupled with the blurring of central categories, is it even possible to establish a typology of fascisms, in their difference to annex formations? If not, what logic, other than the traditional category-based logic predicated on the principles of identity (non-contradiction) and mutual exclusion, could provide useful analytic tools?

How can that same logic grapple with the question of what manner of collectivity has replaced the “masses,” and what its relation is to the preeminent person of the leader, if not projective identification?

If the preeminence of this person is steeped in lies enthusiastically taken up by his supporters, without being dragged down by contradiction, what post-truth logic is this? What if his supporters don't vote against their private interests, so much as they vote in accordance with their shared *desires*? What is the logic of this transindividual desire? If they aren't passively duped, but earnestly, desirously "do their research," as they are beseeched to do by alt-right influencers, what accounts for the boundless proliferation of error they engage in? How does their will-to-truth fuel a post-truth regime? How does the particular way that regime produces error feed racism, misogynyny, and transphobia?

If this regime is lacking a self-consistent rationality does it mean that it has the (paradoxical) rationality of an affective regime? If so, how can we characterize it? What becomes of our traditional political logics, based as it they are on norms and normative categories, in an affective regime of post-normativity where the personal exceptionalism exemplified in the preeminent person of the leader emboldens a similarly post-normative stance among his supporters, who, instead of legitimating his rule, take personal license from his giving himself license to misrule?

Finally, and most importantly, how, in the face of all of this, might we re-access potentials for anti-fascist life?

Shortly after the dramatic finale of Trump's first term as President of the United States in the January 6, 2021 Capitol insurrection, I set about tackling these questions. The eventual result was a book entitled *The Personality of Power: A Theory of Fascism for Anti-Fascist Life* (Duke University Press, 2025). As the title of book indicates, the question of fascism is approached as a co-function of personality and power. That is not saying much, if the fundamental questioning does not extend to these terms as well. Among the premises of the book are: that to understand fascism it is necessary to reproblematicize what it means to be a person, in ways that enable us to construct a concrete and workable

notion of collective personhood; that our notion of power must be yoked not to the imaginary relation of identification, but to the very real circulation of signs as pragmatic operators of collective individuations; and most far-reachingly, that to follow through with this line of thought, nothing less than a new political logic is necessary. Only a non-normative logic can be flexible enough to account for post-truth and post-normativity of the contemporary condition in positive terms, rather than simply in terms of lack or failure as judged by the yardstick of traditional logics and earlier political formations. That non-normative logic was dubbed the “logic of mutual inclusion.”

The book that resulted was itself a fairly non-normal combination of current-affairs based political analysis, political theory, and in-depth philosophical concept construction. The Trump phenomenon was taken as an exemplary historical conjuncture from which concepts of wider applicability could be distilled. The concepts build a “processual” take on fascism and fascisizing tendencies. By that is meant that fascism is taken as a manner of becoming emerging and returning across history, always in new variations. The question, then, is less “what” fascism is, than “how” it does itself. A concern for finding a proper typology of fascism is replaced by the diagnosis of the symptoms of its tending to return. The concepts are diagnostic, rather than descriptive. They are turned toward understanding the harbingers of fascism’s reemergence pragmatically enough, and perceiving them in enough time, to take curative steps to intercept its maturation and redirect collective tendencies toward a different destination.

This vocabulary distills a number of the key concepts constructed in *The Personality of Power*. It is not meant to be exhaustive. It is a skeleton key, covering a number of aspects, but concentrating most concertededly on the logic of mutual inclusion as a political logic. It is designed to be able to be read independently of the book, as a primer on a certain (Deleuzo-Whiteheadian) take on

a process-oriented political theory.<sup>4</sup> It can be read alone, or serve as a gateway to its companion book. If it is read alone, the entries do not have to be read in order. It is in fact preferable to start at any entry that catches the reader's eye, then to wander following the relays to other entries (indicated by italics in the body of the entries and cross-references at the end of many entries). This is likely to result in a rhythm of return to key definitions, hopefully with a different appreciation at each pass due to the different vector of approach, yielding an expanding understanding of the ambit of each concept and its intrication with other concepts. Alternatively, the vocabulary can be dipped into intermittently in the course of reading *The Personality of Power* as an aid to helping the current of concepts the book cascades through settle into a familiarity that the reader can more easily build upon. The vocabulary distills the logic of the book into a skeleton key, while the book adds meat to flesh out the logic. Which means, to get the full body you combine them.

The present vocabulary often makes finer distinctions, or multiplies distinctions, beyond what was deemed sufficient for the purposes of *The Personality of Power*. Conversely, some key concepts are presented more schematically here, due to the pressures on length imposed by the glossary form. This is most notably the case with the entries glossing the modes of distinction mobilized by the proposed logic of mutual inclusion (modal distinction, real distinction, umbral union) and their mutually exclusionary nemesis in traditional categorical thought (formal distinction, redefined for the purposes of this project). These essential concepts are introduced in the main text of *The Personality of Power*, and returned to in a Postscript elaborating upon them more fully and systematizing them as a suite of concepts. The redoubling of

4 The key Deleuzian text for this project is Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983).

the concepts with a Postscript (and now the trebling them with vocabulary entries here) was deemed necessary for two reasons. First, because, by design, the way these modes of distinction are adapted for a process approach to the political does not correspond with their historical usage in philosophy with some readers may be familiar (not to mention that fact that one, umbral union, actually has, to my knowledge, no presence in the philosophical tradition, apart from an odd page or two from Peirce). Secondly, because the primary object of the logic of mutual inclusion (differencing, pertaining to a “collective singular”) is so radically different from the object of the traditional logic of mutual exclusion (identity, pertaining to a particular) that it requires some concerted conceptual dredging to clear it of the logical detritus that the latter has deposited in our brains.

Neither the book nor the vocabulary is meant to have the final word. To the contrary, the aim is to forge a companionship between them that makes the project as a whole *generative*. It is hoped that the interplay between this vocabulary’s definitions, and between them and the discussions in *The Personality of Power*, produces a complexity-effect, a kind of surplus-value of order: a systemic-excess effect empowering multiple uptakes of the concepts, each generating a new variation on their inter-consistency that can be tailored to different contexts, lend themselves to different focal lengths and angles of attack, and serve different processual aims. Not a final word, but an invitation to logico-political voyage.



**ABDUCTION.** A lived hypothesis. An abduction is a direct awareness of tendential orientations and their possible outcomes, as already contained in germ in an event. That awareness includes *tendencies* whose expressions might prove compatible in their unfoldings, along with those that may prove incompatible. The sense of the event's composition of ingredient tendencies is speculative *thought*, in that it carries perception past the presently given, feeling out the futurity in the present's just-now passing. The thinking comes flush with perception, without a separate act of cogitation added to it. It strikes directly as a "perceptual judgment." Abduction embodies Peirce's principle that there is no definite dividing line between perception and thought. Abduction inhabits the area of overlap between them: their region of *mutual inclusion*, where they are immanent to each other in their exercise. An abduction is the elementary unit of *thinking-feeling* at the emergent level of experience as it comes into its own further unfolding, for a pulse of process. It evaluates the complexity of *conatus* activated in the situation conditioning the event. *See also* ERROR †

**ABSTRACT.** *See also* BODY; MATTER

**ABSTRACT GENERAL IDEA.** An instrument of classification deploying the logic of the conventional set or category based on the principle of mutual exclusion. The abstract general idea is "merely abstract": an empty repertory of properties purporting to define the essential nature of a class of beings. The defining properties are applied to *singulars* to test their fitness for inclusion in the class. Subsumed by an abstract general idea, the singulars are taken up as *particular* instances of the *general* category. They embody its defining properties, bearing a nonsensuous resemblance to the category and, mediated by that category, a recognized sensuous resemblance to other members of the class likewise embodying it. This subsumption to a category performs a selective inclusion, or triage, which presents itself as a purely logical operation, but is in

practice inseparable from a value judgment bearing on the degree of conformity to the category. A preeminent term stands at the top of the hierarchy of value as most perfect exemplar of the defining properties. Other members of the class are differentially valued in descending order according to their degree of deviation from that standard. Unconforming singulars that resist subsumption under the abstract general ideas are violently excluded as “other.” The triage, valuation, conformation, and inclusion/exclusion functions of the abstract general idea make it an inherently political construct, despite its self-presentation as a neutral logical aid for knowledge formation (of a kind privileging typology, equated with all knowledge). In fact, it is a power-knowledge nexus. The *application* of the category *overcodes* the field of the singular, taking it up into a *structure* organized by the opposition between particular and the general (subtended, in some accounts, by diacritical distinctions between class members and among the classes themselves, as in structuralism), then folding the structure back down on the field of life in a disciplinary (norm-enforcing) fashion. The *Man-Standard* is the most widespread and virulent political instantiation of the abstract general idea’s norm-enforcing. It denies its own power operation by claiming the supposed neutrality of what are presented as universally applicable notions of “Man,” “humanity,” and “human nature.” Notions of human *identity* are normative products of the political operation of the abstract general idea. Saussurian linguistics is the reign of the general idea and vector of its imperialism in the “humanities” (the “concept” to which the sign refers in Saussure is the general abstract idea; metaphor and metonymy are its condensations and displacements respectively). *See also* COLLECTIVE SINGULAR; COMMON NOTION; SIGNIFYING REGIME; SINGULAR-MULTIPLE; SINGULAR-UNIVERSAL †

**ABSTRACT MACHINE.** *See* MACHINIC

**ABSTRACT MATTER.** *See* INTUITION; MACHINIC; MATTER; THOUGHT

**ADEQUATE IDEA.** *A thinking-feeling that supersedes the objective illusions and errors of reaction.* The adequate idea does not erase the objective illusions. Objective illusion is inexpungeable because it is an event whose occurrence is built into the operations of perception, and events can never be undone. Rather, the adequate idea “doubles” the objective illusion in a way that corrects the full-fledged errors that flow from it. It envelops the objective illusion in an expanded purview that separates it from the reactive path of its amplification toward integration into a regime of *ressentiment*. It does this by deflecting thinking-feeling from the prolongation of the effect of an impingement that remains active in trace form, continuing to generate pain or anxiety. Instead, it redirects thinking-feeling toward the composition of the relational field to which both the impinged-upon and impinging bodies belong. The functional forgetting of the trace allows the thinking-feeling doubling it to become active in its own right. It continues to carry the trace, enveloped in its activity as a *genetic element*, but it is no longer answerable to it. The adequate idea grasps the composition of the relational field as a function of the powers of existence of all of the bodies involved, or their powers to affect and be affected. This means approaching them from the angle of their co-activity, recognizing their mutual participation in a distributed causality that typically channels into and culminates in a punctual impingement most proximately determining the effect, but is never reducible to that linear vector. The distributed causality incumbent in the relations between the elements ingredient to the event is a nonlinear *quasi-causality*. It is the efficacy of relation, as such. The adequate idea must be attuned to the complexity of the quasi-causal, which conditions outcomes that punctually present as the result of a straight causal line between an agent and a patient. This involves

an attunement to the germinal tendencies and contrasting *conatus* among the elements in play. There are three kinds of adequate idea: *common notions*, *collective singulars*, and *singular-universals*. Spinoza, from whom this account of the adequate idea most directly derives, also counts *abstract general ideas* (what he calls “universal ideas”) as adequate ideas, because they provide a shorthand that facilitates reasoning. We might add that in the hands of science they usefully ground formal systems of knowledge whose consistency is guaranteed by systematizing causality through the figure of the law (such as in the laws of nature, applied to the understanding of species as abstract general categories). The truth-value (predictive value) of these systematizations either depends on controlling variables within a closed system, thus discounting relational causality, or on applying statistical analysis to open systems, thus discounting singularity; in other words, it is valid within certain processual parameters. While recognizing the useful heuristic and formalizing functions of abstract general ideas, the present account focuses processual attention on their limitations: their negligence of singularity, their mis-taking or discounting of relational causality, their propensity for selective value judgments naturalizing hierarchies of beings, and the way these short-comings predispose them for complicity in regimes of reaction. †

**ADJUNCTION.** The integration of a body’s *character*, or pattern of life movements, into symbiosis with a field of potential (*full body* or *body without organs*) or a parasitism on it. The adjunction is restrictive if its operator is the *ascription* of a *general abstract idea*. Adjunction can also be self-performed as an emergent turn in a body’s tendential directions entering into composition with the resident potentials of a field of potential and with the other bodies populating it. In this case, the adjunction can be either restrictive or expansive of a body’s powers of existence. It is restrictive when the entering into composition is driven by *reaction*, and expansive

when it is powered by a becoming affirmative of the expression of new potentials. When the adjunction is not self-performed, the body is said to have been “*inducted*” (in something close to the military sense). When it is emergently self-performed, the body has “transduced.” †

**AFFECT.** An ability to affect and be affected corresponding to a passage to an augmentation or diminishment of a body’s power’s of existence, together with a *feeling* of the passage. A sad affect is an affective passage leading to a diminished capacitation, or a reduction in a body’s powers to be (act, perceive, think, feel). A joyful affect is an affective passage augmenting a body’s powers to be. *See also* FEELING; INTENSITY; NORMOPATHY; PASSION; REACTION; REACTION, REGIME OF; THINKING-FEELING; UNFELT FEELING †

**AFFIRMATION.** *See* BELIEF IN THE EVENT

**AGENCY/AGENCYING.** *See* MACHINIC

**APPLICATION.** The folding down upon a body of an *abstract general idea*, attributing to the body a set of properties to which it is held to conform as a particular case of the general category. The assigned properties carry normative imperatives, according to which the body is policed and as a function of which it is disciplined. The *Man-Standard* is the privileged matrix of applicable general categories prevailing under European modernity and its aftermaths. Application effects an overcoding of *singularity*. *See also* CODING †

**ASCRPTION.** The performative act of catalyzing the *application* of an *abstract general idea* to a body. *Point-signs* are vectors of ascription. The fundamental political ascription fostered in and fostering regimes of reaction is that of friend or enemy (as theorized by Carl Schmitt). As a tributary of the abstract general idea,

ascription deploys a logic of mutual exclusion that sidelines *singularity*. It nominally defines the body's *character*, swooping down upon the body's movements from over and above. But because it forces the *adjunction* of a body to a restricted field of potential (giving it a role according to the *codings* of a *full body* or *body without organs*), the nominal definition implants itself in the body's lived reality (overcoding it). †

**ASSEMBLAGE.** See CONNECTIVE SYNTHESIS; MACHINIC

**ASSOCIATED MILIEU.** See FULL BODY

**ATTRACTOR.** See BODY; DESIRE; MACHINIC; MUTUAL INCLUSION; TENDENCY; THINKING-FEELING

**BARE ACTIVITY.** The realm of infra-individual and infra-personal agitation of germinal tendencies. Bare activity is the commotion of incipient tendencies' tendency to express themselves in a taking-determinate-form. In bare activity, tendencies are in *mutual inclusion*. They hold together in their difference from each other, but in such close processual proximity that they are in a continual churning of mutual inflection. Bare activity is the relational movement of *real potential* agitating for actualization following tendential arcs of unfolding from *pathic* encounter. It is the liminal sphere of activity where a body's striving (*conatus*) tangentially intersects its field of potential (*full body* or *body without organs*), so as to skim potential from it into the body's own formation and trajectories. Bare activity is not yet action. Action assumes an already constituted body or person with given capacities. Bare activity is pure activity: proto-action; activation. In its churning, it fleetingly activates spectra of intensity that act as lures for the body's formative feeling or grasping of potential (or "prehensions," in Whitehead's vocabulary). Bare activity is the field of emergence of action. It is not inside a body or subject. Rather, it the tangent point where the

life of the body touches the world's pool of potential, for selective uptake. If it can be said to be anywhere in particular, it is at the edge of the outside. The churn state of bare activity at any given moment conditions the uptake of potential, whose expression can be "primed" by *point-signs*. Since the body's relation to bare activity is a grasping of potential, as abstract *matter*, the playing out of that relation constitutes a mode of *thought*. In the relation of bare activity, the most immanent recesses of the body are in a commotional state of overlap with the potentials of the outside, directly felt and just as immediately thought. In view of this overlap, a body may be said to be "in" bare activity, even though bare activity lies at the limit of its feeling and activity. When a body is in bare activity, it is stirring itself out of its absorption in the *pathic*, on the verge of action. Bare activity provisions *abduction* and orients *intuition*. †

**BELIEF.** The binding force (Tarde) effecting a *connective synthesis*. Belief fuses the thinking-feeling of two or more elements into an integration that counts for one. It is a fundamental articulation of the life of the body, immanent to the formation of every perception. Belief is what delivers "chunks" of already-formed experience as grist for further elaboration. It pre-forms the objects that perception takes up and relays to thought and feeling at a supplementary level to its own. As such, it is the archeology of thought. In its own operation, it is a primary form, or primitive, of *thinking-feeling*, enabling its object-oriented functions. Belief self-effects, without the action of a separate agent or subject: it is a "passive synthesis." It is the mechanism of *habit*. Belief in the more conventional sense is an elaboration upon the perceptions in-formed by beliefs in the primary sense, as they and their habitual effects are taken up into discursive formations of *signifying signs*. Through those circuits, belief becomes socialized in a way that fosters psychologization, which occurs through a process of *identification*. At this level, it is inflected by the collective *imaginings* (in definition 1 given below)

of a *commind*, making it susceptible to the *errors* flowing from the *objective illusions* that come with the imagination's reliance on *abstract general ideas*. Belief in this sense is a derivative of belief in the primary sense. It retains its constitutive force, transposed onto another level of organization where it takes on new functions. Like all things, belief has a *conatus*, which thrusts it into movements of *desire*. On the discursive level, that *conatus* can be called a "will-to-believe." Conspiracy thinking is animated by a robust will-to-believe leavened by an extreme scepticism toward formations of knowledge that purport to operate on a basis other than belief. See also HABIT †

**BELIEF IN THE EVENT.** An enacted faith that when the next step falls, the world will rise up to meet it, replete with potential, brimming with tendencies, teeming with others, and always with a tinge of surprise. Belief in the event is an existential posture: a leaning into the world's powers of self-renewal. To do this, a body must abandon itself to them, then walk with them step by step as their ally or intercessor. To say that it is an existential posture is to say that it can be extended into a habit. Also called "belief in the world." Also called "affirmation." †

**BODY. GENERAL DEFINITION:** A nexus of movements that are bound to each other in an enduring *connective synthesis* that enable them to travel a historic route together through pulses of *thinking-feeling*. By this definition, intensity, potential, and thought are incorporeal, but not immaterial. They can be considered energetic phases of *body-matter*. **SPECIAL DEFINITION:** Anything that has the capacity to experience actions and passions, or to affect and be affected, and thus to be a carrier of *intensity*. By this definition, a *thought* is a body, because it is of the nature of thoughts to inflect, entrain, clash with, and supersede each other, in symbiosis or struggle. Orders of *potential*, such as the *full body* and *body without organs*, are also bodies by this definition. The

difference between the special and general definitions of bodies is similar to the difference between the special and general theories of relativity, where the general theory concerns the interaction of masses as warping spacetime, and the special definition involves a geometric theory of gravity. Except that, with respect to the general definition, process thinking would say “contractions of movement” in place of “mass,” and “constitutes” spacetime rather than “warps” it. With respect to the special definition, it would also take “geometric” with a Deleuze-Guattarian twist, as involving lines (of process), angles of intersection (of formative forces), projections and transformations (of bodies and figures), tangents (of becoming), and topological torsions of all of these. It would substitute “processual poles” or “attractors” for “gravity.” See also FULL BODY; MATTER †

**BODY WITHOUT ORGANS.** There are several interlocking but not entirely overlapping definitions of the body without organs. 1) A *full body* formed from the splitting of a more encompassing full body into contrasting regions of *real potential* in-forming competing formations on the plane of organization. An example is an agonistic collective individuation into friend and enemy. 2) A full body that holds the real potential of the life of an individual body of a certain *character* with certain defining *tendencies*, for example a masochistic or reactionary full body. 3) A full body whose patternings of potential have been edited down limitatively, from the more encompassing level of the same full body on which contrasting tendencies are held in inclusive *disjunctive synthesis* (still held in reserve immanent to the pattern of limitation). †

**CHARACTER.** The continuing patterning of movements and tendencies sustained by a *person* and defining it qualitatively. By qualitatively is meant as a manner of being in becoming. The character pattern is inherited from moment to moment across the historic route of the person’s life. At each step, the character pattern

reintegrates around the impingement of incoming influences, conveyed by the strike of *point-signs*. The reintegration is alimented by *abductions* of new potentials emergent from primings of *bare activity* of both endogenous and exogenous provenance. Character accompanies the person's *bodily* movements, but is *really distinct* from them. There is a presiding feeling that emanates from and envelops the character's unfolding at every step. It is the feeling tone or affective tonality of the character's mannerism, or signature style of continuing its variations on itself, directly thought-felt. It is like the person's atmosphere. The presiding feeling can be specifically addressed as a *personality*. The character has a dynamic unity that makes the individual *person* nondecomposable: divisible, but not without changing in nature (*dividual*). When character is cut into in such a way that it does divide, a personality crisis ensues, which could be permanent or passing (as when we say or are told we "are not ourselves"). The dynamic unity of the character pattern may also fracture into multiple personalities, bringing dividual subpersons to expression in their own right. This definition of character is different from, but related to another: pure character. Pure character pertains to the qualitative-relational *pure potentials* held in *umbral union* on the *plane of immanence*. It is these potentials that the character of a person brings to actual qualitative-relational expression at a global level. *See also* PERSON (PERSONING); PERSONALITY; PERSONALITY OF POWER; PERSONIFICATION †

**CLASS-NAME.** A label that provides a handle for a *collective singular* or an umbrella for an *abstract general idea*. *See also* COLLECTIVE SINGULAR †

**CODING.** The self-organization of *connective syntheses* into a pattern of possible trajectories in the life of a body. The codings constitute a "territory," or a self-limited region of *real potential*. At its most organized, when wobble and play are minimized, the

territory solidifies into a *structure*. This regimenting occurs through “overcoding,” or the policed *application* of an *abstract general idea* upon the singularity of a self-organizing coding. Application filters the real potential held in place by a coding, selectively channeling it down normative pathways, themselves organized into cycles of recognized functions sanctioning certain territorial modes of production and reproduction. Coding in the first instance relies on the formation of *habit*. A trajectory that departs from coded pathways and leaks from overcodings is a “decoding.” A decoding is simultaneously a “deterritorialization,” because it takes leaves of a territory. In the most intense deterritorializations, the territory takes leave of itself, drawn as a whole into a becoming. Decoding and deterritorialization are potentials that are inseparable from coding, as its underside and far side. A *full body* or *body without organs* encompasses this extra-potential of the territory and its codings in an expanded field of real potential. See *also* APPLICATION †

**COLLECTIVE ASSEMBLAGE.** See MACHINIC

**COLLECTIVE INDIVIDUATION.** A becoming correlated and a correlated becoming of individuals. This occurs when an array of bodies is *adjoined* to the same *full body* under the action of *point-signs*. What is an individual and what is a collective individual is a matter of perspective: individuation is always composed of nested levels, each of which comprises a correlated subpopulation. Calling an individuation “collective” in contrast to “individual” is a convenience of expression. The correlation of individuals forming a collective individuation is not fundamentally a conformity. It is a *differential attunement* of the individuals to each other and to the *real potentials* of the field of relation they co-habit. The correlation can become a bond of conformity through the overcoding *application* of an *abstract general idea* serving as a standard, such as the *Man-Standard*. A collective individuation has a character, or pattern of correlation under continuing variation, that constitutes

a *collective personhood*. It has a collective *body* consisting in the correlated nexuses of matter-in-movement that move in concert to express the character and move it through its variations (what is traditionally called a “body politic”). The concerted movement may align the correlated bodies more or less closely, into a dynamic unity of greater or lesser cohesion and consistency. The integration into a dynamic unity is fundamentally quasi-chaotic: metastable at best, prone to perturbations that throw it back into commotion. The commotion stirs *bare activity*, to unpredictable results. *Fascizing tendencies* aim to stir collective commotion, and then to forcefully channel the affected individuations into restrictive channels. *Fascism proper* attempts to discipline it into assuming regimented patterns of laminar movement radiating from the center point of a preeminent person anchoring a regime of *faciality*. †

**COLLECTIVE PERSON/COLLECTIVE PERSONING.**

The pattern of correlation spinning the continuing variation of a *collective individuation*. Like collective individuations, collective persons are composed of nested levels of analogically orders sub-persons, descending to the *infra-personal* level. Collective persons carry *class-names* or proper names, such as “Trump.” When they carry proper names, they are more likely than not implicated in a regime of *faciality* and susceptible to *fascisizing tendencies*. †

**COLLECTIVE SINGULAR.** A population whose members’ *characters* are correlated by a shared genetic element immanent to the constitution of each. “Genetic element” is taken in the widest connotation of a formative factor, of whatever nature. A collective singular has no definite boundaries or precise member count because its members are constantly coming into and going out of existence, and in between are in an ongoing *individuation* by which they pass through qualitative changes, such that the collective singular itself is always in a state of *collective individuation*. Collective singulars are unlimited, nondenumerable, and

in continuous variation. They are dynamic populations whose boundaries waver, making them a fuzzy set, both because the collective singular's constituent individuals are continually growing, dying, and being born, and because they overlap with other populations at their shifting margins (as when dogs interbreed with coyotes and back with wolves; or when viruses horizontally transfer genes across species lines in a continual production of new species). Collective singulars are not species but *speciations* lacking the categorical determinateness traditionally attributed to species in taxonomy (traditionally, because that idea of species has been all but abandoned in contemporary biology). Race as analyzed by W.E.B. Du Bois,<sup>5</sup> with his emphasis on the fact that “intermingling” undermines its integrity as a mutually exclusionary category in the mode of the abstract general idea, making it a field of continual variation, can be understood as a collective singular. Collective singulars escape the net of the *abstract general idea* by nature. Every abstract general idea covers a collective singular in order to discount its singularity and bring it into conformity (set boundaries for it, give it a count, attribute an unchanging nature to it). Owing to the multiplicity of its internal constitution, every *singular* can be treated as a collective singular or counted as a one, depending on the requirements of the approach. “Collective singular” is also the *class-name* applied to such a population. The class-name of a collective singular *indexes* the patternings and inheritances of *potential* governing the correlation among its members. This gives the class-name an existential fullness that the abstract general idea, as an empty logical umbrella, lacks. A collective singular can only be indexed. It cannot be denoted without already transforming it

5 W.E.B. Du Bois, “The Conservation of Races,” in *The Problem of the Color Line at the Turn of the Twentieth Century: The Essential Early Essays*, ed. Nahum Dimitri Chandler (New York: Fordham University Press, 2015). See also Nahum Dimitri Chandler, “On Paragraph Four of ‘The Conservation of Races’,” *New Continental Review* 14, no. 3 (2014): 255–88.

into an abstract general idea. This needs to be taken into account when taking a collective singular as one. Care needs to be taken to prevent the convenience of counting it as one to redeliver the collective singular to denotation and as a consequence to the abstract general. Thus cared for, the collective singular remains an *adequate idea*. See also SINGULAR; SINGULAR-MULTIPLE; SINGULAR-UNIVERSAL †

**COMMIND.** The ongoing *conjunctive synthesis* of endless series of *thoughts* articulated by endless series of utterers, producing a felt surplus-value of thinking-feeling supplementary to the value of each individual thought and driving the production of more thoughts as a function of those already produced. For example, in gossip the commind is the “they said’s” surplus of titillation and credulity produced by “their” latest utterance, feeding more gossip, and giving each bit of gossip an extra charge owing to its deriving from that series. Since language is defined not by the direct exchange of thought between two persons, but by its capacity to transmit the thought to a third in indirect discourse, all language use shares the character of gossip and involves a commind. Social media is one gigantic commind, composed of more or less communicating sub-comminds. In another vein, a discipline of knowledge is a commind, in that it organizes an in principle endless series of thought utterances influencing and relaying each other, and endows them with a disciplinary surplus-value of gravitas and credulity. All discursive formations form comminds. A commind is the *machinic* thinking of a *collective person*. A commind is not homogeneous. It is differential. It is productive of variations that do not entirely overlap without offset, thus remaining to some degree contrastive, if only *infrathinly*. A commind is not a unity. It is a fractal field. Its production of variations comes through proliferating fissures in discourse, which can constitute a signifying rupture between one statement and the next, or merely an infrathin

offset. A commind is a *collective singular* of such breadth as to defy a class-name, other than the default category of “they.” †

**COMMON NOTION.** What two or more bodies share in encounter, by virtue of that encounter. What bodies share in encounter is not a property or set of properties, but rather a co-activity of mutual influence. The common notion *indexes* the dynamic relationality, or nexus of affectings and being affected, of bodies in encounter. It grasps the dynamic *singularity* of a situation. Common notions constitute the first level of *adequate ideas* according to Spinoza, in that they reattach the effect of an encounter on a body to its commingling with others. This provides a path to understanding all the bodies involved in terms of their powers of existence, in the complexity of their relational expression, rather than from the sole angle of the self-absorption in how their impinging force punctually affects a receiving body (the *pathic*; *reaction*). It provides a platform for raising adequate knowledge to its highest level, that of the *singular-universal*. See also ADEQUATE IDEA; INADEQUATE IDEA †

**CONATUS.** The tendency for a *tendency* to prolong itself while augmenting its powers to affect and be affected. Also called “striving” (Spinoza) or “appetition” (Whitehead). All things have conatus, as do the sub-elements entering into their composition. This makes the overall conatus of a thing an integration of a differential bundle of tendencies. The idea of conatus revises the concept of the thing. It shifts from the usual notion of a coagulation of matter with simple location to that of an integral bundle of tendencies, complexly involved in process at more than one level, and carrying a differential of futurities, or potential tendential outcomes. †

**CONJUNCTIVE SYNTHESIS.** The occurrence of a unitary summing-up effect that takes up the surplus-value of flow produced by the “satisfaction” (culmination) of a *connective synthesis*,

and registers it in an emergent feeling tone carrying an affective valuation (a valence of potential). The culminating feeling is a concluding echo of the *pathic* that sets in with the connective synthesis and is assigned a locus by the *disjunctive syntheses* that apply themselves to it. The feeling is the conjunctive synthesis thus indexes the suspension-reactivation of potential in the pathic. By virtue of this, it is the most primary form of *point-sign*. The discontinuous passages from one conjunctive synthesis to another constitutes a kind of lived cartography of the *full body* or *body without organs*. The passage from one to the other is discontinuous because between each beat the ongoing of process necessarily dips back down to the levels of the pathic and connective synthesis, to draw them again into a culminating effect. Through its registering of the quality of the pathic's unfolding to take emergent effect – including its turn toward *reaction* or its readying of *adequate ideas* – the conjunctive synthesis contributes to the evolution of the person's *character* pattern. Conjunctive synthesis, like the concept of the *person* itself, is not restricted to the human, but it applies differently to different manner of beings. The registering of the satisfaction in the case of an inanimate object like a rock is limited to the lowest-degree of satisfaction, which is endurance. In physics, it takes the more lively form of the “excitation” of subatomic particles held in the connective synthesis of the atom. In the quantum field, due to its nonlocality, there is no connective synthesis, and thus no conjunctive synthesis either. But the spontaneous events occurring on that level, conditioned by fields, are captured by connective synthesis at higher levels, feeding conjunctive syntheses taking off from those levels, extracting a surplus-value of animation from the quantum field. The feeling tone of the conjunctive satisfaction, with its *affective* valuation, is an *intensity*. †

**CONNECTIVE SYNTHESIS.** An encounter in which two or more elements bind to form a *machinic* assemblage. This is not

an assemblage in the everyday sense of an agglomeration of parts held in external relation to one another to form a whole. That non-processual notion of assemblage corresponds to the everyday sense of the object, as a static form. The object in that sense is the limit-case of connective synthesis, tending toward stasis. Connective synthesis in the processual sense is dynamic, and is always incomplete as a whole. It constitutes what Deleuze and Guattari call a “partial object.” Its partiality is its dynamism: like all things, a connective synthesis has a *conatus* which expresses *tendencies* to which the synthesis is partial. The connective synthesis contracts elements into a *habit* of coming-together, with a striving to reiterate it. The contraction under the aegis of a tendency to reiterate constitutes a *belief* in the processual sense. The connective synthesis is the fundamental unit of belief. Its tendency to pass to another iteration takes the synthesis up in a movement of *desire* (which, if a link to psychoanalytic vocabulary is desired, can be called a “drive”). The movement of desire is an openness to repeat-processing that forbids the connective synthesis from settling into an assemblage in the sense implying a static whole. An example is the connection between the infant’s mouth and the mother’s breast. Two components (each a connective synthesis in its own right) come together to cut into the flow of milk, and deduct a surplus-value of nutritional and experiential satisfaction from it. The connective synthesis is a cut-flow, enabling a deduction from the flow, to produce a *surplus-value of flow*. This is the base definition of machine in process-oriented thought. The connective synthesis, for Deleuze and Guattari, is a “desiring *machine*.” From the perspective of the tendency of the connective synthesis to repeat, the flow that is cut is ideal: a pure availability; a *pure potential*. This tending toward the ideal qualifies the connective synthesis as an elemental process of *thought*. Connective synthesis is the mechanism for the formation of habit, which is a *general idea* in the act. Since a general idea is a *person*, Deleuze will go so far as

to say the connective synthesis at its basis constitutes a little “soul.” Despite the example given, connective synthesis is not restricted to the human, or even to the living. An object can be understood as a lazy connective synthesis that rests on its laurels and that once it forms restricts its reiteration to a holding-pattern in place. If soul it is, it is one that is slothfully ensconced in the folds of matter. Connective synthesis never functions alone. It can only reiterate because it is “recorded” as a potential in a *disjunctive synthesis* that registers it in a set of potential trajectories between contrasting stations, giving it a locus. An example is breast-feeding coming after a connection between the infant’s gaze fixing the mother’s face, and before a pre-nap cuddle. The coded trajectories take up connective synthesis into serial pathways that are themselves reiterable (*coded* sequencings of tendential arcs). Together, these form a processual *territory*, or circuit of transitions with emergent operations on a supplementary level. The territory can be integrated with others to form a processual landscape (which can be called a “relationscape” to emphasize its compositional nature).<sup>6</sup> Processually understood, all territories, in all senses of the term, are *machinic* assemblages nesting connective syntheses. Another reason the connective synthesis never functions alone is that the surplus-value produced by the deduction from the flow is also taken up, in addition to the disjunctive synthesis, in a *conjunctive synthesis*. This is the emergence of a unitary summing-up effect that is the satisfaction of the synthesis registering affectively, with an affective valuation or weighting, on yet another supplementary level. This supplementary level, which bathes the connective and disjunctive syntheses in a backwash, is the echo of the *pathic* (this is a synchronous backwash, because the order of the syntheses is a logical one, not a temporal succession; the syntheses are dynamically fused

6 Erin Manning, *Relationescapes: Movement, Art, Philosophy* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2009).

in a feed-forward and recursion superposed as a single complex movement in place). Instead of moving the process outward into a landscape, the conjunctive synthesis moves it to the infra-level (to the constitution of fields, territories, or bodies and their individuation, individualization, and personing). Satisfaction should not be understood to designate a “positive” feeling necessarily. It should be taken in the more neutral sense as a culmination in a feeling (felt or *unfelt*). *Reaction* and *ressentiment* develop from connective syntheses involving encounters with other bodies or with circulating point-signs that are aversively valuated and tend toward toward a reiteration of flinching, or the avoidance of it through the repetition of evasive or attack maneuvers. A connective synthesis may be “sad” or “joyful,” but it is always a production: productive of more process. Process runs on it. It is the “production of production” (Deleuze and Guattari). See also CONJUNCTIVE SYNTHESIS; DISJUNCTIVE SYNTHESIS †

**CONSPIRACY THINKING.** See BELIEF; ERROR; LITERAL; REACTION, REGIME OF; SIGNIFYING REGIME; STUPIDITY; THEY

**CONTEXT.** The processual background against which an event formatively separates itself and formally stands out. Context is more than the agglomerate of things present in a situation, nor is it limited to the implicit significations conventionally associated with them. Context is active. It carries a charge of *bare activity*. It is variegated by the texturings of *real potential*. Context in the processual sense refers to the real conditions of emergence of *tendencies*, events, and variations on *individuations* and *personings*. A context is always *singular*. However, a distinction can be made making a special use of “context” vis-à-vis “situation,” with situation connoting the singularity of the context and context connoting the normative parameters applied to the situation. This distinction is useful for expressing the excess of potential in any given juncture over and above its normative

expectations, pointing to the incomplete nature of any *application* of overcoding as well as of any emergent *coding* regularizing the *habits* likely to express themselves (“habitus”). “Situation” in this usage stands for the ever-present possibility of the context being decoded or deterritorialized by feral movements of tendency and *desire*. †

**DECISION.** The irreversible effect of a cut in process having ongoing repercussions. This processual definition of decision goes back to the word’s etymological meaning, “to cut.” A decision can be performative, that is to say induced by a *point-sign*. Or it can be emergent: a taking-form separating itself off from its conditions of emergence so that its own effects kick in, making its *import(ance)* felt. There is no agent of a decision as such. A point-sign catalyzes a field-transformation, more than it exercises a linear cause that is proportional to its effect. It releases a surplus of reorganizing activity around its cutting-in that diffuses across the field of potential, like ripples from a stone thrown into a pond, while also throwing up splatter patterns. The effects of a decision are always co-relational with the ongoing patternings of the relational field it lands in, and with the readjustments of the bodies populating that field that are catalyzed by the cut into the normal course of things. There is no agent behind a catalysis: it self-effects, given the relational conditions. Even in the case of a decisive thought that seems to stem from the interiority of a subject, there is no separate agent of decision. A *thought*, being a sign itself, can intervene in a flow of thoughts as a point-sign, catalyzing a decision with irreversible repercussions in the pond of the thinking-feeling of an individual body, w(h)etting that individual’s *conatus* in ways that inflect its historic path. A decision point-signed by a preeminent individual, as in the ascription of friend or enemy status by a head of state, has repercussions in the stream of thought of the affected individuals on both sides of the friend/enemy divide. The effect is folded into the ongoing of the

individuals' thinking-feeling self-constitution, where it continues to ripple and splatter. This is typically thought of as interiorization, but it is really an *adjunction* whose effects, no sooner than they fold in, fold back out into a *transindividual* movement of *collective individuation*. Decision is never effectively interiorized, because the stream of an individual body's thoughts is always tributary to a *commind*. On another level, at the root of *habit*, decision figures as the cut into a flow enabling a *connective synthesis*. †

**DEMONSTRATION.** A form of *indexing* that points to an object, which is understood through that gesture to be potentially within reach as an affordance for action. Example: pointing your index finger to a donut in a display case. Demonstration purports to be clear and self-sufficient, but it is in fact essentially ambiguous, dependent upon *context* and the *habitual* perceptions embedded in the situation to enable the felicity of its affording. Demonstration, of course, can be deployed through the demonstrative use of language. The ambiguity of the demonstrative is intensified in language, undermining the denotative function upon which the *signifying regime*, in its naïve-realist versionings, purports to be founded. This is because denotation's "truth-value" is dependent on its implicit ability to empower and regulate demonstration. To denote in language is to promise a smooth segue, in principle, to an in situ demonstration: it is a promissory note for affordance, in the absence of the actual conditions for it. The interval opened by this implicit promise fosters all manner of equivocation, intentional and unintentional, coating the denotation with an layer of ambiguity on top of the essential ambiguity of demonstration itself. This destabilizes denotation by undermining its ability to justify itself in other than tautological terms, through ultimately circular signifying relays (as when you try to pin down the definition of a word by looking it up in the dictionary, then looking up the words used in the definition, and then looking up the words in those definitions,

only to find yourself back at the definition of departure). The ambiguity of demonstration, bumped up into denotation, makes the conventional notion of the *literal* fundamentally unstable (making it effectively figurative). See also ERROR; LITERAL †

**DESIRE.** The force of transition (Tarde) driving the movement from one *belief* (in the primary sense) to another. The movement of desire has a tendential arc, governed by limit-poles or attractors. Primitively, the attractors arise from the satisfaction of a *connective synthesis* registered in a *conjunctive synthesis* that indexes it. The intervening *disjunctive synthesis* endows the satisfaction with a locus in a system of contrasts which delineate potential trajectories. The indexing and focusing makes the satisfaction available for repeated achievement. It can now operate as a lure, and the lure as an anchor for *habit*. The repeatability of the satisfaction stages it as an ideality (a reality that is not exhausted in any one instantiation of it, leaving an excess or remainder that alluringly abides). In its ideality as a lure, the satisfaction figures as a *pure potential*: an inexhaustibly repeatable attainment. Warning: the satisfaction is not the object of desire; its ideality is, in as much as it governs a tendential movement (a *conatus* or appetite). Warning: satisfaction is not the satisfaction of a separate subject. Desire is its own subject, and the satisfaction is a formative factor in it. Warning: the desire is not reducible to the attainment of a satisfaction, or even the movement from one to the next per se; most fully conceived, desire is the entire *assemblage* comprising the interlocking of the three synthesis (connective, disjunctive, and conjunctive), as producing an ideality operating as an attractor motoring the movement with its lure. The potential byways of the movement of desire are formatted (*coded*) by disjunctive synthesis into a *full body* or *body without organs* (a field of *real potential* ribboned by habitual or normative avenues of movement). They are also overcoded by the *application* of social categories with their attendant roles. But

desire has an in-borne tendency to run away with itself, escaping or exceeding its channelings by coding and overcoding. Desire pulses. At each culmination, at each satisfaction, it returns to the ground zero of the pathic (the root of its real potential bracing itself for another run). Its movement is suspended for an immeasurable beat, during which the full body or body without organs revises and re-grades the potentials it holds as a function of what has just happened. In this beat of suspension, desire falls out of itself, no sooner to pull itself back out into its movement, reenergized by the lure of its attractors making themselves felt for another pursuit. In *Anti-Oedipus*, Deleuze and Guattari call this falling out of itself for a beat “anti-production.” Anti-production is not a negation; it is a working part of the machine. The movement of desire is open-ended: open to endless variation. Lacking a subject behind its movements, it is self-conducting: *machinic*. Desire is by nature *transindividual*. In a transindividual *regime of reaction*, it turns against its own open-endedness, and clamps down around the repetition of traces of painful or anxiety-producing encounters that continue to agitate and are incapable of being forgotten. When this happens, the affected bodies are readily susceptible to *fascisizing tendencies* and *adjunction* to a punishingly normative, ruthlessly attacking, or paranoid full body of fascist persuasion. This is what is meant by bodies “desiring their own oppression.” †

**DIFFERENCING.** The production of variation, as the necessary condition of process. Differencing is reflected in the adage that you cannot step into the same stream twice – even if that stream is yourself. See also INFRATHIN; STRANGE INTRUDER †

**DIFFERENTIAL ATTUNEMENT.** The nonconscious correlation of the *thinking-feelings* of individual bodies populating a shared field of potential (adjoined to the same *full body*). Differential attunement is the product of the *transindividual* movement of *desire* interweaving bodies’ pathic responses and *bare*

activity at the *infra-personal* level. The attunement is “differential” because correlation is not conformity. The experience of each body is differently embedded in the field of potential according to its *objective perspectives*, and as a result expresses a variation on what it feels like and acts like to share it. Bodies in differential attunement go differing together. Due to their resonant correlation, a *point-sign* of a certain force or magnitude (for example those emitted by a terrorist attack like 9-11) will throw a population of bodies into differential attunement, based on a shared commotion which each will process differently. In general, any *decision* of a preeminent person pokes bodies into a differential attunement that unfolds as a *collective individuation*. Differential attunement is not a “mass” phenomenon, of the sort beloved by classical theories of fascism and critiques of the “society of the spectacle.”<sup>7</sup> There is no such thing as “the masses.” Differential attunements are globally singular, and internally heterogeneous (they are *collective singulars* without a *class-name*). “Mass” phenomena are differential attunements producing such tight correlation that it approaches the limit of homogeneous conformity (never reached). The theory of the society of the spectacle is correct to the extent that it diagnoses this fascistic tendency toward conformity during the 1950s and 1960s heyday of the “mass” media (communicational technologies built exclusively for centralized, one-way, point-to-multipoint transmission). The rise of the internet ushered in a golden age of multidirectional differential attunement, uncabled. †

**DISJUNCTIVE SYNTHESIS.** A holding of contrasting things apart-together to form a web of potential stations for trajectories of desire to arrive at, to transit through, or to be captured in place (with “place” understood as a processual locus rather than a point in space). The pattern of potential stations and trajectories

7 Guy Debord, *The Society of the Spectacle* (London: Rebel Press, 2006).

is the formation of a *body without organs*. The web of disjunctive synthesis is “registered” as a formatted complex of contrasting potentials that subsists in the world. This makes the disjunctive synthesis a form of memory: a world-memory – a memory of the world and in the world – that is contained in no mind, but is immanent to the world’s processual self-conditioning as it moves from pulse to pulse. This memory can also be figured as a cartography of potential, when considered from the point of view of its conservation of the distribution of contrasting processual loci effected by disjunctive synthesis. An inclusive usage of disjunctive synthesis effects a *mutual inclusion* of locuses and trajectories, such that they enter into resonance, enabling the movements of desire to travel transversally across established patternings to form nonlocal linkages creating the potential for emergent *assemblages*. Inclusive disjunctive synthesis is an operator of becoming. Exclusive disjunctive synthesis is a force of anti-becoming. Exclusive disjunctive synthesis results from the application of abstract general ideas to the patterning of potential, effectively overcoding it. The abstract general idea’s observance of the logic of mutual exclusion and subsumption of movements to its normative standard holds a body in its place and channels its trajectories into a limited set of policed transitions. This limitative or exclusionary use of disjunctive synthesis constitutes a “capture.” A limitative use of disjunctive synthesis can also arise bottom-up, through the self-reinforcement and emergent systematization of aversive habits and tendencies formed in reaction to sad encounters. *See also* CONNECTIVE SYNTHESIS; CONJUNCTIVE SYNTHESIS; DESIRE †

**DIVIDUAL.** A word for the *individual* (together with its *character* or *person*) that foregrounds the fact that it is composed of a multiplicity of elements that are integrated into a global formation with its own modes of expression that nonetheless retain an at least residual autonomy. Dividuality means that the global formation is

nondecomposable. It can be divided, but not without changing in nature. The multiplicity and residual autonomy of the component elements makes it possible for the individual to be addressed from the partial angle of one of its elements or one of the sub-levels they form. It can be analyzed from that partial angle, bracketing the integral dynamic expressing itself on the global level. This enables sub-*tendencies* or sub-*character* traits to be abstracted from the individual's integrality. Once extracted, they may be recomposed in combinatory fashion, to mix and match the individual to a range of *abstract general* categories for use in targeting it from a specific angle for specialized purposes. This extractive usage of the individual is endemic to digital culture. It is notably used in the data-mining of internet users' online movements to build sets of profiles of the individual that do not add back up to its integrality of character, but are separated out to aid in targeting it with different marketing strategies for different products and services. Dividuality, however, also has a non-extractive and potentially creative side. The same partial address that its multiple constitution comprising residually autonomous elements enables also empowers *point-signs* to bypass the habits, entropies, and immunitary defenses in force at the global level. It enables them to directly address and stimulate component tendencies in ways that might percolate up to the global level and modulate the individual's character. When this happens through point-signs transmitted from individual to individual through a shared milieu such as a discursive formation, the individual is inducted into a *collective individuation*, or a correlated becoming. This could involve a fascisizing becoming-*reactive* fostering *stupidity*, or an anti-fascist becoming-active fostering *adequate ideas* and the empowerment that comes with them. †

**DUALITY.** See MUTUAL INCLUSION

**ERROR.** The mis-taking of causality as linear and attached to discrete bodies rather than relational and distributed, resulting in

a mis-placing of *import*. The seeds of error are found in *objective illusion*, which implants into the *real potential* of a context *abductions* that misfire (that are misdirected or shortcircuited). These are “proto-errors” incumbent in a situation’s really seeming to be what it is, when the seeming includes a misdirection built into the actual structure of the situation. Full-fledged error results when these misdirections are not put to the pragmatic test, so that their misfiring goes unchallenged. This most notably occurs when *objective illusions* are taken up into a discursive regime operating as a *signifying regime*, in which signs refer prioritarily to other signs and have an arbitrary relation to their referents. Error sets in when signifying signs are unanchored from *indexicality* in the processual sense as signposting potentials, losing the more adequate relational causality at play in the relay from sign to sign. Signifying signs then attempt to reattach themselves to indexicality, in the limited sense of pointing to particular bodies as directly responsible for causal effects. The way this is attempted is by hitching the signifying function to *demonstration*, still at arm’s length from the context and its relational field, so that the ambiguity or misdirection of the demonstration is never put to the test. When the indexing of bodies singles out particular bodies, or especially categories of body, as authors of wrongs (painful or anxiety-producing impingements), the error feeds the formation of a *regime of reaction*. The continued signifying slippage of signs, powered by *free indirect discourse*, fosters a culture of conspiracy thinking. Error understood processually is not a cognitive mistake. It is an onto-logico-pragmatic mis-take. Its proto-connection to objective illusion places it more under the province of corporeology than cognition. See also IMAGINATION (definition 1); INADEQUATE IDEA; OBJECTIVE ILLUSION †

**FACIALITY.** A *signifying regime* revolving around an enunciatory center of signifiante, which is in superposition with the

“third eye” of a preeminent person (abstract eye of power). The center of signifi-ance claims its enunciations to be the source of all meaning and ordering, *quasi-causally* arrogating to itself the responsibility for their production. The metaphorical/metonymic slippages native to the signifying regime enable this by reducing *import* and ordering to signifying effects. The center of significance functions as a “black hole” drawing all movements of signification inward toward itself, at the same time as it functions as a black sun emitting ordering rays of signs back outward, bathing the social field with its radiation. The emissions of signs fall into the orbits of a constellation of mini-centers of signifi-ance, which vibrate to the rhythm of the emissions like atoms excited by photons, or absorb its energies into their own atmospheres like planets. Their vibration creates patterns of resonance with the center and among themselves. The resonance makes all enunciations redundant, as if ventriloquized by the preeminent person. The superimposition of the third eye of the preeminent person upon the black hole/black sun is what makes the regime one of faciality. The gaze of the eyes of the preeminent person’s underpersons resonate in his, as if looking out of his face but from a thousand disparate points. This overcoding produces a correlation in the underpersons, under the influence of which their *character* patterns tend toward conformity and resemblance. Their eyes become mini-centers of signifi-ance ensouled by the preeminent person (preeminent *collective person*). Around the planetary mini-centers orbit sub-sub-bodies like moons. The preeminent person’s quasi-causal capture of all meaning and ordering gives it godlike qualities, which it radiates upon the mini-centers forming concentric circles around it. The person of Louis XIV as “Sun King” claiming spiritual descent from God and radiating waves of meaning and order from his centralized court is the preeminent European historical example. Trump is the contemporary example. With Trump, the preeminent person’s godlike omniscience is made a farce of by the signifying regime

morphing into a post-truth regime, with the accompanying disorders and lacunae of meaning. But the convergence effects of the resonating of the little Trump persons in Trump as preeminent person entitles them (if not ensouling them) in ways that play out with a high degree of correlation, even if the normative force of faciality, under the thrall of the *Man-Standard*, has become challenged by Trump's taking and giving license, so that it oscillates in and out of focus, fostering an alternation between the ferocious imposition of norms and raging outbursts of exceptionalism. †

**FASCISIZING TENDENCY.** A *transindividual* movement of *desire* minted in *reaction* and bathed in *ressentiment*, webbing its way through a *collective individuation* under the lure of the attractor of *fascism proper*. †

**FASCISM PROPER.** The limit-pole or attractor state drawing fascisizing tendencies toward it, most intensely when organized around the center point of a regime of *faciality*. The draw is toward extreme centralization around the black hole of the preeminent person, whose all-*quasi-causally* powerful centripetal force of order is matched with an equal and opposite centrifugal force. The centrifugal force radiates in disciplined laminar flows from the black hole, now operating as a black sun, in vectors of attack against *ascribed* enemies, internal and external to the state. In order to safeguard the center as source of all sanctioned *import* and ordering, the attack aims at the total eradication of all enemies, toward the purification of the body politic of everything that does not accord with the over-coding character pattern of the preeminent *collective person*. Two problems ensue: there are always more enemies hovering around outside the boundaries of the fascist state, no matter how far it pushes its expansion; and there are always more internal enemies lurking in the interstices of the state's structure, ready to pop up at any time. The response to the first problem is a mad outward rush of conquest. The response to the second is an immunitary attack

that turns the rush of conquest inward against the collective body of fascist society. The combined result of these two inverse movement is an irresolvable tension that is effectively suicidal. Fascism proper emerges from and integrates *micro-fascisms*, and may disaggregate back into them at any moment, as underpersons shake free from the center to form their own feral mini-centers. There are also degrees of realization of fascism proper, including bureaucratic compromises that are faceless. Fascism, like all formations, is a field of variation of its governing tendencies, animated by an abstract *machine*. †

**FEELING.** A taking-account of a lure or an impingement whose effect becomes a formative factor in the internal constitution of an occasion of experience. The lure is of an attractor state. The impingement can be endogenous (coming from another level or region in the feeler's constitution) or exogenous (coming from an outside other). The feeler does not preexist the feeling. It is recursively constituted by it: the feeler is what will have had the feeling that emerges. A feeling is a "prehension" in Whitehead's vocabulary. The feeling may be doubled by a feeling-of-the-feeling that compounds the internal constitution of the feeler, creating the conditions for reflective thought. Feeling is a dimension of *affect*, qualitatively registering the increase or decrease in a body's capacitation that is a dimension of an affect. Feeling as defined here is not in the subject, but in the world. It is in the constitution of all things, living and nonliving. The world is in fact made of feeling: the taking-account, in the broadest sense, of relational lures and encounters, as a formative factor in all that registers as real. A rock's form of endurance can be considered a temporal taking-account of its element's mutual relation. In process thinking, the opposition between the organic and the inorganic, and the living and the nonliving, is refigured in terms of the distinction between feeling and feeling-of-the-feeling (with no one-to-one correspondence between the two sets of terms). Kant's "critique of pure reason"

cedes to Whitehead's "critique of pure feeling." Paradoxically, feeling may pass *unfelt* (excluded from feeling at the global level of an individual's composition). †

**FIGURE.** A figure is the form of a *personification* of a processual dynamic. Figure and *image* are closely allied concepts. With figure the emphasis is less on the form's perceptibility as a mode of appearance and the social dissemination of that perceptibility, and more on its internal constitution as an individual instantiation of a social role assigned by a social category, or *abstract general idea*, such as the *Man-Standard*. The category holds contrasting roles together in a *structure* of mutual definition. The structure is a dimension of the "figurative." The figure selectively expresses the figurative (one role per application), *indexing* it from that partial angle onto it. The figurative is the field of *real potential*, or plane of consistency, of the figures that come to express it. There is more to the figurative than the structure. The definition of the structure does not exhaust the reality of the figure or the figurative. On its underside, the figurative shades into a "figural" field, which holds a broader range of potentials than the figurative structure. On that side, the figurative descends by degrees toward the *pure potentials* of the *plane of immanence*. The figure looks through one eye to its structural overcoding by a normative social category, and through the other to the figurative's tendrils of pure potential reaching for the plane of immanence, offering it the potential for expanded degrees of freedom and break-outs or escapes from the normative strictures of its assigned category. It this Janus-faced dynamic that the figure personifies. The openings toward escape enable a relative decoding of the social role, and a partial destructuring of the character pattern the figure exemplifies. When the *application* of the category falters under the force of this run for new potential, the figure may come out from under its overcoding, becoming a processual figure of deterritorialization

(a skirting of the standardizing operations of the figurative in its structural aspect, departing from the cartography of potential it keeps in a limited holding pattern). This feral movement is always recaptured, reterritorialized, by another category, or by an axiomatic (a system of connection, disjunction, and conjunction among decoded flows). Human capital is the figure personifying the deregulatory flows of neoliberal capitalism, ordered by a flexible axiomatic foregrounding the improvised production of *surplus-value of flow* rather than conformity to a standard (yielding a *post-normative* condition). The figure, in its relation to the figurative and the figural, is a processual way of understanding the interplay between, on the one hand, what in subject-centered traditional approaches is discussed in terms of “social conformity” as a psychological result of “identification,” and on the other hand “alienation.” Figures are involved in *transindividual* flows of *desire* and rise from the moving ground of the *infra-personal* rather than the tectonics of a bedrock interiority. As a concept, the figure and the figurative enable a processual take that recognizes structure, but also recognizes that process is wider than structure, so that structure is never determining in the last instance. †

**FORMAL DISTINCTION.** The mode of distinction produced by the *abstract general idea*, based on its governing principle of mutual exclusion. This is the principle of identity according to which a particular subsumed by a *general* can only be itself, and no other. This separates it out as a discrete existent, conceived as self-enclosed within determinate boundaries and remaining essentially identical to itself across its variations. This expels difference from the internal constitution of the thing. Formal distinction is the principle of the same. It privileges self-persistence and self-reproduction over differencing and becoming. As such, it is in the service of normativity. The notion of a separate, sovereign subject central to European modernity is its most politically prominent

and culturally salient client. *See also* MODAL DISTINCTION; REAL DISTINCTION; UMBRAL UNION †

**FREE INDIRECT DISCOURSE.** Reported speech circulating under conditions where its source can no longer be attributed because the report is relayed and splayed across an endless series of utterers. The only subject of enunciation that can be assigned is the series itself, often under the aegis of the unspecified “they.” The impacts of the expressions of this collective subject of enunciation constitute a *surplus-value of flow* of discourse. Gossip and social media are the most prominent social operators of free indirect discourse. They play a central role in the amplification of *objective illusions* into full-fledged *errors* feeding *regimes of reaction*. There are also creative expressions of free indirect discourse that affirmatively explore the *transindividual* basis of thought and language. *See also* SIGNIFYING REGIME; THEY †

**FULL BODY.** The field of *real potential* immanent to a social formation (field, regime, *body*, or *personing*). The full body comprises a spectrum of contrasting potentials held together in their difference from each other, in inclusive *disjunctive synthesis*, structurally narrowed down by exclusive disjunctive syntheses operating upon it. The narrowed-down spectrum is the range of potentials most proximately available for actualization by the formation to aliment its own operations. The more inclusive spectrum immanent to it is the full range of potentials that might aliment its becoming. At that immanent limit, the full body is an implicate order of actualizable relations, or “plane of consistency” in Deleuze and Guattari’s vocabulary. The selective unfolding of the relations held in ready reserve in the full body texture the formation’s composition. The potentials have neither form nor content. They are formative forces, of the nature of *tendencies*. They acquire form and content as they unfold into the settled territory of the formation and accommodate their *conatus* to its compositional principles. Their unfolding expresses

itself in a characteristic feeling tone expressing an *intensity*. The feeling of intensity *indexes* a zone of potential, marking it for possible re-access. The re-access can be triggered by the strike of *point-signs*. The full body has two sides. On one side, it faces the formation's order of *individuations*, *individualizations*, and *personifications*. This is the order that tends toward the separation of forms and contents from each other into the discreteness of *formal distinction*. This is the "plane of organization." On other side, it faces the realm of *pure potential*, or the *plane of immanence* where forms enter into the zone of indistinction in the in-each-otherness of *umbral union*. The potentials of the full body are graded in both directions, as rise and fall between the two planes, as on a sliding scale between coming out in discrete expression and in-folding toward the limit of *mutual inclusion*. The plane of organization and the plane of immanence operate as attractor zones pulling the full body in two directions at once, making it vibrate with rising and receding potential. Every actualization on the plane of organization is a *singular* emergence minting a new variation on potential. Each new variation adds a measure of potential to the world: its *conatus*, or self-drive to repeat and augment, ensures that once the potential has eventuated it is poised to happen again, in some new variation on itself. The potential sinks into the plane of consistency, adding extra fullness to its already-repleteness. It stays on the plane of consistency, while at the same time in-folding into the plane of immanence. The full body thus constitutes a memory of the world, twice-over. First, it conserves the potentials emerging on the plane of organization in its plane of consistency, for its formations' continuing in-forming. Second, this holding them in reserve allows the potentials to sink into the plane of immanence, like an abstract precipitate from the plane of consistency. The plane of immanence is immanent to all formations, and tangent to all of their planes of consistency. This enables the potentials that sink into it from one full body to rise from it by other routes, to in-form any other full body, given the

conditions. It this two-fold memory that point-signs cut into to trigger the re-access of potential. *Point-signs* are catalyzers of the re-unfolding of nonpersonal memories of potential. Since newly emerged potentials that sink into the plane of immanence subsist there ever after, the pool of the world's potential is self-augmenting. But, necessarily, there are limitative mechanisms that come to bear on it. Necessarily, because all potentials cannot enter into real potential at once, or even sequentially, let alone fully express themselves in a taking determinate form taking its place in a formation. The world's *immanence* is overfull of them, in perpetual excess. The determinate form-takings that unfold from them are always in some way limitative. Their unfolding through the net of their planes of consistency filter the potentials that in-form them. The relations that can carry themselves into expression are edited down to those that are compossible with each other, and beneficial, or least not toxic, for its operations' integrity. Even an inclusive *disjunctive synthesis* is filtered (it constitutes a field of mutual inclusion, but fields of mutual inclusion are of greater or lesser dimensionality). An exclusive disjunctive synthesis narrows down potential further and submits it the principle of mutual exclusion. The disjunctive syntheses compose the plane of consistency. They can bubble from the bottom up in the form of an emergent distribution of *habits* that settles into the plane of consistency. *Reactive* habits harden the plane of consistency's texture in ways amenable to exclusive disjunctive synthesis. The exclusive disjunctive synthesis is tempered by the social heat of the top-down application of the categories of *abstract general ideas* and their associated roles, in particular the *Man-Standard*. The two movements of limitation meet in the middle and mix, mutually reinforcing. The limitative full body (or limitative usage of the plane of consistency) is the relative limit of the plane of organization. It is what holds it within certain normative parameters. The plane of immanence, still churning immanent to it all, sets the absolute limit of umbral union into

which no actual organization, living body, form, or content can go. But the potentials it holds may still bubble up and start taking effect, creating resistances and suggesting escape routes from the settled normative limitations. When the escapes start running away with the formation as a whole, a “deterritorialization” of the formation and a reassertion of an inclusive full body ensues. Full bodies are of many, in principle infinitely many, natures. Deleuze and Guattari speak most especially of the full body of the earth, of the despot, and of capital (these are territorializing, reterritorializing, and deterritorializing full bodies, respectively). Trump as a *collective person* is subtended by a reactionary full body of a particular character. The full body can be divided into contrasting, even warring, regions of consistency, as when the enemy-friend *ascription* takes hold in the social field. In such cases, it divides into mutually modulating *bodies without organs* in agonistic embrace (this is the body without organs according to the first definition given above). The importance of the full body for process thinking is that, together with the concept of real potential, it enables potential to be thought in ways that are historically variable and culturally specific, even though potential as such, at its widest scope, is transhistorical and cross-cultural. *See also* BODY; BODY WITHOUT ORGANS; PLANE OF IMMANENCE †

**GENERAL.** The spanning of a multiplicity of elements, covering them in a way that enables them to be jointly treated and count for one. By “covering” its elements is meant that the general has its own *character* which can substitute itself for its elements with respect to certain operations that its generality makes possible on a supplementary level to them. The most basic general is transition, whose character is the affective tonality of the present moment, spanning a departure from a past and an approach to a future in such a way that they can count for one and form a step in a historic route on the supplementary level of a life. *Habit* is another

ubiquitous form of generality. There are many modes of generality, and a plurality of concepts for it. The best known is the *abstract general idea*, which denies its own character, posing as a neutral logical construct. The *common notion*, *collective singular*, and *singular-universal* are correctives to the abstract general idea that are more serviceable for process-oriented thought. †

**GENETIC ELEMENT.** A formative element of whatever nature operating immanently to the constitution of an individual at the *infra-individual/infra-personal* level. A “common genetic element” is a genetic element that passes at the infra-level from one individual to another following ramifying historic routes. Common genetic elements are essential to the formation of *collective singulars*. DNA is the prime example on the biological level. But genetic elements of one kind or another may operate on any level. On the social-media and discursive levels, they can be *point-signs* conveyed by words and images that strike an array of individuals on the emergent level of their personing (the pathic relaying into *bare activity*), catapulting them into a correlated becoming, or *collective individuation*, that ramifies as the effects are passed along through a web of *free direct discourse*. These are popularly termed “memes.” †

**HABIT.** A sequence of actions that bind together through *connective synthesis* into an arc of unfolding that remains in reserve as a potential for reactivation actuatable by a cue or trigger (a *point-sign*). Habits form at the nonconscious *infra-personal* level, and are self-conducting. Habit is a fundamental form of the *general idea*, in that the arc of the performance of the habit spans multiple elements and covers them with its own character. Habits are not inflexible reflexes. Their unfolding can modulate itself in response to chance variations in their conditions of triggering or performance. In their status as general ideas and in their capacity to surpass the given with improvised variations on themselves, they qualify as a form of *thought*. In view of the definition of a general

idea is a *person*, habits can be considered to be “larval subjects” or to constitute little “souls,” sub-persons immanent to the formation of greater persons.<sup>8</sup> Habits can enchain to form composite arcs that give a consistent patterning to the historic route of the life of a body across its episodes. In this, they function as *genetic elements of character*. The greater portion of everyday life is habitual, providing a stable ground that doesn’t need to be attended to, freeing other modes of activity and thought to spool off from. Object-oriented perception itself is a habit, taking an array of qualities and elements up together so that they count for one in the immediacy of experience. Habits can be contracted by a *collective individual* as part of its *collective personhood*, producing a shared set of predispositions providing a default take-off point for more elaborated group behaviors (what Bourdieu calls “habitus,” here understood machinically rather than as a function of structure).<sup>9</sup> This occurs in particular through the overcoding of a *general abstract idea* such as the *Man-Standard*, but it may also emerge from through *transindividual* movements of desire bringing individuals’ patterns of activity into correlation (*coding* them). A habit cannot be consciously formed. Habits self-contract without exception (they are passive syntheses, pertaining to *connective synthesis*). They are not made, they click in. However, their self-contraction can be cultivated. A body can fall into, create, or seek out the conditions propitious for habits of desired orientation to click in. The greater portion of training and education is of this nature. When it happens, practice becomes perception (direct, *abductive* perception). Since habits are a form of thought and are cultivatable, they cannot be considered “raw” or “primitive” experience. They are not simply passive. Their

8 Gilles Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, trans. Paul Patton (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), 74, 78-79.

9 Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline for a Theory of Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 72-95.

contraction is a form of self-activity, as are any variations on it that may occur. They are *machinic*. See also BELIEF †

**HUMAN CAPITAL.** See FIGURE; PERSONIFICATION; RACIAL CAPITALISM

**IDEA.** See ADEQUATE IDEA; COMMON NOTION; INADEQUATE IDEA; THOUGHT

**IDENTIFICATION.** The joint operation of *ascription* and *adjunction*. A person does not identify in any primary sense. Rather, a person is identified by the application of an abstract general idea. Identification is a doing-to before it is a doing; a product before it produces. It becomes a doing and a producing when the dynamic patternings of the character modeled by the folding down upon the body of its assigned standard are mis-recognized as inhering in the body's essence or interior as its *identity*. It is at this secondary level of the psychologization of social dynamics that a particular person can be said to identify with another, for example a charismatic leader. This secondary identification consists in an outward projection of the self-reflection that forms the core of the body's sense of itself as a separate interiority, mediated by language and communicational technologies. The outward projection overlays itself on the self-to-self relation, so that a transductive exchange of character can take place between the two levels. The projective self-other relation then becomes constitutive on the same terms as the self-self relation. This reflective confusion of self-other and self-self is at the basis of the "delusion" of masses in traditional theories of fascism. It is questionable to what extent this is an adequate account even of classical twentieth-century fascism, considering the subpersonal and *infra-personal* elements that remain unsubsumed by identification, and continue to resist, counter, and escape (not to mention the constitutive role of the *strange intruder*). In any case, it is clear that under present-day conditions

this identificatory projection is a specialized and relatively peripheral dynamic, given the fluidification of the *Man-Standard* and the overexposure through social media to outside impingements and formative other-influences that directly strike at the infra-level, far below the reflective level. *See also* FIGURE; IMITATION; POST-NORMATIVE †

**IDENTITY. PRIMARY SENSE** (processual sense): the immediate conformity between the past and the dawning present as it arcs toward the future. This is identity in Whitehead's sense, as the continuing of the affective tone, or "subjective form," of the moment just past as the jumping-off point for the coming future. He uses the example of how anger self-continues across the transition between moments without an added act of an angry mind effecting the continuity from without. The new moment simply dawns in the angry conditions inherited from the moment before. The self-continuity of those conditions provide the background against which the change that the new moment will bring stand outs. It is this "identity" into which the impingement of an other influence cuts, creating a change of state that the new moment will integrate into its emergent self-constitution as a pulse of process forming a step in the historic route of a life. This is the background continuity against which the *strange intruder*, whose arrival triggers the *pathic* at the basis of *reaction*, is felt to be strange and an intruder. This is the only fundamental sense of identity in process-oriented thinking. The example of anger should not be taken to imply that the concept applies only to human experience or to living things. It pertains to the constitution of time and as such applies to all phenomena. **SECONDARY SENSE** (social sense): the result of *identification*, or application of the *abstract general idea* to a body, assigning it a socially recognized role. This is the folding-down from outside and above of a normative standard. The body meets this application bottom-up with its established *habits* already

lending themselves to the role (habitus), and with its acquiescence to forming new ones in continuing conformity with the norm. This lending itself of the body to the abstract general idea is never complete. Other tendencies resist, counter, or escape the category's overcoding of the life of the body and the accompanying valuations. Identification, therefore, is always partial. It never grasps the *singularity* of a life. It is not the essence of the body or the truth of the individual. It is the form of their social subjection. It is a power formation. **TERTIARY SENSE** (psychological sense): the form of content of a person's conscious self-recognition, consequent to its overcoding identification. The person's recognition of itself in its assigned category is experienced as a dual relation occurring self-to-self. This reflective relation is mis-taken for an operation of interiority. It is, in fact, a misrecognition of a social operation. In other words, there is a thirdness to identity that belies its closure and interiority. By "form of content" is meant that identity is both the form of the self-recognition and, in reflection, its content. The form of content – what is recognized as one's self – does not reflect the act of its own performance, which takes place against the background of the multiplicity of subpersonal and infra-personal elements. These are lost beneath the luster of the mirror of self-reflection. This bracketing of the conditions of emergence of the act of self-recognition produces a blind spot obscuring the social process of identification's folding into the life of the body. The social is sequestered, making way for a seemingly self-sufficient psychological surface of experience. What is bracketed is an awareness that the experienced self-identity is a social precipitate, and the product of a power operation. The power operation is a psychoforming (in a sense similar to "terraforming"). This splitting of the psychological from the social may under certain conditions express itself as a split within identity, between one's "true" self and the "fake" social role the body must play. This subjective split is overlaid on the split within the structure of the abstract general

idea between the particular (case) and the general (category). The struggle between the “true” self and “false” self is a false problem that is an artifact of the mis-recognition foundational to psychological identity, in its fealty to the abstract general idea. It is a false problem because it mis-places the *import* of individuality, which is relational, not reflective, pertaining to its role in collective individuations and collective personings, not to its supposed self-sufficiency in (or out of) a role. †

**IMAGE.** A process derivative emerging on a supplementary level of organization to its conditions of emergence, and settling on that level, where it enters other circuits than those available to its formative elements. An example is the photograph of a living body. The photograph can undergo transformations and go places that the body can't. The photo remains genetically linked to the levels it emerges from, and thus can function as a *point-sign* indexing their potential. The example of the photograph is in many respects limited, and potentially misleading. First, the image does not *index* in the simple sense of pointing to the body. It is indexical in the processual sense of pointing past the body to an inclusive field of potential (to the *import* of the body's appearing here in this manner, together with the potential of the image's own emergence in relation to, and as an operator of, that appearance). It is only under certain conditions that this works as a “realistic” function, in the sense of registering a formal likeness of something that the image-production process is physically connected to. The registering is ultimately not governed by resemblance: a field potential does not resemble what emerges from it. The image is a “derivative” precisely in the sense that it is the product of a transformation that distances it from indexicality in this vulgar sense. It is best thought of, not as a representation of the field of potential, but as a topological twist on it that gives it a supplementary form with its own content. That form is not necessarily, in fact is most often not,

iconic, nor its content resemblant. The way in which the image is genetically linked to its conditions of emergence on other levels can be misleading – *especially* when it insists on its iconicity. An image can be doctored or synthetic, in which case its iconicity misdirects the indexical pointing to potential, misplacing the image’s *import* (sometimes intentionally). Images lend themselves to the perception of *objective apparent movements*: the sense that relations between images on the same level form a self-sufficient causal system, neglecting the fact that each is differentially tethered to a field of potential through the manner, moment, and emplacement of its emergence, and that this “vertical” genetic dimension intervenes between any horizontal movements among images succeeding or adding to each other. Every system of images is gapped by a vertical genesis dropping back down to the field of potential and simultaneously rising back up for another go. The causality is “stitched” by this genetic needle work piercing the fabric of any image-to-image order that may seem to be operative on their own level. The image is not a concept limited to media or media technologies. An object is an image of the process of nature, as is an event. A commodity is an image of the capitalist relations of production whose apparent objective movement makes it appear it as the effective motor of consumer society, misplacing its import (Marx’s commodity fetishism). A *person* is also an image of the capitalist process in a different sense (in the figure of *human capital*), and more profoundly of the process of nature that capitalism extractively hijacks (making it an *image-of-an-image*). See also FIGURE. †

**IMAGE-OF-AN-IMAGE.** A second-order process derivative indexing an image or figurative structure on another level. The distinction between image and image-of-an-image is one of convenience, because all images index their own field of emergence, including the others and alternative potentials populating it, as well as indexing, through its field of emergence, the process of nature

patterning an endless variety of fields of emergence. A *person* is always in fact an image-of-an-image because it is a *figure* expressing a variation on a character pattern whose potential is knit into the *disjunctive synthesis* of the figurative *structure* that conditions its emergence. It indexes its figurative structure, and through it the capitalist process with which that structure (and its deterritorializations) are constitutionally in complicity. Through its indexing of the capitalist process, it also indexes the process of nature that capitalism appropriates for its own furtherance. There may be, and usually are, multiple levels of derivation nested in one another. This makes the image a potentially far-reaching, multivalent *point-sign* indexing levels of potential – and an equally far-reaching source of *error* when the image's objective apparent movements mis-take causality and misplace *import*. †

**IMAGINATION.** 1) Following Spinoza, the separation of the effect of an impingement on the body from the nexus of relational causality responsible for it. This results in the most proximate body involved being mis-taken for the linear cause of the impingement. This *objective illusion* fosters the *inadequate ideas* lying at the basis of *reaction*. 2) Also referencing Spinoza, the share of creativity in the operation of the *abstract general idea*. This creativity is limited to a combinatory of properties of different categories resulting in the synthesis of a new category (as when lizardly eyes are combined with a hominid body to imagine the alien into being). It can also reference the combinatory of representatives of already-known categories into a scenario or narrative. The metaphorical and metonymic relays of a *signifying regime* at the same time fluidify the imagination's combinatory and fix its fluidity in a symbolic structure. 3) Another way of defining the imagination, of a more Deleuzian cast, is as the speculative capacity of *thinking-feeling* to surpass the given, which is the abductive condition of possibility for *intuition*. In this usage, which is tailor suited to process thinking,

imagination does not produce hybrid objects, but rather new operations, which may bind into new modes of existence, at least in potential. This can also take the form of scenarios or narratives that produce never-before-imagined variations that extract things from a straight-forward conformity as representatives of their kind, and express the singularity that their subsumption under a category curtails. This is an operation not just of fiction, but of fabulation. Alternatively, imagination can feed a speculative philosophical system by prising concepts out from under the yoke of *abstract general ideas*. †

**IMITATION.** The *adjunction* of one person's *character* to the character pattern of another. Imitation is not a dual relation of one person "projecting" itself upon another in a way that overlays their character patterns on each other, so that the tendencies of one are mirrored in the other or exchanged with it, creating a confusion between them that locks them into a conformal resemblance with each other. This only occurs secondarily, as an outgrowth of the psychologization of the person as an apparent interiority ruled by self-reflection. It is a disorder of self-reflection (itself an *error*), consequent to *identification*. On the contrary, imitation operates at the *infra-personal* level, and is correlating (*differentially attuning*) rather than conforming. It functions *transindividually* through the dissemination of *point-signs* inducing a *collective individuation*. Imitation in this sense is the product of a distributed movement of *desire* daisy-chaining *beliefs* (to use Tarde's vocabulary) in an analogous fashion in different individuals, conditioned by their shared participation in the same milieu, and leading them to share *tendencies* and character traits, but each in its own manner, as a variation on a theme. See also DIFFERENTIAL ATTUNEMENT; IDENTITY; IDENTIFICATION †

**IMMANENCE.** Immanence is not interiority as opposed to exteriority. It is not even interiority without exteriority, since the one

has no meaning without the other. Immanence is in-each-other-ness, resonating with contrasts, full to overflowing. Its in-each-other-ness is not in anything but itself. Immanence pertains to potential. Potentials have no position in space or moment in time. They are nonlocal and transtemporal (although they gravitate and gradate around places and times). Immanence is all and only in potential, co-locative with every position and contemporaneous with every moment – and with the becomings that lead from one to the next. It is that from which events actualize and individuations unfold. Immanence cannot be entered. It can only actualize and unfold. Neither can it be known as such, but only as transductively embodied in the effects of its unfolding. It is often mistaken for the opposite of transcendence. It is not. Transcendence is a figment of abstract general thought that consists in transposing the world's self-unfolding into a principle outside and above it, governing it from a supplementary dimension. The world has no outside or above to stand opposite to. There is no supplementary dimension to it. The world is supersaturated with potential and replete with unfoldings. What unfolds from immanence refolds into it, with a twist, refiguring potential. Immanence turns over on itself, in topological torsion. The importance of the concept of immanence for a philosophy of process is that it withdraws the world from the Judgment of God – or whatever unfolding despotism might attribute itself on principle the totalizing power to overcode all of existence. Immanence stands for the world self-constituting, and its self-sufficiency in its self-constituting, so full of its own process that there is not the slightest toehold from which to stand outside and direct it. It is the character of Spinoza's "naturing nature." *See also* BARE ACTIVITY; PLANE OF IMMANENCE; UMBRAL UNION †

**IMPORT.** The fullness of a situation with felt potential, including what could have been (alternate historic routes that did not

eventuate). Import is distinct from signification. It is peri-conceptual and infra-linguistic. It registers as an overall feeling tone (affective tonality) or atmosphere. It is the feeling of incipient consequence: of coming events that will make a difference. The actualization of a consequential difference is “importance” in Whitehead’s sense. Import is highly textured with contrasting potentials corresponding to different trajectories and their respective productions of importance, but these register in their *mutual inclusion*, unexpressed individually. This does not make it unthinkable. It makes it a project for the *adequate ideas* of intuition. The feeling of vague presences enveloped in an atmosphere of fear is an example of import. As is the feeling of the possibility of joys to come of the dynamic fullness of life in a given situation. Import is misplaced by any assignment of linear causality singling out individual bodies as self-sufficient causes, because this loses the world’s fullness with alternative outcomes complexly playing out in resonance with one another’s potential. Import is graded, upon intuitive inspection, according to the felt availability of contrasting potentials. The more available potentials constitute the situation’s *real potential*. *Abduction* (the immediately occurring operation of intuition in situ) can play a role in this grading of real potential. †

**INADEQUATE IDEA.** A thinking-feeling that separates the effect of an impinging body from the complex relational causality conditioning the encounter, and dotes on that effect. The inadequate idea prolongs the *pathic* moment, in which the body is absorbed in the action on it of an other. The focus on the effect of that impinging action diverts the body from an awareness of the complexion of the situation that culminated in that event, and directs it instead to replaying the resulting pain or anxiety, in a vain attempt to assuage or control it and the possibility of its recurrence. This conserves the impingement as an active trace, such that it continues to produce effects. The other-body most proximately connected to the

impingement is separated out from its relational web and identified as the linear cause, or effective single agent, of the discomfiture. The contribution of the impinged-upon body to the encounter is bracketed, neglecting that every impingement is an impingement because it meets an impingeability, and forgetting that it is potentially within the powers of the impinged-upon body to modulate its own response to the impingement, as it happens or in retrospect. The inadequate idea weds the body to the selective *abduction* or *objective illusion* of a linear causal agent and to the reflex replaying of the effect, rather than fostering an active (that is, flexible or plastic) response. Instead, the impingement lives on as an active trace, agitating thinking-feeling. At the extreme, this reactivation of the trace expresses as trauma. In trauma only the trace is “remembered” – in the noncognitive, performative form of its self-reactivation. Much else, even everything else, about the situation is forgotten, occulted by the effect’s reactivations. The inadequate idea is the potentially trauma-genic inability to forget the trace. Shy of trauma, the body identified as the linear cause of the discomfiture is not just attributed as its agent: it is blamed for it, and comes to be memorialized as malign, with moralistic overtones. If the trace is allowed to continue to repeat itself and resonate with other discomfiting effects, similarly unforgotten and separated from their relational causality, the *reaction* develops into a *ressentiment* as a mode of existence. The misattribution of causality ramifies on the discursive level into a web of *error*. Words become the carriers of the trace. They become second-order impingers disseminating the reaction and *ressentiment* to third bodies, even those who have not been impinged upon by the same or a similar felt agent of evil. They are now impinged upon by the trace, its effect enveloped contagiously in discourse. The result is a political/social *regime of reaction*. The *adequate idea* provides an antidote to reaction and *ressentiment* by “doubling” the trace with a thinking-feeling of complex relational causality, and the variable powers and alternative outcomes its composition carries. †

**INDEX.** The sign-function of pointing to “reacting singulars” (Peirce), and through them to the *real potential* their encounter expresses (and through real potential to *pure potential*). The reacting singulars are bodies in encounter. What is ultimately indexed is less the bodies themselves than their *common notion*, or the dynamic relationality of their encounter and the potentials it involves. The indexing of the common notion paves the way for the understanding of the *collective singular*, and beyond it, the *singular-universal*. Following this path, the index is involved in the construction of *adequate ideas*. More often, however, the indexing stalls at the body mis-taken for the linear cause of a sad *passion*, pointing it out as blameworthy or anxiety-producing. In this usage, the index serves *reaction* and fosters the formation of *inadequate ideas* and their amplification into *regimes of reaction*. The index is a sign-function. It is an aspect in one way or another of all signs, of whatever category (including *images* and *figures*). Signs considered from the angle of their performative indexing of a region of potential are called *point-signs*. Point-signs address potential through a priming of *bare activity*, often in abstraction from any particular encounter, toward future encounters. The concept of the point-sign extends the notion of the index beyond a pointing to a past or actually occurring encounter, into the domain of the performative (which prospectively produces its own object). This performative extension of indexing incalculably augments the power of regimes of reaction. On the other end of the spectrum, signs whose primary sign-function is *demonstration* are also indexes, in a less robust way lacking the power of the performative to self-effect. *See also* POINT-SIGN †

**INDIRECT DISCOURSE.** *See* FREE INDIRECT DISCOURSE ; THEY

**INDIVIDUAL.** A composition of multiple elements integrated in such a way that they can count for one. The individual has a

global character, in excess over its elements, that is emergent from their composition. The individual's composition does not constitute a whole with closure. The individual as such is nondecomposable, which is to say that it *can* be divided, but not without changing in nature. To foreground this characteristic of its multiplicitous constitution, it may also be termed a *dividual*. Its counting for one enables it to be treated as discrete, but it is in fact constitutively open and essentially relational. It is integrated into *transindividual* movements of *collective individuation*, and its constituent elements retain a residual *infra-personal* autonomy, as well as possibilities of direct impingement from the outside which can percolate up to the global level, acting as formative influences or modulators of its expression of individuality (see *strange intruder*). The individual comports a *body* whose manner of movement and movement patterns give it a *character* (*person* it). The character cannot be separated from the manner and patterns of movement any more than a top can be separated from its spin. The character is nevertheless *really distinct* from its body (the nexus of matter-in-movement that enables it to endure across moments in time and unfold continuous variations on itself along a historic route of occasions). The individual is a contrastive conjointness of body and character. See also COLLECTIVE INDIVIDUATION; INFRA-INDIVIDUAL †

**INDIVIDUALIZATION.** The funneling of a *collective individuation* into the determinate form of an individual that can stand, or seem to stand, as a discrete instance among others, in *formal distinction* from them. The independence of an individualized individual as a function of its discreteness is an *objective apparent movement*. In its real constitution, the individualized individual remains the expression of *infra-personal* sublevels within it and of *transindividual* movements across it. The classical subject of capital, embodying the Protestant ethic, is a historical example. Neoliberalism pays

lipservice to the solidity of individualization, all the while throwing it to the waves of volatility, obliging the person, as *figure* of the dynamic of capitalism, to embody the grueling task of personifying the deregulated flows of contemporary capital and extracting from them its own character as a *surplus-value of flow*. †

**INDUCTION.** See ADJUNCTION

**INFRA-INDIVIDUAL.** Active elements in the bodily constitution of an *individual* that are enveloped in its overall composition, forming sub-levels within it that have their own order. The potentials carried in the activity of infra-individual elements are selectively integrated into the individual's global activity, and modulated by it. But each such element has a *conatus* that is not extinguished, so that it retains a degree of autonomy, and can sometimes continue on its tendential way if the individual de-composes. When they can't continue, sub-sub-levels within them always do. An example is the physiological level of the biological individual, which is integrated into the constitution of its higher levels (psychological, social), but only on the condition of maintaining its own order. At death, the global order decomposes and the physiological order disaggregates, releasing its sub-physiological chemical and physical components, which live out their ingredient tendencies in a free state or entering into new compositions. On the social-political level of a collective individual, this release of constituent elements is a "deterritorialization" of tendential potentials which may be reintegrated into the same collective individuation (short of death) to renew or reinvigorate it, or may enter into the emergence of a new one. In their free state, they are called "particles of becoming" (Deleuze and Guattari). The infra-individual/individual composition must be strongly distinguished from a part/whole relation. The activity of parts is entirely subsumed under the functionality of the whole, and has no value outside of it (like a spare wheel). The residual autonomy of the elements of the composition means that they retain some power to

remain active, self-conduct, and self-value outside of it. The global composition of the individual is not a whole, because it is open to the impingement of other influences striking at the elemental level and percolating up through the levels to produce or modulate a global effect. In addition, the individual itself is always in turn integrated into a greater individual with which it co-composes, and/or is enveloped in a milieu with which it exchanges energies and influences. Its globality functions less as a closed whole than as a tympanic membrane across which formative elements pass to strike directly at its sub-levels, and which itself vibrates and resonates in rhythm with changes in its composition with the greater individual in which it is integrated, and/or with its exchanges with the milieu that envelops it. In both ways, the individual transduces impetuses to and from the outside, and is traversed by bottom-up and top-down. Considered from this angle, the individual is a boundary level between infra-individual and the supra-individual. These are two interlinked dimensions of *transindividuality*: the direct strike at the elemental level of impingements relayed from other individuations through their emissions of *point-signs*; and the transductive transmission of impetuses to levels above, beyond, and around the individual. There is also a downward propagation of influence from the global level of the individual to its constituents that modulates the activity of the elements and the manner of their integration. The individual is transversed by this two-way movement of co-modulation. The constitution of infra-individual elements is analogical to the constitution of the individual (levels, milieu, tympanic membrane, transductions, transversal connection between levels, etc.). Every sub-level has further sub-levels nested in it, in an approach to the relative limit of the *full body* or *body without organs*, and through them to the absolute limit of the *plane of immanence*. This makes it a matter of relative perspective whether the elements on a given level are considered infra- or global. Individuals in the everyday sense of living bodies presenting as discrete are infra-individual in relation

to *collective individuations*. An infra-individual/individual composition constitutes a tiered “plane of organization” of the actual. The *infra-personal*, by contrast, constitutes a “plane of consistency” of *real potential*. (The terms plane of organization and plane of consistency are Deleuze and Guattari’s). †

**INFRA-PERSONAL.** Active elements in the constitution of the *character* of a *person* that are enveloped in its overall composition, forming sub-levels within it on which they partially express their own character, within the limits allowed by their integration into the greater person. The infra-personal, like the *infra-individual*, is composed of nested levels. The nesting of sub-persons within greater persons extends below the levels of the plane of organization, to the plane of consistency or field of *real potential* (*body without organs* or *full body*). At the relative limit of the full body, it enters the zone of *bare activity*, which is the boundary region between the full body and the *plane of immanence*, which only *pathic* experience approaches. The infra-personal thus extends into the *pathic* realm, where character is in suspense for an immeasurable beat of process, before re-emerging. The tendential potentials held in *mutual inclusion* in bare activity rise through the nested levels of the infra-personal, taking on a variation in character on each level. The person is the integration of these nested variations in an overall character pattern that expresses all of the levels, but only in effect, as a global effect enveloping their multiplicity. The concept of the infra-personal is a way of holding onto the enveloped complexity of a person’s internal constitution, while indexing it to the openness of the immanent field of active, and activating, potential that is bare activity. †

**INFRAETHIN.** 1). The simultaneous contrast produced by the juxtaposition of two different elements unseparated by a boundary. 2). The overlookable difference between two instances of the same element in successive moments. In relation to the first definition,

think of a black line on a white background. There is no actual boundary between them, only the direct co-presence of their contrasting characters. In relation to the second, think of an “I” said in narrating an event in its body’s life, and an “I” said in a next statement reflecting on the event. The sense of identity between the two “I’s” glosses over the fact that a person cannot say “I” twice in strictly the same sense, because the interval between the repetitions is doubled by an immanent interval of *bare activity* that changes the body and the person, if only ever so slightly and negligibly, but as surely as one jump of the second hand on a clock ticks another moment. In the first example, the infrathin highlights contrast. In the second, it enables it to pass unperceived. In all cases, the infrathin posits the principle of *singularity*: the unimpeachable processual fact that no two things or events are absolutely alike; or as Leibniz would have it, no two things are indiscernible. Or if they are, from a certain perspective, it is because overcoding mechanisms have been *applied* them and taken them up in a produced resemblance that has imposed an operative identity on them, obtaining on the structural level that the overcoding serves. The infrathin is the difference in difference-without-separability. It is the mutuality in *mutual inclusion*. *Modal distinctions* are infrathin. Differences held in *umbral union* are infrathin to the limit. The infrathin’s principle of indiscernibility holds that there is no such thing as merely numerical difference. Every difference is qualitative-relational: a difference in character.<sup>10</sup> Numerical difference reflects the spacing of qualitative-relational differencings (their splaying across process). †

**INTENSITY.** The feeling tone, or affective tonality, of the expression of a body’s *real potential* as it passes from a higher to a

10 Infrathin: Erin Manning, *For a Pragmatics of the Useless* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2020), 13-32 (working from Duchamp’s concept). Indiscernibles: G.W. Leibniz, *Philosophical Writing* (London: Everyman, 1995), 133-135.

lower degree of capacitation. The intensity is the feeling of relative fullness of the passage with available follow-up potential and reactivable pastness. The feeling of intensity is assigned a processual locus (a place in system of contrasts and the trajectories among them) by the *disjunctive syntheses* patterning a *full body* or *body without organs*. This enables it to *index* the potential of the full body or body without organs, parceled into points or zones of intensity. The expression of an intensity culminates in a *conjunctive synthesis* marking the closure of a pulse of process. See also AFFECT †

**INTUITION.** A speculative movement of thought whereby it extends past the given to plumb durations and dimensions below and beyond the normative limits of human ken. Intuition is the abductive exploration of *pure potential*. It involves what Whitehead calls “conceptual prehension,” or the unmediated thinking-feeling of the expressive potentials held in reserve in the *umbral* order of abstract *matter* on the *plane of immanence*. Unmediated does not mean without follow-up. Given the hypothetical nature of abduction, intuition must feel out and fill out its sensing of potential by corroborative and corrective relay back through the *collective singular* and *common notions*, following the course of its own formation in reverse. Then it must put its speculations to the pragmatic test in social, political, or artistic experimentations, before returning to its own exercise, renewed and revised. Intuition thus requires method. It is not a mystical exercise of subjective interiority drawing solely on its own interior resources. It is, on the contrary, a practice of the outside. It contributes to a speculative pragmatism that finds understanding in the world. It answers to Viveiros de Castro’s evocation of knowing that “is no longer a way of representing the unknown but of interacting with it.”<sup>11</sup> Its method is key to process-philosophical metaphysical system. According to the

11 Viveiros de Castro, *Cannibal Metaphysics*, trans. Peter Skafish (Minneapolis: Univocal/University of Minnesota Press, 2017), 105.

opening pages of Whitehead's *Process and Reality*, the systematicity consists in every concept being defined in relation to every other concept – but the connecting thread among them is *what remains unsaid in each*. It is this Ariadne's thread of implicit coherence that intuition follows. *See also* UNFELT FEELING †

**LEGITIMATION.** *See* LICENSE

**LICENSE.** Under *post-normative* conditions where the *personality of power* reigns, power is no longer subject to legitimation in accordance with a state or governmental rationality. The leader or preeminent person holds power on the basis of his personal exceptionalism, which mirrors the prevailing national exceptionalism. Followers do not identify with the preeminent person as in traditional theories of charismatic leadership. Instead of seeing their similarity to the preeminent person as in a mirror, what they see in him is their own difference reverberating in his: his exceptionalism confirms their own perceived exceptionalism. This *adjoins* them to his *post-normative* oscillations. The result is a “grotesque” situation where, to paraphrase Foucault, the holder of power is able to produce and maximize effects of power precisely *because* he is disqualified to hold power.<sup>12</sup> Lack of legitimacy becomes the operative equivalent of legitimation. This coincides with the displacement of the system of rationality by an affective regime. *See also* MAN-STANDARD; POST-NORMATIVE; REACTION, REGIME OF †

**LITERAL. EVERYDAY DEFINITION:** The just-being-there in readiness-to-hand of a thing or affordance, approached as having self-sufficient form and simple location. As taken up in words, the literal is tied to the function of demonstration, as it

12 Foucault, *Abnormal. Lectures at the Collège de France 1974-1975*, ed. Valerio Marchetti and Antonella Salomoni, trans. Graham Burchell (London: Verso, 2003), 11-13.

attempts to anchor the slippage of *signifying* signs in an *indexical* relation to an extra-linguistic reality. Signs can also have a literal relation to each other on their own level when they treat each other's concepts as things or affordances with a just-being-there in readiness-to-thought, and as having determinate content conveyed by a self-sufficient sign-form. In both cases, the literal is fundamentally in *error*. The indexing of the extra-linguistic fails because demonstration cannot anchor signification to a referent in the world by its own devices. It is constitutionally ambiguous, and can only work when certain *habitual* presuppositions are in place that inform the communicants with an implicit, normative understanding of the context that backgrounds the complexity and plasticities of the potentials composing it and that emergently stir within it. In the case of signs addressing each other's concepts literally, the failure is in the polyvalence that the relational texture of thought always brings to a concept (the fact that the complexity of connotation and implication can never be purified from the movement of thought, so that there is no such thing as the pure denotation of a sign that can be literally indexed by another sign). All of this is in denial of the essential thirdness of language (the fact that its utterances as well as the concepts uttered are always caught up in endless relays forming ramifying webs that delinearize thought and expression and weave a *commind*). The literal by this definition is often invoked in discourses of *reaction* and feeds the mis-taking of causal relation and the misplacing of *import* endemic to conspiracy theorizing, even as it undermines it with an investment in the slippages of the *signifying regime* and the post-truth *imaginings* they foster. **PROCESSUAL DEFINITION:** The idea that a thing or context is as it seems. Direct perception registers a context exactly as it seems, including the *objective illusions* that are built into its real constitution. This does not mean it cannot be misleading. Objective illusions are proto-errors that are not simply subjective effects of perspective, but are built into

the *objective perspective* of a body in context, as a function of its actual composition and its fit with the context's composition. An objective illusion isn't yet true or false. It just is. It proves true or false pragmatically, in terms of the felicity of any unfolding that takes off from the perception.<sup>13</sup> What primes unfoldings of action that fail to land felicitously, truly proves in the end to have been objectively false. An objective illusion is a kink in the real that has potential consequences that are neither hidden nor unhidden, but effectively are exactly as they appear: misdirecting. This processual principle that direct perception in itself is without error, in the sense that it registers the being-exactly-as-they-seem of things, asserts that the distinction of truth or falsehood is not relevant to the primary level of emergent thought that is direct perception. Truth and error pertain pragmatically to the felicity of events of unfolding, and only retrospectively apply to the starting point of that movement. This places experience fundamentally outside the frame of cognition. As William James says, the end of the experience defines the beginning of the experience as the knower, and in an instantaneous boomerang effect, bounces back to define itself as known, truly or falsely.<sup>14</sup> This is not a judgment. It is a playing out of potential (recursively, as always) in a way that is self-validating or self-disqualifying. Potential, not reason or cognition, is the substance of thought. *See also* DEMONSTRATION; ERROR †

**MACHINIC.** A self-driving dynamic whose operations carry an agential force, but without a separate agent behind it. A machine in this sense is a "subjectless subjectivity" or "agencying." The agential force consists in luring movements forward toward attractor states or zones of activity. In their orienting function, attractors are the functional equivalent of aims. The movement-toward

<sup>13</sup> William James, *The Meaning of Truth* (New York: Longman, 1911).

<sup>14</sup> James, *Essays in Radical Empiricism* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996), 57.

is an emergent tendency whose aim is self-modulating, never formally given in advance. A machine binds multiple elements together in the dynamic unity of their joint movement-toward. In view of the multiplicity of the elements it composes, it constitutes a “machinic assemblage.” It must be borne in mind that this usage of “assemblage” is different from its prevailing Lego-like sense of a part-by-part construction of already-formed elements externally connected into a functional whole. That mode of composition belongs to the realm of the “mechanical” as opposed to the machinic. The machinic trawls the micro-logical level of *bare activity*, where things are germinally emergent. Its object are the *tendencies* just-stirring at that level, readying for expression, but not yet having taken determinate form through an unfolding onto the plane of organization. The machine itself lacks determinate form or content. It is an order of relations among bundled tendencies, selectively “fused” to unfold together (see *connective synthesis*). The machinic draws on the *pure potentials* of the *plane of immanence*, filtering them into the *real potential* of the plane of consistency at the limit of a full body, through its leading edge of bare activity, and finally into actualization on a plane of organization. In relation to the plane of immanence and pure potential, the machinic constitutes an “abstract machine” operating the selection of potentials bound for fusion. On the level of the plane of consistency, it is a “collective assemblage,” because it addresses bodies and persons *transindividually*. A regime of discourse is a collective assemblage of enunciation. A collective assemblage actualizes in determinate forms and contents by inducting energies, materials, bodies, and signs into jointly taking-form as an actual formation, or as a variation modulating an existing actual formation. The formation may purport to stand alone, but in point of processual fact it stands with others of its kind, co-populating a shared level or “stratum” on the plane of organization. It is the stratum that is the destination of the machinic’s agencying. The machinic populates strata with multiple,

mutually accommodating and competing, formations. A stratum is a distribution of related takings-form, which often possess mechanisms for their own reproduction and for the furtherance, through that reproduction and through other disseminatory operations, of the constitutive tendencies they bring to expression. The collective assemblage is the conveyance for the joint *conatus* of fused tendencies taking actual form amid a concertation and commotion of others around them. The form/content of the results of the resulting emergent ordering on the plane of organization is not pre-established. The machinic is not a preformation. Its expressions generate constantly changing variations on the themes, or the patterns of relations, it iteratively expresses in becoming. The umbral unions of the plane of immanence, immanent to the planes of organization and the plane of consistency, are its ultimate object: its abstract *matter*. The products of *connective synthesis* provide the actual “material” inducted into the machine’s agencying, oriented by its aim. The machinic then elaborates their determinate taking form and holding content. A machine is never a whole because it opens out onto the unboundedness of the plane of immanence’s pure potential (in its aspect as abstract machine), and carries them into an open-ended serial iteration of variations of form and content (through its offices as collective assemblage). The machinic is indifferent to the distinction between the organic and the inorganic. It transverses organic and inorganic strata, infusing them with elemental life. †

**MACHINIC ASSEMBLAGE.** *See* MACHINIC

**MACHINIC SURPLUS-VALUE.** *See* SURPLUS-VALUE OF FLOW

**MAN-STANDARD.** The *abstract general idea* of the Human. The Man-Standard is not the stand-alone figure of the body gendered male. It is a composite figure subsuming underfigures such

as woman, child, and animal as counterpoints to the claimed superiority of Man. The underfigures hold Man aloft in their devalued contrast to it. The Man-Standard is an empty category, in the way that all abstract general ideas are empty, being mere logical constructs repertorying defining properties in the abstract (in the vein of “Man the rational animal” or “Man the strong sex”). But it is an empty category with a capacious function: it is *applied* to bodies to normatively tag them and discipline them in accordance with the applied norm. Far from a neutral logical tool, this function of application makes the Man-Standard a directly political operator. It is inseparable from value judgments that order its underfigures hierarchically, with Man at the top, as epitome of the Human. The Man-Standard sets off the huMan from the animal (which is nevertheless a part of the Man-Standard, as its limit-contrast), and differentially values the human bodies it subsumes under its umbrella. These differential valuations are not limited to figures of gender and age of majority/minority, but extend essentially to race. Implicit in the Man-Standard is that a body ascribed its highest term is deemed white, straight, affluent, European, speaking a major language with neurotypical aptitude, and *personifying* the flows of capital. The Man-Standard is one with whiteness, which is itself synonymous with neurotypicality.<sup>15</sup> Its emptiness opens a gap between white-skinned bodies or black-skinned bodies, and whiteness and blackness. The Man-Standard operates the *ascription* of a property deemed to define a body in order to place in the categorical hierarchy. This is not a naturalistic function empirically based under all circumstances on the presence of a certain quantum of melanin. The formal possibility of the naturalistic functioning of the category of race is self-deconstructed by the fuzziness of the continuous variations and “interminglings” in racial

15 Erin Manning, *For a Pragmatics of the Useless* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2020).

traits pointed out by Du Bois (see note 5 above). On the contrary, the application of the Man-Standard is a metaphysical operation ascribing an abstract *character* through the inherently political, and thus not uncontingent, application of its empty category. Race categorization is a political metaphysics. The contingent aspect of its operation expresses itself in the fact that a black-skinned person can receive a dispensation to embody whiteness (think of such Bush II administration figures as Condoleezza Rice and Colin Powell). Conversely, a white-skinned body may leak from the Man-Standard into blackness: in other words, escape not only to outside or underside of the Man-Standard, but dodge obeisance to the abstract general idea as such, reclaiming the *singularity* that is the birth right of all bodies. The toeing to the color line is a base operation and default position, but not an invariant. The rise of the Man-Standard accompanied, and fortified, capitalism's maturation during its period of colonial imperialism. Its racializing aspect was fundamental to the development of capitalism, which requires the distribution of inequalities bolstered by mechanisms of exclusion. With the help of the Man-Standard, race became the fundamental distinction rationalizing that production of inequality and exclusion under capitalism, with slavery being the most severe (and capital accumulative) vector for it. The Man-Standard co-evolved with capitalism, as an operator centrally contributing to its self-determination as *racial capitalism*. Later, in another avatar, it underpinned the Protestant ethic involved in the construction the citizen of the modern democratic nation-state in the period of industrial capitalism's maturation. Still later, in subsequent variation, it underwrote the full-fledged emergence of human capital under neoliberalism (see *figure; personification*). Lately, the Man-Standard has come by hard times. A *post-normative* disaggregation of its multifaceted crystalline solidity has led to bodies' regularly taking license with its applications. The Man-Standard as disciplinary masculinist norm is still in place, but the pendulum swings

between that pole and a pole of character plasticity where bodies answering to Man manifest properties of its underfigures, in a kind of inadvertent self-parody. This results in a kind of hypermasculinism that can be called *ornamental masculinity*. Ornamental masculinity is closely associated with the *regime of reaction* of grievance culture, where Man-ascribed bodies at the top of the hierarchy nevertheless assume, against all evidence, a posture of vulnerability and victimhood. Figures of hypermasculinity, including ornamental masculinity, are central to today's fascisizing tendencies. See also LICENSE; NORMOPATHY; POST-NORMATIVE †

**MATTER.** A self-relating of movement absorbing and transmitting other movements manifesting as forces and influences. It can be *body-matter*, in the sense of body as a nexus of movements that are bound to each other in an enduring *connective synthesis* and as a result travel a historic route together. Or it can be abstract matter, in other words incorporeal by this definition of body (in its "general definition"). Body-matter is to abstract matter as matter is to energy in physics. But this is more than an analogy: "the energetic activity considered in physics is the emotional intensity entertained in life" (Whitehead 1968a, 168). *Intensity*, *potential*, and *thought* are incorporeal but can be considered energetic phases of body-matter, and thus are not immaterial. Body-matter is a contraction of abstract matter (a congealment, condensate, or precipitate of it). See also BODY; OPTIVE MATTER †

**MEDIA FIGURE.** Synonym for *figure* used when it is wished to emphasize a figure's participation in *collective individuations* and *collective personings* conveyed through the collective assemblages of communicational technologies. See also IMAGE; IMAGE-OF-AN-IMAGE †

**MICRO-SHOCK.** The cutting-in to the body of an impingement or influence, at the level of *unfelt feeling*. Micro-shocks are

occasioned by the strike of *point-signs*, and occasion the *pathic*. They are felt only in their effects. As such, they do not occupy a moment in lived time. They are immanent to time's living-out. They are a constitutive element of the moment's arising. They are not its content. In other words, they are *infra-personal* and *infra-phenomenal*. They are agitations in experience's field of emergence. What they agitate is *bare activity*. They are *strange intruders*. See also SCHIZ †

**MODAL DISTINCTION.** The mode of distinction pertaining to the entanglement of two or more contrasting elements (fundamentally, tendential arcs) that modulate each other's unfolding and issue in a joint effect in which they count for one on a supplementary level. At that emergent level, the elements' coming-together may enter into circuits that the elements alone (if indeed they can stand alone) would not have the capacity for, producing a surplus-value of relation. Elements in modal distinction retain their contrast immanent to their joint effect. They retain their own *conatus* and manner of activity, in the form of a residual autonomy that may under certain circumstances reassert itself. The elements can be said to "bind" toward their joint effect, or to "fuse" for it without becoming "confused." Their jointness of effect does not homogenize them in a way that erases their difference or subsume them as parts to a superior whole that entirely supplants the parts' powers to affect and be affected by its own powers. The binding of their activities to each other is expressive of the overall effect, and the effect under-expresses their ingreience in its own manner of appearance. The elements come-out together into the effect, and the effect carries in its constitution and manner of appearance the dynamic trace of their having come-together. Their activities are bound in mutual capture, such that they become reciprocally inflecting and reciprocally modifying, moving in concert toward a shared unfolding. The elements are "reciprocals" in an occurrent

relation, rather than parts of a whole. Their dynamic relation is conditioned by the singular *context* in which they come together, contingent on the forces that perform their mutual capture in and for that context. Modal distinction pertains to occurrent singularities of composition. The co-composing reciprocals may already be the result of *connective syntheses* subject to reuptake. The joint effect constitutes a *conjunctive synthesis* marking a pulse of *individuation*. The individuation may be of whatever nature: a *habit*, a higher-level *tendency*, a life, an object, an event, or an atmosphere – whatever binds differences in the dynamic unity of its own emergent effect, where the emergent effect is *really distinct* from its ingredient elements. Modal distinction is crucial for the understanding of the *singular*. It lends its name to *modal metaphysics* because the relation between *real distinction* and modal distinction is itself modal, making modal distinction the broader of the two. *Umbral union* can be considered modal in a wider sense, broadening the latter's logic of mutual entanglement to include radicles in immanence as well as reciprocals in unfolding. The dualities haunting Western philosophy, such as mind and body, or affect and rationality, can be resolved by treating them as modal distinctions. A top and its movements are modally distinct, yet actually inseparable (as is the case for every *body*). Their inseparability is the condition of the top's spin (their joint effect, which, as a pattern or manner that can be repeated elsewhere spinning off from a different body, is really distinct from them). *See also* INFRATHIN †

**MODAL METAPHYSICS.** The study of the many mannerisms of universal relational variation. †

**MUTUAL INCLUSION.** An in-each-otherness of potentials or *tendencies*, with and not against their difference. In mutual inclusion, the activity of the one is in the activity of the other, as a modulating or inflecting influence. Mutual inclusion is a differential concept for the way in which the real constitutions of things formatively overlap

at the level of emergence. A field of mutual inclusion is composed of contrasts, each with its qualitative-relational character, that call and respond to each other across their difference. This complicates their difference with germinal variations on their character that might potentially unfold. There are three primary fields of mutual inclusion: *real potential* (emergent from the plane of consistency); *bare activity* (which feeds real potential forward through the full body into takings-form takings-form that will take their place on a stratum of the plane of organization); and *pure potential* (whose field is the *plane of immanence*). Unfolding tendencies on their way to culmination, and determinate forms still in the process of emergence, can be said to be in mutual inclusion to the extent to which they co-integrate different tendencies and potentials into their constitution. What are usually taken to be dualities or oppositions are in fact graded continua of mutual inclusion. *Thinking-feeling*, for example, is a mutual inclusion of thought and feeling, in various alloys exhibiting variable degrees of the powers of each. At either end of the continuum lies a limit-pole or attractor. At one end lies the limit-pole of *umbral union* of the plane of immanence. At the other end lies the limit-pole of a *disjunctive synthesis* of the two tendencies separating-out together into their respective pure forms: pure thought and pure feeling (what Deleuze calls the *cogitandum* and the *sentendum*).<sup>16</sup> Paradoxically, when they approach this extreme they fold back in-under in abstract topological torsion to rejoin and reenergize the point of departure of the tendencies' re-coming together, for another go. At this point of immanent re-infolding, they are minima of relation yearning to set back out on their trajectories together (in other words, they are "radicles" of the plane of immanence). Mutual inclusion is a way of dealing with the dualities of process (like the up and down of gravity, or the left and right of the bilateral symmetry of many animal bodies) outside of a dualist metaphysics, as part of a *modal metaphysics* instead. The

16 Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 140-153.

dualities of mutual inclusion are only departure points for thought, because the twoness of the tendencies will always compose with a thirdness, and more, as when it becomes necessary, for example with the concept of *abduction*, to complicate thinking-feeling into thinking-feeling-acting. There are always composites of multiples, and/or transversals (such as the cutting across of the up and down of gravity by the horizontality of movements on the surface of the earth) or intersecting axes (such the vertical counter-balancing of the bilateral symmetry of bipedal animal bodies' by the hands-feet axis). Mutual inclusion is a differential logic of the multiple and of the mixing of tendencies. There is, however, a certain priority to the processual dualities. As spectrums of potential, they are primitives of process thinking in that the contrast they present cannot be further decomposed or analyzed into smaller elements without losing the dynamic. As continuums, they self-divide into degrees of integrative mixture (every step up increases how much down there is). But if they are cut into from the outside, their character disintegrates (as when reflective thought cuts into the continuum of thinking-feeling and disintegrates it into an opposition between the rational and the irrational). This makes it a central task of process thinking to diagnose which continuums are in play in a given actual mixture – and all actual formations are tendential mixes – and to what degrees, moving at what intensity toward which pole, in what taking-form (or in the case of the pole of umbral union on the plane of immanence, with what coefficient of decoding and deterritorialization of form and content). The thinking of mutual inclusion must always be in movement, for the very good reason that the world of process that it addresses never rests. *Modal distinction* and *real distinction* are conceptual tools for keeping it in movement. *Umbral union* is a way of groundlessly grounding it metaphysically, moving to the limit of thought's capacity to make distinctions without extinguishing them for thought. †

**NORMOPATHY. GENERAL DEFINITION:** Normativity considered as a pathology consisting in the production of “sad” affects fettering the potential scope of becoming. **SPECIAL DEFINITION:** Normativity swollen with *license*. In this definition, normopathy is the dominant character of the *post-normative* condition. Under the grips of a *regime of reaction* normativity becomes revengeful and punishing. †

**OBJECTIVE APPARENT MOVEMENT.** A movement or transformation on the level of an *image*, perceived without an awareness of the conditions of the image’s emergence. The movement between images on the same derivative level is taken to be self-sufficient, and arrogates all causal efficacy to itself. This backgrounds the field of constitutive relation subtending that level, from which it emerged and which continues to feed it with potential. The classic example is Marx’s “commodity fetishism,” defined as the relations between people (the unequal relations between workers and capitalists, and creditors and debtors, that fosters the accumulation of surplus-value that is the processual motor of the economy) mis-taken for relations between things (the system of consumer objects mis-taken for the essence of the economy, as in approaches championing the market). The supposed independence of the individual capitalist subject as sufficient cause of its own choices, rationally captaining its life in competition with others in the same individualist boat, is another example. *Full bodies* invariably produce objective apparent movements as derivative analogs (simulacra) of their own constitutive powers. Objective apparent movements are performative, and as such they do arrogate to themselves a certain derivative causal power. Objective apparent movements are a dynamic, systemic form of *objective illusion*, and like it are entirely real. †

**OBJECTIVE ILLUSION.** A seeming-as-it-is that carries a causal kink in its real constitution. This occurs when the structure

of a situation is objectively projected, with a topological torsion, onto a surface constituted by one of its components. The classic example is a mirror whose objective embeddedness in its situation produces a misdirected abduction presenting objects behind the viewer as objects before the viewer, accessible to the reach in that direction. The objective illusion is the *objective perspective* of the mirror producing a topological twist on the situation's composition that leads the viewer to mis-take the potential causal relations the situation harbors, and as a result to mis-place its *import*. This mis-take occurs because the mirror effectively acts exactly as it seems, in direct perception. Objective illusions are of all natures, not just visual. They may amplify and expand their scope by entering into discourse on the back of *point-signs*, becoming full-fledged *errors* fostering systemic *stupidity* (in themselves, they are "proto-errors"). Their error-inducing power can be short-circuited by the cultivation of *adequate ideas*. In that case, their illusion, being objective, is not expunged. It is "doubled" by the adequate ideas, enveloped in their operation in a way that smothers their error's potential for amplification. Objective illusion is not the result of individual stupidity. It is an endemic danger in all perception. Perception produces the conditions of emergence of objective illusion through its *habitual* synthesis of composites that can stand out as seemingly discrete objects, resulting from and projecting forward their own linear causalities (which are in fact forms of *objective apparent movement*). This brackets the complexity of the relational field. See also ERROR †

**OBJECTIVE PERSPECTIVE.** The partial take on the relational field and the potentials it harbors that comes with any determinate taking-form. The objective perspective is the necessary result of the real embeddedness of the thing in its situation. A thing's mode of implantation in a context grades the *real potential* immanent to it, and draws a horizon around it that delineates a relative limit to its reach

and the purview of its thinking-feeling. The objective perspective's parameters shift with the body's movements, contraction of habits, and the pursuit of *adequate ideas* that extend its purview and correct the *errors* developing from *objective illusions*. †

**OPTIVE MATTER.** The fullness of a context with unexpressed potentials that may be selectively picked up by an abstract *machine* for actual expression. Optive matter is on a graded continuum from *real potential* to *pure potential*. It constitutes the "could have been" of any given event or step in an historic route. †

**ORNAMENTAL MASCULINITY.** See MAN-STANDARD

**OVERCODING.** See APPLICATION; ASCRIPTION; CODING; FACIALITY; FASCISM PROPER; FIGURE; IDENTITY; INFRATHIN; MAN-STANDARD; PERSON (PERSONING)

**PARTICULAR.** See SINGULAR

**PASSION.** The body's feeling, conscious or not, of passing to a higher or lower degree of capacitation in an affective encounter (an affecting and being affected). In Spinoza's terms, the felt transition to a diminished power of existence is a "sad" affect. The felt transition to an augmentation of the body's powers of existence is a "joyful" affect. Passion is the affective playing out of the *pathic*. *Reaction* invests sad passions. *Regimes of reaction* systematize that investment. †

**PATHIC.** The openness of the body to feeling other influences, in encounters with impinging bodies or through the reactivation of traces. The pathic is an off-beat of experience, like an arrhythmia in life's ongoing. The feeling of ingression suspends the continuity of life for an immeasurable, unplaceable instant. This suspension is not a separate moment. It is immanent to the emergence of the moment. In it, there is no world, only the feeling. Or, the feeling fills the world, like an infinite ache or an endless whistle reducing

all experience to itself (Peirce). The pathic corresponds to Peirce's Firstness, in its liminality to the content of experience. It cannot be felt as such. It is felt at best in a fugitive side-perception, as in the feeling of just awakening from sleep or coming out of a profound drunkenness. Aside from that, it is felt only in its effect. The effect begins with the hit of a *micro-shock* immanent to the formation of experience, conveyed by the strike of a *point-sign*. The pathic is not the same as the passive. It has a "passive" share, but one that is actually more passive than passive: a radical, irremediable openness to being-affected that is prior to the distinction between being active and being passive. It also has an "active" share, but it is more a proto-activity, not unlike a flinch or a twinge that primes for action and activates tendencies. It is not an action itself. "It would be nonsense to say that someone tried to have a twinge" or even to say that a twinge is something someone "do[es] at all."<sup>17</sup> The pathic is *infra-personal*. It coincides with the suspensive descent of life toward the *body without organs*, which is in the same stroke a repotentiating rise of the body without organs toward life's reprise. The descent-rearising traverses *bare activity*. Reaction is a follow-up on the passive share of the pathic that backgrounds its active share, curtailing repotentialization, sometimes fading out the active share in a passage toward its vanishing point. The pathic is beyond passion. It is ur-passion. †

**PERSON (PERSONING).** The pattern of a body's ongoing activity displaying a quality of movement that characterizes it. This *character* is the manner of coming-together to move-together of the body's constituent elements. As the patterning moves along the body's historic route with it, it regathers variations on itself into a constantly revised dynamic unity. The dynamic unity remains changingly continuous with itself, as a variation on its own theme.

17 Gilbert Ryle, *The Concept of Mind* (London: Hutchison, 1949), 106.

This evolving continuity of character is the life of the person. The feeling tone of the character across its variations on its own theme is the person's "*personality*." An example is a spinning top: the top is a body (a nexus of matter in movement). Its spin is the dynamic patterning of the movement that constitutes its character. The personality is the continuous variation in the pattern of the spin across different throws in different conditions as it registers in an overall feeling tone. Think of an individual human body as the top; think of the spin it puts on its activities as its character; think of the self-compounding feeling tone of its variations on that pattern as its personality (self-styling), and you have a processual image of the person in the everyday sense. A person is *really distinct* from the body whose character it expresses. The person grows bottom up, through the body's contractions of habit. It is also susceptible to top-down overcoding, the *application* of the *Man-Standard* being the prime example. Personing is the cross-roads of these two tendencies. Overcoding implants normative channeling in a body's character pattern, creating a differential between the person and the joint potential of the *infra-personal* tendencies couched in its consituent elements. This differential can turn into a self-struggle, or what is currently termed an "identity crisis." Processually speaking, however, a person is not an *identity*. Identity happens to it. When the person is overcoded by an *application*, it suffers *identification*. The overcoding is folded into channelings of the body's habits and propensities by *imitation*. This is an interiorization of the outside. In the life of the person, it will be perceived by the person as definitive of its own nature. This sense of identity is a secondary effect of *identification*, and is achieved by specific mechanisms, such as discipline and punishment. This includes self-discipline, in which the person splits its character patterning into an ego and supergo and attempts to channel itself in conformity with the *Man-Standard*, turning its desire to its own punishment. This is a form of *reaction* (reacting to the application of the identificatory category

as an painful or anxiety-producing impingement from the outside and other). Interiorization detours desire into an *objective apparent movement* of self-reflection that mis-takes itself for constitutive, mis-placing the *import* of its relations with others. The interiorization may then exteriorize the self-struggle with normativity into a mimetic rivalry with the other, whose pursuit only heightens the normativity. The truly constitutive relation is between the person and its infra-personal elements, in their transindividual relation to others. The person is not composed of an ego and a superego, but of *dividuals* ("larval subjects" or "little souls"). Its organization is tiered. A person is always a greater person enveloping levels of under-persons in complex imbrication. "Person" is a synonym of character, with the added connotations of the social role the body is inducted into by the application to it of an *abstract general idea* and its struggles with the associated normalizing forces. "Character" emphasizes the process of the emergent patterning of movements and tendencies unfolding from the coming-together and going-together of infra-persons bound together in mutual relation in the same unfolding across the historic route of the body. A person is also a synonym for *figure*, this time emphasizing its exemplification of a processual dynamic, including the process of its own *adjunction* to a preeminent person as an infra-person ingredient to its greater *collective personhood*. At the most elementary level, a person is *general idea*: its character pattern spans a splay of elements whose dynamic unity it expresses in an overall quality or feeling tone (personality). Conversely, a general idea is a person. The concept of the person applies to the character of any emergent patterning of movement standing out from the movement in its own effect, whether the movement is of body *matter* or abstract matter. †

**PERSONALITY.** The *character* pattern of a *person* understood from the angle of the feeling tone enveloping its variations that integrally express them as an overall dynamic unity. The overall

dynamic unity is felt to be self-gathering and self-compounding across its variations. †

**PERSONALITY OF POWER.** A *machine* of collective expression pivoting on the figure of a preeminent person (a greater person or overperson) in the mode of *faciality*. The prevailing operator of power is *adjunction*. The personality of power is rife with *fascisizing tendencies*, resulting in a *collective individuation* in a reactive mode. See also REACTION, REGIME OF †

**PERSONIFICATION.** The exemplification of a processual dynamic in the *character* of a person. All personings are personifications of processual dynamics. The traditional figure of the human under capitalism is a personification of one of the constitutive contrasts of the capitalist relation (worker/capitalist), and through it of the process as a whole. The person as human capital under neoliberalism is a personification of the volatility of the flows of deregulated capital, exemplifying its derivative production of surplus-value of flow. The personification is does not resemble what it personifies. Its patterns do, however, entertain an operative analogy with it, under topological transformation. A personification is a topological figure of the process it exemplifies. See also FIGURE †

**PERSPECTIVE.** See OBJECTIVE PERSPECTIVE

**PLANE OF CONSISTENCY.** The fluctuating limit, vibrating with bare activity, between the real potential of a *full body* and the pure potential of the *plane of immanence*. See also FULL BODY †

**PLANE OF IMMANENCE.** The field of pure potentials, held in *mutual inclusion* in the mode of *umbral union*. The field immanence is not a thing. It is a limit-concept. It figures the limit of thought as the worlds' horizon of infinite potential. Its concept is a way of grounding the system of thought in a thinking of potential and its process of coming to actual expression. At its farthest

reaches, it is Bergson's and Deleuze's virtual. It conditions all emergences with the reactivatable memory-of-the-world of relations past-in-forming tendencies' future. It is real but maximally abstract. It does not exist, but "subsists" at the limit of the thinkable and beyond the limit of what is feelable in any actual sensory mode. It can be felt sensorially only in effect, enveloped. It can be abducted amodally, in an act of *intuition* descending toward it through the *full body*, descending the route following which potentials rise as they filter toward actualization in taking-form. There is no form or content on the plane of immanence, only pure relation. The plane of immanence is ontologically recessive. Being cannot reach it, since it lies at its absolute limit. No body can go into it. It can only come out of itself, into actual expression, in the life of bodies and in the operations of formations. It is not the in-itself. It is the of-itself: that out of which the world always gives more of itself. It is the ultimate source of *belief in the world*. It is not something to believe in. It is what a body cannot but believe from. Paradoxically, its virtuality does have its own spectral mode of appearance in the actual, which Deleuze calls a "virtual image," and which can also be called "semblance" working from Benjamin's sense of the word.<sup>18</sup> See also BODY WITHOUT ORGANS; FULL BODY; IMMANENCE †

**PLANE OF ORGANIZATION.** See FULL BODY; MACHINIC

**POINT-SIGN.** A sign that performatively *indexes* potential. Point-signs address potential through a priming of *bare activity* toward future encounters, even in abstraction from any particular encounter other than with the sign itself. The concept of the point-sign extends the notion of the index beyond pointing to a past or actually occurring encounter, into the domain of the performative

18 Brian Massumi, *Semblance and Event* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2011).

(which prospectively produces its own object). Its performance constitutes an encounter in its own right: a sign strike. The effect may be affirmative: indexing, through bare activity, the *real potential* of the *full body* in a way that activates its relay with the *pure potentials* of the *plane of immanence*, stoking potentials to filter up and take effect, unfolding into singular expression. Most often in practice, however, their effect is limitative, curtailing potential. This occurs most notably with the performative *ascription* to a body or population of bodies of an *abstract general idea* conveying pre-established social roles – prime among them the *Man-Standard*. This *application* of a normative standard sidelines the expression of singularity and channels thinking-feeling into prescribed channels aimed at formatting the future into a conformity with past patterns. In certain regimes of discourse, point-signs can also carry a double valence, at the same time imposing the Man-Standard and undermining it with an impulsive plasticity. This is the case with the post-truth Trumpian *regime of reaction* and its licensing of individuals’ sense of exceptionality and self-centered entitlement. See also INDEX †

**POLES.** Synonym of attractor; synonym of limit. See BODY; DESIRE; FASCISM PROPER; MAN-STANDARD; MUTUAL INCLUSION; POST-NORMATIVE; TENDENCY; THINKING-FEELING †

**POST-NORMATIVE.** At one pole, the post-normative condition is when norms no longer effectively format behavior, serving instead as a pivot around which behavior oscillates. Norms do not disappear. If anything, they harden. They are no longer, as in liberalism, “neutral” regulatory guardrails adaptable to cultural changes. Neither are they unbending prescriptive rules of a moral tenor, as they are in certain practices of religion and in traditional authoritarian family and state regimes. These two normative modes may continue to function, but neither are definitive.

What defines the post-normative condition is the *license* given to the individual to transgress the norms while selectively imposing them on others in the harshest of manners. The same individual may at the same time claim to uphold norms, in either the religious or authoritarian mode, with no hint of contradiction. Post-normativity is a structural hypocrisy, in the sense that it is not reducible to individual character, but characterizes a cultural condition of which post-normative individuals are an expression. That cultural condition can be analyzed as a *regime of reaction*. The “toxic masculinity” of present-day hypermasculinism is an example, closely associated with the alt-right and its neoreactionary hatred of “normies.” Post-normativity can be illustrated by envisioning the bell curve of the normal distribution oscillating back and forth across itself. It is characterized by *normopathy* exacerbated by *license*. There is another pole of post-normativity, opposed to the first, in which norms also no longer effectively format behavior. But rather than oscillating around the norm, individuations eschew normativity as such, moving toward an integral and affirmative revaluation of values operating on an entirely different basis (of ethico-aesthetic, as opposed to moral, tenor).<sup>19</sup> Names for this include “becoming-minor,” “queering,” and the “blackness” of the “undercommons.” See also IDENTIFICATION; LICENSE; MAN-STANDARD (in connection with the first pole); NORMOPATHY; POTENTIAL, PURE (in connection with the second pole) †

**POTENTIAL, PURE.** The entirety of the world’s potential, in abstraction from its accessibility to actualization from the *objective perspective* of any given experience or occasion. By potential is a

19 Brian Massumi, “Virtual Ecology and the Question of Value” in *General Ecology: The New Ecological Paradigm*, ed. Erich Hörl (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), 345-373 and 99 *Theses for the Revaluation of Value: A Postcapitalist Manifesto* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2018).

meant a form of relation and its carrying of a qualitative valence, or pure *character*. The potential contributes its character to any occasion actualizing its relational form. The qualitative-relational matrix is said to make “ingression” in the actualizing occasion, which “exhibits” or “expresses” the character. An example is the color red, which comes to expression only under a certain range of relational conditions (including light conditions, spatial arrays, and body-borne perceptual mechanisms). When red makes ingression, it is always the “same” potential re-expressing itself in a variation on its character. By “same” is meant an emergent variation on a spectrum of related potentials. Each instance is in fact singular: no two reds are exactly alike. The pure potential is the *mutual inclusion* in *umbral union* of an indefinite set of expressions of red in eternal readiness to express themselves in the continually changing constitution of the world. The ingression is not to be mistaken for a passive reception, as in traditional notions of perception. It is an event in the world that is distributed across the conditioning elements, all of which combine passive and active aspects in the mutual adjustments of their participation with each other in the event. The pure potential contributes its character to an occasion that takes it up into its own emergence. The occasion’s exhibiting of the potential characterizes it (as a certain tone of red characterizes a sunset). The character of that experience can be thought of an inheritance from the realm of pure potential (passive aspect), at the same time it is an uptake by the experience (active aspect). It can also be thought of as a contribution by the realm of potential (active aspect) received by the experience (passive aspect). This is another way of saying that the event is tributary to a relational causality that does not parse out according to a simple active/passive dichotomy. Pure potentials can also be complex, such as a pattern of colors in a painting or, even more complexly, the feeling tone of a conversation or other social interaction (which occur on spectrums that we think of as types or genres). Pure potential is a

tool for understanding the infinite potential for events to vary, on every level. Everything that occurs is characterized by the expression of a pure potential, simple or complex, that gives it a feeling tone. The feeling tone is a processual value, in something close to the way we speak of the “value” of a color tone or musical note. All characters active in the world are expressions of pure potential. The emergent variations they bring fold back into the spectrum of pure potential. There they remain, patient for a re-expression in yet another variation, given the conditions. The ideal realm of pure potential, in abstraction from the actualization of potentials, can be thought of as the “world of value.”<sup>20</sup> The before/after dichotomy is no more applicable to pure potential than passive/active.<sup>21</sup> At the same time as a pure potential ingresses into the just-beginning of an occasion, it pulls from ahead as an attractor governing a *tendency*. This transtemporality of its expression, together with the always-at-the-ready-for-another-go of its lingering out of time in the world of value, is what makes it “untimely” (Deleuze; Nietzsche) or “eternal” (Whitehead). In Whitehead’s vocabulary, a pure potential is an “eternal object,” closely corresponding to “pure singularity” in Deleuze’s *Logic of Sense*. In Deleuze and Guattari, the realm of pure potential is the *plane of immanence*. †

**POTENTIAL, REAL.** Pure potential filtered and formatted in processual proximity to a event or emergence. Real potential is the selective spectrum of potential most proximately accessible for expression in that *context*. It can be imagined as an abstract collander sifting pure potentials for ingredience in the event’s leavening, as a function of any number of variables composing the context’s singular complexion: the tendencies churning in its *bare activity*, the *abstract general ideas* hovering ready to *apply*

20 A.N. Whitehead, “Immortality,” *Essays in Science and Philosophy* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1968), 60–74

21 Massumi, “Virtual Ecology and the Question of Value.”

themselves and overcode it, the discursive formations poised to traverse it, the *affective* state of capacitation of the participating bodies that they bring to the context form their previous encounters, the habitual *beliefs* those bodies bear, their propensity for certain movements of desire (their *conatus*), and their inductibility into transindividual movements of desire that might traverse the context. Real potential does not just include potentials that actually end up characterizing the occasion. It also includes potentials that could have been ingredient, but were selected out as the occasion occasioned. These “negative prehensions” are contributors to the shape of the event by virtue of having been excluded in a given manner: they are ex-inscribed in it. In this connection, the notion of real potential has important consequences for the concept of history. It asserts the necessity of including the could-have-been in our account of historical causality. This gives elbow room to history by forbidding strictly deterministic or overly linear versions of its course. In the complexity of real potential’s playing out, there is always room for contingency and spontaneity. If there were not, history would not be history. It would be its opposite, stasis. Every context is accompanied by an atmosphere that surrounds and suffuses it with intimations of the pure potential that real potential filters from its “world of value” into the “world of activity” (the world of events and emergences). Real potential is textured and layered, receding by gradations from the most proximate potentials (the most accessible and probable) all the way to the limit of *pure potential*. There is no strict dividing line between real and pure potential. Ultimately, it is a matter of degree. The *full body* and the *body without organs* are trans-contextual formations of real potential. In their most immanent recesses, they verge on the deterritorialized zones of potentialization composing the *plane of immanence*, which is at once their continuation and their underside. When the activity of a body adjoined to them dives toward those zones through *bare activity*, it is capacitated to access less

probably, more “distant” potentials (potentials further away on the continuum of potential than the most ready potentials held in real potential). Real potential is a term of Whitehead’s. It corresponds to the lower bands of Bergson’s famous cone of the virtual, as it filters down toward the vertex of actualization. †

**QUASI-CAUSE.** A nonlocal, nonlinear cause. The effects produced by a relation, as such, is quasi-causal in that the efficacy is distributed across the terms in relation and inheres in their manner of coming-together to express emergent powers at the global level. By nonlocal is meant equally in the parts and in the whole. By nonlinear is meant the reciprocity of a multiplicity of elements whose activities inflect each other’s unfoldings mutually. Quasi-causality is a phenomenon of *mutual inclusion*. It is an agencying of mutual inclusion (its *machining*). It comes from the in-it-togetherness of disparate elements. Catalysis and resonance can be taken as models for quasi-causality. *Adequate ideas* supplement linear causality by resituating it in the complexity of the relational fields it limitatively expresses. But quasi-causality can also carry the connotation of *objective illusion* when it expresses in surface effects that produce a topological torsion on how their conditions of emergence and *import* appear, such that the movements occurring on that level can purport to be causally self-sufficient. †

**RACIAL CAPITALISM.** The distribution along racial lines of capitalism’s endemic production of inequality. Inequality is inextinguishable from the capitalist process. It is burned into the capitalist relation, whose very definition is the asymmetrical relation between those who have access to money as investment and those who only have access to money as a means of payment, and thus have to offer their life’s energies for exploitation by others who are in a position to skim off surplus-value from their labor to fold into their cycles of investment, always in a way that disproportionately appropriates the fruits of any increase in productivity to pad the coffers of the already

wealthy. The institution of slavery was a way of expropriating the life's activity of Africans, without even the input expense of a salary. It was used to fuel the "primitive accumulation" of capital, which refers to the extraction of monetary value and its concentration in the investment cycle. Capitalism requires that lines of inequality be produced. The implementation of slavery for turbo-charging primitive accumulation at a crucial stage in the early development of capitalism superimposed the line of inequality on the color line. Capitalism has been racial capitalism ever since, as it continues to exploit racial inequality in the "afterlife of slavery." The *Man-Standard* is an essential operator of racial capitalism, providing the standard for the differential valuation of the categories of person it racializes. From that angle, the Man-Standard is the very logic of Whiteness. The *person* itself under capitalism, as a *personification* of the capitalist process, is a derivative form of racial capital. Personifications of the capitalist process carry the mark of its unequal distributions in their real constitution, sunk into their *objective perspective* on potential (as a function of the angle at which their bodies are implanted in the relational field). Human capital (see *figure; personification*) produces and enforces racial inequalities in a fluid form that is all the more difficult to address. The flexibility and *entrée* necessary to surf volatility and draw a surplus-value of flow from it in order to glide one's character to the top of the wave and enjoy the foam on one's face is not equally accessible to all. The hard lines of the traditional Man-Standard fluidify, remaining just as oppressive but in a mode that is more plastic and harder to identify. This contributed to the myth of a "post-racial" society that had a brief heyday early in Obama's presidency, and is still subscribed to by some whites who live their lives as disavowed servants of reaction and its human-capitalist allies. Racial capitalism is symbiotic with the triage and graded potentiation of human bodies by *applications* of the made-to-purpose *abstract general ideas* of racial categories. See also MAN-STANDARD †

**REACTION.** The separation of the effect of an impinging encounter from the real (relational) conditions of that encounter, and the conservation of that effect in the form of a trace of the encounter whose reactivation reiterates the pain or anxiety associated with the impingement. Reaction prolongs the *pathic*, shortcircuiting its share of activation. In its developed forms, it fosters a self-diminishment of the body's powers of thinking-feeling by building upon the passive share of its experience of encounter, and figuring all encounter, and by extension all relation, as intrusive or threatening. In this respect, reaction is a formative element in the notion of the individual as sovereign subject ensconced in the self-defensive or immunitary fortress of a closed interiority. Epistemologically, reaction mis-takes causality by simplistically ascribing the most proximate body to the impingement as its sole author or agent, without inquiring into the nexus of powers that conditioned its actions in that context, nor how the reaction-ready impingeability that the receiving body brought to the encounter was contracted into that body's habitual existential posture as a tendency, nor how both of these might have been otherwise and could be otherwise in any future encounters that might transpire. This moralizing ascription of blame may entirely misidentify the impinging body's actual role no less than its potentials, under the misdirection of an *objective illusion*. Ethically, reaction mis-places *import* by bracketing the way in which this processual context, as a relational composition of powers of bodies to affect and be affected, constitutively includes margins of indeterminacy and alternative potentials that might offer room to maneuver. Reaction can develop into *ressentiment*, or move past it into backlash, in which the reaction reflexively pivots into what is felt to be an equal and opposite movement of revenge-fueled aggressive action against the putative causal agent, and/or into a cossetting of the urge toward such aggression to the point that it becomes

integrated into the person's mode of existence as a *character* trait. The moralistic ascription of blame rankles into the emotion of hatred. Under the influence of the *abstract general idea's* principle of resemblance, the hatred generalizes, prejudicially extending to all members of the perceived class to which the offending body belongs. The result is racism, misogyny, and other ingrained categorical hatreds whose status as *inadequate ideas* is flagrant to those not entirely under their reactive spell. Reaction, however, is a component in all lives. It cannot be controverted; it must be converted through its doubling by *adequate ideas*. This conversion is a becoming-active of thinking-feeling, countering its fealty to the pathic's passive share and the "sad" affects associated with it. Reflexive backlash is not a true becoming-active. It is reaction being "acted" – being roused out of its passivity into action, without any challenge to reaction's mis-placing of import, in a reflex acting out of the resentment-filled feeling of being wronged.<sup>22</sup> See also ERROR; PASSION †

**REACTION, REGIME OF.** When dynamics of reaction amplify to a systemic level and become self-reproducing across transindividual relays of *desire*. This occurs when words and images are so constituted as to envelop the traces of painful or anxiogenic encounters and disseminate their effects to third parties, beyond any given encounter where they may have been produced in situ. The words may be entirely fictional and the images synthetic. What matters is the affective strike-force carried by the reactivation of the disseminated traces. This strike-force is conveyed by *point-signs* indexing *objective illusions*, reiterating and reinforcing their mis-taking of causality and misplacing of *import*. A regime of reaction is the social reign of *error*. It is conditioned by a social/cultural milieu cultivating the priming of bodies' receptivity for the impact

22 Acted: Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, trans. Hugh Tomlinson (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006), 111-113.

of the point-sign's conveyed effects. This circulation of point-signs is borne by a discursive regime structured by *abstract general ideas* and their organizing principles of singularity-denying resemblance. At the limit, the discursive regime fosters widespread conspiracy thinking blooming into a systemic *stupidity*. It sows the seeds of contagions of violent, reflexive backlash actions against *ascribed* enemies. The regime of reaction, like every formation, has its own *conatus*. It is self-conducting as a transindividual tendency that *adjoins* bodies to itself and *inducts* them into its operations, more so than bodies control it. Its operativity is in excess over individual or even group intention. It is *machinic*: self-conducting. The effects it disseminates in-form the *collective individuations* of individual becomings correlated to one another through the distributed action of point-signs. The *character* pattern of the collective individuation constitutes *collective persons*. See also DESIRE †

**REAL DISTINCTION.** The mode of distinction pertaining to the difference of an emergent effect expressing a unity of dynamic *character* that is not reducible to its contributory elements and has a certain autonomy with respect to them. The effect is the manner of the elements' movement: the pattern or abstract "shape" of their movement across phases of unfolding. The same abstract shape can continue across a series of contexts of encounter along the same historic route in a continuous variation on itself. Or it can reiterate in discontinuous fashion in disparate contexts belonging to different historic routes. An example of a self-varying dynamic pattern continuing across a series of encounters is a *person*, or the *character* of the life of a *body*. The person is as really distinct from the body as the spin is from the top. Though they cannot be separated, neither can they be equated. The person is a self-abstraction of an unfolding movement, paralleling its encounters in an emergent expression of their pattern. An example of an effect carrying over across different contexts is the "same" musical phrase played by a French horn and by

a violin. Or the same rhythmic contour in a wave of water and a wave of inspiration in thought. Here, real distinction bears on an effect that is reiterable in different historic routes, with the capacity to migrate from one context to another in a discontinuous variation on its own theme. In each iteration, the effect is conditioned by and contingent upon a singular situation from which its emergence is inseparable. But at the same time, it lifts off into its own movement of nonlocal migration to reemerge in disparate contexts. The effect's migratory reiteration can form series (a musical series in the case of the French horn and violin) or skip from one series to another (as in the water wave and wave of inspiration). In all cases, real distinction pertains to "amodal" realities.<sup>23</sup> These are abstract dynamic shapes that are in excess of any given sensory modality or quality of experience. They cannot be said to be "in" any one modality, because they lift off from them and carry across their difference. They abstract or extract themselves from them, into their own feeling tone. Real distinction is imbricated with *modal distinction*. Modal distinction pertains to the difference between elements bound together in the unfolding of an occurrent relation in a *singular* context. Real distinction pertains to the difference of the emergent effect of such a joint unfolding: the effect that unfolds from the unfolding. Real distinction is a derivative of relational movement. It is crucial for the understanding of the relational reality of the *abstract*. A stream of thought is really distinct from the conditions of emergence from which it unfolds (most proximately, the neuronal movements of the brain, endogenously or exogenously produced, consequent to impingements on the body from the outside and from its own interior). A concept is also autonomous of its particular referents, in that has the amodal ability to extract itself from one stream of matter and jump nonlocally into another, skipping between different contexts and qualities of experience (for example, the concept of revolution jumping from

23 Daniel Stern, *The Interpersonal World of the Infant* (New York: Basic Books, 1985).

the English to the French to the American to the Russian). Thought exhibits both degrees of freedom of the amodal: serial and across series. When it jumps contexts, it tends to span them by taking them back up into a joint unfolding on its own supplementary level, constituting a *general* (not this or that revolution, but Revolution). The amodality of real distinction is the abstract matter of thought. †

**RESSENTIMENT.** The absorption of a body's capacities to affect and be affected into a world-filling feeling of generalized resentment. The resentment is so generalized that its object is the very world it fills, experienced as a bottomless reservoir of painfully and anxiogenic impinging others. Ascribed sets of specified enemies are penumbra'd by a ghost host of vague threatening presences floating everywhere. Ressentiment is maximally retentive of traces of "sad" encounters. It is marked by an inability to forget. "You do not know how to get rid of anything, you do not know how to get over anything, you do not know how to push anything back – everything hurts. People and things become obtrusive, events cut too deep, memory is a festering wound"<sup>24</sup> Because of this, resentment easily descends into nihilism, or inflates into paranoia. In both cases, it cultivates the passive share of the pathic, even to the point of paralysis. In spite of that (or perhaps because of the unsustainability of that condition), it can be incited by the point-signs of a *regime of reaction* to flip into reactive backlash issuing in acts of aggression against the ostensible agents of the perceived wrongs occasioning the suffering. Both the paralysis and the lashing out are strongly inflected by moral imputations of blame, and even attributions of evil. This infuses resentment with a certain religiosity of feeling, even where it is avowedly atheist, to the point that it can be considered a political theology. All *reaction* carries a degree of resentment. †

24 Friedrich Nietzsche, *Ecce Homo*, in *The Anti-Christ, Ecce Homo, Twilight of the Idols, and Other Writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005). p. 80-81.

**SCHIZ.** A cut of *decision* that induces a global readjustment of a *body's field of real potential*, in a kind of existential leap in place. The effect of the schiz resonates across all levels, in a catalysis of change modulating, to one degree or another, all of the ingredient elements' expressions in their relation to each other, and in their overall patterning emergent from that relationality. A schiz is *quasi-causal* in its nonlinear and nonlocal efficacy. If it cuts too deep, it may catapult the body's tendencies over the relative limit that held them within certain normative parameters, shaking it loose, or deterritorializing it, with potentially unsurvivable abruptness. Schizzing may be practiced as part of the method of *intuition*, mobilizing *adequate ideas* that offer prudential possibilities either for controlling the degree of deterritorialization, or throwing out a lifeline to enable a return to patterns of survivability. Schizzing can be a revolutionary practice. *Point-signs* effect schizzes. See also MICRO-SHOCK †

**SIGNIFYING REGIME.** A regime of discourse in which signs (words and images) refer prioritarilly to other signs and have an arbitrary relation to their referents. This makes for a continual signifying slippage of signs through the byways of metaphor and metonymy, powered by the *imagination* and tending at the limit toward *free indirect discourse*, which may foster a culture of conspiracy thinking. The signifying regime is constitutionally prone to *error* and the dissemination of *objective illusions*, and easily lends itself to *fascizing tendencies* and the formation of a *regime of reaction*. A regime of reaction under the signifying sign organizes itself around as center of signifiante. The center of signifiante is occupied by a preeminent person operating as a collective subject of enunciation and arrogating the production of all meaning effects to itself, arraying all sign emissions that matter in concentric circles around its apparent font of meaning. Each circle carries a distribution of mini-centers of signifiante that resonate with the center of signifiante, following a

principle of *faciality*. This produces a conformation of affected body's thinking-feeling that tend toward conformity with normative standards like the *Man-Standard*, while at the same time undermining them through the continued metaphorical-metonymic slippage of signs producing deformations of the standard (condensations and displacements of its *codings*). Formally, the signifying regime is allied with Saussurian linguistics as it moved into late twentieth-century cultural theory through structuralism. †

**SINGULAR.** That which is uniquely itself, incomparable to any other in its details; an inimitable manner of holding-together, incommensurable to any standard. Certain details composing the singular can be rounded off to produce a resemblance between it and an other, likewise trimmed. This operation of discounting details transforms the singular into a *particular*: a peer member grouped as a function of a produced common likeness with others, under the same class-name designating a category, or *abstract general idea*. A racialized individual is a discounted singular subsumed under a general racial category as sub-category of the human, reduced to standing for a particular representative of it and consequently subjected to the differential valuations of the *Man-Standard*. All things (in the widest sense, including movements, situations, and events) are singulars, outside and alongside their discounting as particulars. *Indexes* point to reacting singulars. *Common notions* are the basis for thinking singularity relationally. See also APPLICATION; INFRATHIN; COLLECTIVE SINGULAR †

**SINGULAR-MULTIPLE.** A synonym of singular, used as a reminder that all singulars are composed. They are composed of sub-elements that hold together and go together, not because they are subsumed by a general category, but because the activity of each is in the activity of all (their forces of existence, or powers to affect and be affected, are mutually modulating; their activities are in resonance). This relational interweaving of forces produces

a dynamic solidarity that allows them to count for one (which in turn enables them to be subsumed and curtailed by *abstract general ideas*). The composition goes “all the way down,” through nested layers with no final grounding, other than in potential. The composition can be divided, but not without changing in nature. The activity of the sub-elements is not silenced by their entering into solidarity. It becomes participatory. In its participation, it may be inflected or hybridized. It may pass unfelt at the higher levels of activity enveloping it, of which it nevertheless remains a constitutive element. If the composition is divided and changes in nature, the sub-elements may assert their autonomy, expressing their own *character* and following the unfolding of their own *conatus* with greater degrees of freedom. See also COLLECTIVE SINGULAR †

**SINGULAR-UNIVERSAL.** The *common notion's* understanding of the relational powers of bodies in encounter extended beyond a given situation to embrace any number of potential situations in their movement of variation, forming series and multi-situation nexuses. The understanding of the singular-universal is an approach in thought to the *plane of immanence*, or the world's field of emergent potential. Since the plane of immanence extends below the threshold of conscious thought and on the far side shades into the virtual, this understanding can never be fully explicit. The singular-universal is the third and most far-reaching kind of *adequate idea*. The way is prepared for it by the common notion and the *collective singular*, but it can only be attained through *intuition*, practiced as a method. The aim of the singular-universal is to bring thought into proximity with *pure potential*. †

**SITUATION.** See CONTEXT

**SPECULATIVE PRAGMATISM.** Another word for the method of *intuition*. †

**STRANGE INTRUDER.** The strange intruder is a term Peirce uses to describe the triggering of a experience in, to use a term of Whitehead's, an ingression from the outside. An impingement from an other strikes the *body* at the *infra-personal* level, shocking the body's activities into *pathic* suspense. At this level, the experience is at the threshold, not yet "mine." Its repercussions percolate up through *bare activity* into the emergent taking-form of the next pulse of process. At the pulse's wave-crest, an encapsulating feeling registers the effect: one that says (without words), "so that was me!" (the concluding punctuation of a *conjunctive synthesis*). But it was actually an other entering: a strange intruder. It is only in retrospect that "I" owns the experience as having been "me": a drop in the pool of my experience. "My" experience is a taking possession of other influences, integrated into a pulse of experience that comes to be me, as the impingement plays out into an episode in my life. "I" is always a retrospective effect of an encounter with alterity. Alterity – the experiential openness of the body to the incoming of other-impingements – that lies at the heart of the *person*. Since the experience of "me" dawns in alterity, it just takes a slight shift in focus to see me taking possession of other influence as the impingement of the other taking possession of me. The importance of the strange intruder for process thinking is that the mutual possession of I and other, of self and stranger, is the fundamental dynamic behind the advance of a body through the historic constituting its personhood. It is constitutive of all I am. The social bond is not a contract between particulars, it is a joint possession, at the level of emergence where it is not so easy even to say where you end and I begin. This suggests an ethics of alterity that is radically different from the distrust and punishment of the other that is played out in *regimes of reaction*. As Peirce puts it, "your neighbors are your self to a much greater degree than you would believe." This a rallying cry for an ethics and politics of *transindividuality*. The directions it

leads in are as radically different from the liberal tolerance of the other as from reaction. The other immanent to your becoming yourself is not the same kind of other you stand opposite to and deign to live with and let live with all-too-human magnanimity and rationality. It is the intimate strangeness your body opens up to, in a *passion* that becomes you. Neither does it operate in Levinas's face-to-face. It under-runs *faciality*. It operates from the nonpersonal pathic level of personing, in-coming at the cutting edge of experience, liminal to any claim of human ownership. †

**STRUCTURE.** A system of contasting terms that are subsumed under an *abstract general idea* as sub-categories under its umbrella. The terms do not simply form a logical set, but rather have the status of moving parts in a working system. A social formation characterized by this working system and dedicated to embodying, reproducing, and disseminating its constituent categories, can also be called a structure, giving the term a certain polysemy (referring both to the system of contrasting terms and their social embodiments). It should not be forgotten that such a formation is a limitative channelling of a larger field of potential, which means that the structure is never determining in the last instance. Its power is of *application* (overcoding). An example is a system of gender categories tributary to the *Man-Standard*, where the gender roles actively revolve around each other and are applied to bodies to co-produce certain co-adapted social and personal effects that are mutually held within normative standards enforced by social formations dedicated to that task (such as the traditional family). Once implanted in the social field, a structure is an aspect of the figurative, exerting a formative influence on *figures'* taking determinate form. Structuralism's assertion of structure as a set of diacritical differences (an empty matrix of differences defined only negatively as what they are contrastively not) is, from the processual point of view, a founding fiction. The level of immanence construed as diacritical by structuralism is understood

in process thinking as an *umbral union* of pure qualitative-relational potentials: pure relations carrying a germ of character. This resituating of the concept of structure within a metaphysics of potential extracts it from its structuralist limitation to the combinatory system of basically empty permutations. It gives *body* to structure. †

**STUPIDITY.** The systemic dissemination of *objective illusions*, and the full-fledged discursive *errors* they moult into, by a discursive regime formative of a *regime of reaction*. Stupidity is not fundamentally the attribute of an individual. It is something that *transindividually* possesses individuals through their *adjunction* to a regime of reaction. Stupidity is the acquired, and often fiercely defended, propensity to mis-take causality, and as a result to misplace the *import* of events (see *error*). It is the systematic missing of the event. It is not for lack of a will-to-truth or for lack of skepticism that bodies fall into stupidity. Full-fledged error, according to Susanne Langer, forms at the highest levels of signifying discourse. This makes stupidity a form of intellectuality, not in spite of its errors, but because of them. Stupidity is misdirected by the metaphoric/metonymic slippages of the *signifying regime* into mis-taken *ascriptions* of *character* and causal responsibility, underwritten by the logic of the *general abstract idea* and bolstered by the value judgments of the *Man-Standard*. Stupidity easily segues into conspiracy thinking due to uncertainty and ambiguity produced by the loose fit of abstract general ideas to the singularity of contexts and the effective texture of their relational causality. Stupidity is intensified by the fear of the *unspecified enemy*, whose ungraspable nature fosters a frantic bumbling for a purchase on the world's complexity that is captured by the signifying regime. Stupidity is an acquired deficiency of the ability to process complexity. It is the opposite of *belief in the event*: neglect of the event. †

**SURPLUS-VALUE OF FLOW.** An excess effect that spins off from a flow onto another level where it can enter other circuits

and acquire new efficacies. An example is the monetization of users' navigation on the internet through data mining. More broadly, capitalist surplus-value is a surplus-value of flow extracted from the turnover of goods and financial instruments. The surplus-value is not the profit taken, but the perpetual movement of capital increase that moves across the points of turn-over (sales, trades): an excess of investment power that snowballs across the economy.<sup>25</sup> Surplus-value of flow is not confined to technological or economic apparatuses. The *character* of an individual body as human capital is a surplus-value of flow spun off from the body's surfing the waves of volatility and uncertainty. A surplus-value of flow that is generated with no or minimal input of human labor (thanks, for example, to automation or robotization) is a "machinic surplus-value." A *habit*, individual or collective, is a naturally occurring machinic surplus-value spun off from the unfolding of *tendency* with no or minimal input of human intention. †

**TENDENCY.** A self-triggering and self-conducting movement following a characteristic arc that has a tendency to repeat, with variation. The tendency has no subject other than itself. It is a subjectless subjectivity, or agencying (a little *machine*). A body does not have tendencies. It is had by them, in much the same way a body is possessed of *habits*. The difference between a tendency and a habit is that a tendency can have a singular, emergent expression. Habit is a capture of tendency toward its reiteration. Tendencies are not mutually exclusive. They are mutually included in *bare activity*, where they struggle with one another or find accommodations among themselves, deflect or inflect, stunt or empower each other, as a function of a *conatus* each expresses. One tendency may issue victorious from this incipient commotion, or a number may fuse into an integral expression. The actual unfolding of a tendency

25 Massumi, 99 *Theses for the Revaluation of Values*.

is oriented. It is governed by an attractor or limit-pole that lures it forward through its arc. The limit-pole is never reached. It is a pure (ideal) destination. The unfolding always stops shy of it, while producing a variation on it. The attractor can be considered a *pure potential* serving as a lure providing an aim for the unfolding of an arc of activity. The evaluation of any encounter, event, or regime requires a processual diagnosis of the mix of tendencies in play, and the relative strengths of their respective conatuses under those given conditions. †

**THEY.** The distributed source of reported speech as relayed across communicational assemblages in such a way that a given statement cannot be ascribed to particular subject of enunciation. The “they” in this sense is not the third person, which in indirect speech is assignable to a particular person. The “they” is in the “fourth person.” The fourth person is the relay itself, as a *collective personing* (spun off from a *collective individuation* formed by *adjunction*). It is allied to Voloshinov’s “quasi-indirect discourse,” Deleuze’s “free indirect discourse,” and Blanchot’s “murmur” of language. The “they’s” collective personhood constitutes a *commind*. In a *regime of reaction*, the “they” figures as the subject of enunciation of conspiracy thinking. The “they” is a *machine* of expression. See also FREE INDIRECT DISCOURSE; SIGNIFYING REGIME †

**THINKING-FEELING.** The envelopment of *feeling in thought*, and of thought in feeling: in other words, their differential *mutual inclusion*. The seat of their mutual inclusion is *bare activity*. All unfoldings from bare activity express their mutual inclusion, in a specific ratio and to singular effect. There is no definite boundary line between thought and feeling. They are, however, informed by divergent orientations. They each have a “pure” state, or limit-pole to the tendencies governing them (in Deleuze’s vocabulary, the *cogitandem* or the only-thought, and the *sentendiendem* or the

only-felt). The degree to which a given experience is marked by its departure from the limit-poles, haunted by its distance from them, or feels the pull to attain or return to one or the other of them, determines its ratio of thinking-feeling. For feeling, the limit-pole of departure is the *pathic* “Firstness” of “pure experience”: the threshold of experience which all experience crosses in order to come into itself. The terminal “satisfaction” of *conjunctive synthesis* echoes the pathic Firstness in a way that enables it to operate prospectively as an attractor, governing a tendency of feeling. The after-effect of the pathic, and prospectively its allure, is expressed as the *intensity* of a thinking-feeling. For thought, the limit-pole of departure is the speculative surpassing of the given in a sudden prehension of potential spontaneously exploding into thought like a particle from the quantum void. This is inspiration, a breath of abstract *matter* condensing on the surface of experience. The terminus and attractor of thought is the *singular-universal* governing the formation of *adequate ideas* from a basis in this inspiration. But this is also the apex at which thinking and feeling fold back into each other. At their termini, they fold back under into each other. The degree to which a thinking-feeling integrates inspiration into its unfolding is its coefficient of creativity. Creativity loops back into feeling. It filters back through the pathic, acting in transit as a *quasi-causal* intensifier of the experience re-unfolding from it. This recursive loop between intensity and creativity, feeling and thinking, snaps in as its own attractor: the singular-universal idea that can be arrived at through an exercise of *intuition*. This co-operation has its own *conatus*. It is what leads Whitehead to say that the ultimate aim of thought is the intensification of experience – which, reciprocally, makes thought the aim of experience (this constitutes Whitehead’s “rationalism”). *Stupidity* de-intensifies experience and separates it from what its creativity can do. †

**THOUGHT.** 1) A sign operating in abstract *matter*, affecting and

being affected by other signs in an endless series of utterances, or emissions of signs, composing, at the limit, a *commind*; this movement insofar as stokes a pulse of thinking-feeling. 2) The surpassing of the given in a lived speculation on abductive potential, moving the goal-posts of the possible (in the sense of already known potentials ready and waiting for reiteration in much the same form as before); this movement insofar as it triggers a tendency toward the formation of a *singular-universal* idea (even if that movement is deviated or short-circuited and does not reach its apex). 3) The capture of 1) and 2) in the purported interiority of a supposedly separate subject, so that they are now experienced not as forms of process at work in the wide-open world but as the private contents of an interior life; this interiorization insofar as it fosters reflection (thinking-feeling circling within). *See also* ADEQUATE IDEA; INADEQUATE IDEA; REAL DISTINCTION †

**TRACE.** *See* ADEQUATE IDEA; ERROR; INADEQUATE IDEA; REACTION; REACTION, REGIME OF; UNFELT FEELING

**TRANSINDIVIDUAL.** A movement of *desire* that traverses bodies at the *infra-personal* level of *bare activity*, inducting them into a *collective individuation*. The transindividual effects an inclusive *disjunctive synthesis* of individual bodies and their *character* patterns. It “fields” them: weaves their tendencies together to form or reinforce an associated milieu (*full body*) of potential that in-forms each, but differentially. In the transindividual movement of desire, individual bodies are *differentially attuned* to one another and fall into resonance (meaning that they can affect and be affected by each other at a distance). In resonance, their individual thinking-feelings come into correlation (not conformity), in much the same way magnetized iron filings on a vibrating metal sheet correlate into emergent patterns. Traces of the movements of transindividual desire and the patterns they make are enveloped in words

and images at the discursive level, where they form a nonconscious *commind*. Transindividual resonance is a direct “communication of subconsciouses” (Simondon). †

**UMBRALE UNION.** The mode of differentiation obtaining on the *plane of immanence*. Umbral union is based on the idea that relation is preserved as it approaches the vanishing point of spatiotemporal distinction. A quick way of conceptualizing this is to imagine a line approaching a curve from a particular angle toward a tangent point. The line approaches the curve as a limit never reached. Because of the infinite divisibility of space, at whatever point of proximity it reaches, there will always be at least one other another point between it and the tangent point. The character of the line – its angle of approach – is preserved even as the distance diminishes infinitely. On its passage to the infinite limit, the distance becomes a “vanishing quantity” – so minimal as to no longer effectively count as an actual quantity. All that is left is a residue of character: the quality of the line. This qualitative residue is a pure relation (of a particular tangency). Make the line a tendency. Consider that tendencies are expressions of potential. Consider further that tendencies are not mutually exclusive. They mutually inflect, calling upon each other in the way that love and hate echo each other, nonlocally but in processual proximity. They can also combine to form new, emergent tendencies. Now think of this processual collusion funneling down, through *bare activity*, toward a limit of proximity where they would all intersect at a tangle of tangent points. Here, all tendencies – and more to the point, the potentials they carry – fall into an absolute proximity of *mutual inclusion* without their differences being erased. They still retain a minutest trace of *conatus*, so vanishing as to be no longer counted as actual activity. This makes them sub-microscopic germs of potential carrying a hint of character that may re-express under variation. No sooner do they fall into absolute proximity than their residual conatus

triggers their relational activity into unfurling anew. They pass back through bare activity, with a determination to be determined: to reappear in a surfacing of emergent qualities, conditioned by the precursor tendencies that led to that pivot, and by their tangential inflectings of each other. At the turn-around point of the limit of mutual inclusion, tendential potentials are qualitative-relational “radicles” conditioning the unfolding of pure relation into re-embodying in a determinate taking-form. The determinateness of the taking-form provides an affordance for quantification, but it retains a singular character that is generically and genetically tied to the precursor tendencies it reiterates. Radicles are “dark precursors” of what comes emergently to light.<sup>26</sup> The absolute proximity of the radicles to each other in their mutual inclusion can be figured as an infinite movement of potentials into and out of each other at infinite speed, forming a super-topological figure of tendential arcs falling in with each other out of the actual coordinates of space and time. Since umbral union is infra-spatiotemporal, it lies at, or just beyond, the limit of human understanding. It is approachable through *intuition*, but never reachable. Its function is to groundlessly ground the thinking of process, not in the determinations of *structure*, but in the openness of the qualitative-relational unfolding of expressions of potential in continuous variation. The *plane of immanence* it composes is the ultimate of *modal metaphysics*. †

**UNFELT FEELING.** Feelings that do not express their own *characters* at the global level of an individual or person. They are still feelings because they “take account” of influence of others in the patterning of their tendencies on their own level, and are in turn taken account of by others on that level and, through their production of a supplement of surplus-value, on adjoining levels. They are still felt in a way at the highest level, where pulses

26 Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 119-24.

of feeling culminate in the feeling tone of an overall *conjunctive synthesis*. But they are felt there only in effect: through the formative contribution they made at other levels to the relational texturing of the character of the overall occasion. In other words, they figure as traces. Derivatives of these unfelt feelings' character patterns are positively integrated into the occasion's composition, even though they are not expressed in their own right. They belong to the implicate, *infra-personal*, order of that pulse of experience. There is another kind of unfelt feeling that contributes precisely by being excluded from the composition of the occasion. These are "negative prehensions" (Whitehead). These also belong to the implicate order of the experience's real constitution, but with a twist. They are actively excluded by the occasion as it snaps into its own taking-form because their expression would work contrary to the tendential arc of the occasion's unfolding to its culmination and finding "satisfaction" as an achieved pulse of experience. The affective form of their exclusion, however, leaves a trace in the composition of the experience. Their character, or "subjective form," is positively ex-included. All occasions of experience practice negative prehension as a necessity for their coming to fruition. Tendencies have to be taken up selectively, and potentials have to be filtered, otherwise nothing will take form, no culmination will be reached, and the moment will be still-born in its incipency. It will remain mired in *bare activity*, overfull with a ferment of contrasting potentials, many of which may prove to be actually incompatible. Limitation is necessary for taking-form. But the lesson of negative prehension is that limitation is not the same thing as negation. Quite the opposite, ex-inclusion is necessary precisely because of the infinite surfeit of potential in the world, immanent to every arising. For something to give, something has to be taken away. In this sense, limitation is the enabler of creativity and emergence. This is a way of making openness of opportunity a fundamental metaphysical principle (see *optive matter*), deviating

from the sense to which it is all too easy to fall prey that the kinds of limitations imposed by the *Man-Standard* and *regimes of reaction* – normative rather than creative limitations on potential – are so deeply entrenched in world process that they are all-determining and cannot be dislodged. Susanne Langer’s concept of “objective feeling” is a way of asserting the reality of unfelt feelings. There are also unfelt feelings taking account of each other in *umbral union* on the *plane of immanence*. These cannot be felt by nature, since they subsist in abstract *matter* at the absolute limit of its expressibility. They do, however, abstractly in-form what does come to expression, as their relational-qualitative forms are called to rise through the plane of consistency and into expression through what Whitehead calls “conceptual prehension.” A conceptual prehension is an operation of *intuition* directly *abducting* potentials held in reserve in the immanent order of abstract matter. †

**UNSPECIFIED ENEMY.** The ever-presence of an enemy on the horizon or lurking in the shadows that may irrupt into action at any moment, in a form and at a time and place that is unpredictable. The unspecified enemy feeds an atmosphere of fear, which in turn fosters the implementation of and acquiescence to security measures, turbocharged by *reaction*, that can only hope to have an effect if they endeavor to match the ever-presence and irruptibility of the enemy. The only way to address the unspecified enemy as such is through preemption: acting on threats “before they emerge.” How something can be acted on before it emerges is as much a metaphysical as a political question, and obliges power mechanisms to take on a metaphysical aspect. Since the realm of the already stirring but not yet emerged is *bare activity*, preemptive mechanisms have to learn to address that field of emergence, and prime the becomings that unfold from it in ways that channel the potentials it harbors into controllable forms, effectively usurping them. This amounts to endocolonization of becoming – the last imperialist

frontier. The *Man-Standard* has a key role, in orienting preemptive action toward categories of persons that it deems sub-standard and likely to pose a threat, in particular Muslim bodies, or in the transfer of preemptive strategies from the overseas battleground of the “war on terror” to policing on the domestic front, Black bodies. But the Man-Standard also presents a potential blockage for strategies of preemption, since the whole issue of the unspecified enemy is that its threat has not yet emerged, so it has no pre-assignable character or qualities. Reliance on the racist presuppositions of the Man-Standard, in their traditional pre-categorizing form, has to be tempered by new modes of *dividual* profiling that take into account the metamorphic potential of emergence. The endocolonization of becoming, in the service of *regimes of reaction*, operates at the same emergent level as practices of resistance attempting to challenge power formations and shortcircuit reaction with *adequate ideas*. This presents a challenge to political theory and practice on the left, and to the ways in which the left-right binary has been formatted coming out of the social movements of the 1960s. †

**WHITENESS.** See MAN-STANDARD; RACIAL CAPITALISM<sub>1</sub>