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Abstract

This thesis is Deleuzean-Guattarian study of women’s expressions of potentially transformative worldings imbricated in the fourfold assemblages of intentional, or designed, communities. The women’s expressions of community reach beyond intention or design to suggest community as the events of productive desire. They fall in love with worlds and become worthy of the event of such worlds and with the potential of transformative worldings. Intentional communities as assemblages of desiring production are continuously producing and transforming worlds to fall in love with. The women fall in love with the worlds of other people, gurus, some notion of home, place, spirituality and ecowork. Their love affairs underpin their counter-actualisations and creations of a sustainable life; one that is unthinkable without the spiritual. Such a life is not about intentional communities, as such, but about the relations within the processes of potentially transformative worldings. A Deleuzean-Guattarian sense of positive, productive desire underpins the ways the women in this study construe the multiplicity of and serendipitous nature of the communities that frame their worlds. In this way, each women becomes a small circuit breaker, creating and transforming ‘worlds’ in the pragmatic conditions of the wider desiring machine. However, this thesis suggests that there is more to a Deleuzean analysis of transformative worldings given that such processes also interconnect with the unintended, aleatory nature of communities as ecologies where women are implicated as part of a series of becomings, or transformative worldings, within assemblages that engender those ‘worlds’. Duration inflects all ethnographic research, given that the time of the research, the time of the memory implicated in and vital for such research provides the sensations/forces that produce the multiplicity of its elements in the transformational capture of the thesis.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION: EXPRESSING BORDER WORLDS

Writing a thesis about women in intentional communities:
an intensified ecology of relations

Intensities emerge in the ‘middle’ of extensive relations.¹

Women drift, trickle, storm and flee into the border worlds of intentional communities. They come alone, with children, partners, lovers, husbands and they stay and they go. If there is a single reason why women choose to live in intentional communities it is because they are making love with the possibilities of other worlds. What presupposes such acts of love is the desire for other worlds, where spirituality and sustainability become entangled in an immanent politics of transformation.

A border world, such as an intentional community, is a complex event; a machinic assemblage that emerges from virtuality, where the virtual is the full range of potentiality, the ‘what-ever’, or \( n \) potential, for any world. Such worlds, as assemblages, are multiplicities, which shape ‘semiotic flows, material flows, and

---

¹ ‘Latitude is made up of intensive parts falling under a capacity and longitude of extensive parts falling under a relation’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 283). Deleuze and Guattari write of worlds to fall in love with, worlds of intensities/capacities and extensities/relations, traversed in an infinity of ways. I always think there is a lot of falling in such a mix.
social flows’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, pp.22-23). The worlds of intentional communities are a series of functions, diagrams of power, political technologies, and politics or pragmatics. They are a series of maps, ‘or rather several superimposed maps’ (Deleuze 1988a, p. 41). Such maps – yoga, permaculture, ecofeminism – intensify and shape the ways that women move through a territory, and superimposes their actions and passions on the milieus that they both inhabit and create.\(^2\) I argue throughout this thesis that such formations are an ecology of relations, where the relations between forces, or bodies (Colebrook, 2005a, p. 12), are always more than social, political and cultural matters and concern all of life. This is what Deleuze and Guattari call chaosmos or virtuality or the being/becoming of everything that existence can be.\(^3\) In an ecology of relations, nature subtends and intermingles with

\(^2\) When intentional communities are seen cartographically they incorporate bodies and states of affairs of the assemblage, which includes regimes of signs or collective enunciations of such states of affairs and incorporeal effects as well as territories where ethnologies occur so that the most important aspects of worlds as assemblages are their transformative or transversal moments (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, pp. 370-371). Cartographies give us Foucauldian diagrams or Deleuze and Guattari’s abstract machines, which engender ‘the map of relations between forces, a map of destiny or intensity, which proceeds by primary non-localizable relations and at every moment passes through every point, ‘or rather in every relation from one point to another’... the diagram acts as a non-unifying immanent cause that is coextensive with the whole social field: the abstract machine is like the cause of the concrete assemblages that execute its relations; and these relations between forces take place ‘not above’ but within the very tissue of the assemblages they produce (Deleuze, 1988a, pp. 36-37).

\(^3\) ‘Chaos is not the absence of order but rather the fullness or plethora that, depending on its uneven speed, force, and intensity, is the condition both for any model or activity and for the undoing and transformation of such models or activities. This concept of chaos is also known or invoked through the concepts of: the outside, the real, the virtual, the world, materiality, nature, totality, and the cosmos, each of which is a narrowing and specification of chaos from a particular point of view. Chaos cannot be identified with any one of these terms, but is the very condition under which such terms are capable of being confused, the point of their overlap and confusion’ (Grosz, 2008, p.26). In terms of the milieu itself Deleuze and Guattari state: ‘Every milieu is vibratory, in other words, a block of space-time constituted by the periodic repetition of the component. This the living thing has an exterior milieu or materials, an interior milieu of composing elements and composed substances, an intermediary milieu of membranes and limits and an annexed milieu of energy sources and actions-perceptions. Every milieu is coded, a code being defined by periodic repetition; but each code is in a perpetual state of transcoding or transduction....The notion of the milieu is no unitary: not only does the living thing continually pass from one milieu to another; they are essentially communicating. The milieus are open to chaos, which threatens them to exhaustion or intrusion. Rhythm is the milieu’s answer to chaos. What chaos and rhythm have in common is the in-between – between two milieus, rhythm-chaos- or chaosmos (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 345). For another Deleuzean definition of chaos see, Toscano (2005, p. 43) who sees chaos as ‘virtual totality where all intensive differences are contained – ‘complicated’ but not ‘explicated’ – is equivalent to the ontologically productive affirmation of the divergence of series.’
every other element; it is all of the elements. In this sense, ecology incorporates not only a biological life form with its habits and mode of life, but also ‘the map of relations between forces’ (Deleuze, 1988a, pp. 36-37).

Intentional communities potentially offer a positive, political or pragmatic response to the problems of mainstream communities and societies. Such problems are made visible in the coalescence of forces in a series of singular points that become bundled together as the problems of community, spirituality and sustainability. Singular points subtend the whole of potential for the problems of any given context and it is from them that we are able to create solutions, such as intentional communities. Such communities both draw up the boundaries of community, spirituality and sustainability and offer a response to the issues of the day, whatever they may be. In the chaotic, uneven, uncaring, unequal, inequitable, unsustainable, godless present, intentional communities are perceived,4 by adherents, as collective, sometimes communal, cooperative, caring, sharing, intentionally designed, residential institutions with mutual, core values, specific visions and chosen names and systems of government. Such communities range from rural ecovillages and communes to urban cohousing and gated communities and all of the forms in between. They can be closed, private, utopian or open and intensely political, with service, educational and outreach programs. People, projects, issues, and ideas fill such places. The designs of intentional communities are intensely political in the sense that they fit the circumstances and the times. The state of the world is what drives such designs. Late capitalism is a faceless, bodiless, heartless, destructive monster always at the edges of

4 All of these qualities and styles of life appear in various sections of the Fellowship for Intentional Communities website www.ic.org. They are also replicated in much of the literature and on the websites of intentional communities
the observing, protective, caring circles drawn around each intentional community. Designing and drawing a circle of protection is the work of the refrain (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 343) and the political work of magical spiritual ritual (Pignarre & Stengers, 2011). Experimenting with new modes of existence or new techniques is the work of intentional communities as both a challenge to everything that late capitalism might become and a way to chart some of the processes of survival.

The event of intentional communities is incarnated in bodies – including non-human bodies – but its importance is lost if we do not double the actualisation through various counter-actualisations, which in turn, ‘limits, moves, and transfigures it’ (Deleuze, 1990, p. 161). The actualisations and counter-actualisations of intentional communities are those processes where what is sayable in regimes of signs, and what is visible in regimes of light, are produced.

Many ‘myths’ surround intentional communities but these are challenged by research into intentional communities (Metcalfe, 1995, 2003a, 2003b), ecovillages (Parr, 2009), through online projects such as the Fellowship of Intentional Communities and the Global Ecovillage Network and in the very middle of their expression, ‘as a potentiality that is brought into being only as it acts or exists’ (Colebrook, 2005a, p. 8). Thus, this project begins in the middle of the becomings of intentional communities that are produced through the forces of the outside, made visible in the actualising and counter-actualising actions and passions of women, in the context of micropolitics of existence.
Difference and duration

Rather than see intentional communities as simply microformations or experimental laboratories or small engines of designed, sustainable change, located at the edges of society – and they can be seen as all of these things and more – I want to suggest that every intentional community offers a startlingly varied, world-filled cosmos. Of course, each community is created in a set of circumstances, which can be generally designated as late capitalism (Mandel, 1975) as a capitalism which continuously invents ways to recuperate ‘what it deals’ with for ‘its own requirements’ and immediately ‘externalises’ the consequences ‘or defines them as the potential matter for new operations’ (Pignarre & Stengers, 2011, 16). Such a context is enveloped within radical empiricism of the given as always more than the description of lived experience of the “‘heres” and “nows’” of community, relations of ecology or feminism, or an overarching capitalism. In the doubling of the readings of signs in an apprenticeship,5 by the women and by me – each as the other’s intercessor – their intentional communities, sustainability and spirituality, emerge as the continuous folding and refolding of events, and states of affairs in a love affair that express

---

5 In Proust and Signs (2008, p. 4) Deleuze argues that ‘Vocation is always predestined with regard to signs.’ One becomes something ‘by becoming sensitive to the signs’ of whatever it is that emits signs. Deleuze suggests that for the carpenter it is the signs of wood – the conditions provided by the point of view of the wood and the carpenters perceptions of the conditions of the wood – and their intermingling in the being-of-becoming. What I want to suggest that it is the signs of community, the signs of sustainability, the signs of the environment that are created and deciphered as regimes of signs that produce becomings-other in empirical conditions that are to do not with representing a material world – a woman, a community but rather their assembled conditions of existence as they are expressed in such relationally invented worlds.
worlds. Such is the Deleuzean ontology of transcendental empiricism that is employed throughout this thesis (Deleuze, 2004, p. xix, pp. 68-69, pp. 90-100).

It also forces thinking about not just ‘the risk of confronting’ the ‘sorcery of capitalism’ – or with the risk and the everyday reality and contradictions of being captured as subjected souls, produced to mindlessly ‘appropriate’ and fiddle while the earth is destroyed – but also a getting a hold of a counter-sorcery, which embraces the rituals of ‘yearning’ and ‘learning to give thanks’ (Pignarre & Stengers, 20011, p. 17, p. 45, p. 48). Such a way of thinking, outside of the ‘rational’, confronts the sorcerers of capitalism, challenging them, through counter-sorcery and engaging with ‘things in their wild state’ (Deleuze, 2004, p.xix; Colebrook, 2005c, p. 205), where singular flows are ‘semiotic flows, material flows, and social flows, simultaneously’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 25), always being shaped by aleatory forces and in need of explanation of the given. Explanations of community, ecological relations and women cut into those flows, becoming recodings of whatever effects the creation of any intentional community, where the complexity of each community holds the key to the universe, rather than the reverse (Tarde, 1893/2012, p.37).

Intentional communities express the cosmos as a mixture of science, design or artificial construction – on this earth – in their many assembled worlds and correspondingly they effectuate and express formations of subjectivity and becoming,

---

6 A science of the sensible is how Deleuze defines transcendental empiricism. It is ‘a contradictory flux, or a rhapsody of sensation’ and the sensible is ‘that which can only be sensed, the very being of the sensible: difference, potential difference and difference in intensity as the reason behind qualitative diversity. It is in difference that movement is produced as an “effect”, that phenomena flash their meanings like signs’ (Deleuze, 2004, p. 68).
as movements and tendencies in duration (Deleuze, 1988, pp. 31-33). Becoming can be a total dissolution or rupture, an infinitive, incorporeal event or a movement between the two (Lundy, 2012, p. 3). The movement between the two suggests not simply the questioning of the state of affairs but a flight that creates a nomadic, transformational subjectivity-in-process and in that process undoes the order of things and opens the way to slip between and into becoming-other (Driscoll, 2000, p. 75, pp. 76-83).

Further, I take intentional communities to be what I call ecologies of relations – what Probyn, (2011) calls a ‘rhizo-ethology of bodies’ – that include both ecologies of desire, of passions and beliefs imbricated in all of their overlapping, differing assemblages. ‘Assemblages are passional, they are compositions of desire.’ Desire ‘effectuates’ different assemblages and generates different passions (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, pp. 440-441). Desiring, compositional assemblages then, bring together an ‘unknown multiplicity’ of disparate things and aleatory relations – where a network of exterior, not interior, relations produce assemblages out of a territory shaped from the folding in of the outside (Deleuze 1988a) – are exterior to their terms, which produces an array of effects in a given context. In this sense, each intentional community is rendered different through the varying connections or folding in, of

---

7 Intentional communities are not conventional institutions but forms of resistance or subversion. They are a paradox in that they are particular inventions of association and cultural convention, which belong to the ‘indissoluble complex’ of society and nature, and here Deleuze adds the caveat that ‘we cannot reduce society to nature’ (Deleuze, 1991, p. 46). In this sense, institutions – of property and experiment, which satisfy whatever needs/drives are expressed; for community, spirituality, consolation, sustainability. An institution ‘being the model of actions’ satisfies and constrains within the particular model of community of each community – this spirituality, this sustainability, this community structure (Deleuze, 1991, p. 47). However, institutions are also spatio-temporal dynamisms (Deleuze, 2004, p. 267, always becoming, always open to the possibility of launching into the unknown. Institutions, then, presuppose assemblages. ‘The social is profoundly creative, inventive and positive’ (Deleuze 1991, p. 46) and as such cannot be contained, contractually, technologically within, say, a gated community without unintended consequences. For example, militarization creates resistance and a subversive response given the reciprocal nature of social action.
earth, territory, technologies, ideas and people, into their assemblages. The consequences of the desire for collectivity are expressed in an array of assemblages, making, enveloping, and expressing the territories that are intentional communities. Intentional communities are modes of multiple existences, on what Deleuze and Guattari call the plane of immanence. It could be argued that there is a greater focus on the environment within many intentional communities and that there is a collective desire to act for and with the environment. Such communities become a being-for and a being-with the environment. They practise sustainability with a focus on living lightly on the earth as part of ecologies. As Smith (2007, p. 68) argues, ‘What an ethics of immanence will criticise, then, is anything that separates the mode of existence from its powers of acting – and what separates us from our power of acting are, ultimately, the illusions of transcendence.’

Such propositions are predicated on an ecology being an ecology of relations and so being always and already so much more than a science of an unchanging Nature. More to the point, such an ecology is untimely, organic and inorganic, unnatural, passionate and insistent, yet, paradoxically an ecology that drives a politics of livability. Intentional communities stand for politics of livability, which includes constituents beyond the human, their ‘affiliates and commensals’ (Latour, 2010, p. 477). Rather than the territory or places of intentional communities – and their static, stratified meanings – subtending a politics of livability it is the pragmatic movements toward an experimental deterritorialisation of the earth, community and the self that

---

8 Affiliates and commensals meaning the kinds of beneficial or non-harmful parasitical relations that can exist in biology or socially.
produce a sustainable life. Pragmatic politics takes up all manner of ecological relations and formations that drive livability, rather than create a utopia.

Of course, the worlds of intentional communities have a genealogy that implicates the origins of the first Buddhist spiritual communities, or Sanghas, the communities of the Essenes, Christian communities and monasteries and a variety of other spiritual and millenarian incarnations over time. Importantly, however, such a genealogy of origins requires a Deleuzean twist on Nietzsche, to show the ‘forces’, such as ‘beliefs, feelings, and thoughts... given our... style of life’, or our ‘modes of existence’ (Deleuze, 1983, pp. 1-2).\(^9\) Intentional communities in the contemporary world are different, even in the midst of their spiritual and millenarian incarnations. They are the outcomes of a mixture of planned and aleatory connections and disjunctions that arise out of and subtended by contemporary forms of capitalism. The many types of intentional community, such as spiritual communities, communes, co-housing communities, and ecovillages, are situated within a variety of geographies and landscapes, from rural locations to city neighbourhoods. Intentional communities have historically been planned communities that emerge from disenchantment with the dominant religious or political culture. They incorporate a strong desire for transformation, often expressed as a better life – hence the sense of utopia as the paradoxical no place, good place in Thomas More’s *Utopia* – and, in contemporary terms, are much more likely to be planned in some way, or designed in conjunction with a series of social, cultural, economic and natural environments. Each and every

\(^9\) Foucault’s (1980, p. 139) sense of genealogy suggests also that it is not a linear or teleological progression and that power is implicated in the series of palimpsests that prevent intentional communities in the present being mimetic of some version of the past. Genealogy, in Foucault’s terms, appears even in absence suggesting that each intentional community, even though it deals with contemporary environmental crises does so given its own ‘love, conscience, instincts’ and their repetition and difference.
environment and micro-environment is political and open to transformation. In this sense, the political, or the circumstances underpinning any event, creates potentially transformative worlds and becomings-other.

The contemporary analyses of community by Nancy (1982/1991), Blanchot (1988), Agamben (1993) and Lingis (1994), and also that of communality and friendship by Derrida (1978; 1987; 1988), shape significant discussions in current community studies and have informed the creation of this study, although they are not drawn into the analysis in any explicit way. In truth, the work of Deleuze and Guattari suggested a different trajectory and encouraged different perceptions of the empirical worlds of intentional community.  

This thesis explores the ways that intentional communities emerge from the events of transformational worlding, brought into view through the stories of the women. Such worlds are part of wider experimental assemblages, often seen by their proponents as the border or creative-edge-worlds that challenge global capitalism with more sustainable modes of life. Yet, this thesis is not a claim for the inevitable end of capitalism through the creation of sustainable intentional communities. Rather, this thesis is a series of expressions that implicate the desire for connections to alternative, experimental worlds, where their ongoing creation occurs not only through the desire for change that is both pragmatic and spiritual but through the desire to live in a

---

10 Not ‘resistance to immanence’ and thus resistance itself as a transcendence beyond the sacred as Nancy (1991, p. 35) suggests about an immanent community that is the violence of community and the violence of subjectivity but resistance to any sense of an enclosed, static community of capitalism, or indeed any other kind of community, to a whatever of community. Deines (2006) also discusses this sense of resistance and community from a Nancean and Derridean perspective but such a discussion occurs outside of the purvey of this thesis. Rather the place of resistance is not a location as such but a localizing process and such a localizing process occurs, in a Deleuzean sense, on the plane of immanence as does all transcendence.
different manner and to create different *styles* and intensities in the recoding territorial songs and dance (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, pp. 352-353; Colebrook, 2005a, p. 12; Levan, 2007, pp. 54-56) that mark and shape any intentional community. Such community styles intensify the politics, or pragmatics of sustainability, spirituality, and community. In this sense, intentional communities are the making and unmaking or the actualisations and counter-actualisation of experimental border worlds.

The presumption of utopia within intentional communities from those using Deleuzean theory is predicated either on their rhizomatic and dynamic nature, linked to social movements (Schehr, 1997) or their ‘utopian visions’ that inspire social movements (Anderlini-D’onofrio, 2005). These texts provide a strong analysis of intentional communities as utopian. However, the background research I carried out on intentional communities presented no utopian social formations. I talked about it to various people across the communities but after a first response, which in most cases were versions of laughing denial, serious discussion suggested community was – a mostly – joyful struggle or something that ebbed and flowed or fuzzy aggregates of incompossible elements. Communities are what Latour (2010, pp. 473-474) calls ‘compositions’, which are ‘built from utterly heterogeneous parts that will never make a whole, but at best be a fragile, reversible, and diverse composite material.’ This thesis presents a different perspective to that of Intentional communities as utopias and argues that such communities as both compositions and a ‘proliferation of possible worlds’ (Alliez, 2006, p. 166). Possible worlds are connected to the politics or pragmatism of the cry ‘another world is possible’ (Pignarre & Stengers, 2011, p. 4, pp. 16-22) that suggests a politics of community that entails all of the ‘pragmata’ of
the event of community. I suggest that intentional communities are about experimental compositions which produce new modes and new styles of existence.

Ecological relations stretch beyond perceptions of the organic (rafts of plastic in the oceans, sewage as fish food, satellites in space) and life is more than the ‘organic strata’ or the organism. As Deleuze and Guattari (2004, p. 554) point out ‘the organism is that which life sets against itself in order to limit itself, and there is life all the more intense, all the more powerful for being anorganic.’ Ecological relations implicate social, material and semiotic flows and their encounters as they enter into conjugations of flows or connections, that create ‘knots’ or ‘points with several dimensions’ (Serres, 1967, cited in Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 241) both composing and decomposing them. Furthermore, such relations are implicated in the apparatuses of capitalism seen as that ever-transforming, decoding, deterritorialising, singular mode of production and its continual adaptation to its limits. Within capitalism what is presupposed is not the earth as its precondition of existence but the earth as part of its forces of ‘miraculated’ production, always under the threat of dissolution or of reaching its limits, always seemingly incorporating and recuperating the forces that escape, predicated on mobile and adapting relations of production, distribution and consumption always open to decoding or cutting flows and capitalist axioms – the hijacking and commodification of sustainability (Parr, 2009), gated communities, feminism, the reproduction of racism, the creation of an international working class –
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11 Utopia as paradoxically perceived as ‘embodied utopia’ presents a view that utopia can only ever be a potentiality, as a placeless, unrealisable, spatio-temporal dynamism becoming out of the virtual and duration (Grosz, 2001). There might therefore be utopian moments but these are more like ruptures in the given and not necessarily perceived or embraced by community members and hard to perceive as an ‘outsider’.
12 For Deleuze and Guattari (1983, p. 10), following Marx, the presuppositions of capitalism are the divine gift of the body of the earth, always already mediated by the axiomatic; the axioms of the market, free labour, circulating capital and these axioms are seen where ‘Forces and agents come to represent a miraculous form of its own power’. 
always mediated through an aleatory encounter of ecological relations of the forces of production, where the earth as an ‘immanent cause’ is always obscured in its effect. The earth is both an ‘abstract machine’ and a ‘concrete assemblage’ and as a force of all modes of production – within whatever community is created – those forces are ‘virtual, potential, unstable, vanishing and molecular’ defining ‘only the possibilities of interaction’ unless ‘they enter into a macroscopic whole capable of giving form to their fluid matter and their diffuse function’ (Deleuze, 1988a, p. 37). Intentional communities, lots, houses, regenerated forests, roads, cafes and invisible structural elements all give form to the forces of community and to the yearning for collective solutions. Intentional communities are one form for structuring a politics of livabilty.

**Desiring Machines**

Deleuze and Guattari’s work allows analysis of productive, positive, new forms and contents of the assemblages of feminisms and feminist analyses that intensify and extend connected lines of flight and conjugate them into the production of social life, or flows in the desiring assemblages that are intentional communities. Their work eschews the negative – desire as lack – and embraces positive productivity of desire for spirituality and sustainability that acts, nonetheless, as a double-edged sword of deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation. For, desire ‘is never separable from complex assemblages that necessarily tie into molecular levels, from microformations already shaping postures, attitudes, perceptions, expectations, semiotic systems, etc.’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 237). Lines of flight are entangled with the desire for new social forms. The connections enfolded in desire suggest that, it ‘is never undifferentiated instinctual energy, but itself results from a highly developed, engineered setup rich in interactions: a whole supple segmentarity that processes
molecular energies and potentially gives desire a fascist determination’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 237). Intentional communities fall under such notions of desire. The very intensity of desire for spirituality and sustainability can, when such things are too closely engineered, can give rise to new versions of normative, structuring or stratifying order-words (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, pp. 118-122) – practise permaculture, be a devotee – which produce resistance or flight, yet always open of the other response to order-words which is that of passage or passwords aligned with an affirming, creative politics of livability.

Desire is thus inextricably intermingled with complicated assemblages that are in turn engendered out of desire and its productive connections and experimental becomings-other.13 14 Such complications and microformations as intentional communities are ‘engineered set ups’ that shapes the ‘supple segmentarity’ of the women’s stories of the events of community that engender their becomings-other. Although Deleuze and

13 Becoming-woman is a contentious concept or idea within feminism (Jardine, 1985; Braidotti, 1991, 1994, 2003; Goulimari, 1999; Shukin, 2000) that has provoked debate. Indeed, there is a history of struggle against becoming-woman over the past decades. Deleuze and Guattari offer a challenge for feminism concerning the ‘woman question’ – they turned away from woman as the exchange value of, or as implicated in relations of violence between, men in the Oedipal formulation (now crushed into the ‘nuclear family’), and away from man as the universal subject, to a becoming-woman. 14 Goulimari (1999) for example offers a critical analysis of Jardine’s and Braidotti’s dismissal of becoming-woman. Braidotti (1991, p. 119, also cited in Goulimari, 1999, p. 111) conflates becoming-minoritarian with becoming-woman and argues that the endpoint of becoming minoritarian is a ‘multiple desire’ that will ‘finally result in women’s disappearance’. Goulimari (1999, p. 97) argues that both Jardine and Braidotti turn to Irigaray and sexual difference as a solution to the issues that are raised by becoming woman. Goulimari is concerned that is those very ‘multiple desires’ and their expressions connected to more than sexual difference that are being excluded by feminists such as Braidotti and Jardine. Goulimari also calls Braidotti to account for her exclusionary stance in terms of other minoritarian movements. However, rather than feminism incorporating all of those movements I would argue that becoming minoritarian is nomadic, local and singular and that such becomings might pass through a feminist becoming minoritarian but that, following Deleuze and Guattari, all becomings pass through the singularities opening up ‘divergent worlds’ and becoming-woman on the way to becoming imperceptible (Colebrook, 2006, p.217). My work in this thesis has led me a position closer to Claire Colebrook (2002, 141), who opens the way for becoming-woman to be ‘away from the closed image of man’ and into a becoming that ‘if there is another mode of becoming then becoming lacks any single ground or subject’. In my reading of her reading any self is open to forces beyond the human and to becomings that are beyond the human.
Guattari indicate the problems of the globalising (schizophrenic) capitalist socius on every level – that includes the majoritarian, or molar, relations of gender and sex and other social and cultural markers, such as race, ethnicity and community – they also insist that the connections and conjugations of desire of molar segments with molecular energies enables the unfolding potential for metamorphosis, within microformations.

Becomings-other are implicated in desiring machines, or assemblages, where the virtuality of the embryo and its immense capacity for movement and change in a process of creation is framed in a process of continuous variation (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 111). It is virtuality, as ‘pure spatio-temporal dynamisms’ (Deleuze, 2004, p. 267) or a becoming before it is a being or a species, genus or kind. Actualisation from the potential, the virtual, then, is the process that precedes the determination of subjectivities simply predicated on notions of sex and gender. Creation is thus the process of becoming-other through movement in duration. Movement depends on what the body can do rather than what the body is, although what a body is, and the characteristics of a body, delineate what is possible (the lack of wings on a body generally indicates that flight, without added technology, is not possible). However, possibility does not delineate the potential for actualisation nor counter-actualisation. Subjectivity emerges as a doubling, or a folding in of the outside, with the process of transformational actualisation or production (Deleuze, 1991, p. 81) or becomings-other, generated in flowing, rhizomatic assemblages.

Movement is also a movement towards a future of difference, which in this thesis is a sustainable future that implicates the environment in what emerges as an ecology of
relations that implicate women, who live in intentional communities. An ecology of relations is mapped in an abstract machine, which is a ‘map of relations between forces, a map of destiny, or intensity’, operates ‘as a non-unifying immanent cause which is coextensive with the whole social field: the abstract machine is like the cause of the concrete assemblages that execute its relations; and these relations between forces take place ‘not above’ but within the very tissue of the assemblages they produce’ (Deleuze 1988a, pp. 36-37). The map for intentional communities shapes its type: environmentalist, feminist, spiritual. The intensity of such relations is drawn from the abstract machines that each community embraces and is incarnated in the women’s stories.

Relations are intensified in a given situation. Intentional communities, in the contemporary world of environmental crises and economic materialism, are designed to offer a counterpoint, which intensifies beliefs and passions about sustainability and spirituality. Their existence and their worlds emerge in connection to the earth. In this sense, the earth also acts an intercessor, such that its matter, its landscapes, climates, latitudes and longitudes and its state of affairs all affect the designs and the practices of intentional communities and the lives of the women within them. Such complex, intensified relations form an ecology of their own, which is, in turn, given to us through the stories of the women.

‘Women in intentional communities’, seems an innocent, ethical project for a feminist research project. Yet, feminism and research are not innocent, unitary grounds. Feminism, feminist theory, feminist research, writing, and the concept of ‘women’, emerge out of complex conjugations of very fluid, contested feminisms with
‘whatever’ other bodies of thought that include, as this thesis does, the thought of Deleuze and Deleuze and Guattari. Such theoretical conjugations implicate an infinite series of both companionate and contestatory possibilities for working between the event, the sense and the given circumstances of worlds, especially the worlds we make love with (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 294), in the creation of an immanent, emergent feminism. I attempt, in this way, to look at feminism ‘as a different theoretical heritage where questions have always been voiced in terms of what might become’ (Colebrook, 2000a, p. 10). It is here that border worlds become the thresholds to becomings. Becomings are complicated. Conceptual becomings are ‘heterogeneity grasped in an absolute form; sensory becoming is otherness caught in a matter of expression’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 177). Such becomings pass into and out of each other throughout this thesis.

**Events and Composite Becomings**

The worlds of the women are assemblages constituted by productive desire, not a desire for an object but for experimentation that creates new contexts for life, for new worlds. Deleuze and Guattari’s suggestion ‘But we always make love with worlds’ (1983, p. 294), offers a radical relational ontology where composing bodies,

---

15 Feminist analyses of the various unhappy marriages of other theoretical positions with various feminisms are long standing. See Mann (2006) for one overview. *Deleuze and Feminist Theory* is one volume, which suggests the ways Deleuze and Guattari have been taken up and used by a variety of feminists. In the introduction to this edited volume Claire Colebrook (2000a, p. 5) suggests that it is this very thing, thinking differently that is suggestive of an unstable feminism.
16 In *Abecedaire* Deleuze speaks of desire flowing into an ‘assemblage’, an ‘aggregate’. In this sense we desire a drink, a skirt, or a sunray as an aggregate, in a situation, as a context, where desire constructs in the collective, and the multiple. Assemblages implicate whatever of ‘states of affairs’, ‘states of things’ that suit us in the intermingling machinic assemblages of bodies, passions and actions and their collective statements (les enonces) or regimes of signs emerging as different styles, of community, of deterritorializing and reterritorializing a territory, given the tetravalent nature of the assemblage. And it is within such elements that desire flows.
of thought, matter, flesh, express worlds as they make love with them. The multiple
worlds of the women and their communities emerge out of such lovemaking. In this
sense, the women’s loving expressions and their stories suggest the event of
worldings as implicated in the processes of deterritorialising and territorialising and
caught up in the always partial sense of each intentional community’s style, their
pragmatic conditions\(^{17}\) and their dynamic intensities. The event incorporates both time
and space but a space which moves from extension to intensity (Deleuze, 1993, p.
77).\(^ {18}\) The event is a series, multiplying time and intensity, where matter, of whatever
nature, fills space and time and drives the creation of a ‘prehending’ subject in
process (Deleuze, 1993, pp.77-78). The creation of the prehending ‘individual’ is, in
Deleuze’s sense, not the person as such but all of the body elements, such as the eye,
which along with all of the other parts of a body, prehends a world and as a subject
enfolds and expresses that world in moving processes of becomings (Deleuze, 1993,
pp. 78-79). Such becoming implicate the past in the future. The event is ‘the floating
line that knows only speeds and continually divides that which transpires into an
already-there that is at the same time not-yet-here, a simultaneous too-late and too-

\(^{17}\) In Deleuze and Guattari’s sense pragmatics incorporates the generative component, the
transformational component, the diagrammatic component and the machinic component (Deleuze &
Guattari, 2004, pp. 160-161). All of these components are to do with mixture, intermingling and
combination; the passing into and out of each other of forms of expression and forms of content in
congrete assemblages, on strata, and as evidenced in regimes of signs. Their pragmatics is not that of
say Richard Rorty, who identifies a pragmatic community in conversation with itself (1980) or a
pragmatics of the good of truth for us (1991), which suggests the truth of those who are not ‘us’ can
never be good or indeed truth. This is a complicating factor for any form of ethnographic writing.

\(^{18}\) Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 158), claim that every ‘component of the event is actualized or
effectuated in an instant, and the event in the time that passes between these instants; but nothing
happens within the virtuality that has only meanwhiles as components and an event as composite
becoming.’ The go on to say, ‘Nothing happens, and yet everything changes, because becoming
continues to pass through its components again and to restore the event that is actualised elsewhere, at
a different moment.’ Intentional communities are such moments, such mixtures of functions/states of
affairs and the concept of the event of community as a world in all of its inseparable variations of
becomings.
early, a something that is both going to happen and has just happened’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 289).

My thesis is also centrally concerned with *women* and their lives, their expressions. It is the becomings of women that fold and unfold through the chapters of this work: women becoming-other *is* life within a transcendental empiricism. What this thesis then is about is the creation of concepts and the expression of those concepts in the lives of a small number of women. They are exceptional. Their circumstances are exceptional – even in the everyday events that engender their becomings. Such exceptionality is what escapes the general, the statistically normal but it is also much more; it is about the production of haecceities, a ‘thisness’ to do with each woman, each of her movements and flows, each line that she follows.

Political action as events engenders a theatre of operations rather than simply indicating geographic or ethnographic locations. Intentional communities are actualisations of experimental worlds, the tetravalent assemblages\(^\text{19}\) of bodies, actions and passions, and their territories, which function as an ecopolitical response to the signs of the crises of the contemporary capitalist social machine.\(^\text{20}\) They implicate all

\(^{19}\) Tetrivalence suggests fourfold assemblages that incorporate collective expression and machinic content as well as those processes of territorialisation and reterritorialization (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p555). Intentional communities are such assemblages.

\(^{20}\) The notion of a capitalist social machine by Deleuze and Guattari (1983, p. 41) is one that ‘is incapable of providing a code that will apply to the whole social field’ yet the consequences of that machine concern the whole of the social field on a global level. Rebello (2006) takes up the work of Gibson-Graham and others in arguing that capitalism is not a single, containerized logic. I acknowledge his arguments against ‘capitalocentrism’ and whilst I do not accept that what occurs at the level of the global economy is unified or totalizing I do argue that in terms of uneven and combined development capitalisms there are capitalist axiomatics (abstractions such as ‘money’, surplus value, commodification) that affect sectors of the world variously and that environmental problems are also dispersed differentially because of the capitalist social machine. I would also claim that such environmental problems are global. There is nothing simple, or uni-directional, about capitalist social machines and their rhizomatic productions and connections modulating countless individual locations through the elements of what Deleuze (1995, p. 179, p.180) calls control societies where he says the
levels of life that are in excess of any geography or social system. Such a politics is a pragmatics that takes up the earth as a spatio-temporal dynamism that is *virtuality*: pure potential that is open to the creation of multifarious worlds and becomings-other. Such becomings-other are affects that implicate the event (of the community, the interview, the research) as duration, which brings space and matter into view.

**A rhizomatic ecological feminism**

Feminist politics and research are rhizomatic. We find an experimental multiplicity of heterogeneous connections and assemblages that drift and zoom and rest in their becomings. Feminisms, in their many guises and actualisations, have made, and make visible, the problem of women. In that politics of a multiplicity of points of view, women are produced anew. The connections made by feminisms arise out of particular circumstances, yet are also invented. Feminism research is about endless,
open-ended questioning and curiosity. It is also about what Probyn, for example, in her work on ‘taste and place’ as ecological economies, calls the feminist ‘attunement’ to detail (2013, p. 75), which she argues underpins feminist research processes. In agreeing with her, I would say that it is a feminist habit. Endlessly witnessing the cosmos down to its last, tiny detail becomes a habit of ‘attunement’. It is also a feminist politics of ‘paying attention’ (Pignarre & Stengers, 2011, p. 34).

I view women as minoritarian, in transformation, open to becomings-woman, becomings-other, no matter what the difficulties of the concepts may be, and no matter what wild variations arise from the term ‘women’. This research is about women in the context of intentional communities in the living present and as such is materialist and empirical. Women are matter; they are bodies: they are embodied and subjectivised through matter as well as through becomings or incorporeal transformations. When women create and take up, or draw and exercise, the concept of ecofeminism, for example, they practise a politics of subjectivity as well as subjectivation that not only pays attention to the forces of oppression and exploitation but also to the forces of women and nature with their capacity for resistance. 24 In the
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24 Queer and or Mestiza feminisms, often engage in interpretive, embodied processes of identity and fight to correct sexist and racist distortions for ‘minority identities’. See for example, Unassimilable Feminisms (Gillman, 2010 p. 74) and the work of Gloria Anzaldúa (1981, 1987, 2002). Ecological feminisms, or ecofeminisms, predicated on the dual exploitation of nature and women incorporates a range of social movements and philosophies (Adams 1990, 2004; Adams & Gruen, 2014; Plumwood, 1993; Warren, 2000; Gaard, 2011; Gruen, 2014; Mies & Shiva, 1993; Shiva, 2005, 2007, 2009, 2013; Biehl, 1991; Ruether, 2003; Merchant, 1980, 1992). The connections between feminisms are sometimes tenuous, especially when they are based on identities that are seen as fixed and in opposition to other feminist identities that are viewed as exclusionary rather than inclusionary or in Colebrook’s (2000a, p. 8) terms reactive rather than a necessary becoming-active of philosophy and such a becoming-active requires putting concepts to work.

24 Page (2007), for example claims that the dominance of ecofeminism in studies of religion has been attended by the elision of gender analysis in those fields. In contrast Alaimo (2008) discusses the elision of nature and place in an ecofeminism that privileges maternalism, pacifism, feminism and essentialism and where the connections between nature and place and context are not drawn. Banerjee & Bell (2007) contend that it is gender that is elided in environmental science, because of the sacralizing and essentializing of “nature” in ecofeminism. They propose a dialogic theorisation of gender that intersects with other inequalities. Parr (2013) in her intransigent critique of neoliberal
processes of producing spirituality and sustainability in their lives, women enfold composing forces, or haecceities, such as the forces of the air (everything that is solid dissolves into it) or the sun, which forces us to contract (a habit), as we turn to it and live from it. The composing forces of the moon move the oceanic tides, of the earth, and our body, so that we are flows of matter pulled along, with other matter, by these lunar forces.

Women are constituted as molar forms or identities, which have a tendency to constitute and delimit them as static selves, belonging to rigid social segments, such as sex and gender, class and race, in the contexts of the territories of those selves and social groups. Women are ‘embedded’ in a given context, situation, or ‘a state of affairs’ in any assemblage that they are part of. However, women have the power to engage with transformative lines of flight and enter into molecular flows. They can leave territories, challenge molar identities and social locations, cut into rigid molar lines by ‘confronting the line of the outside’: that roaring, shrieking, shaking, pounding sea of life as well as the continuous contemplating and contracting of habit (Deleuze & Parnet, 1987, pp. 124-125, p. 41; Deleuze 2004, pp. 95-96). In the first instance, a line of flight opens onto an intentional community and women flee, drift, into this new territory moving from one space to the other and opening a molecular flow between territories. The new state of affairs or the context and connections of the intentional communities within which the women live, challenge the always mediated, indirect social and economic relations of both the local and global apparatuses of late capitalism discusses the importance of ecofeminism in the context of food, food production and food ethics. Parr’s work is also taken up by Cuomo & Scheunema’s (2014) in the area of an ecofeminist political economy. Ecofeminism, whatever its theoretical influences – and there are many (See Sandilands, 1999, Warren, 2000) – situates women in the context of a political ecology.
capitalism (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 409-507, Parr, 2009, p. 61). In the second instance, a line of flight intervenes in the processes of subjectivation, forcing a shift in focus and opening to a different outside. The potentiality of women appears as an excess of subjectivity and is created as autopoietic becomings-other as they fold in their new, alternative worlds and tell their stories. Here, the very notion of women’s stories emerges, not so much as a refrain as an *ostinato*, a short, repeated musical pattern played throughout a song that twines through ‘singular memory’ (Parr, 2006, pp. 129-130).

Singular memory complicates the sense of subjective memory and opens up the sense of the untimely or unhinged memory that draws on the whole of the plane of immanence or the whole field of memory. The notion of the singular memory presupposes those singularities that have myriad predicates, which give a subject an identity. If, however, the focus shifts to the singularity as a dynamic element in sense – rather than beginning and ending with the subject – we are left with questions concerning the preconditions or the presuppositions of the predicates or haecceities, which presuppose them. Parr’s sense of singular memory is a useful tool for this way of thinking.

Intentional communities are *worlds* or assemblages of a certain kind made up of ‘complexes of lines’ and parts, movements and speeds that can be either molar or rhizomatic or both (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 4, p. 556). When rhizomatic lines make up a world, they do so by horizontally connecting any number and kinds of
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25 In this section of *A Thousand Plateaus* Deleuze and Guattari state that capitalism is the ‘general axiom of decoded flows’ connected with a ‘new threshold of deterritorialization’. Capital as right is the general equivalent underpinning relations of decoded flows: ‘moving through many models of realisation’ and able to incorporate non-capitalist forms (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004, p. 500, p. 502).
singular point to any other kind of point, always endlessly dividing, rupturing and sending out new shoots and opening up the potential of possible worlds; and of becomings. At the same time lines merge into arborescent, vertical, tree-like assemblages, with centralised, stratified, closed power structures. Assemblages also draw lines. They create processes between points, which are also women’s worlds: whereas rhizomes draw lines that ‘passes between things, between points’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 557), which pass imperceptibly between worlds and events.

Assemblages, such as intentional communities, have a territorial aspect (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 555). Territories are sites in composition and as such are inherently expressive. All of the women mark their territory: through the signs and expression of their living presents, their homes, their style or their quotidian practices, passions and rituals, visible in the ‘possessive, expressive qualities’ defining a territory ‘that will belong to the subject that carries or produces them’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 349). Each woman, as an individual, marks and sacralises her territory in her various actions, passions and rituals that engender sustainability, spirituality and collectivity, and compose her actualizations. Yet, there is more than the expression of the subject, or the self of the “I” in the women’s stories; there are also the actualisations of becomings-other where “I become” something other as a creative passage into the new or as Grosz (2000, pp. 210-234) says, into the ‘politics of the future’. Becoming overthrows both common sense ‘as the assignation of fixed identities’ and ‘good sense as the only direction’ just as it complicates time and eludes the present in the paradox of both the future and the past at once (Deleuze, 1990, p.3, p. 2). Following such oscillations of transformation of subjectivities is sometimes dizzying and sometimes imperceptible but vital for the sense of an assemblage that is opened up,
not just to other assemblages or machines, but to the chaosmos (‘cosmos+chaos’)\textsuperscript{26} which they, paradoxically, attempt to capture and segment in their designs and technologies –arranging, organising and striating – in order to engender the continuation of the chaosmos, through a politics of livability.\textsuperscript{27}

I seek to produce a form of immanence feminism.\textsuperscript{28} This is a feminism of flows, speeds, rests and affects, on the one hand, and forms, subjects and substances, on the other (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 289). In a Deleuzean sense, ‘becoming’ is immanence. The work of Deleuze and of Deleuze and Guattari underpins a transformation of feminism into an ecological feminism of immanence, which implicate the fields of post structuralist and ecofeminist thought. Such feminism engages with a range of desiring machines and constructs an assemblage in the creation of something new.

Post-gender, posthuman cyborgs,\textsuperscript{29} the endlessly fecund maternal body, and the female body as the positive against the presumption negative-male-body-that-cannot-

\textsuperscript{26} ‘So where Kant replaced God with Man, Deleuze & Guattari replace Man with Life, with a self-organizing “chaosmos”... whose modes of organization emerge from matter immanently instead of being imposed from above as a form of law’ (Holland, 2013, p. 21).

\textsuperscript{27} In her discussion of gated communities, where technology, following Jameson, ‘stands for the whole decentred global network of the third stage of capital itself’, Parr sees gated intentional communities as ‘the pinnacle of commoditized community’ and ‘militarized technology’ itself (2009, p. 58). In the politics of livability of intentional communities are taken to ‘stand for’ making love with worlds through becomings-spiritual and becomings-sustainable.

\textsuperscript{28} Whilst my analysis is affected by an engagement with what has been analysed as immanence feminism and millennial feminism (Flieger, 2005, pp. 76-80) the sense of immanence feminism I have used in this thesis has been created again and differentiated through the engagement with the plane of immanence as both the hidden principle of the given and the causes of the given and the paradoxical sense there are only flows or speeds between relatively unformed elements (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, pp. 293-294).

\textsuperscript{29} This is not to say that this thesis takes up and discusses in detail the work of Irigaray, Cixous or Kristeva as a history of immanence feminism, or the work of Braidotti, Haraway, Balsamo, Stone and others but that their resonance with Deleuze and with Deleuze and Guattari is acknowledged at the same time as their very real differences are acknowledged.
have-children, and gender per se are not the focus of this research. The focus is the becoming-other that incorporates, implicates, folds the milieus of women and life in intentional communities on the plane of immanence: nature-god, the culture-nature continuum, where God/Nature is as ordinary as the place of the compost toilet in sustainability and its endless complications in women’s lives.

The use of the term ‘women’ in my research could be taken to presuppose a universal category of women, a common sense idea of gender and sex, that is, of culture and matter. This could, indeed, render women as a static category (or even more troubling to see them as a data set, or part of a data set), as immutable subjects; or even to render such a category as fluid. It may also suggest that I am a feminist researcher/subject, or that I am not a feminist researcher/subject, in the eyes of some critics, who hold that Deleuze and Deleuze and Guattari are impermissible in feminist work (Shukin, 2000). The use of the term ‘women’ implies, perhaps, that I want to ‘prove my Deleuzean case’ for feminism in terms of the empirical data gathered in fieldwork. In this thesis, the work of Deleuze and Guattari forces a different kind of
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30 Battersby (1998) offers a reworking of the female as those who can have children. She turns to Kierkegaard to show that he is superior to Deleuze in his analyses as they concern women, or what Battersby sees as the ground of women, that is the female and what their bodies can do. The inversion that she offers for the production of the maternal body as the norm is just that, an inversion which then places the male in the position of lack – as that body which can not. Such an inversion as it is used in Battersby’s work returns negativity to a sexed body seemingly replicating many of the problems of radical feminism.

31 Shukin (2000, pp.144-155) is deeply critical of Deleuze and Guattari for their perceived master status (which, of course, they have not given themselves) and their many perceived sins of commission against women and girls, far beyond the realms of the philosophical. I do not wish to dismiss such criticisms but hope that my work and the doing of my work offers a different reading of the work Deleuze and Deleuze and Guattari. For instance, her claims that they may be taken as part of the contemporary sexualisation, and thus abuse of girls, is disturbing and, for me, remains unconvincing in the light of their use by a broad range of feminists, who run the risk of complicity in these issues if this is a fair reading. In the reading of Little Hans in A Thousand Plateaus, Deleuze and Guattari’s concern is to move away from the sexualisation of his problem as it occurs in Freud’s case study. Indeed they present his becoming as an assemblage of the horse and the street and not to do with sex as such. Also in their critique of Klein’s object relations they are laughing at, parodying, and the notion that everything is sexual, Oedipal.
thinking. Such thinking undoes pre-existing ‘categories’, insisting that it is within rhizomatic assemblages and their pragmatic systems of collective associations and passions and their regimes of signs that subjectivities in process are produced (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 555). At the same time, women fold in the aleatory forces of the outside, becoming-other. A feminism of assemblages with their pragmatic and passionate associations connects to new feminist ways of knowing.

The Encounter

The paradoxical sense of ‘women’ and the perceptions of ‘woman’ emerged in the encounter in Bonville with Monique. She looked at me as if I was quite insane when she heard what my project was about and said, ‘But men and women are not

32 Deleuze does not draw a negative picture of subjectivisation, rather he sees is as a positivity, an art. In a discussion of Foucault in Negotiations he says ‘Subjectivation, that’s to say the operation which consists in folding the line of the outside, mustn’t be seen as just a way of protecting oneself, taking shelter. On the contrary, it’s the only way of confronting the line, riding it: you may be heading for death, suicide, but … suicide then becomes an art which costs the whole life’ (Deleuze, 1995, p. 114). So subjectivation has costs but they are the costs of life even when they cost ‘the whole of life.’

33 My feminism is of a particular type or mode, inflected by Marxism (of the non-Stalinist kind) and the Women’s and Anti-Racism and Environmental Movements, by the series of my particular histories and locations. I could perhaps say that in terms of a social ethico-politics I am a virtual, multiple history who is continually reinscribed in becomings-other. I live the contradictory experiences of the ‘privilege’ of ‘whiteness’ in Australia, a country still coming to terms with its Indigenous populations and its colonial past, the possibilities of which are realized daily; a country that is postcolonial with all of the paradoxical processes that such a naming entails. However, the privileges of masculinity, wealth and youth are not mine. My class of ‘origin’ is working class, I am not ‘a migrant’ in the Australian context, and as such my ethnicity is seen as unmarked; complex yet able to be placed under the umbrella of ‘European’ given the unification of Europe that has occurred and its inclusion of Britain and Ireland and the one Danish branch my antecedents. The terms ‘Australian’ and ‘woman’ are part of collective enunciations that constitute and subjectivise my body and my self but they are also connected with, and vectors of becomings-other. As long as the limitations implied in those terms and crash into me the potential for change exists. As long as they are not seen as the ground or foundation of my subjectivities and self I also can move within those collective enunciations whilst taking a global, if not cosmic, view of the potential for transformative actualizations incorporating differentiating difference, rather than and beyond the socio-economically assigned highly political ‘identities’. This is a becomings-other and this is the view of subjectivity and subjectification and of the self that I wish to argue for here where the composing forces go beyond the social formation, the social, cultural, political, economic forces of production. I do not feel comfortable with the listing of my supposed subject positions and their implications and limitations but I comfort myself that I am making a stab at responding to the question ‘Who’s your mob?’ And my mob is a very motley conglomeration of virtual, filiative and non-filiative alliances that undo me, just as they repeat me as different.

34 Paradox, in Deleuze’s analysis, ‘is initially that which destroys good sense as the only direction but it is also that which destroys common sense as the assignation of fixed identities’ (Deleuze, 1990, p.3).
different, they are the same.’ Monique’s statement was a shock to my thinking. Her community is one where the lives of the women, in the villages that surround Bonville, are strong evidence of what is called by ecofeminists, such as Vandana Shiva and Maria Mies (1993, p. 77), the ‘feminization of poverty’ with its inescapable links with ‘environmental impoverishment’ and environmental degradation. Did Monique mean that all women are equal with men? Did she mean that everyone is part of humanity and so the same? Or did she mean something even more particular to her community and their charter, which requires that they all be willing embodiments of the realisation of human unity and willing servitors of divine consciousness, and that in this world there is no difference between men and women?

Did she mean that the Bonville was protected from the problems of the outside world because of its divine life?

The encounter between Monique and I was an event. The mutual lack of recognition instantly transformed both of us, incorporeally; she became a political puzzle and I became a ‘mentalist’, ‘vitalist’ researcher. I was not interesting to her from that point on and even though we ate our meals together, in a large communal dining room with about thirty or so people, she remained politely, pleasantly detached.

---

35 Shiva and Mies also claim that it is not only in so called undeveloped countries or underdeveloped countries that the feminization of poverty, which also incorporates children, occurs. This is born out in so called first world countries or those states which are part of the North, in the North South divide, or in the West. Inside all of the named locations there is process that can be named the feminization of poverty. In each community there was evidence of poverty, although in the case of community members it was a relative poverty, not the absolute poverty that is to be found in the surrounding local milieus produced in the reterritorializations of capitalisms in the multiplicity of forms at both the local and global level. In my working with ecofeminism it becomes one that does not deny the empirical relations of ‘women’ and ‘the environment’, indisputable in the feminization of poverty and to the central role of women in addressing the global environmental crisis at all levels of society. However, the focus of this ecofeminism is the deterritorialization of becoming-woman – that is a becoming-other that takes feminism into the middle, onto a transversal line of flight, away from feminism as ‘a major identity’ whilst at the same time, paradoxically, fertilizing that ‘major identity’.
One the one hand, Monique challenged the molar or commonsense notion of women as a category, which is part of either the dualisms of sex or gender, intersected by other social stratifications such as race, ethnicity, age, sexuality, ‘disability’, geographical location and more, resonates with notions such as recognition and identity and analogy; women as nature, mother, caregiver, cave, home, subject. On the other hand, Monique opened up the prospect that all of these elements are potentially undone in the molecular becoming-woman that opens up the categories to the processes of deterritorialisation that occur in intentional communities. That encounter with Monique drew a line through the chaos of my field work and it opened up other paths that helped me to keep moving through that chaos.

I was, perhaps, being offered an exemplary, spiritual, cosmic becoming, in the Deleuzian and Guattarian sense, of community life. Here was, perhaps, a becomings-other of the Deus sive Natura of Spinoza that is an example to the world, where ‘each individual is an infinite multiplicity, the whole of Nature is a multiplicity of perfectly individuated multiplicities’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 280). In such a view, women (along with any ‘individual’) are open to the cosmos in a becoming-other, which resonates with the sense that we do not know what a body can do. Here the indivisibility of the nature-culture continuum, when it is embraced as the living of ecologically and spiritually conscious lives in intentional communities becomes Life as such. It was also possible that this encounter, like so many others in the field, forced me to think again.

In the territorial assemblage of each community habit and the refrain – the latter with its rhythms and tonalities, its cadences and qualities – mark out a territory, a home or
a community. Each assemblage is produced as ‘whatever’ place or space, given that intentional communities are so variable in their locations and their ‘intentions’. The rhythm of women’s voices, their stories are neither identical, nor metrical. The rhythm is made by the uneven sounds of their lines of flight into the new, into life. Such lines of flight are experimental and a turning away from the heartlands of patriarchy and capitalism as such.

An analysis of encounters with each woman becomes one of fabulation, where their habits and refrains are coextensive with the aleatory haecceities and singularities, of land, home, and community, which emerge in their stories. Becomings, events and sense are subtended by the pragmatics or politics of not only the intimate context of each community but the global context. The relationships that emerge in this thesis between all of the elements in each assemblage, including the women and myself, are ‘a folding’, ‘developing’ and ‘undoing’. Such folding and unfolding are inseparable, part of projecting a world, ‘on the surface of a folding’.\(^{36}\) What becomes actualised out of the virtual, within any research process, are our perceptions forming between the folds. As Deleuze insists, there are macro and micro processes perceived in ‘the tiny and moving folds’, and in folding and unfolding. Folds: ‘I am forever unfolding between two folds, and if to perceive means to unfold, then I am forever perceiving within the folds’ (Deleuze, 1993, p.93).\(^{37}\)

\(^{36}\) This is a direct quote from Jean Cocteau, La Difficulte d'etre, Paris, Rocher, 1983, pp. 79-80 used in his discussion of the fold (Deleuze, 1993, p.93).

\(^{37}\) ‘That we were always perceiving in folds means that we have been grasping figures without objects, but through the haze of dust without objects that the figures themselves raise up from the depths, and that falls back again, but with time enough to be seen for an instant. I see the folds of things through the dust they stir up, and whose folds I cast aside. I do not see into God, but I do see into the folds. The situation of perception is not what Gestalt theory describes when it erects the laws of the “proper form” against the idea of hallucinatory perception, but what Leibniz and de Quincey describe: When a herd or an army approaches, under our hallucinated gaze ... – the event’ (Deleuze, 1993, p.94).
Women, as the figures of feminist research, along with intentional communities, emerge out of various sets of circumstances and exist in many locations. Women live within experimental intentional communities, creating new worlds for themselves and the future and therefore, become open to research. The ever-unfolding challenge to thinking, provoked by the insistence that ontologically, existence is a continuous process of becomings-other in an intermingling of bodies, intensifying transformative forces incorporating, yet always beyond, the human, becomes the challenge of using concepts which ‘themselves change along with the problem’ (Deleuze, 2004, p. xix). Rather than a discovery of what already is and its further analysis, I want to enter into the dangerous practice of thinking the thorny notion of women’s lives within what is the ongoing, ecologically complicated proliferation of the open border worlds of intentional communities. In the expressions of these worlds, the assemblages of bodies with their passions and actions emerge as an ecology of relations, where the flux of spirit and matter is interwoven in process of metamorphosis.

I contend that the ‘individual’ who prehends a world (Deleuze, 1993, pp. 77-78), fabulates that world within duration, and does so even more strongly when duration is captured in the transformation of worlds. Duration, is the intensity of experience or of the already existing in the given, minus change and extendable into the whole of experience (Goodchild, 1996, p. 24). Duration, in all of its guises insists that

---

38 The notion of ‘worlds’ exists throughout philosophy. It has entered the broader domain of social theory and informs the interpretive strand of ethnography (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998) that is itself subtended by phenomenological notions of worlds being the locus of immediate subjective experience. Worlds are mostly humanist within social theory. However, there is a new Deleuzean and Guattarian world to take into account and this includes the worlds of the living, the never living, and the machine.
intentional communities are not simply locations or organised spaces emerging out of the counter-culture challenge to global capitalism but experience in duration. Duration also suggests that ethnographies are not simply produced from located, spatialised subjects and communities but incorporate the serendipitous of real experience as a product of duration rather than the subject and their production (Goodchild, 1996, p.24). Thinking through the relations of time passing allows the processes of transformation to be taken into account. Rather than the historical time of intentional communities duration implicates the time of intensities and extensities, where assemblages of intentional communities, become expressions of potentially transformative worlds, productive of events and their incorporeal effects.

Rather than beings as such, who are designated as women, it is in the embrace of a joyful aggregation of particles both internal to and external to women in their becomings that becomings-other can be engendered in a ‘being of becoming’, as an affirmation (Deleuze, 2006, p. 22). A joyful becoming is an ethical and I argue ecological becoming, at the level of the being of becoming and at the level of thought that challenges notions of what is with the modes of the conatus – the desire to persist in being – where existence as a positive power to act is ‘immanent and durational’ (Deleuze On Spinoza 10th March 1981), including all of the emergent singularities that will populate worlds to come. Such becomings-other are

39 Deleuze (1986, p 10) in his discussion of duration in Cinema 1: The Movement Image states. ‘Relations do not belong to objects, but to the whole, on condition that this is not confused with a closed set of objects.’ He continues that ‘through relations, the whole is transformed or changes qualitatively. We can say of duration itself or of time, that it is the whole of relations.’ Duration is, in this sense a qualitative or virtual multiplicity.
imbricated in new assemblages of capacities and relations that engender becomings-other.\textsuperscript{40}

Women and their stories constitute the foci, or the singular points that connect the themes of this thesis; each woman is produced as a ‘class of one’ through her story which I render as doubly fabulated refrains. In this sense, each woman’s song has an opus number that constitutes her as an ethnographic story doubled in its retelling. Yet each person, or class of one, implicated in the general concept of women, where becoming-woman assumes a created, co-extensive world incorporates a factor of commonality. I am suggesting that the commonality is the refrain and its singular opus number – each woman’s story – rather than simply gender or biology or their mixtures. It is in such repetitions\textsuperscript{41} of singular refrains that worlds are produced and becomings-other occur.

The practices of this thesis foreground Deleuze and Deleuze and Guattari as intercessors in an immanent, millenarian feminism, rather than expressing a confrontation with their work (Colebrook, 2000, p. 12). It explores the events which

\textsuperscript{40} One of the becomings-other that concerns women, and any feminist expression of women, is becomings-woman as both a collective and individual transformation that is created through experimental assemblages of bodies, enunciations, actions and passions. In Deleuze and Guattari’s work becoming woman is a minoritarian becoming that is open to all humans as an experiment, which like all becomings does not change the bodies as such but rather changes their expressions, their subjectivities. Such affective experimentation creates worlds of becomings-other, where women, in all of their variability and through all of their aleatory connections, and aleatory assemblages are constituted as transformational subjectivities, or subjects-in-process, paralleling their becomings-other. Rather than offer an analysis of becomings-woman as such this thesis concentrates on the other ways of becomings-other that could be taken as the underpinnings of becomings ‘whatever’ other than any form of majoritarian subjectivity.

\textsuperscript{41} Deleuze (2004, p. 113) has a three layered concept of repetition that is linked to Nature-God; ‘We produce something new only on condition that we repeat – once in the mode which constitutes the past, and once more in the present of metamorphosis.’ In the third repetition is ‘repetition of the future as eternal return.’ Repetition is a return of a future of difference; not return of the same. The connection to God-Nature is the folding of the transcendent onto the plane of immanence in the contraction of habit 92004, PP95-97).
generate the sense of any women becoming-other in her milieus. Such feminism, I want to argue, moves away from common sense notions of women, or women as a cultural, social or biological fact, or aggregates constituted through the mixtures of social and biological positions such as gender, sex and race. Instead it moves towards the metamorphosis of women in a series of becomings-other in the folding in of new worlds.  

In a thesis, much of the story is necessarily edited out or set aside, to attempt some clarity out of the chaos of everyday life in these dangerous times. This is what contemporary ethnographers call the ‘art and politics of interpretation’ (Denzin, 1995, pp. 500-515) where strong notions of causality are claimed as the basis for any story used in mapping the real. Fabulation offers a different perspective. The artful interpretation of stories, where the author is still in charge of the art work, becomes instead a series of events, of ‘ethico-political articulations’ or ‘ecosophy’ (Guattari, 2000, p. 27). We ‘catch someone else telling tales’ and enter into a relationship of intercession. The tale-tellers and their tales become the intercessors for the researcher-thesis and the thesis-researcher the intercessor for the tale-tellers (Deleuze, 1995, pp. 125-126) and in doing so give ‘fabulation’ a political meaning (Deleuze, 1995, p. 42).

Although I do not take up the feminist debates surrounding becoming-woman in this thesis my sense of becomings-other is influenced by the work of Claire Colebrook. Colebrook (2002, 141), opens the way for becoming-woman to be ‘away from the closed image of man’ and into becomings such that ‘if there is another mode of becoming then becoming lacks any single ground or subject’. This suggests that any self is open to the forces of the outside, including and also beyond the human, and the folding in of those forces into becomings-other. I am not suggesting that there is not a strong sense of being a woman in each community but rather that the processes of transformation in each community open up becomings-other beyond becoming-woman. Such folding in of the outside also drives the transformation of subjectivities, especially when they incorporate new ways of folding new worlds into the self.

174). Such a politics is one of ‘interests’ and ‘of bearing witness to the many aspects of entangled slow stories (Stengers, cited in Probyn, 2011a)

A thesis is like Deleuze and Guattari’s version of a book (2004, p. 4) in that it is a fabulation without a single author. The thesis forms an intensified assemblage consisting of matters, dates and speeds and in the spaces of their connections creates, in the way of fabulations, the potential for a people to come (Deleuze, 1995, pp. 125-126). The ‘workings of matters and the exteriority of their relations’ make up a thesis, shaping its territory, its signs out of its connections to whatever, other assemblages. If interpretation falls prey to the dangers of representation and its ruin (Olkowski, 1999), joining in the formation of an assemblage always already connected to a multiplicity of other assemblages, offers other challenges and these I attempt to engage. The *caveat* here is the difficulty of articulating the whole of the fields of reality, or mental and spatial representational worlds and the necessity to begin in ‘the middle’ (Buchanan, 2005, p. 5). For this thesis, the ‘middle’ emerges from the stories of the women who live in intentional communities.

**Expression rather than Intentionality**

Intentionality is a contested concept in social theory and philosophy. It is particularly vexed in terms of the ethico-politics of this thesis and in political, cultural and social theory.\(^{44}\) Intentionality philosophically, presupposes the phenomenological relation

\(^{44}\) For example, intentionality, regarded as ‘collective intentionality’ is seen as driven by behavioural/socio-cultural characteristic specific to humans because of the collective nature of those socio-cultural cognitive capacities (Tomasell & Moll, 2010, p. 331). Intentionality is philosophically defined as ‘the power of minds to be about, to represent, or to stand for, things, properties and states of affairs’ (Pierre, 2010). All versions of intentionality, whether including externalism relations or not rely upon the powers of the human mind. In a Deleuzean analysis it is possible to sidestep a phenomenological sense of intentionality and turn to the radical empiricism of intentional community
between a human subject, or human consciousness, and a thing\textsuperscript{45}, the consciousness of the women, of the researcher and the thing of community, such that consciousness of the thing, for the subject, is central to the experience of materiality. Yet, intentionality breaks down when humans are no longer the centre of creation as such but a part of the assemblages or in the in-between, part of the incommensurability of worlds and complicit in turning the phenomenon into epistemology (Deleuze 1988a, p. 109). In this sense, there can be ‘composable’ relations incorporating the more than human, expressions in excess of the expressors, between what can be done, said or intended, given the multiplicity of capacities for thought, perception and action and given the multifarious nature of the thing or object emergent in its various expressions.\textsuperscript{46}

In this thesis, I argue that intentional communities are not simply given within human ‘intention’, as such, but rather are foldings of space and bodies, through the phenomenon of the event (Colebrook, 2005c, p. 190), which imbricates perceptions, actions and passions, including, yet always beyond, the human. Out of such thinking a community emerges as both a non-figurative site where forces coalesce – a plateau– and as actual machines, producing blocks of affects and sensations, like a work of art,

\textsuperscript{45} Latour (2005, p. 5) shifts the focus from social facts to social things. He argues that ‘things’ are not ‘inert objects’ outside of ‘controlling subjects’ but must be part of and are gatherings, or assemblies. He calls objects issues saying that they gather assemblies around them and map out issues and create publics and in this way objects have again become things. Grosz (2005, p.4) sees the thing as that which can be differentiated in becoming: ‘Becoming is the operation of self-differentiation, the elaboration of a difference within a thing, a quality or a system that emerges or actualizes only in duration.’

\textsuperscript{46} This is not to say that all such relations are joyful for the bodies involved. There is the potential for a one body to decompose another or that bodies can decompose each other and given that life is never simple there is rarely an either or of composability or decomposability (Hardt, 2001, p. 382).
an encounter and an experiment, all at once (Ballantyne, 207, p. 38). However, communities are moving works of art.

Intentional communities are territories as expressive, rhythmic territorialisations of milieus, rather than as the creation of an intentional mind. Rhythm allows the ‘passage from one milieu to another... coordinated between heterogeneous space-times’. Rhythm, as movement, is the in-between that connects milieus so that nomadic actions such as ‘landing, splashdown, takeoff, are possible for the women, who ride a line of flight from one world to another (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 346). Intentional communities are border worlds, produced through rhythmic, expressive movements of bodies and forces, creating heterogeneous, extensive spaces-times where the lines and flows of the social, the semiotic and matter – statements, bodies and things and their expressions – conjugate as expressions of community.47 Careful experimentation and subtle metamorphosis occurs in such communities where women potentially become other.

Intentional communities allow dynamic space and time to be thought and configured within evolving environmental territories, encouraging the emergence of new ecologies, new relations. In this sense, they continue the work of the stratum and assemblages for it is on the stratum that ‘we’ are ‘stratified – organized, signified

47 Milieus are exactly what a territory ‘bites into’. A milieu ‘ has the interior zone of a residence or shelter, the exterior zone of its domain’ it has ‘zones’ and is marked by “indexes” or components taken form any of the milieus: materials, organic products, skin or membrane states, energy sources, action-perception condensates’. Expressive rhythm draws milieux into a territory (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 347).
subjected’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 178). Through the processes of assemblages deterritorialisation of the strata becomes possible. Only in the assemblage are the incorporeal transformations of expressions, expressed and attributed to bodies or contents constituted and only in the assemblage do contents and expression pass into and out of one another. The strata are necessary for survival, to provide that little bit of order, the ‘small plot of land’ or ‘home’ from which to launch forth into the unknown where the new is constituted.

Events implicate duration, encompassing the processes of subjectivities in process and their becomings within the milieu of a world. Events and their movements, sounds and sights produce the intensification of time and space, of spirit and matter and transmutations within the machinic assemblages of the worlds of intentional communities. The subject, or ‘individual’, who shifts from the habits of a life both sees and makes a world in connection with other elements of an assemblage, moving from one milieu or territory to another. Such worlds are more than simply existing and reproduced through time; they are heterogeneous assemblages where an individual woman captures and intensifies duration materially in her becomings.

---

48 ‘Lodge yourself on a stratum, experiment with the opportunities it offers, find an advantageous place on it, find potential movements of deterritorialization, possible lines of flight, experience them, produce flow conjugations here and there, try out continuums of intensities segment by segment, have a small plot of new land at all times. It is through a meticulous relation with the strata that one succeeds in freeing lines of flight…’ (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004, p. 178). Stratification is concept which implicates arboreal hierarchies and structures in contrast too, to rhizomes of heterogeneous aggregates. Both are necessary for life in social formations such as intentional communities. The strata of the State, civic societies, governments, ideologies all subtend intentional communities and inhere in them (Thanem & Linstead, 2006, p. 43)

49 Simone de Beauvoir (1993, p.476) argues, ‘With her fire going, woman becomes sorceress, by a simple movement, as in beating eggs, or through the magic of fire, she effects the transmutation of substances: matter becomes food. There is enchantment in these alchemies, there is poetry in making preserves; the housewife has caught duration in the snare of sugar, she has enclosed life in jars.’ Yet,
The event, as an actualisation or counter-actualisation, is not linked to a notion of liberal individualism. Rather, Deleuze’s notion of counter-actualisation offers an individual as an event and actualising an event. In the event the individual is able to transcend her ‘form’ and her ‘syntactical link to the world’, such that she has the capacity to ‘grasp herself as event: and that she grasps the event actualised within her as another individual grafted onto her...’ (Deleuze, 1990, 178-179). Such a sense, of counter-actualisation, or becomings-other, subtends the women’s stories and the entangled relations, through which they develop and express their experimental subjectivities. 50

Such a view of the event moves ‘women’ beyond the stratifying, or ordering and structuring notions of sexual difference and gender into a world of composing forces and autopoiesis (Deleuze, 1991, p.85). 51 This challenges the dominance of molar processes of stratification, such as gender, opening normative sexed-gendered subjects onto becomings-other. However, understanding ‘very well the event “to be hidden”’ (Deleuze, 1990, p. 178-179) is part of sidestepping or complicating what an

the rendering of duration is more than the shifting of matter into culture; it is also the action of matter upon culture. Rather than seeing the transmutation as simply one way – the human/woman acting to capture ‘life in a jar’ – I want to suggest that nature/matter is force, the magic of fire for instance that shifts relations beyond human control such that duration is open to thinking rather than simply open to capture.

50 ‘Each individual would be like a mirror for the condensation of singularities and each world a distance in the mirror. This is the ultimate sense of counter-actualization…. Counter-actualizing each event, the actor-dancer extracts the pure event which communicates with all the others and returns to itself through all the others, and with all the others.... To explore all distances, but over a single line; to run very fast in order to remain in the same place. The gray butterfly understands very well the event “to be hidden” just as the black butterfly understands very well the event “to invigorate”’ (Deleuze, 1990, pp. 178-179).

51 I am aware of the critique made by Zizek of vitalism and autopoiesis as an ignorant lazy way of thinking (Dema, 2007, para. 11). I do no regard autopoiesis as a pseudoconcept but a useful tool for viewing self-reproduction within the production of assemblages. It is always the re-production of difference, not the same and part of the doubling of subjectivity. It is part of, not outside of emergence. It is a process of folding and unfolding in the face of whatever forces of whatever world.
identity-based, or even a plurality, or series of predicates of a complex identity might entail. A woman can be spiritual, environmentally conscious, a teacher, a mother, a gardener but this is not necessarily implicated in any of her becomings-other. The event incarnates a process of becoming that may be partly a process of hiding, of not being seen, of blending in with the environment, of being part of an ecology, part of processes, an event of hiding rather than dominating and subjugating any given world. In this sense, ‘graying’ and hiding, for some butterflies, or blacking and invigorating and displaying, as its opposite in other butterflies, is the process of counter-actualisation. All butterflies are butterflies but they are different, given the event and counter-actualisation. All ‘women’ fold in the outside in the creation of ongoing subjectivities (Deleuze, 1988a) and given the condensation of singularities, events and counter-actualisations unfold difference: nothing could be made clearer in the stories that the women tell in this study. Such difference is not diversity but difference in itself, emerging in repetition, in duration. Some women understand very well the event to become a certain kind of thing - subject-object - and some women understand very well the event to become a certain kind of grafted individual in a series of becomings-other. Such becomings-other are imbricated in what Guattari calls an ecosophy and what I am calling an ecology of relations, given that I see human subjectivity as interleaved and transformed within symbiosis: the Nature-Culture continuum.

52 Deleuzean difference is not that between 'comparative' ‘external’ ‘terms’, such as woman, man, humanity or ‘internal’ ‘constitutive’ ‘relations’ of ‘structuring’ terms, but difference suggests fields as a ‘relation between fields, strata and chaos’. Things are effectuated by difference but difference in itself is a process producing things, ‘the reservoir from which they derive’ (Grosz, 2005, p. 5).

53 ‘…only an ethico-political articulation – which I call ecosophy – between the three ecological registers (the environment, social relations and human subjectivity) would be likely to clarify [the ecological dangers that confront us] (Guattari, 2000, p. 27).
Sustainability and Spirituality

The design practices of the three communities, Clear Creek Community in Australia, The Motherhouse in the United States and Bonville in India, where the fieldwork for this thesis began, are informed by a transformative desire for a life that engages with the earth to create worlds that function sustainably, and this often incorporates spirituality. Sustainability, in this sense, is a ‘whatever’ form of sustainability that encompasses every event and aspect of collective and individual life in the myriad of worlds that insist in each of the communities.

Living lightly on the earth suggests entering into assemblages of becomings-garden as becomings-sustainable or entering into community work and becoming socially sustainable. It is a way of dealing with energy needs in a local ways, using the materials at hand to make homes or food that would otherwise need to travel many kilometres and require more embedded energy. Women living lightly on the earth create becomings-other, implicating new becomings-woman. The women of Clear Creek Community pay attention to their natural and social worlds, folding in new green technologies with philosophies and practices such as permaculture and feminism. The women of Bonville are creating new forms of social, economic and environmental sustainability that incorporate spirituality in a becomings-divine. The women of the Motherhouse have created new forms of social and environmental sustainability by joining with their bioregion in a Community Supported Agriculture project, generating new political forms of spiritual, social and environmental sustainability. These different styles of sustainability and spirituality express new
worlds and new becomings-other. Such becomings-other are folded into new ways of becomings-other of each woman in each of the communities.

The potential for sustainable life is intensified within an intentional community through the aggregation of alternative energy systems, alternative building systems, organic forms of agriculture, and alternative ways of thinking. Sustainability is a concept that is an event as well as a state of affairs (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 15) that entails working with nature to design systems generating more energy than they use. Living sustainably requires an experimental or molecular ecopolitics that constitutes each community within what I suggest is nomadic thought.

Nomadism, as a transformational force, challenges the state and other molar forms of organisation. In a ‘metamorphosis machine’ (Patton, 2000, p. 110) non-State examples of new spiritualities and sustainability, such as the designed ecologies of intentional communities, including magical thinking, permaculture, biodynamics and organic gardening, shift both the functions of the territory and becomings-other into unknown zones of thinking and practices. Such nomadic practices can be seen as gentle – other – forms of guerrilla activity (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 421) or Guattari’s soft subversions (2009). Such nomadic activity varies from forms of action, where the fight is directed at greening various locations and constructing ‘food

---

54 Patton (2000, p. 110) names the war machine the ‘metamorphosis machine’ and this seems to avoid negative connotations of war and to suggest that nomadology is simply the process of deterritorialization as metamorphosis. Perhaps in doing so, it disguises the politics and the pragmatics of any such machine, however, it certainly captures the sense of the war machine that I see in practice in intentional communities. Capitalism is a series of deterritorializing machines par excellence and war ‘clearly follows the same movement of capitalism’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 514) and it follows that the State appropriates the war machine and this can be seen with designed communities, which are vary from ‘alternative’ communities to those that are largely real estate deals. The war machine and the figure of the nomad evoke the life and death struggles inherent in everyday life against molar forms such as the State and its institutions as it engender new deterritorializations. See Robert Marzec (2001) for an analysis of the war machine and capitalism.
forests’ to teaching permaculture or building a communal compost toilet. Cities are also greened, or sacralised, sometimes through gestures that contain the seeds of transformation rather than being ‘out of place’. For example, someone might plant a hazelnut in the crack or seam of a concrete edifice, or use a ‘gay’ bathhouse for sacred rituals (Prior & Cusack, 2008, p. 271). The permaculturist, ecologist, feminist or spiritualist may be seen here as part of an assemblage that is a nomadic operation against the state, a construction of ‘outside thought’, a minor science, which is itinerant or ambulant.

I suggest that sustainability as becoming-garden and spirituality as counter-actualisation of conventional religious forms are moves that create new worlds, struggling against what Mollison calls the ‘stupidity’ of non-sustainable ways of life (1996, pp. 16-17). However, the turbulence created by the composing forces is not simple or easy. Becoming-garden is, on one level, the generative response of the local, the micro, the human, to the global environmental crisis. While the response to such problems generates a pragmatic ethics, it also generates the desire for a spiritual life that pervades every level of life and remains both open to what is to come, as well as offering provisional responses to actual problems. As such, sustainability and spirituality implicate the ‘whatever’ of becomings (Braidotti, 2006, p. 148). The problems of living sustainably and/or spiritually, for each community, move in the direction of ecological nomadism, where nomads traverse a field of relations that are a symbiosis of nature and culture.

55 Researchers may also be seen as itinerant, ambulant, doing the ‘legwork’ of fieldwork in particular.
I argue in this thesis, however, that the totalising sweep of a particular spirituality or sustainability, in any given intentional community, where the expectation is that everyone is ‘spiritual’ or ‘sustainable’ in the same, identical, imitative, resembling way, creating compossible worlds is not possible. Intentional communities are rhizomatic assemblages and as such generate an efflorescence of positive difference in itself. In Deleuze’s terms, they generate ‘divergent series and incompossible totalities that pull them outside, instead of being closed upon the compossible world that they express from within’ (1993, p. 81): and creates lines of flight. What appears in each community is not an organic unity of forms and contents of spiritualities and sustainability, constituted through a countersignifying system of signs or through order-words and sense events, but transformations. Such transformations are incorporated in regimes of signs that are, in turn, translated into each other and can create new styles of becomings-spiritual. Experimentations in spirituality and sustainability are subtended by the movements and rests of bodies in their functional and expressive rhythms (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 356). Such experiments and investments create a plurality of these elements, which traverse so many cultural forms and that express becomings-other in the stories of the women. Here I am thinking of geomancy, Feng Shui, and the importance of the hexagram, the mandala.

---

56 Deleuze and Guattari (2004, p. 150 and pp. 153-154). discuss the components of pragmatics ‘the first could be called generative since it shows how the various abstract machines form concrete mixed semiotics, with what variants, how they combine, and which one is predominant. The second is the transformational component which shows how these regimes of signs translate into each other, especially when there is a creation of a new regime. Generative pragmatics makes tracings of mixed semiotics; transformational pragmatics makes maps of transformations (Deleuze & Guattari 57 Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 89) suggest that whether it is ‘imperial unity or spiritual empire, the transcendence that is projected on the plane of immanence paves it or populates it with Figures. It is a wisdom or a religion – it does not much matter which. It is only from this point of view that Chinese hexagrams, Hindu mandalas, Jewish sephiroth, Islamic “imaginals,” and Christian icons can be considered together: thinking through figures. Hexagrams are combinations of continuous and discontinuous features deriving from one another according to the levels of a spiral that figures the set of moments through which the transcendent descends. The mandala is a projection on a surface that established correspondence between divine, cosmic, political, architectural, and organic levels as so many values of one and the same transcendence. That is why the figure has a reference, one that is plurivocal and circular by nature.’ Deleuze and Guattari provide the concept as the counterpoint to the
that has been taken up in permaculture There are also the many, many ‘ancient
wisdoms’, including the resurgence of the occult, Wicca, Goddess worship,
Paganism\textsuperscript{58} that have been recuperated into the becomings-spiritual of the women and
project the transcendental on the plane of immanence, of Nature-thought, in the rituals
and practices of the women.

The women are not imitating spirituality and sustainability; they do not imitate or be
any form of the Divine or the garden. They are not identifications with Nature, or
Indigenous cosmologies. Rather, through their actions and relations in a world, they
express power and create new affects and new capacities for being affected, for
becomings-spiritual.\textsuperscript{59, 60} It is through actions, practices and passions that each of the
women enter into becomings that are alliances with a plurality of movements and
rests, spatio-temporal dynamisms, bodies and mixed regimes of signs: in blocks of
becomings. Even the most Christian of practices, for example those of the early
members of the Motherhouse, such as writing experimental liturgies and joining in
communal prayer, rather than keeping to the practice of individual prayer, were seen
as radical, and an affirmation of women collectively creating and controlling their
own spiritual practices. Such forms of radical change have continued in the
community, paving the way for a metamorphosis into an ecofeminist politics, a
politics of social justice and a plurality of spiritualities. The relationships of the family

\begin{itemize}
\item figure and suggest that transcendence spirals down onto the plane of immanence or alternatively is
thought, created on the plane of immanence.
\item \textsuperscript{58} Such expressions of new spiritualities have been accepted as part of many intentional communities
and as part of some expressions of ecofeminism.
\item \textsuperscript{59} ‘Becoming produces nothing other than itself. We fall into a false alternative if we say that you either
imitate or you are. What is real is the becoming itself, the block of becoming, not the supposedly fixed
terms through which that which becomes passes’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p.262).
\item \textsuperscript{60} An analysis of becoming offers a non-identitarian sense of the metamorphoses of individual women
in each of the communities. That is it offers a different trajectory to the notion of a spiritual quest – or
indeed a secular spiritual quest – as is posited by Jason Prior and Carole Cusack (2008) in their analysis
of the secular spirituality in gay bathhouses.
\end{itemize}
of Christ transform from filial to those of an alliance; of companions and worlds. The flesh and the blood of Christ are not consumed by his relatives in the Eucharist but by his friends, or by his companions.61

Further, ‘it is in the domain of symbioses that bring into play beings of totally different scales and kingdoms, with no possible filiation. There is a block of becoming that snaps up the wasp and the orchid but from which no wasp-orchid can ever descend’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 263). The blocks of becoming of the women, as I argue throughout this thesis, are not evolutionary; they are not species bound but rather are involutionary, creative, experimentations. Within their worlds and their communities the women produce experimental alliances of blocks of becoming – the women and forests might form an alliance creates a becoming woman-forest but from which there is no line of descent – which emerge as actualisations and counteractualisations of the virtual of sustainability and spirituality.62 To explore the production of subjectivity, hinging on a point of subjectification, which ‘can be anything’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, pp. 142-143), I take up an analysis of women and spirituality within the framework of a semiotic ‘postsignifying regime of signs’ and return to an analysis of women and becoming as a sense-event in the chapter on sustainability.

---

61 Gerard Loughlin (2007) argues this position of friendship in the introduction to Queer Theology: Rethinking the Western Body. However, what I am arguing is that friendship is a conceptually more complex concept, indeed, following Deleuze and Guattari (1994) a geophilosophical concept that is contingent on context. I use the term companions to signal the Buddhist notion of the Sangha and the transversal, nomadic spatio-temporal dynamism that is suggested in the notion of Sangha.

62 I was told by many different community members in each of the communities that their communities were ‘laboratories’, ‘experiments’, ‘experimental’.
This thesis is a nomadic ethnography (St Pierre, 2000, p. 258) into the field of three intentional communities. In this sense, it is a political, pragmatic engagement with the expressions of community, spirituality, sustainability and the environment imbricated in the circumstances of each of the intentional communities. In the chapters that follow I weave women’s expressions and perceptions of intentional community as they are intensified and extended in their relationships to spirituality and sustainability. What is presented in this thesis is something more than common or good sense about the worlds of women and their intentional communities and becomes something more again, intermingling in the conditions of existence – both virtual and actual – of the immanent, empirical world (Deleuze, 1990, p. 102).

In the following chapter some of the concepts and propositions entangled in this thesis are intensified and extended. Of course, there will be concepts and propositions that escape this work, needing explication where they appear. However, the purpose of the chapter is to offer some insight into those concepts and propositions and the kinds of problems and solutions, or non-solutions encased within them.
CHAPTER 2

CONCEPTS AND PROPOSITIONS

In Search of Ecologies of Relations

In this chapter, some of the concepts and propositions subtending this thesis will be discussed. The analysis of the stories of the women in intentional communities and the fabulations, drawn from those stories, need concepts and propositions to frame them. For, ‘concepts, with their zones of presence, should intervene to resolve local situations’ in the kinds of detective novels or science fiction that are theses (Deleuze, 1994, p. xix). In a sense, the propositions are expressed relationally in the problems and events of living differently in late, global capitalism. These problems and events create varied themes of sustainability, spirituality and worlds, as umbrella notions subtended by circles of propositions and the relations inside of them (Deleuze 1990, p. 12), which in turn are subtended by shifting political or pragmatic presuppositions, circumstances and the events that flow from them. It is in such contexts that concepts are created anew and we shift from ‘proposition’ to ‘proposition that engenders becomings.’ This opens up the possibility of taking into account every fabulation; and in this way they can have a conceptual force as we shift from event to proposition to proposition and back again as they are transformed in each fabulation, not just of the lived experience of ‘human intentionality’ within the bifurcation of nature and culture but the experience of the cosmos. Such a blurring of the bifurcations of nature and culture open up a non-hermeneutical interpretation of the world, not through the human mind but ‘because of the worlds own activities’ (Latour, 2005, p. 4).
Intentional community is a concept that is an event and sense just as it is a mixture of bodies from which these elements come. Actual communities also imply a series of solutions to a series of problems: this can be extrapolated through all of the elements of this thesis. Propositions emerge in the expression of the problems of community, spirituality and sustainability, as does sense and any the creation of ‘solutions’ to the problems. This is not to say that intentional community or the communities themselves are solutions but rather that solutions themselves might make the problem clearer or paradoxically that there are no final solutions to the problems (Deleuze, 1994, pp. 214-215). I return to this in the conclusion of this thesis.

Concepts are variable, open multiplicities which have change into other concepts given the problem as it presents and changes over time. Such problems are expressed in propositions. For example, one of the propositions for my thesis is that each intentional community is an event whose sense exists in duration, as both an actuality and a concept and that the stories of the women and the slow movement through analysis produces a singular series of fabulations that express changes in long process of analysis both captures and express modes of that existence are open to change through that analysis. While propositions are the ‘sayable’ in Stoic terms, such expression allows us to move between sense and the event with some idea of the mixtures of bodies that sense and the event are drawn from. If the event is ‘an incorporeal, complex and irreducible entity, at the surface of things, a pure event which inheres or subsists in the proposition’ (Deleuze, 1990, p.19; Patton, 1997; Patton, 2002, p.27), it is incorporeal transformation, expressed in language yet ‘attributed to bodies’ and states of affairs (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004, p. 95; Patton,
2002; p. 27; Massumi, 2002b, p.6) that creates sense. Sense is at the edge, where ‘the event is sense itself” and ‘the border between propositions and things’ (Deleuze, 1990, p. 22).

Shifting away from the ground of ordinary propositions underpins the work in this thesis. Ordinary propositions are expressions of the possible, of external states of affairs or the given. As expressions or causal manifestations of desire and belief, they generate ideas and anticipation about states of affairs. They are implicated in the words that “signify” ‘universal or general’ concepts, where any premise or conclusion requires demonstration (Deleuze, 1990, pp. 12-16). Each of these elements of the proposition –denotation, manifestation and signification – form a circle: it is a circle of relations and heterogeneity. It is not the ground for any premise or conclusion but rather, of a series of possible presuppositions. The circle of propositions, the difficulties with true and false, with seeing desire and belief in any “I”, which in turn has significance as the ground for what is true and false falls prey to the collapse of identity as the ground for sense (Deleuze, 1990, pp. 16-17). For, if propositions are the expression of sense as an event, a ‘pure’ event of complexity, incorporeality and surfaces (Deleuze, 1990, p. 19), then it is possible to work with sense as a paradox. Deleuze states: ‘Sense is both the expressible or the expressed of a proposition, and the attribute of the state of affairs ’ (Deleuze, 1990, p. 22): as such, propositions contain ‘many relations’ between states of affairs, expressors and signs implicating concepts and sense (Deleuze, 1990, pp. 12-22). If propositions come from the given of habits or conventions or what we contemplate, and do not make sense outside of their expressions, then they generate ‘a wild creation of concepts’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994. pp. 105-106). A transcendental empirical thesis, its concepts and
propositions is concerned with the potential of habit. I return to habit again later in this chapter.

If concepts are linked to ‘a given field of experience’, such as the three intentional communities where the field work for this thesis was carried out, then they express any ‘possible world, existing face, and real language or speech’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 17). They also emerge in connection with ‘whatever’ problem and ‘whatever’ solution permeating whatever research or writing occurs and form assemblages that are becomings (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 16).

Woman is an event spoken by her concept, and this is a political act where a new concept of women can emerge, just as spirituality and, sustainability are also ethical and political concepts, entangled with varying elements in a mobile ecology of relations that is directed toward transformation. What makes a concept is ‘the inseparability of distinct variations’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 21), such that we need to make women, sustainability and spirituality over and over again, always producing something new.

The event does inhere in language (Deleuze, 1990, p. 181), in particular circumstances and driven by particular forces, which implicate the chaos of immanence. The singularities of the event as ‘turning points and points of inflection’

For Deleuze and Guattari, the concept, ‘speaks the event, not the essence or the thing...’, it is ‘an incorporeal’. Most things can become a concept speaking the event (in this way even a bird can be an event). Their claim is that, ‘The concept is defined by the inseparability of a finite number of heterogeneous components traversed by a point of absolute survey at infinite speed’ (1994, p.21).
(Deleuze, 1990, p. 52) are interconnected with the duration of events and their intensity. Events are the becoming of difference and change in the flow of the cosmos (Stagoll, 2005, p. 22).

The concepts of the Sangha, the ecovillage, multiple occupancy communities, communes, communal living, along with the concepts of becoming or utopia, might be the creations and present connections within assemblages of intentional communities as worlds drawing on the virtual.\(^6\) All of the elements of community have their own concept and each woman has her own concept but every concept is connected to other concepts. Concepts are machinic too, so that, ‘Zones and bridges are the joints of the concept’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 20). A world cannot exist outside of expression implicating the women in the expressing and the expression of the events of their worlds. Without their expressions, there would be no way of discovering how their worlds appear in the throes of creation or how their subjectivities enter into becomings.

---

\(^6\) Conjugations and connections pass into and out of each other but they are linked to the processes of a territory that may be social, affective, but also concepts, regimes of signs. The processes of the territory implicate deterritorialization and reterritorialization. These messy processes, at times inseparable except analytically, and both can take on negative or positive aspects. When a woman enters a line of flight, from say Christianity, or her daily life, she deterritorialises. Entering an intentional community may be either a connection where the reterritorialization is positive and productive, or it may be negative – conjugation where the reterritorialization is negative and she is captured, segmented once again. However such processes are not clearly delineated in the stories of the women or in their lives which often remain opaque to the research process open only to speculation, especially in terms of the future and further lines of flight. There are several places where conjugations and connections are discussed. Some of those discussions that have informed my sense of conjugation and connection are Buchanan (2004), Buchanan and Parr, (2006), Patton (2007), Thanem and Linstead (2006). Buchanan (2004, p. 5) offers the clearest sense of the impossibility of separating conjugation and connection in Deleuze and Guattari’s work. Patton (2007) offers an analysis that takes on the virtual nature of conjugation and connection and links it most closely with de/reterritorialization in existing assemblages. Thanem and Linstead (2006, p. 46) locate conjugation and connection in desire where what is conjugated is not productive of desire and what is connected is productive of desire.
The worlds, the neighbourhoods, the postures of each of the women and the communities generated in the intensities of their colours and songs and their various and singular enumerations are all what Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 20) name an ‘intensive feature’ and such intensities produce the stuff of this thesis. In the following chapters, I attempt an answer to the question of such intensities – although the colours beyond the general, I think, become too complex to name except in their becomings-other. Chromatically, there is the colour green of sustainability, of landscapes and of the environmental social movements, complicated by the reds and blacks of socialisms and anarchisms, the purples of feminisms, the whites of spirituality and all of the mixtures that such colours produce in environmental social movements such as those of contemporary intentional communities. Claiming such colours for the women and their communities is to think in too simple a way and to ignore the corruptions and co-options of such colours. It is perhaps the collective postures of bodies that best express sustainability in ecologies⁶⁵ of relationships that see humans as incarnated in the entangled symbiotic milieus of nature and culture.

Paradoxically, it is elements and forces within such relations that produce the subjectification of humans such that they are divided into gendered, raced, classed, sexualised aggregates, yet also produce the capacity to resist such majoritarian identities and become something other. For instance, the postures of the compost toilet resist modern, unsustainable technologies of centralised waste management and return the products of bodies – always beyond the human – to the earth.⁶⁶

⁶⁵ See Deleuze in his dialogues with Claire Parnett (2007, p. 42) where he discusses geographies of relationships. Although geographies of relationships are also important in Intentional Communities the analyses that I carry out in this chapter are only partly about the geographies of relationships and more centrally concerned with ecological processes: the ecologies of relationships.

⁶⁶ Jenny Allen’s (2002, p. 109) Paradise in Your Garden: Smart Permaculture Design, tells the story of the bodies involved in composting biolytix toilets – for an individual dwelling, community facility or commercial business – which are a water and compost based system, where all of the organisms involved in recycling waste matter, turn it into reusable components in the garden and for the earth.
As well, Deleuze and Guattari argue that ‘The concept is an incorporeal, even though it is incarnated or effectuated in bodies. But, in fact, it is not mixed up with the states of affairs in which it is effectuated… The concept speaks the event, not the essence or the thing – pure Event, a haecceity, an entity: the event of the Other or of the face’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 21). As such, the events of women, of intentional community, of sustainability and spirituality are concepts.

This thesis teases out certain concepts/problems as they are given in the emergent solutions. Concepts imbricated in solutions-to-come: in becoming-woman, becoming sustainable, becoming place as productive desire, the will to power of becomings-other suggest ways in which feminism in its ecofeminist form, environmentalism in the form of permaculture generate change. The doubling of the subject-object relations into a multiplicity of subjects in the research process, the ambiguous and contingent subject occurs because there is ‘the other person’ (potentially any ‘other’ whatever) in each of us. Such a sense of the impersonal ‘other person’, haecceity or the thing and the relations produced out of them in intimate milieus of communities and women turning away from capitalism pervades Deleuze and Guattari’s (1994, pp. 99-100) calls for ‘a new earth, a new people’ or for a utopia in the conjunction of what is ‘real here and now in the struggle against capitalism.’

Intentional communities are designed territories cut out of processes of deterritorialisation in that they effect a line of flight out of existing assemblages, creating new assemblages, new regimes of signs and a decoding of milieus all of which are implicated in potential transformations (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p.556). They emerge out of the convergence of a multiplicity of lines of flight. Yet, these
lines are segmented and framed not only by the reterritorialisations of space but of whole assemblages, so that intentional communities emerge as always more than marked places, they are also recodings of previous milieus. The forces that drive such markings and recodings are passional, subjective signs that have affective and material force: a word, an object, a place, a figure, a guru, a sense, a fear, a love, a world. All of these possible elements can propel transformative processes into motion. All of these elements also have propositions that underpin the speaking of concepts and the ways of thinking that we are forced into through propositions.

In the creation of intentional communities, the qualities of their milieu change. For example, degraded farm land is regenerated into wild areas, forests, gardens and homes. A new nature is constructed. It becomes an interweaving of material, social and semiotic flows, an interweaving of the organic and the inorganic and a new politics. It is subtle yet it has the creative force of an edge or a border. Borders begin, not by identifying sides, but ‘in the middle’ of the segmented pieces creating any assemblage (Woodward & Jones, 2005, p. 238).

**Subjects-in-process or women’s becoming-other through spirit and the earth**

This thesis takes up the problem of subjectivity, especially in the chapter on spirituality, and its doubling in the folding and unfolding of the processes of subjectification. It argues that becomings-woman emerge from an event affecting transforming subjectivities in multiple variations of becomings-other. Such folding

---

67 In a discussion of subjectivity and the fold, Deleuze says of Foucault that he is very different from Heidegger in his use of the fold because he is ‘addressing different problems’, because ‘in Foucault
of the line, confronting it and riding it, is the “processes of subjectification”, where subjectification is ‘bringing a curve into the line, making it turn back on itself, or making force impinge on itself.’ In this process of folding in the outside, ‘we get ways of living with what would otherwise be unendurable.’ Subjects do not precede the processes of subjectivity, thus, ‘subjectivity that has to be produced, when its time arrives, precisely because there is no subject’ (Deleuze 1995, pp. 113-114).

What is un/endurable for women who enter and live within the micropolitical territory and milieu of intentional communities differs. Yet questions of the environment and spirituality are pivotal foci in their stories and in the production of new individual and collective subjectivities.

The women in this study confront the lines of life and the movements of the given, riding them in the constitution of dynamic subjectivities, which in turn are doubled in production and beyond notions of an always already produced as becomings. A radical sense of subjectivity as always in process emerges, shifting away from a single self or static identity, to selves as always becoming multiplicities. Doubling or folding produces subjectivities out of confrontation with the given of not only a social formation but with a territory, the earth and the cosmos. All of the concepts inhering...
in the refrain (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, pp.342-386) inhere in the analysis of intentional communities as the movements and song which mark them out. Dynamic subjectivities are folds, pleats and crinkles in process, that is, diastolic and systolic subjectivities always produced in the movement and rest of bodies and body parts suggesting that such bodies are affected by the composing forces of the outside that is folded in and out in a doubling process.

Following Deleuze, I argue that it is movement which produces and defines the becomings of subjects and their milieux. It is through intercessors forcing thought and action that subjectivities are both produced and transcended in processes of auto-production or autopoiesis. In a doubling of autopoiesis and becoming-other, ‘the subject transcends itself but it is also reflected upon’ (Deleuze, 1991, p. 85). I suggest that autopoiesis\(^7\)\(^{\text{70}}\) and becomings-other, are the contents of subjectivity, doubled in metamorphosis.

I argue that women can be rendered as an infinitive ‘to woman’. ‘Woman’ is not simply a subject, a noun, or collective noun, but a nebula, a subject-in-process: a fortuitous case (Deleuze, 2004, p. 88, fn. 19). I contend in this thesis that the future depends upon a repetition that constitutes the eternal return, not of the same, not of general categories such as ‘women’/‘woman’ as sameness or fixity of identity, but of difference: metamorphosis. This is the eternal return of ‘ever not quite.’ The contingent assemblage, or haecceity, that is any ‘woman’ and the other assemblages or haecceities that she connects into, direct the territories that she creates, the refrains

\(^{70}\) ‘Guattari’s transversalist conception of subjectivity escapes the individual-social distinction as well as the givenness or preformedness of the subject either as a person or individual; subjectivity is both collective and auto-producing’ (Genesko, 2000, pp.145-146).
and rhythms that she produces, in a self-development or autopoiesis. She has the capacity to launch lines of flight, lines of drift that create not only transformative, molecular subjectivities but to become singularities, events, rhizomatic, and nomadic becomings such as becoming-woman. Such a view of ‘women’/‘woman as becoming, therefore, always moves beyond diversity in kinds. The practices of subjectivity engaged in by the women in this research, including myself, are mixed with events, with the ‘individualizing voices’ that speak us, express us as not only as subjects-in-process, as women, but as incorporeal events, as directing haecceities (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 288).

Subjects-in-process act to transcend themselves and the given when they invest in beliefs, actions and passions which produce new forms of subjectivity and new ways of thinking about the world. Individual women and groups of women produce or constitute themselves as subjects through processes of subjectification that become more than shelter and instead become a confrontation with and a riding of the line. As Deleuze suggests, what matters in the ongoing formation of subjects is the degree ‘to which, as they take shape, they elude both established forms of knowledge and the dominant forms of power’ (Deleuze, 1995, p. 176). I argue that this is the potential for women in intentional communities – to transcend the given and constitute new ecologies of relations. This is the production of subjectivity as a subtle confrontation of the line. This line can be many things to do with spirit and the earth. It can be a ‘wind’ of change, such as the pneuma of spirit or the hurricanes and tornadoes.

71 Riding the line is not necessarily regression or nihilism as Braidotti (2000, p. 304) fears and warns against – it is about everyday life – leaving a marriage as Louise did, entering a community working to become ecologically sustainable, becoming an ecological or green guerrilla but not giving up your day job, becoming a feminist.

72 Transcending the given is what Braidotti draws back from in her fear of regression and nihilism.
attributed to climate change as the ‘unformed elements’ and ‘anonymous forces’ of ‘Nature, the plane of immanence or consistency, which is always variable and is constantly being altered, composed and recomposed, by individuals and collectivities’ (Deleuze, 1988c, p. 127-128).

Deleuze and Guattari (2004, pp. 279-280) insist on the link between haecceities and the metamorphoses of things and subjects, which complicates any discussion of subjects when they state: ‘In short, between substantial forms and determined subjects, between the two, there is not only a whole operation of demonic local transports but a natural play of haecceities, degrees, intensities, events, and accidents that compose individuations totally different from those of the well-formed subjects that receive them.’ These are the individuations of the actor-dancer, those events that allow counter-actualisations of individuals actualising an event and in that process becoming open to transcendence (Deleuze, 1990, pp. 178-179).73

---

73 Guattari in Chaosmosis (1995, p. 11) claims that a ‘multiplicity of cartographies provide regimes to the different assemblages of subjectivation. All of them are important in so far as they support a certain context, a certain framework, an existential armature of the subjective situation.’ This shifts the mode from the subject to assemblages of subjectification. ‘Making yourself machinic and molecular war machine’ (here Guattari cites Rap culture and its importance for millions young people in the 1990’s) ‘can become a crucial instrument for subjective resingularisation and can generate other ways of perceiving the world, a new face on things, and even a different turn of events’ (Guattari, 1995, p. 97). Discursive and non-discursive affects of singularities, of singular subjectivities are generative and open to creation. Becoming spiritual, becoming a goddess worshipper, becoming a pagan, an ecofeminist, a liberation Christian, an Yoga practitioner all of these are open to the processes of resingularisation or what I am calling, following Deleuze, counter-actualization and part of molecular war machines? Resingularisations seem to have an extra political dimension that can change the world. Perhaps as forces that work against molar forms of consumerism, or work for sustainability, engage in radical politics against the world environmental crisis. Moving into intentional communities can be part of this yet there are no certain outcomes. They may ‘in turn engender new forms of power or become assimilated into new forms of knowledge. For a while, though, they have a real rebellious spontaneity’ (Deleuze, 1995, p. 176).
Affect and affectivity are connected to the circumstances of each woman’s life, its states of affairs and her incorporeal ways of becoming. Given that affectivity is a matter of circumstances these are, following Deleuze:

‘precisely the variables that define our passions and our interests. Understood in this way, a set of circumstances always individuates a subject since it represents a state of its passions and needs, an allocation of its interests, a distribution of its beliefs and exhilarations. As a result we see that the principles of the passions must be combined with the principles of association in order for the subject to constitute itself within the mind. If the principles of association explain that ideas are associated, only the principles of the passions can explain that a particular idea, rather than another, is associated at a given moment’ (Deleuze, 1991, p. 103).

Ideas, such as community, sustainability, spirituality and the environment are collections, or assemblages of bodies and ideas, and it is ‘human nature’ to connect or associate ideas with each other to form ecologies of relations. The designation of ideas is doubled in their designation. Ideas ‘must be designated to each one of us’ and in this sense, the ideas in each women’s existence are designated in her ‘becomings-subject’. As such, ‘woman’ is an idea, or a term, that is an ecology or a collection, association or assemblage, of ideas. Such an idea is designated to human beings, to women, within the given and within the mind. They cannot be ‘designated within the mind without the mind becoming subject – a subject to whom these ideas are designated, a subject who speaks. Ideas are designated in the mind at the same time that the mind itself becomes a subject’ (Deleuze, 1991, p. 101). Deleuze continues, ‘the effects of the principles of association’ and their ‘complex ideas: relations, substances, and modes, general ideas’ subtend contemporary intentional communities and becoming-subject. Within these principles, ‘ideas are compared, grouped, evoked.’ Further, ‘this intimacy, between complex ideas and the subject, such that one is the inverse of the others, is presented to us in language; the subject, as she speaks,
designates in some way the ideas which are in turn designated to her’ (Deleuze, 1991, p. 101). This denotation of the subject, through her expression or manifestation an ‘I’ who speaks of ideas, events in turn designates a world constructed out of association and a given state of affairs. The ideas or concepts that are designated to a particular subject correspond to all of the general ideas possible or attributable to a subject out of that which is possible, is central to Deleuze’s radical empiricism, which insists that ‘relations are external to their terms’ (Deleuze, 1991, p. 101; Deleuze 1990, pp. 12-14).

When Deleuze urges us to stick to the concrete, I have an irresistible urge to laugh out loud, for even the concrete in Deleuze and Deleuze and Guattari’s work is saturated with concepts that pass in and out of ‘the concrete’. That aspect is what makes their work useful, what makes it endlessly productive; nothing is too mundane to be made into a concept, to become a micro politics of desire and forces. A transcendental empiricism is rendered in their work; stick to the concrete and make concepts. Deleuze warns, ‘The more gifted a philosopher is, I believe, the more he or she tends to leave the concrete behind, at least in the beginning. Resist this tendency; at least from time to time, just long enough to come back to perception, to affects, which will redouble your concepts’ (Deleuze, 2006, p. 363). Perceptions and affects constitute subjectivities and as such, must underpin any research on becomings-other.

If thinking is creation then, following Artaud, the difficulty is ‘to crystallize’; that is, thinking engenders thought and the expression of thoughts – speaking – crystallises subjectivity in duration. Duration implies a sense of memory as both habitual and spontaneous; the connection of memory in the present and memory as both actual and
presentations of the past. In this way, thought and speaking is a force of subjectivation through language that is a given, albeit a living given, yet open the crack or the caesura and thus to transformation and to the future. Such a view of memory, on Parr’s (2006, pp. 129-130) analysis opens the way for ‘singular memory’ which draws on memory as pre-individual singularities and as a field rather than the memory of the subject. Such a way of thinking asks what an incarnated subject can do, in the grip of such forces and in following lines of flight or drift in becoming-other. This way of thinking moves towards a politics of becoming-imperceptible (Grosz, 2002, p. 469, Braidotti, 2006). Or perhaps, in Colebrook’s terms, dance permits ‘the movements and rhythms of bodies to establish a space and a territory’ which will also ‘allow for a refrain that shifts from function to expression’ (2005a, p. 13; Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 247).

Here subjectivation, subjectification, and subjectivity are seen as an event. Folding is an event of subjectification in which the composing forces of the outside are folded into the self, creating new forms of subjectivity. A subject’ is a remaking that implicates the subject herself, creating subjectivity anew through actions and beliefs in an ongoing process of becoming-other. Deleuze (1995, p. 160) suggests, in Negotiations, that the notion of the subject ‘needs to be completely recast’ and he asks ‘what becomes of the subject if predicates are events?’ The subject is constituted in the given and the subject transcends the given via the transformative event.

Ecologies of relations imply forces beyond the flux of the social, such as the radical sense that Deleuze and Guattari create when they say that ‘everything its production’ and that there is no distinction between man and nature (1983, p. 4). Bateson (2002, p.
4, cited in Berressen, 2009, p. 57) captures the sense of such an ecology when he said, ‘In the pronoun we, I of course included the starfish and the redwood forest, the segmenting egg, and the Senate of the United States.’ Latour (2004, p. 23) writes of risky attachments, tangled objects’ which presupposes ecological assemblages as part of the political, the technological and so on. Ecologies of relations incorporate the political, cultural and economic, although they suggest such other forces as well. Ecologies of relations are rhizomatic implying the composing forces of desire and Nature and the biological and an aleatory proliferation of bodies, of states of movement and rest, in a politics and practice that is more than human and where these composing forces move and mix with each other and traverse each other nomadically, rhizomatically in a becoming, ‘a time to come’.74

Propositions about the concept of ‘women’

This thesis complicates the problem of the common sense notions of ‘women’ as a collective noun, ‘woman’ as ‘a subject’, as molar; such subjects are presupposed, predicated and constituted in the repetition of a contracted, habitual present where the eternal return is that of the same, not difference, in becomings-woman. The propositions concerning women need to express woman as an event and to grasp the

---

74 It is only through ‘forgetting’, in the Nietzschian sense that the ‘bounded and autonomous ego’ or in Nietzsche’s terms the ‘sovereign individual’ the ‘emancipated individual’, ‘this master of free will’ that the subject ‘man’ earns ‘the right to make promises’, where ‘promising becomes a praiseworthy act of a responsible agent.’ Where ‘the “great health” that Nietzsche alludes to…knows that growth requires destruction, that knows that to become requires that we in some sense destroy what we presently are’ (Nietzsche, cited in Schrift, 2000, p. 153). What Schrift takes from this exposition of Nietzsche, which subtends the notions of becoming, the ‘to come’, and which also underpins my attempts to enter into the processes of becoming in terms of subjectivities in this chapter and throughout this thesis, are the processes of becoming: the how and what of becomings that are unceasing and unending (Schrift, 2000, pp. 153-154)
question/problem of woman as more than common sense. ‘Woman’ as a closed, given idea becomes a virtual idea, open not only to constitution as a virtual object that has a spiralling series of co-existent presents and to an actualisation. Yet, her potential is that of the virtual object and the virtual idea (Deleuze, 2004, p.123 and p. 349) as a multiplicity: ‘she’ is a ‘nomadic singularity’ (Deleuze, 1990, p.107). She can follow a line of flight and leave the safety of the everyday flying on the forces of the ‘witch’s wind’ (Deleuze, 1988c, p. 130). In terms of subjectivisations, as actualisations and counter-actualisations, it is the act, the movement, the nomadic genesis of subjectivities as bodies that is understood through their speeds, their rest and movement, their vitality. In this sense, becoming-other provides a new series of possible propositions about women, such as becomings-spiritual and becomings-garden.

If the subject does not exist outside of its production, then women/woman as a concept might not be attached to sex, race and gender, except as it is produced in a given social formation. A fluid, open ecology of relationships shifts the apprehension or perception of women from the given of the passive synthesis. Here a woman is not stratified and classified but is seen as a ‘composition’ of defining actions, passions and practices made visible in her life and expressed in her story. The tendencies of stratified definitions of ‘women’/’woman’ work in the context of always-already determined social formations. At a common sense level, the relations and subjectivities of those ‘individual’ women whose stories form the core of this research seem to be no different. If ‘women’/’woman’ is an order word whereby ‘women’/’woman’ is determined, and collectively coded as gendered, raced and sexed categories within a given social formation that accepts only a codified diversity of
women in general and at the same time attempts to incorporate and smother difference as such, then we need something more to approach the problems that such notions produce. Thinking through a Deleuzean and Guattarian framework of concepts, and the propositions and expressions they can generate, shifts not only the problems but the solutions implicated in the questions of women in intentional communities.

The processes of subjectivity, marking a territory and being an organism, order the living present of the everyday. However, transformation is imbricated in the ‘ever not quite’ or the ever not the same, of all elements of the repetition of life. The actor-dancer as ‘woman’ is a moving figure of the infinitive, a verb, not a figure as a noun. It is the actor-dancer who ‘folds the line outside’ and the counter-actualising, becoming, actor-dancer who is active in the processes of subjectification, not hiding or ‘passing’ as a ‘woman’ whatever that means in any given but rather ‘confronting the line, riding it…’ (Deleuze, 1995, pp. 113-114).

---

75 After all such diversity is the basis of a successful consumerism, an advertising industry and a form of capitalism that trades on segmented and niche markets.
76 ‘Staying stratified – organized, signified, subjected – is not the worst thing that can happen…This is how it should be done: lodge yourself on a stratum, experiment with the opportunities it offers, find an advantageous place on it, find potential moments of deterritorialization, possible lines of flight, experience them, try out continuums of intensities segment by segment, have a small plot of new land at all times. It is through meticulous relation with the strata that one succeeds in freeing lines of flight, causing conjugated flows to pass and escape and bringing forth continuous intensities for a BwO. Connect, conjugate, and continue: a whole “diagram,” as opposed to still signifying and subjective programs. We are in a social formation; first see how it is stratified for us and in us and at the place where we are; then descend from the strata to the deeper assemblage within which we are held; gently tip the assemblage, making it pass over to the side of the plane of consistency. It is only there that the BwO reveals itself for what it is: connection of desires, conjunction of flows, continuum of intensities. You have constructed your own little machine, ready when need to be plugged into other collective machines’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 178-179).
77 Braidotti (2000) claims that the Deleuzean figure of the subject is meat. Yet the meat that Deleuze discusses at length is the meat of the figures in Frances Bacon’s paintings. It is meat in movement, stripped of the face, often contorted or deformed in a topological expression of bodies. This does not seem to be the kind of meat that Braidotti is referring to. I discuss her Deleuzean subject in more detail later in this chapter.
78 Vectors of subjectivity do not necessarily pass through the individual, which in reality appears to be something like a “terminal” for processes that involve human groups, socio-economic ensembles, data-processing machines, etc. Therefore, interiority establishes itself at the crossroads of multiple components, each relatively autonomous to relation to the other, and if need be, in open conflict’ (Guattari, 2000, The Three ecologies p. 36). Guattari here pushes subjectivity beyond the subject and
The word *women* functions as a collective term and as such, it is often understood to refer to only standardised, statistical notions of women, women as ‘data sets’: ‘a molar, collective formation’ but in a challenge to such reductive notion of ‘women’ as netted inside such statistical wholes, Deleuze and Guattari (1983, p. 69), shift any understanding of such wholes by suggesting that everything begins with nebulae, a series with blurred outlines. Here, *molar* or collective formations comprising singularities are distributed haphazardly (a living room, a group of girls, a landscape). ‘Then, within these nebulae or these collectives, “sides” take shape, series are arranged, *persons* figure in these series….’ As such, the women figure in the fuzzy aggregates of intentional communities and are ‘nebulae’, taking shape within duration, as ‘singularities distributed haphazardly’. It is in long duration that each woman and her community becomes other than a molar formation, opening the way to transformations of the data set and the data collector from ‘an immense flow’⁷⁹ that is cut into, selectively by the women and by me and reproduced in a fabulated becomings-other.

### Habit, Memory and the Future

⁷⁹ In Deleuze and Guattari’s terms this process is one where chaos reigns in the ‘immense flow’ only to be contained and then ‘blurred again…but this time in a *molecular* and pure multiplicity, where the partial objects, the “boxes,” the “vessels” all have their positive determinations and enter into aberrant communication following a transversal that runs through the whole work; an immense flow that each partial object produces and cuts again, reproduces and cuts at the same time’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, pp. 68-69).
I suggest that woman is an empirical ‘term’ that moves in-between rhizomatic points, in ‘permutating series’ and ‘decentring circles’ (Deleuze, 2004, p. 82) of relations. Such repetitive movements, in Deleuzean terms, constitute the three synthesis of time, which underpin experience and each ‘draw something new’ from repetition (Deleuze, 2004, pp. 94-97). ‘Habit’ is the time of the passing, living present; memory complicates habit or the present with the past because it repeats an actual memory in the present; \(^\text{80}\) and the future as that disjunctive, out of joint time, which is directed not to habit and the present or to memory as repetition of the past in the present but repetition generating ‘the third time in which the future appears’. This is the transformational time of a ‘caesura’ where the circle of time is broken and the ‘beginning and end no longer coincide’ (Deleuze, 2004, pp, 111-112).

Habit subtends the perceptions of a witness (perhaps what Donna Haraway (1996) calls a modest witness). In this sense, the habit of women is contracted in both specific and general conditions and it is in the transcendence of that habit, that given, that becoming-subject, subjectivity in process, is possible: becoming-woman. At the same time, a woman is an ecology of relations: a rhizomatic assemblage\(^{81}\) of bodies...

---

\(^{80}\) ‘Whereas the passive synthesis of habit constitutes the living present in time and makes the past and the future two asymmetrical elements of the present, the passive synthesis of memory constitutes the pure past in time, and makes the former and the present present... two asymmetrical elements of the past as such’ (Deleuze, 2004, p. 105). These syntheses of time underpin Braidotti’s (2000) teratologies or the memory and meat of subjective processes.

\(^{81}\) ‘What is an assemblage? It is a multiplicity which is made up of many heterogeneous terms and which establishes liaisons, relations between them, across ages, sexes and reigns...different natures. Thus, the assemblage’s only unity is that of co-functioning: it is symbiosis, “sympathy.” It is never filiations which are important, but alliances, alloys; these are not successions, lines of descent, but contagions, epidemics, the wind’ (Deleuze & Parnett, 1987, 69). And ‘An assemblage is precisely this increase in the dimensions of a multiplicity that necessarily changes in nature as it expands its connections’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p.9). Following Spinoza Deleuze (1988c, p. 127-128) states ‘A body can be anything: it can be an animal, a body of sounds, a mind or an idea; it can be a linguistic corpus, a social body, a collectivity.’
that are more than human, more than analogous series and structures, more than organic, more than an organism, more than imagination. ‘Woman’ is imbricated in intensities, affects and percepts in the process of becoming-other. Becomings are in the middle of relations in the middle of desire and as desiring and productive machines are also the pragmatic politics of states of affairs, of worlds – the middle lines of becoming-woman, becoming-other and becoming-imperceptible. Such betweens, intervals, gaps or hinges are the milieus of the future where individuations occur and subjectivities, which themselves transcend the given, are open to singularising processes of subjectivities, to production and to becomings. In the middle of terms, multiplicities become: terms such as sustainability, spirituality and the environment; terms such as permaculture and ecofeminism that offer versions of sustainability, spirituality and the environment as they affect women and community. This is a conjugation of terms, a production of subjectivities: an ecology of relations; a rhizomatic process.

Given that each ‘experience’ is seen in transcendental empiricism (Deleuze 2004, pp. 68-69) as succession and movement and as different and separable, then it follows that the experiences of each of the women, as a subject-in-process, are separate and

---

82 The sense of woman offered here is other than a cyborg, a nomad or a mestiza even though these figures may insist in feminism and in feminist politics. I make this claim in contrast to the work of Lloyd (2005, p. 17) who suggests that the cyborg, nomad, mestiza and thus the work of Haraway and Braidotti are part of a grouping that ‘do not explore the particular mechanisms of process that generate the subject as unstable and open to rearticulation.’ The sense of a subject, even an unstable one open to rearticulation suggests something there to be discovered, represented, and worked on rather than in need of creation. Lloyd, in her work on the Lacanian subject of lack and those feminists such as Cixous and Irigaray, who enter in the Symbolic as the representation of women as lack, “She does not exist, she can not-be” (Cixous and Clement, 1994, p. 34 cited in Lloyd, 2005, p. 18) and as such is ‘a subject for whom identity closure is impossible’ (Lloyd, 2005, p. 17). Here is a subject that is open, unstable because she does not exist but is still a subject. This notion of constitutive lack and the possibility of entry into the Symbolic is antithetical to the notion of production as positive desire and the notion of the subject constituted in the given but transcending that given that I pursue in this thesis.
different. Deleuze (1991, p. 88) insists: ‘We must begin with this experience because it is the experience’. This experience is an haecceity, a thisness which has its own ‘concrete individuations that have a status of their own and direct the metamorphoses of things and subjects’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 288).

Relations, as the effect of the association of ‘human nature’ or subjectivities, within experience, constitute a subject capable of transcending experience. Our associations are stratifying or structuring elements for the subject whereas passions constitute the subject (Deleuze, 1991, p. 120).

Ecologies of relations point to bodies and their relations in time and the cacophony of events that are the flux of the given as never static and precede and are implicated in, the habit of saying “I”, in the practices of subjectivity. The time of such ecologies

83 In his work on Hume Deleuze discusses the externality of relations, experience and the constitution of the subject. The subject is constituted in relations not of its own making, that is, the given, and that it transcends the given is central to Deleuze’s transcendental empiricism. Experience, as ‘thisness’, is actualised in an event effecting an incorporeal transformation of the subject, which is presided over by haecceities. Experience, as such, is not constitutive but ‘a collection…an animated succession of distinct perceptions’ or ‘to denote various conjunctions of past object’ it seems that experience is not constitutive of knowledge or subjectivity (Deleuze, 1991, p. 87, p. 108). The very externality of relations to their terms renders the subject capable of transcending the given. Ideas or terms ‘do not account for the nature of the operations that we perform in them, and especially of the relations that we establish among them.’ Deleuze continues ‘…ideas are not designated within the mind without the mind becoming subject.’ Association, therefore, ‘is the necessary conditions of relations’ (Deleuze, 1991, p. 87, p. 101). Association explains connections, ‘habits of thought, everyday notions of good sense, current ideas, and complexes of ideas which correspond to the most general and most constant needs common to all minds and all languages.’ However, association does not explain ‘…the difference between one mind and another…. Why does this perception evoke a specific idea, rather than another, in a particular consciousness at a particular moment?’ (Deleuze, 1991, p. 103). The point here, is that ‘politics precedes being’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 225).

84 The sense of the self-constitution of the subject is important in discussions of agency within feminism and other forms of social theory and constructivism. Deleuze discusses the subject through Foucault as ‘the practices of subjectivity’ in terms of subjectivation as ‘the process of folding the line outside’ as not simply self-protection but as ‘an artistic will out on the final line’ ‘a production of self’ (Deleuze, 1995, p. 114). And ‘The simple fact that subjectivity is produced, that it’s a “way,” should be enough to convince one that the word should be treated very carefully. Foucault says “an art of oneself” that’s the exact opposite of oneself…” If there’s a subject, it’s a subject without any identity. Subjectification as a process is personal or collective individuation, individuation one by one, or group by group. Now there are many types of individuation. There are subject-type individuations (“that’s you…,” “that’s me…”), but there are also event-type individuations where there’s no subject: a wind, an atmosphere, a time of day, a battle… One can’t assume that a life or a work of art, is individuated as a subject: quite the reverse’ (Deleuze, 1995, p. 115). Here Deleuze is suggesting the process of subjectivity that I take up in this thesis – the subject-type and the event or haecceity-type.
as given is contracted and expressed in habit, the habitual, the actualised,\footnote{For Deleuze (1988b, p. 97) actualization, or the ‘rules of actualization are not those of resemblance and limitation, but those of difference and divergence and of creation.’ See also the analysis offered by Boundas (1996) of the links between Deleuze, Bergson and Nietzsche. If the ‘rules of actualization’ are applied to women then they become difference, divergence and creation in their movements, their rests – that is they are counter-actualizing, this is the transcendence of the subject, its self-production, its response to the event.} and counter-actualised, the time of the living present but there is also the time of the ‘pure past’ expressed as memory and also the time of the future as difference expressed in the eternal return: these three syntheses of time (Deleuze, 2004) affect subjectivities along with the territories, the histories and psychosociality of ‘the subject’ and their deterriorlialisations, their counteractualisations.

Saying “I” as a woman has been and remains problematic \textit{yet women say it}, as we all do, over and over again, through habit. Time is always part of the stories that they tell. For example, Chandra, from the Bonville, speaks of her ‘what I am’ as changing, \textit{over the last year}. Her “I” is in a process of counter-actualisation; as an actor-dancer, she understands the event of \textit{pulling back} in her community work and in this process is an individual who actualises an event. She is able to transcend her ‘form’ and her ‘syntactical link to the world’. She has the capacity to ‘grasp herself as event’ just as she can ‘grasp the event actualised within her as another individual grafted onto her….’ Chandra is not exploring ‘all distances’ over a single line, but some of the distances. She is exploring some of the potential of the line and in this process of counter-actualisation, running ‘very fast in order to remain in the same place.’ Chandra understands very well the event ‘to pull back’ (Deleuze, 1990, pp. 178-179) and the event of becoming-other.
It is clear, in all of the material that I gathered throughout my research, that women in the throes of becoming do say “I”. They claim subjectivity, they practise subjectivity, and their lives are processes of subjectivation. Their lives are predicated on the presupposition of a subjectivity open to transformation in the doubling of counter-actualisations: subjects-in-process in transformation, in the event of becomings-other. In the wake of the manifestations of the many elements and series of feminisms in everyday life, women say “I” in a way that is in flux because they are entangled with many variations of sustainability and spirituality. Women not only enter institutions or bodies, such as intentional communities but they also question those institutions and actively change them. All of these actions presuppose a different future to come. The ‘habit’ of contracting habits, of entering relations, is natural, and necessary for life, but the habits themselves within relations are invented and such relations and institutions are open to change (Deleuze, 1991, pp. 44-45). Further, they are open to distortion, such that they are unable to be represented in any regular straightforward narrative. In this sense, women’s expression is multifaceted, layered with elements of the past and the future to come, imbricated in the living present. In this way, there is an interweaving of the problem of religion and the solution of new spiritualities, or of the problem of unsustainable life in the face of environmental crises and the solution of an ethical, sustainable life. The women’s stories are expressions of what they wanted to tell me at the time, in the iteration of their story for the interview and for the tape recorder, and of what they wanted told about their lives and their communities in a thesis. In addition to this, the stories are a way of producing and practising subjectivity, of presenting the incorporeal transformations of becomings-other – and in this telling, of thinking through the abstract and concrete worlds of radical empiricism.
Collective Assemblages

Because ‘Assemblages are passional, they are compositions of desire’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 440), they are therefore linked with the processes of subjectivity and the ways that subjects-in-process or the becomings-subject of an individual may be designed. As such, assemblages both intensify and order the chaos of life. In this thesis, I look at the passional nature of the assemblages that are intentional communities and show the ways that they are compositions of desire and intensifications of desire. Such desire is productive of connections and conjugations, as the transformations and blockages of the flows of desire.

I argue very strongly that such relations are ecological and ecophilosophical and not only geophilosophical in the ways that are suggested by Deleuze and Guattari (1994) in What is Philosophy? At stake is an ecology of relations, a politics of engagement. Bodies are beyond the human, organic or inorganic in a cosmos that includes the earth; where the Nature-culture continuum is actualised in a series of becomings-other\footnote{Following Foucault, Deleuze and Guattari offer an explication of the actual in terms of becomings: ‘The actual is not what we are but, rather, what we become, what we are in the process of becoming – that is to say, the Other, or becoming-other’ (Deleuze and Guattari, 1994, p. 112). I use this sense of the actual throughout the thesis as it emerges or is actualised and counter-actualised out of the virtual.} in that relation between the territory and the earth. All intentional communities are designed environments but contemporary intentional communities are designed in concert with the natural environment.
In this thesis, collective assemblages, or regimes of signs, are seen as coextensive with language as collective enunciations, or indirect discourse that generates a pragmatics as ethics, politics and semiotics, rather than a linguistic system (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 93). Information and communication are not the focus of such a pragmatics but rather they are the expression of incorporeal transformations effected by language – order-words as variable language, functions in the collective assemblage or regimes of signs, imbricated in the processes of subjectification that bring the women and their worlds into view as events and their incorporeal effects. Each woman expresses not so much an identity in her processes of subjectification as she engages with her intercessors, or conceptual personae, but a movement towards becomings-other in the connections and conjunctions of bodies and their worlds: such worlds incorporate open ‘unformed elements’ and ‘the intensive states of an anonymous force’ (Deleuze 1988a, pp. 127-128).

The implicit presuppositions of the assemblages that constitute intentional communities are imbricated in intercessors or conceptual personae. Each woman, in a sense, has a series of subjective, implicit presuppositions and pre-personal

87 Pragmatics ‘expresses the set of incorporeal transformations that effectuate the condition of possibility of language and utilize the elements of the linguist system. The language-function thus defined is neither informational nor communicational; it has to do neither with signifying information nor with intersubjective communication. And it is useless to abstract a significance outside information or a subjectivity outside communication. For the subjectification proceedings and movement of signifiance relate to regimes of signs, or collective assemblages. The language function is the transmission of order-words, and order-words relate to assemblages, just as the assemblages relate to the incorporeal transformations constituting the variables of the function. Linguistics is nothing without pragmatics (semiotic or political) to define the effectuation of the condition of possibility of language and the usage of linguistic elements’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 94)
88 Olkowski, (1999, p.29) for example, argues that regimes of signs and their mixtures, belong within certain assemblages as part of given historical and political conditions. The sounds of a language, a voice, its cadences, and pauses, in this Deleuzean sense do not represent the subtending historical and political reality – or what is called the ‘state apparatus’ as against any nomadic force but rather a multiplicity of regimes of signs. Olkowski uses the example from Alphonso Lingis of the sounds of the Quechua voices in the ‘dark nomadic nomos that are resolved into the state articulation of cocaine and the ‘international’ coding of that trade as criminal by the ‘reigning barbarian empire in Washington, and Bonn and Tokyo’.
singularities that map her world, drive her actualisations and her becomings-other. She maps her world through her intercessors, perhaps a community leader, or her spiritual or environmental sages. Such sages are constructed through in the regimes of signs that are part of her processes of subjectification and part of her becomings-other.

I also argue in this thesis, that the intercessors of the women that engender their becomings-other are more than human conceptual personae and personae imbricated in the folds of Nature. The earth is a virtual intercessor in the lives of all of the women shaping their deterritorialisations and reterritorialisations, and their rhythms and refrains that actualise becomings-other.

Intentional communities are produced as both social machines that conjugate and desiring machines that connect and generate transformations as eco-machines.

Whether or not communities are ‘outside’ of capitalism, or signal the breakdown of capitalism is an issue that is complicated in a Deleuzean and Guattarian machinic analysis. There are revolutionary moments and utopian elements in intentional communities and they are certainly creative experiments on the margins of capitalism. However, capitalism is a ‘segmentary system’ that is open to regeneration. I argue that, in terms of social and environmental sustainability, intentional communities play a role in creating and projecting sustainable futures that can be incorporated within capitalism. In fact, Deleuze and Guattari assert that capitalism, as a social and desiring

---

89 Deleuze and Guattari (1994, pp. 61-73) discuss conceptual personae, aesthetic figures and psychosocial types. Whilst I take up the conceptual personae and to some extent a sense of the aesthetic figure, although this is more implicit than explicit, I attempt to move away from the notion of a psychosocial type. For instance when I discuss the way that a woman leaves a marriage what is important is not the severance of economy the mode of exchange from a marital exchange to a non-marital exchange but the process of deterritorialization that occurs and the ways that each woman tells her story. For instance a social type could be the community member but what I am attempting to show is that each woman is community member as an assemblage in an assemblage that generates more than an aggregate, more than a class of one that is reducible to a type, no matter how seductive the image of thought of that ‘type’ may be as a shorthand or a stereotype.
machine, becomes identical in the breakdowns of the social machine, in its failures, its ‘disharmonies’ and ‘dysfunctions’\textsuperscript{90} Such crises and their contradictions feed capitalism by forcing it to mutate, rather than lead to the death of the social machine.

In this sense, intentional communities are emblematic of the failures of capitalism but not of its death.\textsuperscript{91} Intentional communities are engendered in the ‘misfirings’ of capitalism; they mark where the desiring machine challenges and connects with the social, desiring machine and creates a residuum – the eco-machine as change.

Intentional communities necessarily place themselves in ‘a negative relation’ to the negativity, the blockages of flows of capitalism. They create the positivity of change: metamorphosis.

Change is created in circumstances, in the in-between of relations in the AND \textsuperscript{92} or the interval. In the construction of new borders and in lines of flight and flows,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{90} Capitalism is not undone by the catastrophes it generates but instead ‘regenerates’ out of the disharmonies and dysfunctions caused by its breakdowns (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 151). This is clear in the takeover of ‘sustainability’ by world governments and corporations as they attempt to deal with the global environmental and financial crises.
  \item \textsuperscript{91} ‘In all rigour, there are only economic social problems, even though the solutions may be juridical, political or ideological, and the problems may be expressed in these fields of resolvability. The famous phrase of the \textit{Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy}, “mankind always sets itself only such tasks as it can solve”, does not mean that the problems are only apparent or that they are already solved but, on the contrary, that the economic conditions of a problem determine or give rise to the manner in which it finds a solution within the framework of the real relations of the society. Not that the observer can draw the least optimism from this, for these “solutions” may involve stupidity, or cruelty, the horror of war or “the solution of the Jewish problem”. More precisely the solution is always that which a society deserves or give rise to as a consequence of the manner in which, given its real relations, it is able to pose the problems set within it and to it by the differential relations it incarnates’ (Deleuze, 2004, p. 235). Such a reading of intentional communities sets the scene for the abstract machine, the structures of causality that are \textit{virtual}. It also takes up the notion that ‘Something in the world forces us to think’ (Deleuze, 2004, p. 176). Patton in \textit{Deleuze and the Political} (2002, p. 19-20) suggests, following Deleuze that it is not knowledge ‘expressed in propositional form’ but learning or apprenticeship that leads to thinking as an effect of forces, as an activity that is ‘trespass and violence’ (Deleuze, 2004, p. 175). In this sense it is not the known of community, the known of what is woman, the known of intentionality, community, sustainability, spirituality, the environment but the thinking that is forced from their problems as they encounter each other. Deleuze (1995, p. 146) argues that concepts are ‘not universals but sets of singularities that each extend into the neighbourhood of one of the other singularities.’ Singularities are imbricated in multiplicities; intensive multiplicities form assemblages (See Deleuze, 2004, p.231) for definitional work on multiplicities and Deleuze (1995, p.146) for singularities).
  \item \textsuperscript{92} As Deleuze argues ‘the English and the Americans are just about the only people who have set conjunctions free, by thinking about relations…. AND is neither one thing nor the other, it’s always in-
becomings-other occur in an imperceptible way. I argue in this thesis that the borders, the intervals, the mixtures, insist and subsist in an ecology of relations that zigzag through things and events in becomings-other, engendering new paths into sustainability and spirituality and collectivity. It is in the use of the AND – the piling up of events – that a rhizome is produced. It is in pragmatics and experimentation that a rhizome is produced; it is in the assemblage of serendipitous elements that the section of the rhizome that is segmented into an intentional community is inhabited.

The very nature of the rhizome itself means new shoots are always taking off in different directions. New incarnations of social and desiring machines emerge out of such creations, experiments and new processes of subjectivation and becoming.

Thriving intentional communities make rhizomes. It is important to highlight at this point that the ecology of relations is a political ecology that not only enters into fields of nature but insists that culture is imbricated in Nature. I attempt to make a rhizome with every element of my thesis and this concept of a rhizome carries though every chapter and in every becomings-other – the experimentation ‘applied in the course of events’ that Intentional communities are a part of – the becomings and the experimentations. They are a pragmatics: no longer simply interpretation, but rather

---

93 ‘Schizoanalysis, or pragmatics, has no other meaning: Make a rhizome. But you don’t know what you can make a rhizome with, you don’t know what subterranean stem is effectively going to make a rhizome, or enter a becoming, people your desert. So experiment’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 277). Such a pragmatics is a micropolitics out of which is generated new processes of subjectivation and new becomings-other (Guattari, 2009, pp. 148-149)

94 Massumi (2002a, p. 255) uses a notion of ‘belonging’ as a political ecology drawing on the world of Guattari. He sees it as creating a ‘symbiosis’, which is interesting for the ecology of relations that I am suggesting in this thesis and also interesting in terms of the symbiotic, and often parasitical relationship that human beings have with the earth that is often hidden or forgotten in the everyday. I take this up in the chapter on community but here I want to emphasise the political nature of the assemblages of intentional communities.
experimentations that women are making in concert with the territory and the earth in a taking up of any-space-whatever and becoming a world – peopling a world.

The stories of the women actualise the events of intentional community that evoke the inseparability of states of affairs, of the circumstances of their lives and the incarnated, incorporeal effects of those states of affairs. Worlds and their signs are expressed in the assemblages\textsuperscript{95} of communities and sociabilities that the women co-create alongside all of the varied elements, relations and circumstances that subtend and compose such communities. I argue that desire produces such assemblages in its connections and conjugations as we ‘invent new possibilities of life’ (Deleuze, 1995, p. 95). Productive desire is also linked to the intercessors of the women: the philosophies and theories and the conceptual personae that the women take up in their lives in intentional communities. Thus conceptual personae, or intercessors, are vectors of becomings-other implicated in the intermingling of the women’s opened-out worlds.

In this thesis, I suggest, following Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 41), that intentional communities, as worlds, are creative concepts, a response to a problem, images of thought that include the unthought (prehensions). Out of such concepts, images of thought and prehensions, experimental worlds are constituted on a plane of immanence: a plane that is itself constituted or effectuated in the actualisation of a

\textsuperscript{95} ‘We will call an assemblage every constellation of singularities and traits deducted from the flow – selected organized, stratified – in such a way as to converge (consistency) artificially and naturally; an assemblage in this sense, is a veritable invention. Assemblages may group themselves into extremely vast constellations constituting “ Cultures” or even “ ages” (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 448). As well assemblages are traversed and undone by the deterritorializing work of fuzzy aggregates, which create the molecular layers of assemblages that render them other than static territories and instead open the territories onto the cosmos. The women in their actions experiment and make rhizomes creating fuzzy aggregates of their communities.
concept as an event that exceeds expectations. Such actualisations do not come out of what *is* but rather are becomings-other in worlds where thinking occurs, not between the subject and the object, but ‘in the relationship between the territory and the earth’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 85). Such thinking ‘opens onto the cosmos’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 372).

In this chapter I have drawn together some of the proliferation of concepts and propositions available in the work of Deleuze and Guattari. The overlapping concepts of assemblage, rhizome worlds, drive this radical empiricist analysis of intentional communities and the women who live in them. Such overlapping concepts also show that in this machinic desiring cosmos that the women and their communities insist on muscling into the processes of fabulation underway.

The following chapter negotiates the events of a kind of Deleuzean and Guattarian ethnography. Duration and fabulation underpin the methodology of this thesis and in the following chapter I set out to develop an ethnography that attempts to deal with singularities, differential relations and becomings.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY: ETHNOGRAPHY AS AN UNTIMELY TANGLED TALE

The very idea of fieldwork

Entering the field is specific to ethnographic work. The very idea of fieldwork (Viveiros de Castro, 2012, p.28) is claimed to have its origins in the image of the lone anthropologist, Malinowski, landing on the shores of an island, with supplies for a long stay and on the verge of contact with the unknown. Fear and anxiety shape this experience in Viveiros de Castro’s analysis. The heroism of launching into fieldwork in ‘unknown’ islands or the unknown territories and cultures seems odd in terms of my fieldwork. Time, as duration, extended through space has driven my ethnographic practices, rather than location or site specific fields as such. In this thesis I practise an ‘intermittent’ (Jeffrey & Troman, 2004) and ‘focused’ (Knoblauch, 2005) ethnography, further complicated by feminist ethnography and the work of Deleuze & Guattari.

96 Malinowski’s fieldwork was ‘inadvertently extended’ because he had to sit out the First World War, which coincided with his fieldwork (Jeffrey & Troman, 2004). I am aware of the debate in anthropology presented as the ontological turn in the journal Cultural Anthropology. I move around the field as it is retrospectively filled with the so called futurists – Latour, Sahlins, de Castro, Blaser, Descola, 2013; Kohn, 2013 – who are accused of homogenizing those self-same multiplicities that they attempt to deterritorialised (Bond & Bessire, 2009). The dualism between archaisms and futurisms is the least positive form for such debates to take in terms of my project which is much more modest in its scope. I want to work out the way that worlds’ function, why we fall in love with them and, to a degree why we destroy them and I want to work with the women’s stories to fabulate with all of the particular, singular elements that might make up any sense of whatever universalism. Here I move into a Tardeian question concerning the universal as requiring a necessary resemblance between large groups such that the small, other groups are left behind and insist on the importance of variation and the inventions that underpin them (Toews, 2003, pp. 84-85).
The long, sustained process of research for this thesis entailed a shift from the work of Butler and Foucault to the work of Deleuze and Guattari. This shift meant a relearning of the communities and the women’s stories, which produced an entirely different series of fabulations. I carried out intensive research ‘in the field’ spending a month living within each community in 2001. Each of the communities in my project have a website, they all produce newsletters that have been available for research and can be found on-line, some of their members have had sections on the website and some of them individual blogs. Books have been written and published videos and DVD’s produced and YouTube and the internet have millions of sites concerning intentional communities. The members of intentional communities engage in ‘theorizing’ their own ‘conditions’ (Biehl, 2013, p. 673), in their own field through organisations such the Global Ecovillage Network, implicitly and explicitly, complicating the field, complicating the rules and insisting that the field remains open.

If the technologies of communication and connection to the world is taken into account the field becomes something that seems endlessly plastic and to stretch always into new territories. – I arrived in each community using the latest in travel technology and then used cars, travelling in streams of traffic, for the most part. I was technologically ‘connected’ to the world at almost every point of my journey. I was ‘booked in’, in advance, to each community in terms of permissions to be there for research purposes and in terms of accommodation. Little was left to chance. The fear I experienced and the risk was about the new to me, rather than the new and unknown. Another marked difference between Malinowski’s situation and mine is the now an automatic part of contemporary research projects, which concerns institutional
ethics approvals for research. Committees now assess and control an individual researchers’ ethical stance when dealing with others. The informed consent of research subjects who agree to participate in any study is a given. I offered confidentiality in terms of the identity of each community and each woman and the offer was taken up in every case. Of course, such a gesture led to a strange event; an occlusion of proper nouns and the incorporation of stories without ‘proper’ attribution. There was a painful realisation that I could not use identifying texts published by the communities or individuals from those communities. This changed the nature of my project.

The problem of ‘the informant’ is one that I think bedevils ethnography: the ethical question of the invisibility of an informant is underpinned by the problems of the ethnographic gaze, post coloniality and ‘going native’, further complicated by the plurality of natal cultures within all of the communities. In this instance, the ethnographic present is upheld; we were all ‘there’ and there is evidence to show this, but everyone of the women are given a pseudonym and with it the dangers of simply another constructed identity. On the one hand, the risk is, of course, the cannibalism of ‘eating the name’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 130). Yet, on the other hand, as Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 24) suggest ‘proper names are masks for other becomings and serve only as pseudonyms for more secret singular entities.’ Such dilemmas surround the very notion of the subject, produced without an identity or as faceless bodies. Entering the world of art, of Bacon’s faceless heads (Deleuze, 2003, p. 27) or of philosophy, of Braidotti’s sense of the subject produced as memory and meat permits a move away from an already formed subject, a woman in a place with a story and allows something of the sense of the ‘larval subject’ to emerge, where the
conditions of the self are still in the process of being drawn as is the self (Deleuze, 2004, p. 100). The problem, for me, became one of kinds. If the thesis is art, a rendering of whatever “heres” and “nows” then women are not faceless subjects, so much as they are refrains, stories and fabulations drawn and sung in a thesis. They are not the same kinds of bodies as those in Bacon’s work but the force of blocks of sensation, of affects and percepts; affects do pass through them and percepts are what allow their story to be told in their anonymity, given that percepts are the ‘non human landscapes of nature’ and affects are ‘nonhuman becomings of man’. Somewhere in this breakdown there are the women, entering that landscape and entering their becomings.

The fieldwork that I carried out included interviews – an assemblage incorporating a small battery operated tape recorder-microphone-interviewee-interviewer-chairs-a room – and interviews in themselves became part of a process of encoding stories and decoding stories as a process of fabulation.

97 Deleuze and Guattari offer percepts and affects to render blocks of sensation so Ahab perceives the see through becoming-whale and becomes ocean Mrs Dalloway who perceives the town through becoming-like a knife, and becomes imperceptible exemplifying the non human becoming of man when she is like a knife passing through everything. This is the dilemma of anonymity. How to show the women perceiving but becoming-other in the field of ethnography that is saturated with materiality and realism. One of the ways is to act ‘as if’ ethnography is like art and to keep ‘interrelatedness, precariousness, curiosity, and unfinishedness in focus... in making openings rather than truths (Biehl, 2013, p. 673). However, Biehl (2013, p. 573) also wishes to move beyond anthropologies subjugation to philosophy and to allow ‘peoples own theorizing of these conditions’ to ‘leak in, animate and challenge present-day regimes of verdiction’. Philosophy and ‘people’s own theorizing’ have both become points of subjectification for me and where community becomes a haecceity driving my becomings-community.

98 Geertz (1973, pp. 15-20) incorporated the term ‘thick description’ into ethnography to capture the ethnographer’s task of rendering the chaosmos. To the ‘generative question’, ‘what does an ethnographer do?’ His answer is: ‘He writes’, or ‘scribes’. He writes fiction; ‘something fashioned’ or ‘something made’ and that such interpretations of anthropological fieldwork are ‘second and third order’ analyses. For Geertz, ‘guessing at meanings, assessing the guesses, and drawing explanatory conclusions from the better guesses, not discovering the Continent of Meaning and mapping out its bodiless landscape’ is the essence of cultural analysis. ‘In these shoes? I don’t think so.’ What I hope to show is that while Geertz offers a path through the limits of positivist ethnography and posits the power of the guess, he takes a path, following Ricoeur that sees the intentional, phenomenological “saying” as fixed in the “said”. The process of inscribing thick description rather than grappling with the forces of the outside, and the serendipitous sense of the guess gets lost in an authorial “said”.
I have taken sections of the transcripts of the interviews with the women and rendered them as a ‘poetic’ form. The forms are also rhizomatic – rhizomes are anomalous becomings produced by the formation of transversal alliances between different and coexisting terms within an open system (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p.23) – where the women’s stories create unexpected irruptions and offshoots. What is at work here is the translation of the transcripts into stories in a poetic form as perhaps an ‘irruption of women’s voice’ but more as an irruption of becomings-other. The women, their stories, their communities, their relations constitute an array of other elements as assemblages that are themselves constituted by individuations that are multiplicities that ‘have a status of their own and direct the metamorphoses of things and subjects’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 288). ‘Women’ are taken to be such haecceities as it is virtual women with every potential connection, conjugation, conjunction and disjunction rather than that which provides the figure for feminism. Haecceities that ‘direct the metamorphoses of things and subjects’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 288) and where subjectivities are constituted in relation to those various aleatory actualisations that are constituted from the virtual in local circumstances through the variations of connections and conjunctions. What is available in the use of the AND (conjunction) is the surpassing of the syllogism and the subordination of the

---

99 This is a version of an ethnographic tool (Stewart, 1996) but one that allows the stories of the women to enter into the imagination as refrains, threads of tunes, sonorous movements in time (Lingis, 2004, 282). Stewart (2012, p. 233) says in an autobiographical piece that the first time she moved from prose to a ‘narrative poem’ in front of her ‘peers’ and ‘All manner of four letter words broke out: I was accused of fabricating the research.’ She also claims: ‘How you can know and what you can tell is limited by the format chosen.’

100 Alecia Youngblood Jackson’s article ‘Rhizovocality’ moves through many of the concerns that I have as a researcher and ethnographer of ‘other cultures’. As she claims feminist, postcolonial and poststructuralist theories have been most concerned with the issues of voice. Her use of Deleuze and Guattari’s ‘figuration of the rhizome, the irruption of women’s voice’ leads her ‘to invent a concept of voice, rhizovocality, that signifies voice as excessive and transgressive yet interconnected (2003, p. 693). I take the rhizomatic voice as a collective assemblage and part of the theory of pragmatics that shapes this research and this thesis.
conjunction to the verb to be. Such a surpassing of the syllogism, of the verb to be forces ‘the encounter with relations’ to ‘penetrate and corrupt everything’ to ‘undermine being, make it topple over…’. The AND is not even a specific relation or conjunction, it is that which subtends all relations, the path of all relations, which makes relations shoot outside their terms and outside the set of their terms, and outside everything which could be determined as Being, One, or Whole’ (Deleuze 2006, pp. 42-43).  

Beginnings

Ilsa:

*Let me get into it... warming up.*

Okay.

*I’ve been thinking about it of course since we (met).*

So, I start.

*You were the potential stimulant to think about things right now*

So I felt it’s an opportunity

*And for what reason it’s useful for you or for me it*

And it started to sweep out some things

*Ja. I would like to try it. If I see that my voice sometimes fades, I don’t know, I will catch my breathing.*

101 ‘Instead of the series of syllogisms at the basis of the subject of lack where Being is man, where man is the subject who enters the Symbolic through language and woman, as man’s other arrives in the Symbolic as lack and not as subject there is the ‘extra-being, inter-being’ of the AND. The incorporation of the AND is a way of escaping the syllogisms of the verb to be. ‘Relations might still establish themselves between their terms, or between two sets, from one to the other but the AND gives relations another direction, and puts to flight terms and sets, the former and the latter on the line of flight which it actively creates. Thinking with AND, instead of thinking IS, instead of thinking for IS: empiricism has never had another secret. Try it, it is a quite extraordinary thought, and yet it is life’ (Deleuze 2006, p. 43).
Interviewing ‘subjects’ and taking the interviews as ‘objects’ of research creates and ensnares an ecology of relations as an assemblage, traversed by subjects and objects in a complicated cartographic process. In this process the relationship between subject and object is one of reciprocal presupposition. Nature and culture are inseparable in such an ecology; worlds and subjectivities are always in the process of creation or becomings-other, as they are traversed and captured in duration. Such worldings emerge from chance encounters between elements in the research relationship and in the middle of cultural and natural worlds. Each element in the process produces the world of the woman and the expression of events she has embraced as ‘her story’.

Each story is more than a series of phenomenological events and the embrace of those events. The interviewee is the woman, as a subject-in-process and a series of becomings-other, in the story and thus in the middle of the research and travelling with her is the researcher, as a subject-in-process and a series of becomings-other, who is also in the middle, yet forced by circumstances to create cogent beginnings and ends, all doubling and entwining in the processes of transformative worldings. Such double articulations of the ethnographic task create a topography of multiple durations, where worlds are not only expressed but ‘multiply our world peopling it with “all those expressed, which do not exist apart from their expressions”’ (Deleuze, 1994, cited in Viveiros de Castro, 2011, p.137).102

The task of ethnography then becomes one not of entering worlds and keeping them open to future representation but rather one of setting aside the violence of

---

102 Viveiros de Castro is an anthropologist who has taken up Deleuze, as have I, to show that Deleuze understood the question of the ‘other’ in <i>Difference and Repetition</i> in a way that was integral to any ethnographic work which seeks ‘not to explicate oneself too much with the other, not to explicate the other too much, but to maintain one’s implicit values and multiply one’s own world by populating it with all those expressed that do not exist apart from their expressions’ (2004, p. 324).
ethnographic representation and instead multiplying worlds. We multiply worlds through entering the openings that occur between chaotic, simultaneous events – worlds and women – and present them subtly, and in this sense, ethically, as we all work to be ‘worthy of the event’ (that necessity of the dice throw that is life) (Deleuze, 2006, p. 26).

The interview\textsuperscript{103} as an event occurs as a spatio-temporal dynamism overflowing the boundaries of the spatio-temporal dynamisms of the assemblages, or bodies, of the communities. Rather than a text, or data, open to analysis, and the making of meaning (Elliot, 2005, p. 22), the interview and fabulation concerns the functions of stories of the women in the world of their communities and in the world of the academy: as corporeal passions and actions of bodies and the incorporeal acts or expressions of bodies (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 95). The selective fragments that are taken up in the construction of interviews and field work come from mapping processes that cut up and interrupt the flow of events which are the creation of worlds. Such worlds are part of a global incorporeal environment: in this way individuals rather than being rendered as ‘subjects’, ‘objects’, and identities, such as environmentalists, permaculturists, spiritualists and so on, enter into productive, relational becomings.

Ethnographies have many caveats for radical empiricism. Representation is in ‘ruins’, researchers may not speak for the other, they may not other the other, and then there

\textsuperscript{103} Feldman (2011, p. 376) states that ‘Anthropologists have long agreed that doing ethnography is more than doing participant-observation. We readily turn to archives, interviews, statistics, media coverage, and a host of other sources of information when ‘being there’ is logistically challenged or as supplements to further elicit the proverbial native’s viewpoint. Furthermore, contemporary ethnography does not simply transcend the local, but rather it shows how place is composed of processes that link a multitude of locales around the globe. Most tellingly, socio-cultural anthropologists universally describe themselves as ‘ethnographers’ not ‘participant observers’

are the relationships that develop between researcher and subjects as the taboo areas of ethnography (Kulick & Wilson, 1995). In contemporary ethnographical practices restrictions are placed on research and researchers by institutions. The ‘consent form’ is used to protect the identity of individuals and their communities in the outside ‘worlds’. The future wellbeing of each of the women in this study and the desire for confidentiality for themselves and their communities makes it imperative to protect the identities of participants both without and within their communities. The concern to protect the women and their communities meant much more than providing pseudonyms for them. It also dictated that the writing up became other than a conventional ethnography of gender or culture in a series of locales (Marcus, 1995).

Fieldwork as simply participant observation has been challenged (Nader, 2002, p. 28). The sense that ‘direct sensory experience in ‘the field’ is the ground for ethnography and its products, limits what ethnography can do and needs extension beyond the field (Feldman, 2011, p. 375). Ethnography is not necessarily the product of ‘being there’ or of observing and listening, even across multiple sites. Rather ethnography concerns the folding in or incorporation of whatever sources, sites and subject or object as a plurality of whatever ‘composing processes’ appear in a relational multiplicity created out of positive difference, divergence, the disjunctive syllogism or becoming (Vivieros de Castros, 2011) needed to produce a fabulation.104 It became instead a fabulation based on relations the stories of the women, which became refrains in the process of the many times that I heard and read their voices.

104 Feldman (2011, p. 376) draws together support for what some ethnographers might consider unorthodox methods for ethnographic work. His suggestion that ‘archives, interviews, statistics, media coverage and a host of other sources of information’ are only added to in my ethnographic attempts to take into account an ecology of relations
Ilsa is not the name of the ‘subject’ chosen out of a list of possible names as a representation of the interview process and its product. Rather, Ilsa is an assemblage: a breath, a body of joy and pain, a voice, an evocation of a spatio-temporal dynamism that exists in her-my duration, in her-my politics of fabulation. Using the feminine name Ilsa does not make it ‘her’ name, just as using the feminine name and ‘her’ does nothing other than ‘make a diagram of an assemblage’ of ‘a haecceity type’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 292).

Ilsa enters into ‘direct discourse’ drawing her ‘voice’ from the collective assemblage, an assemblage of enunciation ‘combining many heterogeneous regimes of signs, extracting ‘something’ she calls herself; her “I”: a process that incorporates ‘operations of signifiance and proceedings of subjectification, in an assemblage…distributed, attributed, and assigned, or that the variables of the assemblage enter into constant relations, however temporarily. Direct discourse105 is a detached fragment of a mass and is born of the dismemberment of the collective assemblage: but the collective assemblage is always like the murmur from which I take my proper name, the constellation of voices, concordant or not, from which I draw my voice’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 93). Such heterogeneous regimes of signs and constant relations are the stuff of ethnographic research. They are the stuff that is spoken and listened to and heard in a series of ways, over time in space; stuff that is seen and processed in various lived presents that are spatial, ‘the field’ of the

---

105 ‘My direct discourse is still the free indirect discourse running though me coming from other worlds or other planets’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 93). Such indirect discourse is incorporated in the use of order-words and the incorporeal transformations that are inherent in the order-word. Order-words are taken up at various points in the thesis.
research, but are expressed within the flow of time – this is duration (Vannini, 2002, p. 195).106

Such ‘a field’ is that of transcendental empiricism implicating the virtual – haecceities, intensities, singularities, Ideas and events – and the actual conditions or state of affairs of the Event (or the series of divergent events of the being of becoming that compose the Event or Being) engendering difference.107

Ilsa said at the beginning of her interview that thinking about the interview since we had arranged it a few days earlier had begun a process which included time for safe reflection and in this safe reflection she had been moved, just as she expected to be

106 Vannini (2002) writes of waiting for a train in India and for a plane at Hong Kong airport. Schweizer (2005, p. 777) writes of Snitow’s work where she says that in romance novels women wait for the hero to act and also quotes Bergson who says that mixing sugar and water is waiting for the sugar to melt. Ethnographic research is akin to waiting for the sugar to melt: waiting for ethics approval, waiting to travel, to arrange a visa, waiting in airports, waiting to arrive, waiting to arrange interviews, waiting for interviews, waiting for the field (work) to fold me into it. As well there is the waiting in the ethnographic process where the thesis is being written, read and reread by a supervisor/s and the durational process of the writing itself where the ethnography is unfolded and unfolds in the enfolding of the mass of material. What does a researcher do, what can a body do while it is waiting? Vannini (2002, p.195) offers a strongly Bergsonian notion of duration which suggests that we are misled if we see waiting for a train as a spatial process. He sees it as a qualitative process of passing time, suggesting that ‘in everyday life, time is often confused with space. This confusion is at the roots of our inability to experience freedom. We measure the passage of time and the intensity of emotion through and in space, as the movement of minutes, hours, days on a line, or as the quantification of feelings in a continuum. Yet Bergson suggests there is no such… reduction of a flow, or duration, into discrete units. Just as every moment carries with it the originality of an unfolding life of the universe, every sensation carries with it a qualitative human character that is unique and unrepeatable.’ What I am suggesting, following Deleuze (2004, p. 299) in his critique of Bergson concerning intensity is that it is not prior already constituted qualitative elements – time – and quantitative extensities – space but quantitative intensities and a fusion of the processes of duration and becoming.

107 The ‘field’ is that of conditions or circumstances and the questions raised not only by the action but by the relations between desire, circumstances and the imagination– the circumstance of the javelin thrown into the ground outside a deserted city, the desire to claim it and the imagination to believe that such an act is a claim of ownership (Deleuze 1991, p. 48). Deleuze’s (1990, p. 100) example of the battle to argue that it is the Event the ‘field’ is virtual and actualised and this reading of the ‘battle’ field resonates with the ‘ethnographic’ field. The battle is virtual ‘because it is actualized in diverse manners at once and because each participant may grasp it at a different level of actualization within its variable present…. But it is above all because the battle hovers over its own field, being neutral in relations to all its temporal actualizations, neutral and impassive in relation to the victor and the vanquished, the coward and the brave; because of this it is all the more terrible. Never present but always yet to come and already passed, the battle is grasped only by the will of anonymity which it itself inspires.’
moved and was moved by the interview itself. Looking at some fragments of her interview shows more than Ilsa’s words, it also shows her actualising an event.

*Started to sweep out some things*
*Also for safe reflection.*
*To trigger*
*And*
*You know*
*To move me.*

Ilsa is ‘actualizing an event and able to transcend her ‘form’ and her ‘syntactical link to the world’ such that she has the capacity to ‘grasp herself as event: and that she grasp the event actualised within her as another individual grafted onto her….To explore all distances, but over a single line; to run very fast in order to remain in the same place (Deleuze, 1990, pp. 178-179). This is subjectivity produced in counter-actualisation and becoming.

Ilsa’s use of language is very strong, the infinites ‘to move’, ‘to trigger’, suggest that she understands very well these events. For Ilsa, the interview process, as a chance to counter-actualise, is very clear here. As an actor-dancer she is triggered and moved in the processes of reflection; her ‘syntactical link to the world’ is transcended and her ‘form’ as a subject is transcended. It is not simply that the interview is an event and a process of counter-actualisation, for both of us together and singly, but also that Ilsa in her thinking, in her ‘safe refection’ is able to ‘grasp herself as an event: and that she grasp the event actualised within her as another individual grafted onto her… Each individual would be like a mirror for the condensation of singularities and each world a distance in the mirror. This is the ultimate sense of counter-actualization…. Counter-actualizing each event, the actor-dancer extracts the pure event which communicates with all the others and returns to itself through all the others, and with
all the others…. To explore all distances, but over a single line; to run very fast in order to remain in the same place. The gray butterfly understands very well the event “to be hidden” just as the black butterfly understands very well the event “to invigorate” (Deleuze, 1990, pp. 178-179). Ilsa is a subject-in-process in this interview, she is making judgements: she is reflecting and expects to be reflected upon. She ‘extracts from that which affects’ her ‘a power independent of the actual exercise’
She, as do all subjects-in-process ‘invents’ and is ‘the maker of artifice’ (Deleuze, 1991, p. 86).

When I began the transcription of Ilsa’ interview I experienced a strong bodily reaction again. The interview was perhaps the most difficult of all to transcribe and it took me several weeks after my return from India to complete that task. I simply had to stop and do something else. It had been an interview where strong emotions were expressed by Ilsa through the stories of her life and her memories of some very painful events, which were harrowing. She suffered great losses in her life partly because of her decision to stay and live in Bonville and her grief over those issues and the death of her mother, while she was absent from Europe was hard to witness.
Expressing grief, or other strong emotions, is difficult when living within a community such as Bonville where vitalism is frowned upon. Ilsa saw the interview as a challenge and a chance to speak about the many things that she was prompted to think of because of the upcoming interview and to sweep them out.

108 ‘We are all subjects in another respect, that is, in (and by) the moral, aesthetic, or social judgement. In this sense the subject reflects and is reflected upon. It extracts from that which affects it in general a power independent of the actual exercise, that is a pure function and then transcends its own partiality…. The subject invents, it is the maker of artifice (Deleuze, 1991, p86).
Ilsa had a calm, thoughtful, almost deliberate way of speaking. Her stories were deeply moving. The processes of affect, the impact on me, on us both were clear to her and to me. Her take on the interview itself was interesting. Some women in her community refused to speak to me and refused to be interviewed. I was seen as a ‘mentalist’ and a ‘vitalist’ or someone who had only an intellectual, incarnated understanding of the world. The research project itself removed the possibility for connection because through it I was not intent on bringing the divine into the world through my life and my work.

In a discussion about researching, and ‘doing’ ethnography without a long and deep interaction in the field, Ilsa expressed her sense of what was needed concerning ethnography.

*You need a distance but you have also had a legitimate experience and the value of this experience is not dependent on the time frame. Your experience after 10-15 years is not more valuable or more grounded, or more subtle, or whatever. I don’t believe in this way of looking. Just be brave.*

And I have been brave. I sat through one of the most harrowing series of memories in bloody duration\(^{109}\) and then listened to it again and again, until finally I had *some distance*. I felt that I owed that distance to Ilsa; that the debt-exchange relationship meant that in order to fulfil my debt for the exchange and use the duration of our memories and be worthy of the event as she was in the telling and incorporate her story but it was hard won. And in excess of this distance, as debt-exchange I want to

\(^{109}\) Cook et al (2006, p.660) exhorts us to ‘do more to narrate our own ‘detective work’: the emotional geographies involved in searching for, meeting and learning about the lives of the people (and other others) who might be helping us live the lives we live (and vice versa), and the processes through which our politics might radically change….’ I think it is impossible to escape the emotional geographies of ‘our own detective work’ but several of the stories I was told required a great deal of ‘emotion work’ in and out of those ‘emotional geographies’.
argue that interviews are connections of desire\textsuperscript{110} in the Deleuzean and Guattarian sense and that this became as important to my ethnographic methodology as the notion of the exchange ubiquitous to capitalism and the capitalist market.

As well, Ilsa offers a sense of time that is not to be measured in length, or units, and where such time might be the judgement of the groundedness of research or its value and subtlety. For Ilsa it is the legitimacy of the experience that is important. In the language that I would use it is ‘the deep and creative’ experience of the time we were together. I would argue that is was so with all of the women – there was a deep and creative experience of fabulation in all of those lived presents that seem so unrepeatable but were in fact repeated by the women and me many times.

Fabulation unfolds as creativity. It is what occurs when we negotiate with ‘mediators’ whether they are human, things, territories, worlds, imaginary, art, design, and where all of these are a series. ‘If you’re not in a series you’re lost. I need my mediators to express myself, and they’d never express themselves without me; you’re always working in a group, even when you seem to be on your own. And still more when it’s apparent (Deleuze, 1995, p. 125). And this was my experience. Rather than speaking on my own, simply following a ‘master discourse’ I am ‘working with a group, several groups and we are all “telling tales,” “caught in the act of telling tales”. This is what Deleuze calls a minor discourse ‘with one or many speakers’ and ‘it is here that we come upon what Bergson calls “fabulation”… To catch someone in the act of

\textsuperscript{110} ‘Desire is the set of passive syntheses that engineer partial objects, flows, and bodies, and that function as units of production. The real is the end product, the result of passive syntheses of desire as autoproduction of the unconscious. Desire dies not lack anything; it does not lack its object. It is, rather, the subject that is missing in desire or desire that lacks a fixed subject; there is no fixed subject unless there is repression. Desire and its object are one and same thing: the machine, as a machine of a machine’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 26).
telling tales is to catch the movement of constitution of a people (Deleuze, 1995, p. 125-126).  

When I spoke to Ilsa I was not saying all that I could. There is a strong contrast between my field notes and what I said in the interview. She was an educated, intelligent, woman but at the same time a delicate and subtle woman, who may have been distressed at the ways in which some of the women in her community responded to an outsider. The swift rejections, the cold faces, the brusque and dismissive attitudes, directed at the ‘mentalist’ ‘vitalist’ researcher in an intentional community suggested strong resistance to becoming a supposed ‘object’ of research. Perhaps this is a little paradoxical, given that the community regards itself as a ‘university for all humanity’ a ‘laboratory’ a series of experiments for all of mankind and the seat of the evolution of mankind. In contrast, there were women who willingly agreed to spend time with me, share part of their lives with me and tell me their stories, for whatever reasons.

Any negative reactions may have been ameliorated with more time spent in the community: an increase in the time of duration. I think that the time of ethnography

---

111 Deleuze goes on in this section of Negotiations about mediators and the process of fabulation to discuss the movement from a colonialist discourse about the Palestinians being thrown out of their territory and says that to ‘the extent that they resist they enter the process of becoming a people It corresponds exactly to what Perrault calls being caught in the act of telling tales. So to the established fictions that are always rooted in a colonists discourse, we oppose a minority discourse, with mediators’ (Deleuze, 1995, p126). And this is what is attempted in this thesis, to oppose the minority discourses of the women, the micro, everyday discourses of sustainability and spirituality and community to majority discourses; as such discourses are made visible in the fabulations of the women and I.

112 In the ‘doing’ of fieldwork there is a recognition of the moral and ethical difficulties of such research practices: the use of informants; coaching informants to understand your concerns and your research project; soliciting stories that ‘fit’ the research; using theoretical frameworks that demand a ‘fit’; becoming the confidante of certain people or groups and many more. Yet it is in the irruption of resistance, that push away, the possible interviewee who says no, the coldness, the set-up phone call that is not returned, or is refused; the suspicion evinced that allows the researcher to see that every
is the time of duration, which is the intensity of the present time; the intensity of the passions that are witnessed and expressed in the flows of memory. This is the way that I take Elizabeth St Pierre’s suggestion that she, ‘Like the nomad intends to travel while remaining seated’ (2000, p. 258). Yet, unlike St. Pierre, I undertook a multi-sited research – although it could be argued that any site is several – across three intentional communities in three countries. Even more complicated than that was that the three countries are divided into geographical and cultural regions and in each community there were women who had ‘migrated’ to that country and so had different natal countries. Such multi-sited research produces the ‘worlds’ of the research as well as the communities and the women in the ways that all of the singularities, the haecceities, preside over the production of the individual and individual worlds.

Multi-sited research (Marcus, 1998, pp. 79-104) invokes the global nature of the ‘problem’ of any environmental crisis that is a subranging element in intentional communities but it also invokes the ‘methodological anxieties’ of ethnography. That is it needs to take into account the postcolonial worlds and capitalist worlds that intentional communities are a part of, and their circumstances in the global environmental crisis as part of a version of a world but not necessarily in the sense that Marcus suggests of a ‘total world system’ (1998, pp. 82-86). Worlding is for me, following Deleuze and Guattari, not based on ‘the objects’ of research to be found across sites but rather the processes of becoming. This is not to deny that the plane of

relation, because its terms are external to it, and open to composing forces of their own, will move towards a different outcome.

113 Although this is what explicitly subtends my research other work on ecovillages, for example that by Adrian Parr, (2009, pp. 49-64) suggests that ecovillages, whilst conservative in terms of private ownership and land and their response to the urban situation that they are still an important comparison to the militarized ‘gated communities’ that are proliferating in America and that she sees are part of a process of militarization. Of course there are intentional communities that are not based on private ownership of land and Bonville is one of those communities; however that is not to deny potential for conservatism invoked in the construction and defence of a bounded territory.
immanence incorporates postcolonialism or capitalism but to suggest that they are formations, contingent, not set forms and that they are flows, in flux, folded and unfolded in any construction of the socially given that appears in duration, in the circumstances everyday of any such ‘site’, or series of sites.

When Marcus (1998, pp. 90-95) suggests that the techniques of multi-sited ethnography include ‘follow the people’, ‘follow the thing’, ‘follow the metaphor’, follow the plot, story, or allegory’, ‘follow the life or biography’ and ‘follow the conflict’ he is suggesting that what is most important is the movement between sites and embedded situations as against a static single-site study that follows local subjects as produced subalterns in a postcolonial or capitalist situation (Marcus, 1998, p. 95). Marcus’ later claims (2008) reiterate this simple following of events because he characterises anthropology as moribund and awaiting transformation. Yet, the contemporary fields of anthropology and ethnography have a strong thread of innovative work that does not tail-end worlds but multiplies them.114

Indeed, the multi-sited ethnography that unfolds in my thesis begins with a notion of multi-sited research, as Marcus suggests and not that of a single site-study, following local ‘subjects’ but with no sense that the subjects were already produced or that the situations were static and there to be ‘read’ or interpreted. My presupposition is that each woman in each community is a minor voice, wanting to be heard and an haecceity, a singularity, an event, an assemblage constituted within events, within

114 See the work of Biehl, 2005, Biehl & Locke (2010), who take up the notion of desire and what they call a Deleuzean cartography to discuss subjectivities, Stoller (2009), Viveiros de Castro (2011), Feldman, (2011), Nielsen, (2011), include some of the most contemporary incorporations of Deleuzean concepts and theory in ethnographic work.
continuous assemblages: it is a presupposition of ‘thisness’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 289) as it is expressed and multiplies worlds.

What arises out of all such qualitative research practices is, of course, the ‘problem’.

Ilسا was and is prescient in my research. She foreshadows the event, the composing forces of the event, duration, time and memory and the question of experience and its expressions. The question of the ‘ground’ in empirical research is challenged through Ilسا’s story. Experience is not more grounded simply because it is over a longer period of time in a place, indeed ethnography is the lived time of duration as a virtual realm that relies not upon the measurement of time but on an intuition of time in the Bergsonian sense of time as continuous duration – ‘each moment flows with our memory of the past and appears to us as new and unrepeatable’ (Vannini, 2002, p. 194). Time is real but ethnographic time is that of the immediacy of the lived present, when we are sitting within a field, a set of circumstances that are in excess of the lived present. It is the memory of the interview under the fan in a very hot palm-roofed hut with no windows or flyscreens. It is the sound of the voice on the tape two years, five years later in an air-conditioned office heard for the nth time. It is the time in front of the computer, in the library, in seminars where ethnography is stretched out, followed by the return to the tapes, to the field work notes115 that produces an indefinable something more. Intuition is the time of

---

115 ‘The researcher is required to report exactly her methodology, her data, her verification, or her work will be rejected by the journal and she may be dismissed from her position and from the profession’ (Lingis, 2007, p. 115). Such are the ‘order-words’ of ‘research’ and within what is called by Denzin (1997, p. 44) ‘modernist’ ethnographic research where the order-words are elaborated through various twists and turns that separate time and space when they are in fact inseparable. Yet what has happened in ethnography in the past two decades since the ‘cultural turn’ in which Marcus and Clifford played a seminal role, has been a process of critique and questioning and experimentation; bundles of lines of flight and the creation of new passwords. My ethnography works to produce another variant of a password.
experience that is experimental: life where we live creatively and where matter and memory create an excess out of a virtuality that includes time as duration and space as extensity where each is an indeterminate folding, unfolding, refolding that constitutes the everyday as movement – nomadology (Deleuze, 1993, p. 137).\textsuperscript{116}

Such a sense of time as duration in movement is not locked into the movement of the thing or the practices of research and writing, rather the tapes, the writing are abstractions of movement. Intuition is a sympathy that has us passing into the thing, the practice, the memory, the place, rather than remaining outside of it.\textsuperscript{117}

Each woman encapsulates the ways in which Deleuze and Guattari see expression, invoking Bergson’s intuition against intellect where the intuition is ‘the art of living’ and where the experiences of life exceed the intellect, which seeks to immobilise reality rather than take reality intuitively as an undifferentiated flow where the potential delay between the ‘moment of perception’ and ‘the moment of action’. That is, the greater the ‘zone of indeterminacy’ the greater the ‘access the subject will have to an alternative axis of movement: that of intuition’ (Herzog, 2000, p.6). Sense is linked with experience in Bergson’s concept of intuition. Experience as the turn of experience in Bergson is explicated in the following quote.

\textsuperscript{116} Deleuze uses Tony Smith’s image where are driving towards the future in ‘a sealed car’ on a ‘dark highway’ disrupts the Leibnizian notion of the monad transforming it into a nomad. Not only is the sense of a encapsulated world opened up and out to the chaosmos – the crapshoot – it is held open in movement and fusion of elements in divergent series: the stories/songs of the women, in counterpoint not just with each other but with the more than human crowds that enter into the politics of sustainable life. Here the common sense notion of space as being that which subtends us, contains us, is pried open in becomings, indissolubly constituted in movement.

\textsuperscript{117} Bergson uses several devices to discuss intuition as imbricated in duration. In terms of the colour wheel he says that we need to pass into orange to intuit the way that we are captured in between red and yellow and to see that it is part of the whole of the colour wheel. This is how I attempt to approach the stories of the women as saturated with the duration of their lives and their communities.
We start from what we take to be experience, we attempt various possible arrangements for the fragments which apparently compose it, and when at least we feel bound to acknowledge the fragility of every edifice that we have built, we end by giving up all effort to build. But there is a last enterprise that might be undertaken. It would be to see experience at its source or rather above that decisive turn where, taking a bias in the direction of our utility, it becomes properly human experience (Bergson 1911/1970, p.184 also cited in Morris, 2005, p.281).

In Bergson’s analysis, what is known to us in inner or outer experience or as undivided continuity is pure intuition. (This resonates with the concept of the fold). Intuition is seen as a method developed by Bergson (Grosz, 2004, p. 235; Morris 2005, p. 281). I want to use Morris’s argument here to complicate the notion of experience. Morris suggests that sense-making concepts, which permit articulations enable continuity within (originary) experience (within the plane of immanence), rather than within a transcendental plane. When we do this ‘we are seeking sense’ (Morris, 2005, p. 281). Such a seeking of sense within originary and undivided experience focuses on coherent cores incorporating intensive not extensive variation.

The sense we are seeking will overturn existing conceptual prejudices and lead to new concepts and so will involve abductive-intensive variation. By freeing reason from utility and so going beyond the turn of experience Bergsonian intuition seeks an intuitively given experience that already contains the concepts that make sense of it. This sort of concept will grasp a structure of invariance within an intensively variant experiential continuity. So far as this concept is generated by the given, it is sense.

Grosz (2004, p. 235) discusses Bergson’s intuition as ‘contemplation or observation that opens up worlds to us, rather than narrowing the object down to our potential concerns…. He regards intuition as the only mode of apprehension in differences in kind and of that virtuality that resides in the living transposition of the past into the
Intuition is the only way we can consider duration and becoming without transforming them into representation and without considering them cinematographically….apprehend being and the world “from the inside.” As such representation is capture. Is the rendering of lived experience able to be other than a snapshot or perspective that acts as a more or less valid representation all that may be achieved? Carla, for example, is taking her experiences as intuitively given experiences, those that make sense.

Intuition has the capacity to permeate our thinking and our ways of seeing and knowing so that we may become intensely aware of the turn of our ‘lived’ experience. Intuition is an undivided continuity that is not only linked to our inner and outer experience but is also linked to time so that ‘each moment flows with our memory of the past and appears to us as new and unrepeatable’… experiences (Vannini, 2002, p. 194).

What might be the verification of Janine speaking of the unsayability of spirituality, who stops in her story to ask I don’t know, what do you think? Do you have a…? And in asking her question diverges from ‘the interviewee’ as a supposed ‘object of research’ and supposed docile subjectivity of the interviewee and in fact refuses the role. Laughing and telling me to ‘find out’. And Janine questioned me closely about many of the issues that we discussed during her interview and when I visited her home for a dinner with some of the other women from the community and when I did some weeding in the bushland across from her home, and when I hitched a ride into the town for supplies with her and on several other occasions. Her curiosity about my project was as intense as my curiosity about her. What seemed to be different was that
I was keeping fieldwork notes about the time that we spent together and the conversations that we had; in this sense my questions had a purpose beyond wanting to know and the difficulties of wanting to know what could not be said.

The assemblage of the interview is disrupted by the overlapping territories that bite into the milieus of the research, the ‘interview’ that leads beyond ‘expectations’ beyond the ‘look’ of participant observation, and beyond the presumptions of interpretative ethnography into fabulation – a catching of someone telling tales (Deleuze, 1995, p. 125) and the process of joining in that fabulation in the selection of words, stories, and repetition of them to produce a refrain.

What we ‘look for’ is unfortunately what we shall find….It is perhaps difficult for an analytical or analytically trained mind to admit that recording, gathering, sorting, deciphering, analysing and synthesizing, dissecting and articulating are already ‘imposing our [a] structure,’ a structural activity….Rare are those who realize that what they come up with is not ‘structure of their narratives’ but reconstruction of the story’ (Trinh 1989, 141-142, also cited in Denzin, 1995, p. 231).

Trinh raises some important problems that I think are shifted out of the way, or skewed in a topological Deleuzean ethnography that rather than having as its centre
the open ended, semi-structured interview\textsuperscript{118,119} between a subject and another subject, as the object of research; or participant observation with its blending of insider and outsider, subjective and objective observations, where ethnographic understanding is the object of the research, this ethnography has stories, fabulations

\textsuperscript{118} Deleuze questions whether there is ‘anything to be gained by expressing sense in the interrogative rather than the infinitive or participial form (“Is God?” rather than to-be-God or the being of God)? He suggests that ‘the gain is slight… because a question is always traced from givable, probable or possible responses. It is therefore itself the neutralised double or supposedly pre-existent proposition which may or must serve as response. All the orator’s art goes into constructing questions in accordance with the responses he wishes to evoke or the propositions of which he wants to convince us. Even when we do not know the answer, we question only in supposing that in principle it is already given, or that it already exists in another consciousness. That is why – in accordance with its etymology – interrogation always takes place with the framework of a community: to interrogate implies not only a common sense but a good-sense, a distribution of knowledge and of the given with respect to an empirical consciousness in accordance with their situations, their points of view, their positions and their skills, in such a way that a given consciousness is supposed to know already what the other does not….Despite this weakness, the interrogative formula has at least one advantage: at the same time as it invites us to consider the corresponding proposition as a response, it opens up a new path for us. A proposition conceived as a response is always a particular solution, a case considered for itself, abstractly and apart from the superior synthesis which relates it, along with other cases, to a problem as problem. Therefore interrogation, in turn, expresses the manner in which a problem is dismembered, cashed out and revealed, in experience and for consciousness, according to its diversely apprehended cases of solution. Even though it gives us an insufficient idea, it thereby inspires us in the presentiment of that which it dismembers’ (Deleuze, 2004, pp. 195-196). And sense is located in the problem itself. Sense is constituted in the complex theme, but the complex theme is that set of problems and questions in relation to which the proposition serves as elements of responses and cases of solution (Deleuze, 2004, p. 196).

\textsuperscript{119} I used tape-recorded semi-structured interviews with a small number of themed, open-ended questions, which were meant to encourage focused, two-way communication, to both give and receive information. What was most important was to establish rapport, and most of all to encourage the women to go beyond the questions asked in the first instance about sustainability, spirituality and the environment. The use of ‘silent prompts’ (waiting in silence to give the interviewee time to continue at their own pace, to gather their thoughts, accompanied by nodding, saying ‘yes’, or ‘uh hu’) is also encouraged in such interview processes and I used such naturalizing ‘techniques’. The semi-structured interview is used extensively in social research following the ‘qualitative turn’ and is the technique used in a variety of fields of qualitative research, such as sociology, anthropology and geography and cultural studies when only one interview will be held. Yet such research techniques have been open to critique (Denzin, 1997, pp. 44-45) and it is the use that they are put to that is the crux of the issue. I do not suggest that the interview material expresses the ‘truth’ or a snapshot of a particular situation, time or place. The politics of semi-structured interviewing suggest that was occurs is indeed pragmatic but in a Deleuzean sense where what is expressed – in the exchange is just that a relation of debt and exchange. The sections of transcriptions that I have rendered following Stewart (1996) are a way for me to disrupt the notion that the words of the women represent them, or allow their voices to be heard. I wanted to clearly identify myself in the processes of expression of the women’s stories using Stewart’s methods but more than that I wanted to introduce a sense of the collective enunciation that I pursue throughout the text and what Jackson Youngblood calls rhizovocality – not just the murmur of indirect discourse but the ways that it can shoot off, become other, be in excess of understanding. There is a great deal of material that I did not use from the tape-recordings, or from my participant observation and this was not simply for reasons of space that are very real in a thesis project but because I used what seemed to appear to me out of the world, the chaos, of the mise-en-scene of fieldwork. But even more importantly the rapport that was built up in the interview processes involved all of the dangers of complicity (Marcus, 1998, pp. 105-131).
of worlds within worlds, with all of the conjugations and connections to intentional communities and their spaces, their durations that flow from the interview. The production of the stories is deliberately offered as elements of a world, along with the world that is being produced in this thesis.

Rather than carrying out participant observation over a period of time, although I did use the methodology of participant observation as well, the interview is used as a device, a structure, almost a theatrical device that breaks the familiarity, the milieu, of the everyday. It is a break, an event that shifts the flow and undermines the dominance of the participant observer, whose eyes never stop recording, cataloguing, and so on. Such an interview is an overt assemblage of form and content, never closed, always with an opening for a line of flight. The openness about a semi-structured, open ended interview is not only in the fields open to discussion but in its variance and in the potential for the interviewee to shift the discussion, to circle around the discussion, to leave and return to elements of the discussion many times or to close down the discussion if they wish. There is not the same sense of the interviewee ‘forgetting’ that they are in a research milieu. All of the elements of the milieu are present: the subjects -researcher/interviewer, the tape recorder, the notebook, the chairs, the women, the voices – the enunciations that can be nothing but collective.

Every woman chose anonymity in this research: some in terms of the world outside of the community and some for their own protection within their communities because they wanted to speak about complex and painful issues with anonymity. Each woman has been given a name that is not her own in this research and indeed several of the women had already take names different from their birth and family names. These
names, meant to preserve anonymity did something else as well; they created a kind of becomings-other, where I thought of them, wrote of them discussed them under this new name and it changed all of us. In such a process the flow of voices, of thinking and the everyday, perhaps, passes through the anabranch of the research process and returns to the main flow or stagnates or dries up. In this way the interviews were complicated billabongs implicating both potential becomings and the belongings that emerge out of becomings (Massumi, 2002a, p. 76).

Haecceities, singularities imbricated in desiring machines in some ways allows experimentation with the concept of women. Whilst Elizabeth Adam St. Pierre takes up the notion of women as haecceity in her research she sees her project as in her terms following Spivak and doing work on ‘behalf’ of women. ‘Feminism will undoubtedly continue to move out of licensed subversions and into breaks that mutate and proliferate the category woman’ (St. Pierre, 2000, p. 306). In taking up an experimental ethnography passing in and out of an immanent feminism, rather than simply a poststructuralist feminism, I want to suggest that it is life, duration, the given and the thought of the given that produces not only the proliferations of desire but also the transformations and that the category of woman as a becomings-other that occurs on more than the multiple planes of feminism; the organisational planes of feminism.

What appears in the stories of the women is that there is an increase in intensity of whatever composing forces affects them, that are folded into them and that these pre-impersonal singularities that preside over their production as individuals are expressed as part of a collective enunciation: part of free indirect discourse. I take this up
throughout the thesis but it begins in the style of ethnography that informs this research.\textsuperscript{120}

Interviews are captures of flows, segmentations of lines of drift; the everyday, or lines of flight. Interviews are structures but not simply one way tools or technologies ‘recording, gathering, sorting, deciphering, analysing and synthesizing, dissecting and articulating… a structural activity….’ (Trinh 1989, 141-142, also cited in Denzin 1995, p. 231). Interviews are structures, (even a semi-structured, open-ended interview is still a structure) technologies of capture, yet more; they are events. In the Deleuzean sense structures are predicated on at least two heterogeneous series (the signified and the signifying, lack and excess) and the revolutionary gap between each series, which implicate the constituting relations between the two, relating to particular events (in this case the interview), incorporating ‘singularities that are assignable within the structure’. The processes of rendering singularities ‘assignable’ are practices of capture and segmentation that presuppose ways of knowing framing the irruption and creation of the new, the irruption and creation of excess. ‘What is in excess in the signifying series is literally an empty square and an always displaced place without an occupant. What is lacking in the signified series is a supernumerary and non-situated given – an unknown, an occupant with a place, or something always displaced. These are the two sides of the same thing’, in this case the interview as an event, ‘two uneven sides – by means of which the series communicates without losing their difference’ (Deleuze, 1990, p. 50).

\textsuperscript{120}Bogue (2003, p. 72) states ‘narrative voice slides into a characters voice, such that one cannot distinguish between “indirect discourse” (As she looked out the train window, she thought that her loneliness was unbearable) and “direct discourse” (As she looked out the train window, she thought, “this loneliness is unbearable”) but must speak of a “free indirect discourse” (She looked out the window, such loneliness was unbearable).”
What is in excess in the interview, as a sense-event, is beyond what is captured and is other than what is captured. It is a becomings-other in a spatio-temporal sense. When Ilsa says right now, what is implicated is her living present imbricated in my living present-time, of the interview, not simply captured in the interview but spiralling through the functions of the interview in the processes of ethnography as duration.

Here I am thinking of Ilsa when she says If I see that my voice sometimes fades, I don’t know, I will catch my breathing. Here affect is ‘the revolutionary gap between’. Ilsa thinks that she will need to catch her breathing because what she wants to tell me is intensely personal. Ilsa is not so much giving an interview as exchanging her story as a series of singularities which generate her “character” in her story. She does not want recognition, to be seen as a common sense, or even good sense participant, constructed as an identity – someone, perhaps a self, who gives an interview (See Deleuze 2004, p. 169-170 for a discussion of recognition), or even to recognise herself; she wants to create, enact, fabulate, to think not as a way of creating an identity for herself but as a new, creative process of exchange. You were the potential stimulant to think about things right now. So I felt it’s an opportunity. And for what reason it’s useful for you or for me, it, and it started to sweep out some things. So for Ilsa the interview is a sweeping out of some things. More than the ‘knowing capture’ of sense for Ilsa and me as the ethnographer, or how it is useful to me was a part of her thinking; her thinking about the processes of thinking, the sweeping out

121 Massumi (2002, p. 236) uses the term ‘knowing capture’ to suggest the processes through which ‘science’ through its investigative processes captures what is already there, predetermined but even more importantly how this process is one which clamps down, in a knowing capture on anything new that emerges.
of *some things*, the problems that set thinking off; intermingled in the ‘gap’ with the problem of the interview, in the *right now* of time, in the force of time.

**Ethnography as a “tangled Tale”**

Tangles tales, fabulations, are rife with singularities and ‘…it seems that the singularities attached to a series’ (Deleuze, 1990, p. 50) are a series of interviews-semi-structured interviews, of singularities constituting questions, answers, interviews and the problems and the thinking folded into, implicated in such series ‘determines in a complex manner the terms of the other series. In any case, a structure’ such as an interview, ‘includes two distributions of singular points corresponding to the base series. And for this reason, it is imprecise to oppose structure and event: the structure includes a register of ideal *events*, that is, an entire *history* internal to it (for example, if the series include “characters,” it is a history which connects all the singular points corresponding to the positions of the characters relative to one another in the two series).’ (Deleuze, 1990, p. 50) But here in a series of discrete interviews, structured as semi-structured and structured in a series of discrete locations within discrete locations, with discrete “characters” the multiplying singular points – the aleatory points – generating connections or conjugations of which becomes expressions of those “characters”. Ilsa is the character, the voice, that might fade but who will take a breath.

When I claim that I am entering a series of worlds it is in an attempt to break from the dominant sense of the binarised structural series that informs the work of Levi-Strauss such as the raw and the cooked, the bricoleur and the engineer (1973, 1983). Deleuze
offers another way into the series when he suggests that there are ‘two heterogeneous series that converge towards a paradoxical element, which is their “differentiator.”’ I am working with a trinity of series that becomes a multiple series but the principle is still relevant but extended in complication.

‘This is the principle of the emissions of singularities. This element belongs to no series; or rather it belongs to both series at once and never ceases to circulate throughout them. It has therefore the property of always being displaced in relation to itself, of “being absent from its own place,” its own identity, its own resemblance, and its own equilibrium. It appears in one of the series as an excess, but only on the condition that it would appear at the same time in the other as a lack. But if it is in excess in the one, it is so only as an empty square; and if it is lacking in the other, it is only as a supernumerary pawn or an occupant without a compartment. It is both word and object at once: esoteric word and esoteric object’ (Deleuze, 1990, pp. 50-51).

So the problem for me is, what are the words, what are the objects that connect the singularities or singular point, through a paradoxical element, a ‘differentiator’? Such a differentiator in the ethnographic process incorporates perception, memory, selection from the virtual of the ethnographic matter and the experience.122 The interviews and the ethnographic process are thus a “tangled tale” and a tripling of the series, and as an emission of singularities in each and every interview that exists in duration as a further complicating factor: the interview in the now, the process in the now and the interview as it is produced in the assemblage of the ethnography, as a rhizome with lines shooting off from it. The multiplying of the series occurs in duration and in each event.

122 Such a differentiator ‘has the function of articulating the two series to one another, of reflecting them in one another, of making them communicate, coexist, and be ramified. Again it has the function of joining the singularities which correspond to the two series in a “tangled tale,” of assuring the passage from one distribution of singularities to the next’ (Deleuze, 1990, p. 51).
The emission of singularities presents the problem of what those singularities are and how they might appear as the excess in any and each of the interviews as the series. ‘In short, it has the function of bringing about the distribution of singular points; of determining as signifying the series in which it appears in excess, and, above all, of assuring the bestowal of sense in both signifying and signified series. For sense is not to be confused with signification; it is rather what is attributed in such a way that it determines both the signifier and the signified as such. We can conclude from this that there is no structure without series, without relations between the terms of each series, or without singular points corresponding to these relations. But above all, we can conclude that here is no structure without the empty square, which makes everything function’ (Deleuze, 1990, p. 51). Here Deleuze shows a way out of the signified-signifier bind by claiming that they are both determined as such by sense and sense is one of the excesses that comes out of the interviews as multiple, heterogeneous series.

For instance, a singular ‘atypical expression’ such as Pearl saying that she hates that word in reference to permaculture is an atypical expression; Sira offers an atypical expression when she says *I don’t feel like I’m living in a community somehow I haven’t managed to attract a community around me, you know not, not a really sort of supportive community.* Such expressions are atypical and perhaps emit ‘the potential for an unlimited series of further (collective) expressions by individuals who will retrospectively be assigned by a propositional system of capture to membership in a group …* (Massumi, 2002, p. 22-23).

There is no innocence in such an ethnography since it begins and ends with creation – all of the processes of imagining a thesis, gaining approval for a thesis and its
processes at the macro, institutional level of the academy and at the micro level of each location imagined for the research and from the ‘subjects/objects’ implicated in the research process. Gathering material for a thesis along with all of the research processes are entailed in fabulation. Such processes are not only fabulations but they express duration, in the syntheses of time the final synthesis of which is the eternal return of *difference*. Parr’s (2008, p. 186) development of the term ‘singular memory’ is important to any sense of untimely fabulations. The memories of the women, told in their stories are told in the ‘ethnographic present’. They are not the memories of the women as subjects but constituted through the forces of pre-individual singularities, such as desire. A subject remembering is reterritorialising the past (the virtual past) and fabulating stories.

When de Certeau is quoted as saying that ‘Every reading modifies its object’ (cited in Denzin, 1997, p. 231) the jump is through those processes of reading/modification of that object to the reader/ethnographer who is reading a field site and processes of subjectification, to the reader who is reading the ethnography and raises the question of how the object, the partial object, or what Massumi calls the partial-subject, modifies the reading in its experimental, serendipitous line of flight. De Certeau is offering a certain perspective that shifts in the work of Deleuze and Guattari from interpretation, which is lodged in contemporary radical ethnographies as the art of interpretation as a reading which modifies the object to the difference between interpretation and usage.

In Trinh’s terms, the academy and the researcher sets up endless codes of ethics, conduct, and various series of practices within disciplines, intended to govern,
capture, the object being researched. Thus the researcher’s work and ethnography as part of the social sciences generally, fits this mould in a repetition that supposedly extends human knowledge, adds to the given field in some meaningful way. Yet it is a nomadic researcher, a legworker, who enters into an assemblage and becomes part of a rhizome riding out of the despotic regime of signs, away from the order-words that the academy insists on, this is the redundancy of ‘objective frequency involving signs or elements of signs’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 147) who is folded into the new, new concepts, new percepts and new affects.

In this research the shift is partly to postsignifying or subjective regimes of signs where the focus is subjective resonance of the Self, “I” (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 145-147) of the women as the processes subjectivation are expressive of differentiations and differenciations, as they co-mingle in the transformations and constitutions of subjectivities in a problematic field or a milieu. It is in assemblages and regimes of signs that the processes of subjectivation emerge as vectors of becomings. In those movements between the outside and the inside, in the processes

123 Martin Joughin in his translator’s notes for Negotiations (Deleuze, 1995, p. 189) suggests that a more nuanced translation for ‘mots d’ordre (maxims, directives – literally “ordering” words or phrases)’ than that of ‘order-words’ offered by Massumi in his translation of A Thousand Plateaus would be ‘precepts, since this conveys their prescriptive or normative character, and contrasts them with “concepts” and “percepts”. Joughin suggests that in calling mots d’ordre “order-words” Massumi conveys none of the everyday resonance of the phrase.’ Whilst I sympathize with translators’ attempts to translate as faithfully as they can, translations can never be innocent and I think that Massumi’s translation of order-words has a grip on the pragmatics of order-words and does not jar with the flavour, or style, of Deleuze and Guattari. Percepts, too, are used by Deleuze and Guattari (1994) in What is Philosophy?, it seems to me, in a very different way to order-words, in this sense the normative, prescriptive ‘percepts’ seem more like passwords than order-words.

124 In Difference and Repetition (2004, p. 258) Deleuze explicates the difference between differentiation and differenciation. ‘We call determination of the virtual content of an Idea differentiation; we call the actualization of that virtuality into species and distinguished parts differenciation. It is always in relation to a differenciated problem or to the differenciated conditions of a problem that a differentation of species and parts is carried out, as though it corresponded to the cases of solution of the problem. It is always a problematic field which conditions a differenciated within the milieu in which it is incarnated. Consequently – and this is all we wish to say – the negative appears neither in the process of differenciation nor in the process of differenciation. The Idea knows nothing of negation.’
of folding subjectivities, as vectors of becomings, are ‘torn between the two planes…
“the infinitesimal particles of impalpable matter,” that also glues all of the particles
back into coherent form, slips them into the envelope of this or that character’, this or
that subject-in-process into which singularities are pressed, or in other words it is
haecceities, singularities that engender things and subjects ‘direct the metamorphosis
of things and subjects’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 288).

This is not to suggest that the researcher should not serve an apprenticeship and learn
the artisanal skills necessary in a given field but that every artisan enters into an
assemblage; into actualisations and counter-actualisations of the virtual and from that
assemblage potentially new ecologies of relations emerge and are created. However
the path through the theoretical field of the ‘new’ ethnography zigzags out of the ruins

At the same time Ilsa cuts to the heart of the debates within contemporary
ethnography – that combination of fieldwork and writing – moving between the
traditional requirement for lengthy periods of fieldwork as an immersion in participant
observation within a single ‘exotic’ site of anthropologists, accompanied by extensive
field notes and the experimental, multi-site expressions of ethnography that are
implicated in an assemblage of actions and passions in cultural studies.

I kept field notes and I lived in each community and engaged in the practices of
participant observation but I did all of these experimentally in the creation of a
fieldwork process. I also carried out a series of semi-structured interviews. I wanted to
‘capture’ women’s words, their intonations, their syntax, their lexicons their
tonality;\(^\text{125}\) not to offer technical analysis of these elements and qualities but to hear them, captured on tape, to listen to the voices and their enunciations, their statements.

‘Everything begins with nebulae, statistical wholes whose outlines are blurred, molar or collective formations comprising singularities distributed haphazardly (a living room, a group of girls, a landscape). Then, within these nebulae or these collectives, “sides” take shape, series are arranged, persons figure in these series…. Next, everything becomes blurred again, everything comes apart, but this time in a molecular and pure multiplicity, where the partial objects, the “boxes,” the “vessels” all have their positive determinations and enter into aberrant communication following a transversal that runs through the whole work; an immense flow that each partial object produces and cuts again, reproduces and cuts at the same time (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, pp. 68-69).

This perspective, offered by Deleuze and Guattari, fits with the vision of the battle and the sense we draw what is remarkable – that is part of the task of the researcher-ethnographer – to select from the chaosmos those elements that will enter into relations.

The forms or doxas of traditional anthropological or ethnographic methods are not pursued in this research process. It was not a matter of what ‘should’ be done according to ‘experts’ in the field rather given the ways that ethnography has opened up in the past decades and the plurality of methods and styles and given the plethora of ‘experts’ and styles, the process was one of experimentation. Ethnography as a rhizome, an assemblage, a pragmatics where politics precedes being: an experiment implicating the work of Gilles Deleuze, and Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari.

\(^{125}\) Tonality is linked to regimes of signs – in particular the postsignifying regime of signs that I take up throughout the thesis – tonality as ‘the Postulate as the point of subjectification (He loves me); pride as the tonality of the subject of enunciation (delusional pursuit of the loved one); Spite, Rancor (a result of a reversion to the subject of the statement…in querulous delusion… a sign must follow a segment or linear proceeding through to the end before it can begin another, whereas the signs in paranoid delusion form an endless, self-adjusting network developing in all directions’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 142). I am not claiming in this thesis that tonality is merely, or necessarily, a product of passional delusion or paranoiac delusion but that it is part of transforming subjectivations, of becomings-other and central to fabulation.
'Pragmatics\textsuperscript{126} as a whole would consist in this: making a \textit{tracing} of the mixed semiotics, under the generative component; making the transformational \textit{map} of the regimes, with their possibilities for translation and creation, for budding along the lines of the tracings; making the \textit{diagram} of the abstract machines that are in play in each case, either as potentialities or as effective emergences; outlining the \textit{program} of the assemblages that distribute everything and bring circulation of movement with alternatives, jumps and mutations' (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, pp.161-162).

A strong sense of collectivity and of collective enunciations subtends the stories of the women in this research. This is not to say that each woman is not a person or not ‘herself’ but that what ‘herself’ is remains problematic, even opaque given the circumstances of a subject-in-process implicated in a collective assemblage and as in any rhizome she is a bud or shoot that can enter a line of flight or a line of drift into a new formation.

Ethnography harbours problems with the relationship between research and reality, writing and reality. ‘Writing now functions on the same level as the real and the real materially writes’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 156). What I want to argue is that there are no clear barriers between the work of research and the processes of constituting realities: processes that ‘subjects’ engage in as do researchers. Meta-ethnography, as a meta-fiction, implicates the assemblages, the multiplicities, the becomings, and the rhizomes that subtend every little ethnographic machine. The multiplicity that is implicated or folded into the researcher/researched dualism and

\textsuperscript{126} Pragmatics have four components generative, transformation, diagrammatic and machinic – see Deleuze and Guattari (2004, pp. 160-161). I offer a full discussion of pragmatics which informs the work done, particularly in the mixtures of regimes of signs that are used as an analytic tool later in this thesis.
that complicates it in its unfolding into the product of the thesis is an haecceity: a pack of wolves, waves, and four o’clock in the afternoon. In this project the haecceity of the plunge into tropical darkness at six o’clock suggests the opacity and potential dangers of fieldwork in the unknown, in the dark.

**Stuck in the middle**

Planning for field work sets ‘the researcher’ in the middle: in the middle of life in ‘the field’, in the middle of the life of ‘subjects’ who are in ethnographic work part of the ‘objects’ of the research, in the middle of ‘one’s’ own life, one’s own theoretical concerns and in the middle of all of the virtual structures, such as language, modes of production, periods of history, social movements: all of the abstract machines that produce more or less concrete, empirical assemblages where ‘worlds’ and lives are incarnated. It is not calm, or a becalmed, middle where nothing happens but rather a middle of potential that is moves in and out of the chaos of the plane of immanence: life.

The women tell their stories as fabulations, expressions of their lives and communities. Their making sense, the enunciations that they offer, creates states of affairs and their incorporeal effects. For example an interview is a state of affairs and an incorporeal effect or quasi-cause and so too is a story in its telling. The interview is proper name is a specific state of affairs, whereas the interview, as in each interview carried out with all of the actions and passions that inhere and subsist in it is an incorporeal sense-event. The interview as an incorporeal event has the reality of the expression of the/my proposition-problem (Deleuze, 1990, p. 56). As a state of affairs
an interview is a mixture of bodies, the bodies of the women, the bodies of their stories, their communities, my body, the bodies of the questions and discussions, the bodies of the technologies of capture, the tape-recorder, the notebooks. An interview is bodies (beyond the human) voices and enunciations mixing, weaving, shooting off on lines of flight, drifting along other lines. Connecting points, singular points, points of subjectification, possibly weaving patterns, patching quilts, making pictures, words, order-words, passwords, outside noises, interruptions, passions, actions: the attributes of the interview.

The interview itself is the effect or the result of this intermingling of bodies, the intermingling of voices, sounds, breathes, faces watching each other, lips and tongues moving telling tales and generating the quasi-cause of the incorporeal effects in ‘the flat world of the sense-event, or of the expressible-attribute’ (Deleuze, 1990, p. 22).

The work of transcription is political in contemporary ethnography. And it is from the notion of sense that I take my direction in this ethical minefield given that sense, following Deleuze, does not exist outside the proposition that expresses it. However, sense is not the proposition as such sense inheres, subsists, or insists.\textsuperscript{127}

\textsuperscript{127} ‘Sense is both the expressible of the expressed of the proposition, and the attribute of the state of affairs. It turns one side toward things, and another side toward propositions. But it does not merge with the proposition which expresses it any more than with the state of affairs or the quality which the proposition denotes. It is exactly the boundary between propositions and things... The event belongs essentially to language; it has an essential relationship to language’ (Deleuze, 1990, p. 22). And also that:’ Sense is indeed attributed, but it is not at all the attribute of the proposition – it is rather the attribute of the thing or state of affairs. The attribute of the proposition is the predicate – a qualitative predicate like green, for example, or rather the event expressed by this verb. It is attributed to the thing denoted by the subject, or to the state of affairs denoted by the entire proposition. Conversely, this logical attribute does not merge at all with the physical state of affairs, nor with a quality or relation of this state. The attribute is not a being and does not qualify a being: it is an extra-being. “Green” designates a quality, a mixture of things, a mixture of tree and air where chlorophyll coexists with all parts of the leaf. “To green,” on the contrary, is not a quality in the thing but an attribute which is said of the thing. This attribute does not exist outside of the proposition which expresses it in denoting the thing. Here we return to our point of departure: sense does not exist outside of the proposition...’ (Deleuze, 1990, p. 21).
As well it could be argued that for the women the agreement to participate in the interview process and to tell their stories is an expression of the ways in which they want their communities to be perceived. They want to have some say in the ways that their communities and their lives are perceived and expressed by a researcher. Such stories are a gift of their time, their stories and elements of their lives that they are willing to share. At the same time the women’s stories are taken up in the research process as part of that research process; in this research process material about intentional communities and women was gathered in other ways outside of but connected to those stories.

Such stories are part of an ethnography: a narrative, a fabulation that has a series of refrains concerning community, spirituality, sustainability and the environments and all of the ecologies of relationship, the becomings that arise, imbricated within subjectivities or subjects-in-process. The refrains of the women, and their relations within the plane of immanence in becomings-other, shape this thesis. The refrains create, through the work of the researcher, a diagram, a plane of organisation; a series of chapters that are constituted through the connecting, diagrammatic elements of a structure that implicates an assemblage: a series and structure that reaches beyond themselves into blocks of becomings. A rhizomatic multiplicity emerges which is ‘only determinations, magnitudes, and dimensions that cannot increase in number without the multiplicity changing in nature’. That is, ‘An assemblage is precisely this increase in the dimensions of multiplicity that necessarily changes in nature as it expands its connections’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 9). Multiplicities are not the elements of a unity but are rhizomatic assemblages, nomadic connections.
This thesis attempts a transcendental empiricist\textsuperscript{128} ethnography of women and their lives in three different Intentional Communities in three different countries. I attempt a Deleuzean ecological feminism in terms of women and their connections to assemblages that are more than human. The immanentist feminism that subtends this research incorporates a new form of ecofeminist ecosophy, following Deleuze’s superior, or transcendent empiricism, to construct a new ethnography that moves beyond such work that has been done by Jackson (2003) on rhizovocality and St. Pierre (2000) suggesting a transversality and a nomadocity that opens up a new ecology and politics of ethnography as a politics of the virtual, the potential of the territory and earth and all potential worlds.

Here the researcher and the researched are imbricated in transversal, rhizomatic relations; in the rhizome that offers many ways into and out of habits a pragmatics that is external to them both in that they constitute something that did not exist prior to the relationship. The folding of each into the other, the folding of the outside into each that suggests the posthuman. A posthuman that is not only a mutant cyborg, or the trickster of Haraway’s work but beyond the constructed human into a becomings human-other that includes other species, other forms of life, matters, art experiment that is beyond ‘the subject’: a potentiality drawn from the virtual that is beyond the possible. Not the eternal return as the same but as difference. Not the repetition of history of intentional communities as a repetition of the same or as farce but as potential for the new: the potential for becomings-other.

\textsuperscript{128} In Deleuze’s work on Hume, in particular *Empiricism and Subjectivity*, and in *Difference and Repetition* it is thinking that is emergent from the observation of repetition, that change occurs in the observant contemplating mind (2004, p. 90).\textsuperscript{128} It is the external association of relations that are observed and intuited as difference and thus this has implications for the interview and participant observations processes as well as transcription and the ‘writing up’ of the ethnography.
I experienced a ‘becoming-bird’ in the micro-community that I was staying in, in Bonville that was an outcome of participant observation. Leon, one of the Russian scientists, who lives in Bonville, on a ‘yoga passport’, begged me to sound like a kookaburra and to sing a child’s song about the kookaburra. In my field notes I write about the fun/disorderly conduct of this event in the micro-community food line in the community dining room. Generally, the mood was earnest or serious, particularly about what food was going to be put on by the cooking team that was on the roster for that day. And I was not only a paying guest but a ‘researcher’ and as such was treated variously with a range of practices that ranged from interest in my research project, courteous interactions, care that I was two minutes late for a meal and that there was no food left and along with embarrassment that I was a paying guest, part of their living, to determined distancing techniques – smiles and eyes that passed right over me – to suspicion, as I was ‘mentalist enemy within the walls’. And whilst the members of that micro-community had their own ways of dealing with guests Leon simply presumed that they were there to interrogate, to give information and to be not so much a servitor of the Divine but to serve his immense curiosity about the natural world in Australia and to sing and be cajoled into cooking with members of the community and pull my weight. I did laugh like a kookaburra several times in that food line and sang the song. Leon enjoyed it and so did I even though I thought at the time and still think that his motives were mostly to make a fool of me, to show that the ‘researcher’ was all too human. I was willing to breach the walls of ‘objectivity’, and value free research and I did it every day in a myriad of ways. My ‘passions’ as a subject were engaged in every community that I visited. I was not only a researcher I was their sometimes their ‘intimate enemy’.
Although conventional ethnography is based on field work for a year or more and participant observation supposedly within particular sites the incorporation of cyberspace into ethnographic space, particularly that captured by any new social movement such as intentional communities (Schehr, 1997) or New Spiritualities (Nash, 2006) is a different prospect. Not only are some of the new social movements global but they are also a moving feast (Chesters & Welsh 2006). There is material on websites and material that is in published texts such as newsletters, books and so forth. When a community is both a community and a part of a social movement, when it is the individual who belong to such communities and when confidentiality has been granted to the communities and the individuals it is difficult to use published material without appropriate acknowledgement. I was told by women whom I interviewed that I could use their publications but this has become an ethically vexed issue for me because of the confidentiality granted to their communities and themselves, and that they accepted. The stories that were told to me in interviews the perceptions gained from participant observation were given with the proviso that their identities and the identities of their communities would not be revealed and using the publications would do just that. I have read the publications and inevitably they have given me information but I have not used such information unless I also had it from a primary source.

Each community has a website that includes ongoing news and information about their communities and the residents. I have accessed these websites on a regular basis and noted and thought about the changes that are occurring within each community.
Yet this is vexed ethical area\textsuperscript{129} for me given that there is debate concerning the issues of informed consent for websites publishers even though they are in the public domain. In the end I have used the burgeoning information from many websites for many intentional communities, including the three where I researched, as a process of observation which allows me to keep abreast of the field whilst out of the field without entering the debates surrounding website research and holding fast to the ‘not for publication’ edicts of some of my ‘informers’.

And given that a systems is a ‘set of concepts’ an ‘open system’ occurs ‘when concepts relate to circumstances rather than essences’ and concepts are not simply ‘whatever generalities happens to be in fashion…they’re singularities, rather, acting on the flows of everyday thought…’(Deleuze, 1995, p. 32). It is circumstances that subtend the research process, the lives of the women, the intentional communities and the ecologies of relations (their cartographies). In this sense the work of social theory is nomadic in that it is the aborescent which produces the ‘opposable form’ and constitutes the problem and the need for other, non-totalising ways of being, for \textit{becomings}.

\textsuperscript{129} Research ethics may be one of the most important differences between traditional ethnography and ‘netnography’. Netnography has been largely developed in marketing as a technique for gathering data about online communities (Langer & Beckman, 2005; Kozinets, 2007) and it has migrated into other research areas – Jo Nash’s (2006) article on mutant spiritualities uses some of the techniques of netnography. There are ethical issues concerning the use of such material without informed consent even though the material is in what is argued to be a public domain. Although there are other areas of ‘disguised’ research they are researchers in the field and are seen as open to the gathering of the ‘rich, thick descriptions’ whereas this is not possible for on-line communities. It has been argued that netnography is a virtual ethnography but when it is used in research projects outside of marketing it is generally accompanied by other forms of ethnographic research.
The researcher as wasp; the intentional community and community member as orchid.

‘The orchid deterritorializes by forming an image, a tracing of wasp; but the wasp reterritorializes on that image. The wasp is nevertheless deterritorialized, becoming a piece in the orchid’s reproductive apparatus. But it reterritorializes the orchid by transporting its pollen. Wasp and orchid, as heterogeneous elements, form a rhizome’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 11).

As a wasp-researcher I entered into the processes of deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation with the orchid-communities and orchid-community members where I did my field work. I was attracted to the communities by their tracing of a seductive image of difference to mainstream communities. Their difference involved overt representations of ecological sustainability, feminism and spirituality along with actions to produce those elements through organic and permaculture practices.

Part of the reproductive processes of intentional communities is to attract new members, supporters and researchers who will further their work and lives. It is the taking of research/pollen from the communities that constitutes the potentiality of the communities outside of themselves. Part of the work of the wasp-ethnographer is to enter into a relationship with the orchid community and become a part of its reproductive apparatus. It is to develop a relation with the lives of the women within the communities, within the territories and the milieus that the territories bite into. It is about the ways that the meaning of the earth changes (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 411) in duration. What Cook (2006, p.660) suggests is that ethnographers ‘have to undertake research that might allow ourselves and our readers – as much as is possible – vividly to appreciate the lives that others live partly because of us.’ What I am
suggesting is that becomings-other shapes a different style open to a vivid appreciation.

Deleuze and Guattari take up their rejection of the representational work of mimicry, mimesis, and constitutes the relation between the wasp and the orchid as a becoming. In this sense I was involved in a process and series of actions that were a becoming wasp-researcher of the orchid-community/community member and a becoming orchid-community/community member of the wasp-researcher (2004, p. 11). In the event of such a becoming the orchid-community, community member does not reproduce the tracing of the wasp-researcher; it forms a map with the wasp-researcher, in a rhizome’ (2004, p. 13). And what I claim is that that is the beginning of an ecology of relations.

An ever greater deterritorialisation emerges from the productive relationality of both becomings where the wasp-researcher is both deterritorialised and reterritorialised in her becoming as is the orchid-community, community member due to the intermeshing of the actions, the inseparability of the actions in the flow of intensities that are not part of the processes of signification but rather are part of a line of flight constituted within the same rhizome (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 11). The passing into and out of each other implicates, folds the molar, the aborescent acts of the researcher and the researched into the molecular, the rhizomatic acts of the researcher and the researched and the intermeshing of the elements and levels of the actions and the incorporeal effects that flow from such acts.
I want to think of the event of the interview with regard to affect. The event, along with sense is folded into the processes of fieldwork, which generates research in a plurality of ways in the development of concepts that cope with the production of new worlds. I learned to respect this long list of too whatever about the research, the interview process, me as an interviewer that silenced some of the women and I learned to laugh about it too. I kept having the image of the rats in the television series The Young Ones and where one rat eats the other because he has been killed (by Vivian) saying ‘he would have wanted me to’. So whereas I might have assumed that I was left with interpretation, interpretation of voices and interpretations of silences, or interpretations of the actions and passions of the women in the fields, the social formations of their intentional communities, what I came to grips with, to the extent that it is possible, is that rather than enter the narratives of the women I enter their fabulations, their becomings-other, creating my own fabulations and becomings-other in that process.

Are interviews and their writing up and interpretation the smile without the cat (Deleuze, 2004, p. 195)? An expression of the women as incorporeal from which their bodies/stories are only virtual objects/subjects in the ethnographic process? There is no doubt that the women are flesh and blood, passions and actions, living becomings that are rendered only as fabulations in this research. I am aware that it is sometimes the practice to blend several women into one, and also sometimes to changed
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130 Julie Mahler in her ethnographic research uses a Bergsonian toolbox including duration and the Deleuzean notion of the event in what is called an empirical and theoretical study. Whilst the content of her work is very different the alliance of the empirical and theoretical precepts are close to my project. Rather than see such theorisations as a mask (Denzin, 1997) I see them as ‘threshold’, or borderland tools, taken up to complicate the in between of the stories turned into ‘data’ (Mauthner, Parry & Backett-Milburne, 1998; Tuck, Smith, Guess, Benjamin and Jones, 2014), which I have attempted to avoid through process of fabulation.
significant details about each of the women to protect their identities and I have changed their names and the names of their communities but there has been no blending and no changing of the words the women spoke. The material that I gathered in interviews, through participant observation and through several years of following their community’s fortunes (and the fortunes of many other intentional communities) through a variety of texts and research materials, including a wide range of internet sites about their and other communities are not simply to offer a sense of authenticity or to prove that I and the women were present but to think the problems of the thesis in a way that incorporated the stories of the women in a faithful fabulation.

Denzin (1998, pp313-314) suggests strongly that:

‘In the social sciences there is only interpretation. Nothing speaks for itself. Confronted with a mountain of impressions, documents, and field notes the qualitative researcher faces the difficult and challenging task of making sense of what has been learned the art of interpretation. This may also be described as moving from the field to the text to the reader. The practice of this art allows the field worker-as-bricoleur (Levi-Strauss, 1966,p.17) to translate what has been learned into a body of textual work that communicates these understandings to the reader.’

Such a view leaves the researcher in the grip of communication and interpretation, and in the grip of the problem of ‘what has been learned’ rather than, as St. Pierre (2000, p. 264) argues ‘inscribing some place, some field. A nomadic ethnographer might, for instance appear in one local space and then another without defining transitions and paths to connect those points into a fiercely ordered grid of striations. A nomadic ethnographer speeding within connections might gnaw a smooth space to her territory (the field grows)’. This is the nomadic ethnographer who is breaking free of an ethnographic territory that captures and freezes thought into prescriptions.
Rhizomes, shooting off in all directions might join bricolage in the forging of new connections from desire and constitute transformations and metamorphoses. In the assemblage, the territory, such transformations may emerge as blocks of becoming in ‘some place’ ‘some field’ and some becomings may be captured in conjugations that are dead ends for change.

I feel as though I have lived with more than 30 women in my life/mind for the largest part of this research project but in an intricate dance with Deleuze and Deleuze and Guattari. This makes for a well populated field in which even the most faithful of researchers changes her mind. ‘Repetition changes nothing in the object repeated, but does change something in the mind which contemplates’ (Deleuze, 2004, p. 90). So each time I listen to the interviews that the women and I did together, each time I read the transcripts of our words each time I have copied and transformed their words into a part of this thesis and framed them into each woman’s story, each woman’s connection to the elements of this thesis, as they are created in the women’s becomings-other, what is changed in the processes of these repetitions is my thinking – my contemplating mind. And it is true I have felt as if during the years of this thesis that I have lived with many women, and three communities, in my ‘mind’, and in my life – such is the weight of duration.

I take heed of the warning: ‘The misfortune in speaking is not speaking, but speaking for others or representing something’ (Deleuze, 2004, p.63). In the chapters that follow, I attempt to let the women’s words shape the work and I hope that the movement towards the future in the processes of telling tangled tales also moves this research beyond representation to a series of fabulations that express necessity/destiny
as chance that is grasped as *amor fati* – that moment when through pure chance we take the completely singular, aleatory event as our destiny (Deleuze, 1983, pp. 26-27; Deleuze, 1990, pp. 149-150).

In the following chapter, I offer some analysis of the concept of community and then provide a different sense of community through the concept of worlding. I take some of the women’s stories of making love with worlds and weave in some other kinds of considerations in an attempt to show that worlds are always in the process of emergence.
CHAPTER 4
TRANSFORMATIVE WORLDINGS AND DESIRING PRODUCTIONS

‘The world does not exist outside its expressions’ (Deleuze, 1993, p. 132).

‘If we had a keen vision and feeling of ordinary human life, it would be like
hearing the grass grow or the squirrel’s heart beat, and we should die of that
roar that lies on the other side of silence’ (Elliot, 1872, p. 177).

In this chapter, I use the work of Deleuze and Guattari to re-imagine and rethink the
contested concept of community as other worlds. While critiques of community focus
on its enclosed, exclusionist, unified essentialist nature and its links with static notions
of identity and othering, I want to suggest a different approach. I propose that
community, metamorphosed into whatever assemblages of intentional community,
becomes a series of transformational worlds where characters, conditions and
landscapes (Deleuze& Guattari, 1994, p. 2) draw on prior conceptual notions of
community but reshape them into something other. I do this through an analysis of the
stories of the women as they make love with their worlds. Making love with worlds is
a collective practise, a spiritual exercise and above all a singular pursuit. For, even in
the most enclosed communities we are not unified essences but scattered existences

As both a question and a problem community returns within social and philosophical
theory. Through all of the debates community remains a notion that permeates both
everyday life and theoretical discourse. In what follows I sketch some of the pervasive
ideas of community and offer an analysis of intentional communities as worlds and
the expressions of those worlds by the women who live in them and make love to them.

Traditional and conventional theorisations of community centre on the filiative, familial and religious bonds between humans (Tönnies, 2001) along with theorisations of community that see community as based on identity, place, interest and attachment (Cohen, 1985; Hogget, 1997). Radical, contemporary concepts of community offer the sense of an existential, always-already being-with notion of community (Nancy, 1991) and shift them into the new realms of worlds and their expressions.\textsuperscript{131}

**Various notions of community**

The desire for the ‘natural’ community has long been a conservative response to societal crises (Bell & Newby, 1971, p. 22). Through the ghost of Tönnies’ *Gemeinschaft*, the notion of a natural community both repeats and offers a model for a conservative return to filiation, which I suggest is disrupted in contemporary intentional communities in their movements towards constitution and evolution. The desire for contemporary, sustainable, intentional communities creates a connection

\textsuperscript{131} Community studies have a long history with many influential conceptions of community offered in the debates that surround the nature of community. Often new notions of community are developed as correctives to prior versions of community offered along the way (Bell & Newby, 1971). For example, Putnam’s claims for a decline in social capital echoing some of the fears of Tönnies about the problems with the loss of connection and hence community in contemporary society are challenged by those who research the growth of information communication technology (ICT) Using a Deleuzean and Guattarian framework for community as worlds allows some sense of place, association and attachment along with interest but skews them into territory, alliance and the assemblage that perhaps bypass the overly romantic notions of community, and the overly rational and humanist notions of ‘the local social system’ that Stacey (Stacey, 1969, cited in Bell & Newby, 1971, p. 49), for example, argued for because she saw community as a non-concept. Hoggett (1997, p. 8), in a later conception of community, argued that community groups based on identities are part of contemporary life but that such identities are open to mutation and choice.
other than filial or based on blood. Yet, the desire for community is still linked to the distinctions that are made between Tönnies' model of community and society (Gesellschaft), although that is not always clear in the women’s stories. What is clear is the desire for community-mindedness or like-mindedness as it is expressed in Clear Creek Community, or belonging to a territory, a place. What is not clear is the form that the community bonds take. In Tönnies’ model of community these ‘natural’ bonds, were ‘religion, work, family and culture…characterized by emotional cohesion, depth, continuity and fullness’ (Bell & Newby, 1971, p. 24).

For Tönnies, shared, implicit understanding, rather than consensus, subtended traditional community and differentiated it from a society of confrontational social relations, society, or Gesellschaft. The ‘natural’, ‘tacit’ ‘understanding which needs no thought will not survive the moment in which understanding turns self-conscious…. Community can only be numb – or dead’ (Bauman, 2001, p. 11). In this analysis of Tönnies, offered by Bauman, ‘‘Spoken of’ community is a contradiction in terms.’ Consensus is not seen as the same as an ‘understanding shared by all its members…. consensus is but an agreement reached by essentially differently minded people,’ (Bauman, 2001, p.12). This is not the same as the shared understanding of community which ‘precedes all agreements and disagreements.’ Yet, it is one of the elements that all of the communities believe that they need to strive to attain, at great cost and apparently without success; generally, their tacit understanding and like-mindedness requires a consensus model that is in turn mostly reduced to a
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132 Zygmunt Bauman (2001, 10-12) in his book on community suggests that it was Tönnies who ‘(intentionally or not) invited ‘community’… to return from the exile to which it had been banished’ by modernity. Gesellschaft denotes society as a rational association between people that is also mechanistic and impersonal. The Intentional Community Movement is a response to such a society and its incapacity to adapt quickly enough to affective and social desires. Intentional communities are associations but I am arguing that they are affective rather than ‘rational’ in Tönnies’ terms.
majoritarian form of consensus. Community as ‘little’, ‘self-sufficient’ (Redfield, 1980) has underpinned much of the traditional anthropologically-informed view of community. Such concepts need to be created anew in each repetition of designed communities. Such new creations of designed worlds are actualised in the stories of the women and through their practices and their passions.

Intentional assemblages, or designed communities, are not Naturist, in the sense of humans romantically escaping society or returning to the Land and living communally in pristine Nature. Even when movements for a return/escape to the land emerge and an immersion in the natural are attempted they are enacted with an eye to a different, sustainable future (Jacob, 1997), a different assemblage. As such their styles are different, their mechanisms are different. Yet, the assemblages of the designed communities, in this research, incorporate Nature and varying perspectives of Nature in their understandings and designs. Designs are not simply technical but part of the whole assemblage, with its collective enunciations and machinic desires. Just as machinic assemblages are ‘only technical as a social machine, taking men and women into their gears, along with other things, structures’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1986, p. 81), intentional communities always incorporate more than the technical in their designs and their enunciations.

Worlds, leaning into a future responding to and irrevocably within contemporary social formations, need to take account of the inseparability and convergence of nature and culture. Such worlds undo the binaries of culture and nature, the plastic and the natural, the individual and the social and attempt to transform social formations. Binaries offer an always-already set of determinate conditions that inhibit
change and always refer back to what is determined elsewhere. Binaries, however, miss the point of change because they focus on the determinate terms, and their negation or valorisation, rather than the political relations of becoming other. It is the relations, rather than the static terms that are vital to change (Massumi, 2002a, pp. 68-70).

Assemblages of women and intentional communities are folded as spatio-temporal dynamisms in relations with ecologies, which they are inseparable from in the becomings of a nature-culture continuum. Such assemblages of ecologies are for the future – perhaps for utopia – they work with and create new, open, more sustainable, ecological systems, incorporating the whole of the forces of the Nature/Culture continuum. Intentional communities work with nature, in so far as they understand it, yet more than that they attempt to design with nature as it is manifested locally (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 422) and in doing so they create worlds.

None of the women begin their stories with a discussion of the juridical forms and contents or such territorialisations that are part of any such assemblage. Yet, such framings and codifications are implicit and sometimes even celebrated, in the stories of their variable paths into these intentional communities. Each woman opens up to something more and in the event of joining, or entering, they become other; the incorporeal ‘community member’ in another world. Such worlding is not simply the act of moving into a community but of slipping into a series of relations between bodies and their organisation into tetravalent assemblages. Such acts are a response to the event, the chance encounter, between the wasp and the orchid, with the attendant relations caught in duration. In the women’s stories, worlds and transformed selves
are constituted from myriad singularities: the circle of the dance, the song and love for Lesley; home and love for Mia; sand, a young man and community for Claudia; home and peace for Pearl; falling and waiting for Ella; breaking the barriers for Sophie; nonhuman alliances for Rose; trees before a little bit of community for Janine; the impossibility of community for Sira.

In this chapter, I re-imagine intentional communities through the work of Deleuze and Guattari. I suggest that intentional communities and the women in them are transformative worlds produced from desire. In this sense their geographies, topologies or landscapes implicate more than place and spatial arrangements. Their communal relations are not based on blood and the beliefs and passions underpinning their existence are about transformational journeys, for subjects and the earth, rather than traditional institutions. While it is true that each community has institutions and an organisational structure, these appeared in the stories of the women as they affected their day to day living and are not central to this discussion of the ways that women engage in worlding or in the sense that each community is a myriad of worlds. Bonville is a community situated on a beach, somewhere on the coast of India, the Motherhouse was founded on Midwestern farmland and Clear Creek Community is on hinterland farmland, such elements become the backdrop framing worlds and providing elements of style rather than the creation of worlds and desire. If the movement of a lover in the dance can be a world or an element of a world, then clearly worlds abound in the flows of affective, social life. If the world of a tick consists of a bush, a warm blooded vector and the capacity to drop onto that animal and suck blood then clearly worlds incorporate natural flows. If we speak of worlds and worlds within worlds then clearly worlds implicate semiotic flows: worlds pass
through our lips. In this chapter, I see intentional communities as a myriad of worlds that pass through the women’s lips as they tell their stories. Worlds are always in the process of becoming and this is what I call the worlding that occurs in each community for each woman.

The expression of worlds creates the excessive, rhizomatic, affective, fuzzy aggregates subtending the becomings-other of new, open desiring assemblages. Such worlds are caught in new, transformative collective enunciations and are in excess of everyday ways of living. Such worlds are created, not out of the already thought, or the thinking of an already-existing subject, and not within a pre-conceptual understanding of ‘being’ as an always-already ‘sharing’ or ‘being-with’ that needs undoing to prevent dangerous or fascistic totalisations (Nancy, 1991) but out of the events of making love with worlds (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 294), which shift the ‘habits’, constitutive of any self, and instead transform us in the contemplation and creation of such worlds (Deleuze, 2004, pp.94-95). The events of creation of worlds and their connections occur within the unfolding of duration, both constituting the
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133 Jean Luc Nancy (1991) with his sense of community as sharing or ‘being-with’ eschews the pragmatic actions that are the work of community. Nancy sees only the dangers of fascism in the ‘work’ of community. Yet, what if intentional communities are constituted as worlds that we make love with (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 294)? This shifts the sense of love beyond the couple (conjugal, heterosexual, homosexual, otherwise) beyond the family, motherland, to a myriad of worlds. Deleuze and Guattari also offer an analysis in their plateau on the refrain of birds creating homes, displaying and so on (designing territories in their actions, practices and habits) as perhaps the first art: so worlds that we create are works of art? The territory bites into the milieus/worlds (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 347) but there is more to this for the intentional community. The claim: ‘But we always make move with worlds.’ has also been taken up by Grosz in Space Time and Perversion: the Politics of the Body, (1995, p.200). Lingis (1985, p. 90) mentions ‘the bureaucrat who fondles his files’. Such worlds are more than human, more than the constitution of space and its milieus through territorializations; they are a living of all relations in time/space (duration) and a loving worlding that constitutes becomings-other through a conjugation with the other. In this sense, the file-fondling bureaucratic is not revealing an inner, inherent file-loving self but is part of a process of becomings-file, where pre-existing singularities connect creating counter-actualizations. Subjectivity is a process of connection and the enfolding of an outside, perhaps a file in what Deleuze calls a contraction of a habit, or in Guattari’s terms a transversal subjectivity (1995, p.551), or a subjectivity-in-process, or subject-in-process, always already doubling in both the contraction of the habit and the transformational contemplation of what is other.
supposedly bounded space of community and a community assemblage as events, folded into the women’s becomings-other.

Intentional communities seen as assemblages of composing forces, making ever more connections, rather than simply a series of forms and contents, compels us to think (Deleuze, 2004, p. 176) rather than communicate. Out of such composing forces and within rhizomatic assemblages, individual and collective worlds are crystallised, more randomly, with transversal lines drawn by bodies of every type criss-crossing and shooting off in unexpected ways, deterritorialising already designed elements, places and spaces. In such aleatory, creative and transversal processes counter-actualisations resist the present and move towards the future.

Whilst we fall in love with worlds, we transform them through desire. Desire is ‘a prepersonal ‘germinal influx of intensity’” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 164) generating machinic, productive life. The force of desire consists of flows, blocked or
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134 The sense of communication that emerges from the work of Habermas and its use in analyses of community and democracy by theorists such as Iris Marion Young (1986, 1997, 2000) is taken up by sustainability practitioners (Sarkissian, Hoffer, Shore, Vajda and Wilkinson, 2009) who see communication as central to developing practices of sustainable community. Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p.108) in What is Philosophy? argue that democracy and communication are not lacking, rather what is lacking is creation and ‘resistance to the present’. Drawing ‘communities’ into democracy is, as Deleuze and Guattari argue, drawing them into the majoritarian democracies of capitalism, not creating a future and a people to come.

135 Deleuze and Guattari (2004, pp.370-371) discuss assemblages as crystallizations ‘that respect neither the distinction between order nor the hierarchy of forms.’ They claim that ‘What holds all the components together are transversals, and the transversal itself is only a component that has taken upon itself the specialized vector of deterritorialization. In effect, what holds an assemblage together is not the play of framing forms or linear causalities but, actually or potentially, its most deterritorializing component, a cutting edge of deterritorialization.’ This suggests to me therefore that although the forms of intentional communities are part of the story they are important as they are traversed and deterritorialised and this is what the women are so adept at; transgressing and deterritorializing. Deleuze and Guattari claim that ‘assemblages swing between a territorial closure that tends to stratify them’ such as the construction of a plan, the building of a home, the design and construction of a garden ‘and a deterritorializing movement that on the contrary connects them to the Cosmos. Thus it is not surprising that the distinction we are seeking was not between assemblages and something else but between the two limits that any possible assemblage, in other words, between the system of strata’ (and for Deleuze and Guattari, this is the role of the milieu), ‘and the plane of consistency.’
enabled by desiring machines, from which assemblages *emerge*. Desire is machinic, productive life as positivity, connection or assembling, which produces difference not lack. The assemblages of intentional communities are productive and transformational at the level of subjectivities-in-process and becomings-other, given that they continue to create outward connections.\textsuperscript{136}

Intentional communities as becomings *and* events are alliances, not filiations (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p.263). It was rare for any woman to join an intentional community as a filiative act.\textsuperscript{137} They were both repelled and drawn by bodies of ideas: escaping various aspects of their own, mostly ‘Western’, cultures and drawn by ideas of the land, of a way of life constituted from the forces of life – an alliance of love as a rhizome, not a blood-based tree – an aleatory, desiring production that is a local opening to the forces of the earth and the cosmos. This is an important counterpoint to Tönnies and his notion that community is based on blood relations or filiation (Bell & Newby, 1971). In contradistinction to such consanguineous communities, the event of intentional communities as becomings, are alliances not filiations. Filiative reproduction is an outcome of the possible generated through an intensely reductive sexual reproduction that acknowledges just two sexes, not the ‘thousand tiny sexes’ of Deleuze and Guattari. Filiative community incorporates the fantasy of filiation itself

\textsuperscript{136} ‘Once a rhizome becomes aborified, it’s all over, no desire stirs; for it is always by the rhizome that desire moves and produces. Whenever desire climbs a tree, internal repercussions trip it up and it falls to its death: the rhizome, on the other hand, acts on desire by external productive outgrowths’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 14). This statement by Deleuze and Guattari is suggestive of the tension in producing fabulations coupled with the ways an intentional community is produced and as such both are ‘productive outgrowths’ of a rhizomatic ecology that is never centred on the human as a fully formed subject and its intentions but rather on the aleatory mix of forces that both create and potentially transform subjectivities and habits.

\textsuperscript{137} Bianca came to Clear Creek Community because two of her daughters lived there and there is also some movements between mothers and daughters at Bonville in and out of Bonville but this occurred after the mothers were long established in Bonville. Within the Motherhouse there was only one mother-daughter dyad and the daughter had in fact never lived within the community but was part of the international organization that had the Motherhouse as its centre.
as the capture of what we are, in that ‘all filiation is imaginary’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p.263). Becomings-other as the creation of alliances, implicated in assemblages and worlding, evade filiation.

Because filiation incorporates the dualistic sexual machinery of reproduction and screens out alliance and heterogeneity by minimising diversity in favour of ‘small modifications across generations’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 267), it is not surprising that intentional communities become through alliance, or that perfect reproduction remains part of a repressive regime. Filiation offers a different expression of community to that of a community as an expression of alliance.138 Alliance is created also in the debtor-creditor relation ‘which in both sides turns out to be a matter of memory – a memory straining towards the future’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p.190). The debtors and creditors in an ecology of relations are more than human and in an environmental crisis that affects the world, the alliances that are struck envelop memory as it strains towards a sustainable future; these are memories of a different world straining towards a different world.

Filiation suggests ‘natural’ relations such as the community machine, the family machine and the machine of heterosexual couples, that we might be plugged into as individuals and persons, yet no ‘natural’ given determines an alliance; it is aleatory, rhizomatic in its formation and emerges out of disjunction, chaos, and is a response to disjunction and chaos and desire. As such, ‘These combinations are neither genetic nor structural; they are interkingdoms, unnatural participations. That is the only way

138 Leela Gandhi (2006, p. 19) offers an analysis of an affective community that is outside of the ‘family, fraternity, genealogy, filiation’ and takes up instead a Derridean analysis of friendship that is “always insufficient and future”.
Nature operates – against itself” (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 267). Nature in this sense is itself a becoming-other. Nature is other than filiative or familial: it is instead ‘unnatural’ where the ‘unnatural’ is the ‘natural’. Deleuze and Guattari argue persuasively that ‘Unnatural participations or nuptials are the true Nature spanning the kingdoms of nature’ (2004, p. 266). I am arguing that intentional communities connect with and traverse Nature and that in turn, nature connects with and traverses the assemblages of each community, creating alliances beyond and even outside of filiation. Such alliances are with whole worlds and constitutive of whole worlds, where humanity is only an element.

Incompossible worlds: stories in counterpoint

The ‘divergent series’ of the worlds within the world, of the women and their intentional communities, exist as potentially endless different points of view. Even when the women live in the same community the sense and events shaping their worlds vary. Worlds border other worlds, impinging upon each individual’s world.\(^{139}\) Such expressed worlds subsist in, or are presupposed in, the events and singularities constitutive of individuals (Deleuze, 1990, p. 111). Each woman, as she engages with a series of new possible worlds and the expression of those worlds, is both open to the...

\(^{139}\) ‘If it is true that the expressed world exists only in individuals, and that it exists there only as a predicate, it subsists in an entirely different manner, as an event or a verb, in the singularities which preside over the constitution of individuals. .....It would be arbitrary to give a privileged status to the inherence of predicates. .....The inherence of predicates in the expressive individual ‘presupposes the distribution of pure singularities according to the rules of convergence and divergence. These rules belong to a logic of sense and the event, and not to a logic of predication and truth...’ (Deleuze, 1990, p. 111). Thus it is in the events, with their states of affairs and their incorporeal effects and their verbs that the women express worlding and becomings-community.
composing forces of those worlds and the fabulation of those worlds. Such forces – of
the Outside and fabulation – have transformative potential for subjectivities-always-
in-process: new gestures, actions and passions can open each woman’s world through
the intensities of the new. In her own way, each woman moves from engagement with
a world, to connection with a world, and in the middle of these processes moves into
becomings-other and a becomings-community in all of its complexity. In what
follows in this chapter the divergent worlds of the women seem to exist in
counterpoint, forming the intricate assemblage of each community.

Making love with worlds – Lesley, Mia and Claudia

Lesley finds love and inadvertently a path into an intentional community in the middle
of the circle\textsuperscript{140} in a Rhythm and Life workshop, in the setting of the intentional
community. Mia finds love and a new life – the \textit{enlightenment}, or the \textit{changing life
moment} is difficult for her to \textit{express} because it is a tangle of emotions, actions and
memories captured for and in an interview. It is a connecting series of events in
duration translated into movement from one country to another, one world to another,
entering a new spatio-temporal dynamism, a fuzzy aggregate exceeding the
assemblages and the territories.

\textsuperscript{140} Although Lesley speaks of singing in the circle it is circle dancing that is central to her story. She is
a dancer. At the moment she ‘falls’ in love and enters the process of making love with worlds, such that
we make love to the brow, the cheek, the landscape of a beloved (Deleuze, 2000, p. 6) she is in a circle
that is singing but it is part of a circle dancing scenario. Circle dancing became reinvented as a sacred,
new age practice connected to feminism (Starhawk, cited in Christ & Plaskow, 1979) for those who
lived an ‘alternative lifestyle’. Such rituals are seen as transformative.
Lesley, from Clear Creek Community and Mia, from the Motherhouse, emerge in the first instance, but become interwoven with myself and others. It can be said that all of the women emerge and are fabulated and fabulating in interaction with their unfolding worlds, in the multiplied time and space of the technologies (the social and technological machines) of ethnography. Also, the ways in which such possible worlds emerge, as expressions of revelations, are simultaneous with the virtual in a univocity, or immanence, that is constitutive of virtuality, of duration and space, in becomings-other as they are counter-actualised in a present and a milieu (Grosz, 2001, p. 119). In this sense, within this present, this milieu, this woman and out of that virtual past, are actualising future worlds. Such counter-actualisations, or individuations, and becomings-other, are contingent encounters as events that are relationally emergent in a given state of affairs (Deleuze, 1990, pp.149-150).

Mia – The Motherhouse

It was amazing for me
And it was really giving me the sense of belonging,
A sense of belonging to something wider than myself
And really big
And also gave me a sense of being home
And being connected to the world and it was very beautiful.
In the midst of all of this I met Claire
And so we started a love story – we don’t go into that right now (laughs) –
The psychological dynamic of it.
I’m sorry but it was a very important encounter
Because, somehow, she was also representing a way of living,
Which was so alternative to the way I was living.
I was living a very normal professional life, very Bourgeois (laughs),
And even being involved in feminism and politics
And I think already very leftist mind, Marxist mind.
But, so, anyway I was fascinated by this world.

And one reason...

\(^{141}\) Here the interweaving of \textit{amor fati} suggests not only the chance encounter, the aleatory nature of ecological relations but also the ethics that inform the political or the pragmatics of the entirety of those relations. The \textit{event} is ethically embraced in the ethnographic situation, in the community assemblage, in the given state of affairs. Such a given is the social and natural world that we inhabit with all of its problems.
So what happened was that because of Claire
But also because of my interest in understanding where I wanted to go
After this enlightenment –
I don’t know how to express this –
You know, it was a changing moment,
A changing life moment for me...

Lesley – Clear Creek Community

I came here for a course.
It was a Rhythm of Life workshop.
Drumming and dance
And a bit of massage, and Tai Chi,
And singing and bit of drama in it.
Just, a thing.
And we were standing in a circle, singing, and I looked across at Mark
And we went doooiiing
And I thought, I’ll talk to him at morning tea time.

And I’ve always imagined living in a community

I never imagined I would ever do it
I had no idea permaculture existed.
Yeah I just, it was just by accident that I
Found out about it or by (laughs) divine intervention.

Lesley and Mia express different life-changing events of connection and love
beginning with the revelation of possible worlds that become their entry points into
the assemblages of intentional community. Such possible worlds are created in a
becomings-world actualised out of our embrace of the chance encounter, created out
of dice throw, or the action that draws on the potentiality of the virtual – not the
possible in terms of what is possible, as always-already determined – but the potential,
the aleatory infinity of worlds and the in-between of their relations. It is in the series
of actions that produce the dice throw and our embrace of its outcomes that we fall in
love with necessity (amor fati).

142 ‘There is no love that does not begin with the revelation of a possible world as such, enwound in the
other which expresses it’ (Deleuze, 2004, p. 324), and love is duration, an intensity as well as an event
(a revelation) of a state of affairs doubled in the revelation of that world.
For instance, when Mia begins a love story with Claire, at a conference, and a singing, dancing Lesley connects through a look with Mark, these events are not simply a delimited possible present but an open-ended potentiality, an incorporeal event, constituting an incorporeal transformation that is a doubling of causality in the actor and the character. Worlding emerges from chance, producing the woman and her expression of events, and her embrace of those events in this instance: the interviewee and the woman in the story, the woman in the research and the researcher, all doubling in the process of worlding, engender transformations. Such worlds are emergent within time-space events, simultaneously constructing other events that enfold states of affairs and incorporeal transformations: transforming subjectivities in the event of an emergent possible world. Mia the Bourgeois, Lesley the Singer-Dancer both encounter and connect with new and transformational worlds. Claire and Mark, in the midst of the event, are attractors toward, and vectors of, possible worlds. They are signal-signs of difference, designating and catalysing connections to new worlds and opening up other worlds, in the event of the creation of new worlds, for Mia and Lesley. Such becomings-world enfold the worlding, subjectifying predicates, synthesised into a world of rhythm, drumming, dancing, singing, touch, massage, drama, for Lesley and, unexpectedly, intentional community and permaculture for Lesley and an intensification of leftist mind, Marxist mind, feminism and politics in a something wider and something very beautiful for Mia. As well, such transformations of worlds incorporate and intensify all of the synthetic predicates, all of the worlding into the fuzzy aggregates of the assemblages of intentional communities. Each woman is open to the new, to other possible worlds. She is open to new ways of living and not locked into her pre-existing truths or answers. What occurs in such an event is an
incorporeal transformation of subjectivity. Each woman enters into new processes, takes on new gestures, actions and passions. In her becomings-community each woman is open to change, to new syntheses of other predicates.

Mia expresses her encounter with the new world as a *changing moment* implicating more than the intensity of *belonging to something wider* and *being connected to the world*, producing a belonging and suggesting the extensity of a becoming-wider for her and a being of becoming-connected. Mia expresses an intermingling not just with another woman, Claire, but with a *very beautiful* transformational world that is a community assemblage, that is connected to an alternative political world, with all of its complications. Mia’s becomings-other are not produced in a spatial world. She does not point out where the community is located. Rather, the desire for expansion and connection coexists with a whole, dynamic world that is ‘duration, or time itself, that is the whole of relations’ (Deleuze, 1986, p. 10).

For Lesley, an event of circling becomes an encounter with Mark and opens up the community to further encounters so that it becomes more than an *imagined* potential for life. Circling, as an act in time, exposes the intensity of relations of bodies in a direct and dramatic way through sexual/romantic attraction. It leads into a vagabond subjectivity that moves into another world: a prior world of her imagination, a *community*. A political ecology of relations transforms her actualisation in the assemblage, unexpectedly, for her, incorporating permaculture as a thing, a series of ideas and practices, with founders and practitioners.
Given that abstract machines do not themselves have goals or ideas (that is, social technologies do not drive change) these emerge later in the processes of actualisation of a world in an assemblage. The assemblages that are actualised out of the women’s worlds are generative experiments in subjectivity and becomings-community. In this sense, the event of engagement, or participation and whatever expression is simultaneous with the event of community and the becoming aware, or paying attention (Pignarre & Stengers, 2011, p. 34) to community occurs in the throes of that engagement.

Mia is fascinated by this world and she expresses a sense of belonging to something wider than herself and really big. Her story renders her belonging in duration, in the first instance. It is a past that she draws on and moves out of to explain not only her present but her sense of futurity, of what is important in the world; a space for spirituality, for herself and Claire and creating art. Her story also moves in the extensity of space, of the world of the community as extensity wider, big. Yet belonging is in Mia’s story a political ecology\(^\text{143}\) that inflects both space and time. What is connecting for Mia is the wider outside of a community engaged in a political struggle for change not just at the level of gender, race and class – at the level of her Marxist mind – but a micropolitics that is connected to the world and a way of living that generates a life changing moment. In this expression time is the central element in

\(^{143}\) Massumi (2002, p. 255) sees political ecology as creating a ‘symbiosis’ of ‘processually unique and divergent forms of life’ that is part of ‘a tending of coming-together, a caring for belonging as such.’ This resonates with Mia’s processes of worlding and her symbiosis with not just a lover but with a community that reaches beyond her self (interest) to an affective world that has incorporeal effects – of enlightenment and becoming-community. Of course the world of the Motherhouse is not only connected to social justice work but to environmental work in a caring that is not quite so disinterested as Massumi suggests but it is part of a politics of belonging that is expressed in ways of living for Mia.
her enlightenment. Mia captures the impetus for her movement into her community, into her place, in time.\textsuperscript{144}

Lesley places herself \textit{here} and \textit{in a circle} consisting of moving bodies arrayed at the points on a circular connecting line, rendered also as a series of predicates and haecceities – the lightning flash – \textit{doooiing} of love. Such perceptions of the ‘here’ in intentional communities are pervasive and are signal-signs of the attempt to create order out of chaos. The first element of a traditional ethnography would begin not with the stories of those who \textit{belong} but with the space that is taken as the ground of the story: the setting or the locale, that phenomenological ‘sense of place’ that is seen to emerge from the subject’s encounter with movement in time and space rather than an encounter with matter and stories that evoke place/matter. What such spatiality denotes for me, however, is the kinetic and dynamic dimensions of the \textit{here} as the ephemeral moving circle and the \textit{here} of dynamic memory as that of a place as territory that only nominally pre-exists acts of territorialisation, acts of song and dance and of the milieu of the workshop, with its gestures and passions and the sense of \textit{being connected to the world} as bodies move through time-circle lines in the constitution of space. Mia and Lesley both slip into a community on a love story and on the aleatory ‘flash’ of attraction and enlightenment: the beauty of a world and its potential.

In the middle of the stories of Mia and Lesley, I keep thinking of Claudia in Bonville for whom \textit{sand} was that little asignifying particle of a very molecular world that

\begin{footnote}
\textsuperscript{144} Both Grosz (2001, p. 118) and Massumi (2002, pp. 6-16) in their discussions of time and space argue following Bergson that time and space are constituted in movement.
\end{footnote}
loomed in her memories, evoking the event of her engagement with the world of community. As such sand is a rhizomatic process of disruption, perhaps an asignifying sign, one that engenders incorporeal effects, offering a description to a researcher that, paradoxically, is both indexical of a treeless, chaotic Bonville, at that time and refuses the identify of Bonville/herself as sand suggesting that both she and it are a dynamic more. The dynamic more is also the thisness of that sand: sand as a haecceity ‘directing the metamorphosis of things and subjects’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 288). It is also this sand scratching in my memory, as I reread Claudia’s expressions of the event of engagement with her community, suggesting, in memory, that it is a haecceity insisting in her future disaffection with her world and her isolation within it. This fits with the sense that it ‘is the entire assemblage in its individuated aggregate that is a haecceity; it is this assemblage that is defined by a longitude and a latitude, by the speeds and affects, independently of forms and subject, which belong to another plane’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 289). Sand becomes an haecceity, a thisness, of Claudia’s world.

The sand, as an asignifying sign, is a singularity mixed with the attraction for other individuals, the woman-guru and a man, entangled in a clear line of flight from violence and the social unrest of that period in her country of origin.\textsuperscript{145} The evocation of Bonville as sand and the thought/disbelief that sand is an attractor/director, or the implications of making love with a world of sand, or even in the sand is paradoxical, especially given that today Bonville is reforested, with many productive and beautiful gardens. Even more, Claudia is one of the women whose life work has been and is to

\textsuperscript{145} In fact, many of the people who were the first members of Bonville came after the upheavals of May ’68 in Europe and through the precursor and ensuing liberatory political and social upheavals such as the Civil Rights, Student, Anti-Racism and Women’s Liberation Movements in various countries in ‘the West’.
create the forests: she is part of a forest assemblage. Claudia rode into Bonville on a bicycle, in the first period of the life of the community and remembers a world of sand. Clearly, her ‘self’ is not expanded by sand or nor is sand added into a pre-given self, or identity, or part of a counter-actualisation. Instead, sand both is part of the production processes of subjectivity for Claudia and an as-signifying particle that is part of the world that she falls in love with. Perhaps this is why Claudia needed ‘to green’ – to transform a harsh environment and to create the green belt of the community.

Clearly, her ‘self’ is not expanded by sand or nor is sand added into a pre-given self, or part of a new self-realization. Instead, sand is part of the processes of singularisation that is not individuating Claudia but neutral resist the frames of reference imposed by an identity but is linked Perhaps this is why she needed ‘to green’ – to create the green belt of the community.

The sense of a Spinozist body as more than human, as an accretion, a collection of affects and particle-forces, subsists in Claudia’s story of a world in an intense ecomorphism. It demonstrates the productive ecology of relations of worlds as the fuzzy aggregates of assemblages as eco-machines that are beyond mechanical (indeed sand is anathema to most mechanical devices): her world incorporates sand as one of the levers, or cogs that catalysed Claudia’s falling in love with a world and her movement into Bonville.

Sand emerges as implicated in the two-fold event of Claudia’s individuation and her metamorphosis, and is implicated in the transformation of her world at the level of the landscape of her community from a barren, brown plain to a fecund, green space and in her transformation from a devoted follower of the woman guru and forest worker
into someone whose world is still changing but whose directions are not so clear.
Perhaps sand prevents her from entering a process of extrication.

Such interminglings and the ways that they create both affective, yet singular events out of possible worlds and incorporeal transformations of selves-subjectivities in becomings-other, are central to the stories of all of the women. Such worlding is not only expressed in the modifying predicates or the ‘descriptions of mixtures or aggregates’ (Deleuze 1990, p. 113), of memories, of territories and their milieus that could be attached to each woman as a world in herself but in the transversal, divergent movements of synthesising predicates that ‘define persons synthetically, and open different worlds and individualities to them as so many variables or possibilities’ (Deleuze, 1990, p. 115). The dance-dancer- circling-breath-bodies-out of body-silver rope-anchor-story becomes Lesley’s assemblage. She expresses the possibilities of other, emergent worlds, subjectivities and becomings appear paradoxically out of the virtual of intentional communities: the diverse opening up for each woman of the virtuality that is intentional community and their conjoined counter-actualisations unfolding from the series of events. Such events and assemblages are constituted by the sound and the rhythm of the singing, the dynamic circling: the dynamic connections of bodies into new possible worlds.

**Beginning again: the event of becomings-community as home for**

**Pearl – Clear Creek Community**

*First week,*
I sat there
And thought
Good God! How could anybody live in a place like this?
Only a mad person would want to live in a community like this.
It’s too insular, it’s too hippie
You’re on top of each other
Everybody knows everything about each other.
Why would they?
It’s crazy!

*That was the first week.*

At this point of Pearl’s story a little bubble of laughter was just beneath the surface.

She is wonderful performer and storyteller. I kept thinking, ‘utopia? *This* is utopia?’

At the end of the second week
I was sitting in my camp chair outside my caravan
My husband had gone off then, doing his stuff
And the children were away
And I had the most overwhelming feeling that I was at home.
It was not the slightest doubt in my mind
That I was sitting in a place I never wanted to leave.

*That was the joyous part.*

Here I was,
I’d found my home.
It was peace that came over me.
I mean, I feel quite emotional saying it.

And then the second thought was
How in God’s name was I going to convince my family?
Right?
So I was in a panic.
How was this going to happen?

Pearl recreates the memory and the image of the transformational event of the two worlds that she encountered in Clear Creek Community. Her initial time in the community was two weeks but when it is reframed as duration, the, for Pearl, slow-quick process of waiting in the then and the now, is accompanied by the quick
succession in the telling of her story. Duration is expressed as an intensity of sensations, of dumbfoundedness, joy, panic, peace and all are simultaneously linked to bodily reactions indistinguishable from her memories and her feelings. She is flooded by forces, sensations, affects in a series of images of a community that is named insular, hippy, crazy – other – and just one week later/one story element later, that community is named home.\textsuperscript{146} She is dumbfounded and joyous, and peace came over her. And then panic. Why panic? The paradoxical forces that dumbfound Pearl are not those of the first week, the forces of spectacle (Deleuze, 2003, p. 61) the spectacle of the community that left her horrified, discomposed, and resistant to community life as she experienced it, as it affected her. The forces of the second week, however, are those of sensation, where, ‘the visible movements are subordinated to the invisible forces’ (Deleuze, 2003, p. 62-63). Pearl is not with her family when she has her revelation. Her shock of recognition is an invisible force, where the community of the first week transforms – in her thinking and her imagination – into an overwhelming feeling of home and home becomes a ‘new value’, and a new beginning.

Pearl is in her story isolated as a figure and as such she creates herself as sensations subjectivated through the invisible forces of isolation, deformation and dissipation (Deleuze, 2003, p.34) which are made visible in the telling of her story, in the movements between the moments of chaos of the first week and the rhythmic moments of the second week that Pearl follows into the milieu of the community. She moves imperceptibly away from the given of her life and the strata that her life is

\textsuperscript{146} There is some sense in which home can be part of an image of thought as recognition, where thought remains captured ‘by the same care or ideas of the time’ but it can also be strikingly new. ‘The new with its power of beginning and beginning again…’ (Deleuze, 2004, p. 170-171).
constituted within and faces the body without organs of the ‘community’ or the chaos of the community. It is her isolation, which gives the space for thought that seems to allow this turn away from habit, the given, her life, her husband her family life, the circle of her ‘home’ to twist her life, and as it seems to accidentally take a chance. There is a disruption of the given for Pearl and a foreshadowing of the disruption of life for Pearl’s family, giving rise to her panic. There is a conjunction of events in Pearl’s story that are seemingly linked to the place of the community. I am suggesting that the thinking otherwise of home arises in the event of her isolation, where the mixing up of time and place in the whole of relations creates a new sensation of home. The event of the sensation changes the field of her home, as a chromatic event in terms of the refrain, not in terms of colour as such; rather, it is musically chromatic. Also sensation emerges in terms of the deformational forces that twist her and force an emotional intensity from her and force a change in her, not as a phenomenological sense of place but on the compositional plane.¹⁴⁷ Her attempt to become a part of the place that she never wants to leave is, in a sense, the forces of dissipation, and a becomings-place.

Pearl’s story, on one level, begins in a territory, a territorial collective assemblage that is not her own, and where she feels out of place. She is in a hiatus from travelling, at a point in her line of drift, not yet ready for, or open to, a line of flight. The point of the hiatus is Clear Creek community. There is a collective refrain in this community that has created a territory out of chaos. A collective home that is an ‘organization of

¹⁴⁷ Deleuze (2003, p. 53) suggests that the forces of deformation ‘become visible whenever the head shakes off its face, or the body its organism.’ The notion of the face is important in the work of Deleuze and Guattari as it is seen as a site of subjectivation. The fascination of the faces of the other in anthropology, especially historically, has been partly displaced by new sensibilities and the wish to avoid ‘othering’. The capturing of the force of the voice and its use in fabulation, however, brings with it its own set of ethical dilemmas.
space’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p.343) where there are multiple milieus. ‘From chaos Milieus and Rhythms are born’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p.345). It is marked, striated, by a multiple of milieus that were a provocation to Pearl. The ways that the zones of the milieus tumbled into each other, space was limited, privacy was limited, it was an insular community, and people were ‘on top of each other’ all affected her negatively in the community at that time and in that first week. The silence in this rendition of the community is its earlier period as a commune, a period that most members of the community saw as a problem for their image in the wider community. There is a fear of being seen as a commune, living in chaos, without order, breaking the normative rules of heterosexual, monogamous, sexuality, family life and living all together in dwellings and so on.

The ‘thisness’ of the community for Pearl is stark; ‘a place like this’, ‘a community like this.’ Her move from ‘a place like this’ to a ‘place I never wanted to leave’ is a territorialisation of space into a place of feeling at home. Pearls’ sense of home is neither the notion of home as a house, or the ‘domus’ as a normative, gendered space (Wise, 2000, p.300-301), it is a feeling about place. If home is a ‘collection of milieus’ (Wise, 2000, p. 299) it is also a rhythm, a moving between milieus or a line of drift, with loops and knots that form the milieus. Pearl’s home is feeling, her collection of milieus are created from sensation and embedded in the milieus of her story, her memories, her refrain and its repetitions.

Pearl’s story of her arrival in the community is singular, an haecceity, but not so unusual. She had come to Clear Creek Community with her family, as a visitor, while her husband was on sabbatical, and in this way she ‘landed in’ the community. Many
of the other women ‘landed in’ the communities that they were living in. At the same
time many women chose the communities that they were living in and their stories are
stories of ‘blast off’ or ‘drifting’ as well as stories of landings. Pearl and her family
were not experimenting with the idea of community life, as were many of the others.
They were not thinking of the community as a place to settle. They knew another
family in this community who had children that their children knew and could interact
with. Clear Creek Community was in its early period. There were many residents who
were still to build their houses and were living in a camping area of the community –
‘on top of each other.’ Pearl’s sensation of home was chance, aleatory, almost an
accident. Pearl has a chance, a chance to move into a community that she
experiences as home, a chance for peace, rest, to be in a place she never wanted to
leave. Pearl is in the in-between of her multiple milieus and these milieus are open to
chaos. Rhythm is the milieu answer to chaos. Both chaos and rhythm are in-between.
This is Pearl’s chance for a passage, a transcoded passage from one milieu to the next,
where such a passage has rhythm, to move on the thread of a tune, a thready difficult
tune asking how was this going to happen? ‘In this in-between, chaos becomes
rhythm, not inexorably, but it has a chance to (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, 345).

Pearl’s territorialisation is a potential deterritorialisation, a line of flight from her
existence into the reterritorialisation that is the intentional community. It is a
reterritorialisation that she fears she will not be able to create. Prior to arriving in

148 I am working here from the notion of chance and the accident that is suggested by Deleuze (2003, p.
124-125) in Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation where ‘the figure is no longer rigorously linked
to essence, but to what in principle, is its opposite: the event, or even the changeable, the accident.’ And
‘Modern painting begins when man no longer experiences himself as an essence, but as an accident.
There is always a fall, a risk of the fall; the form begins to express the accident, and no longer the
essence.’ In this way Pearl, and the other women, are not an essence of the feminine, woman, female,
who is a homemaker because of their essentially feminine/female qualities. Rather they end up home-
making through chance, accident, serendipity.
Clear Creek Community Pearl had spent some time travelling in America, where her personal focus had been on new age spiritualities. She wasn’t a visitor who had no idea about community life but from her vantage point as an outsider, it dismayed and challenged, even outraged her, in her first days there. Take up the notion of the outsider? Her response to the community is like a refrain which builds up the images and returns to images and words as a repetition. Her story is, in a sense, to convince me, as the listener/researcher of the intensity, the sensation and the affect of the revelation that came to her but more importantly it is a becoming. Home strikes her body, like lightning. She acts out the scene building up to her revelation, a revelation that came to her in an unexpected place, a ‘community like this’. She witnesses the emergence of home that is at the same time her emergence as a self who is a larval subject (Deleuze, 2004, pp.99-100). A subject who sees and voices the problematic of home in this community, who judges a community that she saw as insular, hippie, without privacy, was home. Hers was a revelation of home, a particular kind of home, one that resonated with her as ‘overwhelming feeling’, a feeling of ‘home’ that she ‘never wanted to leave’.

The silences in Pearl’s story suggest the virtuality of the given – that is, what Deleuze calls the organic passive synthesis. The virtuality that engulfs a life, in the sense of the potential moves that a life could make, and ‘the habits that we are’ (Deleuze, 2004, p. 95), along with the impossibility of knowing what a body can do and what Deleuze calls a self as a larval subject, or a fractured self leading to a subject in dissolution (Deleuze, 2004, p. 323). Pearl is pulled up by habit, the habit of family, shared
decisions, shared lives, responsibility and her habit of judgement. The virtuality that engulfs Pearls life is her past as an activist feminist, someone who was involved in politics and decision making. At this point in her life however she is following her husband and attending to her family.

Pearl expresses panic at the thought of convincing her family and expresses (acts out, for me and herself) the intensity of her desire/need using the form of a story tale, distancing it from her desires/needs by crying, ‘How was it going to happen?’ A place she ‘never wanted to leave’ - a home - and a family whose everyday life was elsewhere. Pearl moves from community, to home to a place she never wanted to leave. If home does not pre-exist, and that is my understanding, then Pearl’s revelation is a moment of becomings-home, a desire to become home, a constitution of home out of what is not always already there, waiting discovery but rather does not pre-exist. Home in this sense is the catalysing agent for Pearl’s line of flight, or password, from one life to another, from one collection of milieus to another. It is also a password as a ‘motif’ of a refrain. It is as if the fly/home refrain seems to be to the spider/web/home refrain where the community as home has drawn Pearl to it through the linking of her home refrain to the community’s home refrain.

149 Alternative spiritualities offer on the one hand the possibility of eluding the judgement of God, eluding the stratification of traditional religions and subjectivities and on the other hand, they offer flight, self-realization or becoming destratified deterritorialised God as a lobster – God as a pincer, a double bind, as double articulations – into new expressions of spirituality, new foldings, new subjectivations, new becomings that elude the judgment of God. Rather than the ‘negative and limitative use’ of the disjunctive syllogism (the either/or) constructed in the Kantian philosophy of God as the master, the God of Judgment, Deleuze looks to a disjunctive syllogism that is not exclusive but keeps bifurcating, such that there is a multiplicity of figures: sorcerers, witches, shamans, ‘forming on the crests of waves’ (Deleuze, 1990, p. 293). The processes new subjectifications and becomings-other potentially create a situation where a woman can have done with judgment – enter lines of flight from the judgment, the crystallizations of (the Christian) God.
Pearl’s coding and transcoding happens as a rhythmic passage between the milieus of her life inside and outside of the community where action takes place (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 346). Pearl is in the milieu of family, family break because of her husband’s sabbatical, she is in the milieu of a spiritual search, she is in the milieu of the community physically and as a visitor but not part of it, not a resident, without belonging she has the shock of home. The milieus at this point pile up on and around each other and Pearl moves between them risking a slip, a splash-down. The motif of the community (and this is the case for each of the communities) expresses in some way, in whatever way it does, its form of capture of Pearl (the equivalent of the spider’s web, the orchid and the wasp and so on), of her imaginings of home. It can only do so and can only be so, because its expressions, its affects, its intensities, its forces, resonate with Pearl, and the other women, for whatever reasons. The melody of the community is a counterpoint for the melody of Pearl and the melody of both, arising outside her family, serve as a counterpoint for ‘another’ - the researcher.

Pearl’s panic to the revelation of home, as a potential becoming-home, is a response that seems reasonable if passive synthesis, habit, the given, is understood. She is a wife and a mother and she is accompanying her family during her husband’s

---

150 ‘Every milieu is coded, a code being defined by periodic repetition, but each code is in a perpetual state of transcoding…. Transcoding… is the manner in which one milieu serves as the basis for another, or conversely is established atop another milieu, dissipates in it or is constituted in it’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 345). Action

151 Deleuze sees the three passive syntheses as constituting the unconscious. He suggests that ‘they correspond to the figures of repetition which appear in the work of a great novelist: the binding, the ever renewed fine cord; the ever displaced stain on the wall; the ever erased eraser. The repetition-binding, the repetition-stain, the repetition-eraser: the three beyonds of the pleasure principle. The first synthesis expresses the foundation of time upon the basis of a living present, a foundation which endows pleasure with its value as a general empirical principle to which is subject the content of the psychic life in the Id. The second synthesis expresses the manner in which time is grounded in a pure past, a ground which conditions the application f the pleasure principle to the contents of the Ego. The third synthesis, however, refers to the absence of ground into which we are precipitated by the ground itself: Thanatos appears in third place as this groundlessness, beyond the ground of Eros and the foundation of the Habitus’ (Deleuze, 2004, p. 140).
sabbatical. She was not actively looking for a home, nor was she supposed to be looking for a home given the parameters of her life and her functions within that life. It is the response to the solitary moment of her revelation before her becoming, when she was not, a ‘lone woman’. She has this revelation of home when she is alone and it is a jumping off point for her becoming a ‘lone woman’. Her husband is ‘doing his thing’, her children are not there. In that moment of solitude, of contemplation, of imagining, she finds home. Pearl is resisting the order-words of her life mother, wife, and follower. Her family are not part of the revelation but crash into it when she realises that there will be a conflict of desires.

It may be the solitude of the evening, her contemplation of and constitution of a place, the milieu. The solitude of the evening is a haecceity, this evening of the second week, constituted by the rhythm of the repetition of the ‘spacetime block of the components’ of family life. The children are off, the husband is off. She is sitting alone outside of her caravan. The demands of everyday life and family are quieted by being in this location at this time, at ‘peace’. It could be said that a circle has been drawn, a home constituted in the processes of contemplation. All of the processes, deeds, actions occur at a distance, for it is distance that needs to be marked (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 352) to allow a territory. It is a moment of revelation, a singularity, an haecceity and a refrain, a repetition, followed swiftly by the disruption of the panic.

**Duration – muted sensations of falling and pioneering – Ella**
Ella entered Clear Creek Community after the idea grew on her and her partner. They were looking for alternative ways of living at the time, although what they were looking for unfolded into something else because the community was very different from their expectations.

_I read about Clear Creek Community in an alternative magazine_
Or something of that sort and I
They were actually advertising blocks for sale.
And I showed my partner
And I said ‘Oh look, this looks like what we’ve been looking for.’
And he looked at it and he said ‘Oh no, it’s some scam.’
And so we put it aside.

And then about a year later I saw it again.
And I said ‘Look, it’s not a scam. It’s really happening.’
You know.
I said we should take a look at it.

And we had some friends from down in Melbourne
That were looking to come up into the country... to live.
And we actually thought well this is probably more suited for them.
So we arranged to come up here
And have a tour and showed them around.
And it was actually a ghastly day.
It was really hot and there were no facilities here
And I had a cranky baby on my shoulder.
And it wasn’t really like...
I didn’t get here and think ‘oh wow’
It was like
_Oh this looks like hard work._

And funny enough our friends decided it wasn’t for them
But the more we felt into it
The more the idea grew on us
Because I just didn’t like the whole suburban atmosphere at all.
It wasn’t doing it for me.
I wanted bigger gardens.
I had, I was really starting to develop my love for a garden
And I knew that I had to get more into my passion for herbs
And things like that
And I felt yeah this would be a really nice place to move to.
Ella and her partner came across Clear Creek Community in an *alternative magazine* when she saw blocks of land, within the community, advertised for sale. The blocks were quite reasonably priced and large in contrast to suburban blocks causing her partner to think it was a *scam*. Even when Ella saw the advertisement again later and thought that they should look at it, there was still, seemingly, a hesitation – or a sense of waiting and time passing – and they only finally went to the community with friends, who were looking to live in the country. The friends, in the end, were not interested. The visit to the community showed all of the problems of its infancy. Yet, the desire to live in the community did develop slowly for Ella and her partner; they *felt into it*.

Affective intensity is restrained in Ella’s story of her moves towards Clear Creek. The idea of life in an intentional was not a passion for Ella and did not quite blossom but slowly emerged as a sensation of duration and out of dissatisfaction with suburbia. Massumi (2002, pp. 24-28) writes of the dampening effect of matter-of-fact language on intensity. I experienced this in the quiet, dispassionate telling of Ella’s story.

> So we didn’t know how we were going to do it  
> But financially somehow we pulled it together  
> And we just decided, ‘Yeah let’s go for it.’  
> And I think in the beginning  
> We envisaged all the other community members would do what we did  
> And buy in  
> And kind of all move up really quickly.  
> But there was just a small core group of us in the beginning.  
> There weren’t that many people here  
> And it took quite some years before we were at full capacity.  
> And we used to sort of sit around talking in the early days  
> Like, ‘gee I wonder what it’s going to be like when everybody gets here.’  
> You know, because we were just such a little group.
When Ella first arrived she thought there were about twenty people who were the small core group... in the beginning and the build up of numbers in the group was quite small. At that time, in Australia, and elsewhere in the world, it was just the beginnings of ecovillages as a form of intentional community and of permaculture. The legal forms of such contemporary intentional communities were still being worked out and so everyone within the community was waiting and wondering what it’s going to be like when everybody gets here. A further sense of waiting – as duration – moves through Ella’s story, where the small group who are the community at that time wait for the community to happen.

Probably about...
I don’t know, it felt like about 20,
20 of us, something like that
But we were of great assistance to one another in those early days
Because it was very hard.

Actually I was quite amazed when I first came here
Because it seemed really denuded
There were hardly any trees
And I kind of imagined when I heard Clear Creek
I sort of thought of really lush flowing water ways
With rainforest all around
And then I got here it was very pastoral looking
And dry
And I thought oh gee you know
It’s not what I envisaged
But then I actually saw there was
Some people already camped out here by the river
And I saw our then oldest member of the community Old Jim,
Who just passed away recently?
And I saw wow there’s quite a cross section of people living here already
And they looked interesting.
It didn’t look just like a stereotype of one sector of the population,
It looked like a nice interesting cross section of people.

But when we did come here there were no freehold titles available
They were still going through all the legal set up of the community
And so there was just the visitor’s area
Where everybody had to camp out in
Until we could actually legally start building on our blocks.
So I lived in a caravan there for a year  
And I think that’s when I really got to know everybody  
Because we were all in a similar situation,  
Trying to sort of cope with bad weather  
And no hot water and electricity  
And no telephone  
And long walks recharging batteries up to the house everyday  
And yeah some pretty kind of dire situations  
But somehow we all pioneered our way through it  
And loved it –  
In retrospect (laughing).

Ella’s sense of waiting is mitigated by the ways that the core group pioneered... through it. The images of long-term camping, without facilities and utilities, resonate with the beginnings of many other intentional communities. Yet there is a transmutation occurring here – not the duration of the ‘snare of sugar’ enclosing life in a jar’ of de Beauvoir’s ‘poetry’ of making preserves (1993, p.476) but the transformation in duration wrought out of making a world and loving it – in retrospect. What Ella laughs about is life in an emergent community, rather than ‘life in a jar.’ Moving through dire situations, including situations thrown at us by bad weather events and the shifting natural and cultural environment, is transformational.

1983 is pre-tree cover - Chandra

In the story that follows Chandra is engaged in a process of fabulation about her interactions with the villages and villagers. She provides a moment for the beginnings of the group 1983 is pre-tree cover. Here is the given as constitutes her world. There are no trees growing on the territory of the community. Pre-tree cover is that period in the history of the community when everyone worked hard and often went
hungry. They ate what they grew and the seasons where not always good, nor were their nascent gardening skills. What provoked Chandra to think and to act to become an activist with the villagers was the treelessness of the land and thus their visibility. It was the treelessness that rendered the villagers visible in the force and vividness of their lives:

Because actually

If we look over there they would be immediately there

With their poverty and their need and their enormous lacks

The villages/villagers were immediately there – no distance was possible at that time. The borders between the body of the community and its many segments and the bodies of the surrounding villages generated incorporeal effects: a scenario of poverty, need and enormous lacks that did not go away and could not be disguised or ignored. There was no buffer zone for either body. The border, as the in between of each body at that time was raw, present, invisible in the every visibility of the villages; there were no trees between them.

Deleuze (1991, p. 85) suggests ‘The subject is defined by the movement through which it is developed. Subject is that which develops itself. The only content that we can give to the idea of subjectivity is that of mediation and transcendence. We note that the movement of self-development and of becoming-other is double: the subject transcends itself, but it is also reflected upon…. In short believing and inventing is what makes the subject a subject.’ Chandra, with her belief in and desire for a relation of collective consciousness and her capacity to be other than white acts to produce
change in the circumstances that she is constituted within, she acts for change that is outside of herself and enters into a becoming-other, or transcendence of the given that is subjectivity. The movement through which Chandra, as the subject is developed occurs in the given and transcends it. It is the subject who believes and is thus able to ‘infer’ and ‘to invent’. Here Chandra, as the subject transcends the given through belief and invention, through her movement towards the villagers/villages, towards poverty, need and lack, towards the dirt and sitting in the dirt. This is what feminists and ‘women’ do, although they may do this in different ways. We believe, invent, infer and create according to our interests, our dispositions ‘totalities that are not given in nature’. The question is ‘Why this system and this form?’ (Deleuze, 1991, p. 47). Why this notion of women, of community, collective consciousness, of spiritual belief, why not that? I take up these questions in the following chapter.

For Chandra sitting has more than one sense. When she is sitting in the dirt with people she is engaged in practices that constitute her individuation and subjectivity, her counter-actualisation as an actor-dancer, in the infinitive ‘to sit’ and also constitutes the individuation of the collective and the particular practices that it engages in both individually and as a collective. Sitting is also an haecceity: a body engaged in movement and rests, slowness and speed; sitting, at rest, on the ground, in the dirt, in order to engage with people, outside of the whiteness, or spirituality of the community. Whiteness as a spiritual practice is an haecceity. Being white means not only wearing white clothes but transcending the material world, desisting from

---

152 Subjects ‘infer one part of nature from another, which is not given. To invent is to distinguish powers and to constitute functional totalities or totalities that are not given in nature’ (Deleuze, 1991, p. 86).
153 Nature is used in a particular way in Hume and in Deleuze as that which is human nature, given the given, and its relation to Nature – where nature and society form an indissoluble complex (Deleuze, 1991, p. 46)
practising the sensuous, sexual elements of life, practising abstinence in terms of sex, alcohol and not eating meat, in other words the denial of such expressions of need, or the suppression of such desires that are often claimed to be necessary for ‘the death of the ego’ (Rindfleish, 2007). The throw of the dice, the serendipitous move, the aleatory, the moves that are made at a particular moment are haecceities. (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 288).

Community – breaking the barriers ... of the crap that’s out there – Sophie

Perhaps because Sophie, unlike her husband Harry, did not fall in love with a possible world, her story moves quickly and explicitly to the frustrations of her encounter with the rules of her new world. Sophie came to the Clear Creek Community with her own concerns. When she says I didn’t actually come here for all that she means the community. The community, as a game with rules, or a code, struck her only after she got there. Previously, Sophie had been a gardener with a small acreage and came to the community to do a permaculture course. She and her husband, Harry, did things like gardening courses together as a bridge for the marriage. They worked away from each other and gardening was a conscious effort to spend more time together.

Sophie

154 In Chandra’s community I was faced at one point with a very hostile male resident who accused me of ‘egoism’. I could only understand his accusation as it applies to Eastern spiritualities and in particular Integral Yoga, which was the form of spirituality that has developed in that community. In a more Western sense it would be rare for such an accusation to be made or to be seen to have much force. However, none of the women that I interviewed offered any such criticism. Although those who refused to talk to me may have also judged me as suffering from egoism.

155 When Deleuze and Guattari discuss haecceities in A Thousand Plateaus they write of the diastolic fall of love and rise of fascism through ‘Lorca “five in the evening” when love falls and fascism rises. That awful five in the evening!’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987/2004, p. 288).
And we came up here for two weeks
And Harry wasn’t that interested
But I was,
So I bought the land –
Harry didn’t want to –
As a sort of investment.

And then I went overseas for six months.

In that time Harry actually fell in love with the place

Sophie’s interest was sparked in the event of that first contact but not Harry’s. Harry fell in love with the place later, while Sophie was overseas. Her initial interest was in the land as an investment, not the community, or intentional community, as such. One trigger for both of them moving to the community was a changing work situation; they resigned from their jobs, sold up Harry’s house and moved to the community.

So we were here for a very short period of time
And then I sort of realized that the community aspect was very much
An aspect of being here
When I’d really come for the gardening
And playing in the place,
Clean air,
A lovely place to live...
If we were to have kids it would be a nice place to raise kids.
They were my thoughts.

So when we came here it was a bit of a surprise.
Harry, it was his house... and he sold it and made that choice.
I sort of went along with the flow

For Sophie, the life-changing events that led to her flow into the community created a chance for her to play and to garden. Her possible world was connected to Harry’s falling in love with the place to the event of falling for a world. Harry and Sophie’s worlds were disjunctive worlds but incorporated a sequence of events where love and play entered into the experimental convergence of their divergent possible worlds. In
a sense, Harry’s *falling in love* brought Sophie more than she expected when she went with the *flow* into an intentional community without thinking of the community *aspect*. Her initial thinking was around her desire to play, to play and to live out the possibilities of the *if* of children. Yet, her move created an unexpected encounter with *crap*, which not only forced her to think about community but was a confrontation with community that brought her into an uneasy becomings-community as part of her playing the game.

Sophie’s careful confession that she found a *little bit that small town mentality* forced her make a *switch* in her approach to the community that was now her world too. She drew on past associations with other communities such as sporting communities and adopted new ways of moving in this new world. She joined the overarching body of her community, the Cooperative, and got active. Yet the transposition of the rules, or the codes and conventions of an existing world into another world in the throes of becoming, produced even more problems.

*I found that there’s a sort of system  
Or there’s a dysfunction  
Or there’s whatever words on the list you could use.*

*Basically you’re perceived as a threat  
And basically they’re not really big on change, not really big on growth  
And don’t perceive a very strong spiritual philosophy where they’re taking responsibility for their lives and their actions  
And I found that very disappointing  
That if it didn’t go their way then they went totally mainstream.*

*And here we are living in an experiment.  
And we have the opportunity to pioneer  
And break all the rules and create something really new  
And break all those barriers... of the crap that’s out there  
And really have a go at something  
But they’re still...  
They’re too afraid*
For Sophie, the presuppositions of her community seem reciprocal amongst its members; they are mostly unspoken engendering unwritten rules, combining with often silent expectations of styles and indexical gestures and constructing Sophie as a threat. And all of a sudden you are perceived as someone wanting to take over… when really you’re coming from a completely different space. Sophie’s space is one of a new experimental game. Her game is imbricated in an assemblage, where the playing field is also the community. Without the field the game is not possible but it is a field as the condition of play connected absolutely to the virtual, to potentiality and all that can be actualised. Deleuze and Guattari (2004, pp. 389-390), in their discussion of Chess and Go, offer a way of assessing Sophie’s problem. Sophie is caught between what she perceives as the static codes of her community and her sense of living in an experiment. Sophie perceives the codes of community as akin to the rules and stratifications of a game such as Chess, where all the pieces appear to have mainstream static identities, properties and moves that occur in a coded space. She sees such an encoding of community as dysfunctional. She presents the existing community members as if they are each like a chess piece, or ‘a subject of the statement endowed with a relative power, and these relative powers combine in a subject of enunciation’ in the ‘interiority’ of the game (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, pp. 389-390). Sophie is excluded from the ‘interiority’ of the game by the game’s power to produce others who do not belong. In turn, she wants the community to be open to changing situations, not a series of set moves by set pieces according to pre-existing rules combining to produce fixed identities or subjectivities. She wants the existing

players in the community to join in a game of decoding that opens everything to an experiment.

If the community members will only play the game as if it is Go change and experimentation would flourish. In Go, the piece is mobile and able to move in any direction, in any configuration. The piece itself is a strategy for a situation, and the goal is situationally mobile, a function of the play. In Go, the field is opened onto other environments, or other neighbouring worlds. The players can pop up at any moment, in any space because the rules are fluid and the ground is not fixed. The element of chance is paramount in Go. Sophie expected that living in an experiment would be more like Go.

Sophie engages in a game that is more like Go than chess. Rather than accepting an identity as someone wanting to take over she joins the Cooperative, she and Harry build a home and a permaculture educational business and she is instrumental in the sporting life of the community. Her play extends beyond the garden into a playing in the place that is predicated on popping up in new ways, creating new opportunities and daring to take a chance as well as go with the flow. In this sense, Sophie’s space is not so much one of measurement but durational.\(^\text{157}\)

Twisted Alliances

\(^{157}\) Sophie’s space is an affective heterogeneous, a rhizomatic cartography of creative actions, connected to and productive of her community, one that is not simply reducible to the space of extensity or numbers.
Alliance and desire create the event of intentional community as rhizomatic assemblages, always shooting off in a new, unexpected direction. The flows of desiring machines, or assemblages\(^\text{158}\) and their interruptions, constitute alliance. The interruptions in terms of the assemblages that engender intentional communities emerge from thought, from the necessity to think otherwise thrust upon individuals and collectivities as they are in the midst of a problem that challenges the survival of this world: the global environmental crisis and all that it presupposes. The irrationality of capitalism\(^\text{159}\), the irrationality of production and consumerism and the absolute and relative poverty of large segments of the world population spill into the environmental crisis and joyless, negative becomings. Such becomings are suicidal endings created in the multiplicity of desiring machines, producing pollution, degraded environments, desertification, climate change, greenhouse gases, holes in the ozone layer along with the potential endings of ecosystems and the rapidly escalating extinction of species worldwide. Such forces force us to think and form new alliances. Alliances in the in-between of such global and local systems\(^\text{160}\) are ‘anomalous’ and intentional communities occupy such anomalous positions in their social fields (along with the many other new social movements that challenge local and global capitalist social formations). An even more complicated sense emerges in the micropolitics of what happens at the level of the single individual and their worlds and connecting all of the

---

\(^{158}\) A shift from desiring machines to assemblages occurs in the two books of *Capitalism and Schizophrenia* I use both concepts perhaps interchangeably and beyond the sense of ‘the subject’ in desiring machines.

\(^{159}\) Following Gibson-Graham (1996) I do not see capitalism as an impregnable container however I do see it is an series of open, self-organizing systems and as such able to survive great challenges and able to metamorphose in the face of such challenges. Whether the earth can survive such transformations is another issue and we are still learning ‘what a body can do’ in this regard.

\(^{160}\) *The modern political system is a global whole, unified and unifying, but is so because it implies a constellation of juxtaposed, imbricated, ordered subsystems; the analysis of decision making brings to light all kinds of compartmentalizations and partial processes that interconnect, but not without gaps and displacements’*(Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p.231).
‘small variations’.\textsuperscript{161} Such alliances may indeed be ‘unnatural,’ beyond human community in intensive blocks of becomings-other that incorporate more than the organic, the fleshed bodies of non-human others and other forms of matter as they embark on a line of flight and challenge the ‘established powers of the earth’ (Deleuze & Parnett, 1987, p.40).

For an alliance,\textsuperscript{162} there is a crossover of species, the formation of an ‘interkingdom’ such that, ‘there are as many sexes as there are terms in symbiosis, as many differences as elements contributing to a process of contagion’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 267). As a multiplicity, an alliance connects and conjugates, wildly, various elements. In alliance as opposed to filiation ‘…contagion, epidemic, involves terms that are necessarily heterogeneous: for example, a human being, an animal, and a bacterium, a virus, a molecule, a microorganism. Or in the case of the truffle, a tree, a fly, and a pig’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 267). Or in the case of an intentional community, an alliance might be thought to incorporate becomings of place, woman, wildlife, landscapes, design, and spirit, within the frame of a global environmental crisis and its myriad of components, including the infinitesimal.

\textsuperscript{161} Deleuze (2004, pp. 157-158, fn. 3) draws on the work of the microsociologist Gabriel Tarde to show ‘the possibility of microsociology upon a whole cosmology’ a cosmology that insists on the ‘differently different’ of the individual ‘where what happens within a single individual: for example, hesitation understood as “infinitesimal social opposition”, or invention as “infinitesimal social adaptation”. Such microsociology is suggestive of the infinitesimal nature of the experiments, alliances, relations that constitute a rhizomatic assemblage.

\textsuperscript{162} In a sense this thesis is a geophilsophy that is an ecosophy; an extension of Deleuzian-Guattarian geophilosophy into the Guattarian concept of ecosophy.\textsuperscript{162} It takes the micropolitics of geophilosophy for intentional communities and invents each community in the fits writing into becoming: fabulation. A geophilosophy of affective community that is constituted in fabulation, using the polyvocality of the kinds of supple segmentarity,\textsuperscript{162} which intentional communities suggest (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p.231). Here the supple segmentarity is that of what Deleuze and Guattari call ‘primitive segmentarity that is characterized by a polyvocal code based on lineages and their varying situations and relations, and an itinerant territoritality based on local, overlapping divisions. Codes and territories; clan lineages and tribal territories, form a fabric of relatively supple segmentarity’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p.231). The lineages in contemporary intentional communities are based not on blood as such but on beliefs and desires.
An alliance beyond the human, for example, kept Rose sane and alive through the worst of her isolation within Bonville.

Rose – Bonville

You asked the question ‘what kept me?’
Then I would also say that it is the love for my dog.
I had my dog
And I could not go away
And because I loved the dog
And the dog loved me
I did not want to break his home.
He was very supportive of me,
When, during,
Now he’s very old.
I will introduce you to him
But during my difficulties he was there,
I was sometimes screaming out of desperation
And he would come
And he would lick at my face
And he would sit there
And I knew, okay, this was love
And if I went away what would...
I did not want to abandon him too.

In her story, Rose exposes an intense alienation from her community and the surrounding villages. At the height of her anguish and suffering Toutou, her dog, is her only companion in a world that is unremittingly hostile. Toutou is her reason for staying in the face of such desolation.

Rose agreed to meet with me partly because of her alliance with her dog, Toutou (a French child’s word for doggie), partly because my introduction to her was through Hanna, who looked after the dogs in Bonville but had previously been a greenbelt worker, like Rose, when she first arrived. Rose also agreed to speak with me and be
interviewed because she has a story to tell that continues to need telling. The creation of her world and its alliances is one that is fraught with challenges, particularly emerging out of relations with the villagers. The very uneasy alliance with villagers is, however, a part of the assemblage of the community. Dogs, such as Toutou, are also desirable guard and protection elements of an assemblage where there is an underbelly of village envy and violence toward all aspects of the community. When Rose says she was attacked, attacked, attacked, it is not simply the serial nature of the attacks, the repetitions of the attacks and the effects on her sanity of such attacks but the continuous nature of such violence in the community. Only Toutou came to her aid in the face of the attacks, and because of Toutou, Rose stayed.

Desiring connections beyond filiation – Janine

Somewhat surprisingly, when Janine opts for Clear Creek, she expresses a desire for trees rather than community. Her impulsive and spontaneous line of flight, including opting out of her marriage, emerges out of her desire for trees: plantings of trees that will survive her departure. An intentional community that is designed following the values of the natural environment seems to her to be the place where such a posthuman alliance with trees, and other elements of the landscape, might be possible. When she has an opening, she zooms into community and into an ‘unnatural alliance’ but ‘that is the way Nature operates – against itself’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 267). The folding in of the world of trees into Janine’s world – the interweaving of her

---

163 Although Rose does not mention it, and it was only referred to obliquely there is also violence and envy within the community itself and between micro-communities. In fact Bonville has a history of violent factions that suggests, perhaps, that the supramental, ‘overman’ will not evolve painlessly and that the outside world with all of its problems exists also within Bonville.
lines with the lines of trees, into a bundle of lines – is what Nature depends upon: in this sense, both Janine and trees, her plantings, are part of an assemblage; an assemblage fostered in her intentional community. She opts for an alliance that implicates her view of nature and her view of community, where she might get a little of what she needs as a lone woman – an alliance within an assemblage – in her process of worlding.

To be honest community wasn’t the big thing with me.

Even when, at the time when we were looking at community living,
I think Matthew showed more interest in than I did.
But it was more an academic interest really with him and

And I had the sense of,
Well,
There was that one thing,
You know.
Everywhere I went I’d plant trees
And we’d move
And you’d know that nobody else would care.

Intentional communities are events, where for Janine, ‘the tree greens’ (Deleuze, 1990, p. 21) not just itself as a sense event but also greens Janine, her life, her community, her story where planting trees for the future is a part of dangerous thinking, a thinking that greens her world.164

However, the process of living in the community has changed Janine’s appreciation of community.

164 Changing a life to plant trees, leaving a marriage to plant trees, living in a community to plant trees might be seen as dangerous thinking, part of the witch’s flight where we ‘head towards the horizon’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 41) of such thinking on the plane of immanence greening a world as well as the earth.
Oh yes it has changed,
Yes, it has changed
Yes, I think it’s very valuable.
When people talk about communities where,
You know,
Some people here say we don’t live close enough,
We don’t have enough interaction,
And so on,
I realise that this actually does suit me,
Because I seem to like running away every now and then
But I really appreciate having a community.

Janine’s appreciation for community is about company and the sense that what she
does, in such a community, will not be undone. Rather than having any sense of
yearning for community Janine wants a world that suits her and accepts the level of
involvement she wants to have in her community. What suits her is a world of
greening, with wilderness available at its edges and after the event, community for
company.

The impossibility of Intentionality - Sira

In the event of the micro-community a state of affairs arises which also has
incorporeal effects that are incarnated. Sira has been involved in several micro-
communities in Bonville that have proven not to work for her She speaks here of one
of the earlier micro-communities that she helped to establish. What Sira came to see
very clearly was that everyone had different agendas in joining, or establishing, a
micro-community and that for some of the people community was bullshit – especially
when it was linked to living communally.

Oh dear,
Why did I think it would work?
I mean (sighs)
Well it didn’t,
And I mean,
I still feel quite sort of,
I feel very upset actually that it didn’t but it,
And I don’t,
I do know actually why
It’s because people all had different agendas.

We all had different agendas.
And I mean we had so many discussions before we started, you know
And I mean when I sort of look back I get quite angry
Because, we had,
One of the things that was very important to me was that we ate together
And this is
‘Oh yes we’ll eat together we’ll have a communal kitchen, ad, da, da.

The communal aspect of eating, buying, cooking is what engenders community for
Sira (the very thing that her lover thought was bullshit). What made her think that this
micro-community would work for her was that she was in on its planning from the
beginning, through many meetings and felt that it would be both an alliance of
companions and an aggregate of all those elements that would meet her needs.

Then we get there and then there’s sort of like,
There was only 7 of us you know,
And then sort of 3 of them said
‘Oh we don’t want to cook in the evenings,
It’s too much bother’
And ‘oh we just want a snack’
And you know ‘we want to go out’,
‘We want to have this freedom’

Sira’s attempts at compromise are unsuccessful, raising the problem of the
‘intentionality’ of community, given that it is always what breaks down between two
worlds, between the folds of what is said and what we see. Intentionality breaks down,
not just between what we see and speak, but between the worlds of others who see
and speak, such that there can be no originary intention to be communal that does not collapse in the in-between (Deleuze, 1988a, p. 109) of human interactions.

And I said okay,  
Well fine  
Well we’ll just have lunch together, you see.  
I didn’t,  
We were never going to have breakfast together  
People get up at different times  
And everything  
So that was okay.  
So anyway, so anyway  
Then we were just having lunch together  
And then this other couple came  
And they were a couple who really had been looking for somewhere to live  
And you know,  
I mean, they’d been,  
Well he hadn’t,  
She had been to all the meetings.

We get there,  
The day they get there suddenly there’s this other basket,  
So we say hang on what this other basket?  
Oh well we want our own basket because we eat fruit  
And sort of stuff,  
You know sort of extra stuff.  
So I said okay.  
And then it transpires that they had actually planned to build their own kitchen  
And I felt really let down actually.

The doubling of the sense of the basket is not just its arrival as a divisive measure against communalism but that it is spoken of as it is if it was not that divisive move but just extra stuff. Just as ‘this is not a pipe’ implicates the doubling or folding of what is seen and what is said (Deleuze, 1988a, p. 109), ‘this is not a basket’ suggests that the forces that accompany the basket are the building bricks of a separate kitchen and another blow to any sense of communality for Sira. Instead of living communally the couple in question wanted to homestead.
I mean what this couple really wanted to do was to homestead
And I don’t think there’s anything wrong with homesteading,
You know
I think there should be an opportunity for everybody to do it.

And then anyway they,
You know so basically what they did they went to Voyage
And they homesteaded.
I mean they kept pretending they were part of the community
It was just bullshit

The connections at Bonville become very tenuous when the members are all pulling in
different directions so that there are always people like Sira who, at least for certain
periods of time, do not get their needs met. Her need was to live communally in terms
of eating meals together and the other members of that community had a need for a
looser Sangha and for a variety of experiences including homesteading. Sira felt let
down because there had been so much initial planning that had meant very little in the
actualisation of the event. For Sira, the incorporeal effect of the event of betrayal that
was incarnated was herself as an injured person and an outsider, such that that
community in that particular micro-community became bullshit. Her eventual solution
was to set up her own community, which has proved to be successful.

Sira also speaks of some of the strongest struggles in Bonville as being over
development and the kinds of development. In a sense she presents an alternative view
to the level of ordered growth underpinning the community’s strong notion of human
evolution.

That’s the other thing.
There’s a sort of juggernaut here of sort of development
And it’s developing in horrible ways.
And it’s very difficult to stop.  
You know nobody seems to have the will to do anything about it.  
You know there’s always plastic  
And I don’t know, it’s not, it’s not very nice.  
The other thing actually I feel about Bonville is that I don’t know,  
I don’t feel it’s on the cutting edge of anything.  
I don’t know.  
I mean maybe this is.  
Maybe this little place here is on the cutting edge.  
I don’t know ‘cos I think when you get a piece of land  
And you say, ‘right let’s try and empower this piece of land’,  
Then in some ways you are on the cutting edge somewhere  
But I don’t know.

Sira told me about other problems with the community that show the difficulties of attempting resistance to the consumerism and the products of the outside and also in terms of the filiative dimensions that survive in the community. Couples, families with children, are often placed at a disadvantage and are unwelcome in some of the micro-communities. For instance, the fairly affluent micro-community that Chandra and Rajni are part of does not accept children as members. Sira describes one of the other micro-communities that she lived in as a fiefdom, suggesting processes that are feudal, with a leadership group that is not democratic. In terms of governance, Sira offers a weary description of the frustrations of operating on a consensus model of this continual community thing griped in an interpretation of the edicts of their deceased woman guru:

Oh I mean you go through this continual community thing you know.  
I don’t know.  
I mean I was involved in this Economy 200X  
And we had a seminar last year,  
February last year,  
And it was really fantastic  
And the thing is the woman guru said  
There was to be no exchange of money  
And we don’t really know what this means.  
Nobody knows what it means.

And anyway what we did in this seminar was
We came up with several sorts of models,
You know and it was really nice
Because there were sort of various things you could kind of plug yourself in depending on your own,
Not just one thing,
You know you could be in a circle
And run a unit
And you had lots of different things you could do
And sort of experiment with money.

One of the things was to have our own alternative exchange unit
And it’s been stymied.
The whole thing has been stymied
By someone who said ‘no that’s not how the woman guru said it was to be’
and you know
And I just feel we went through all this stuff,
We had a community process
And this guy managed to suck all the life out of it
By sort of writing these long emails
And saying
And everybody felt that we had to sort of you know
Sort of engage with him
And it’s just, I don’t know it’s just kind of …

Here, Sira produces a series of problems generated within the community and the processes of organising sustainably towards the future. Out of all of the work, however, there came the despotic voice of a departed Guru. Rather than continued transformation and evolution, the Guru or an equivalent, is invoked to capture and block change. This happens in all of the communities – those in power attempt to direct the organizational changes that occur in each of the communities. However, the community that is the least likely to survive as a community, the Motherhouse, is the community that is engaged in the most revolutionary processes in an attempt to survive. They are planning and designing for an ecovillage in their grounds that will open up the community, to men and children, for the first time in their history.
Intentional communities can be ‘in the middle of nowhere’ and they can be everywhere in any-space-whatever.\textsuperscript{165} When Rajni said to me, when you are travelling in a group you are an intentional community, what she was expressing was the sense that any group travelling together included the need to protect, to be each others’ sisters and brothers, in a familial, filial sense that has strong resonances with the Indian culture\textsuperscript{166} that she lived alongside. She forced me to think when she claimed that intentional community is not necessarily ‘place’ as such. Rather it can be, and is, any space whatever, freed from place but still a milieu and a haecceity, still an assemblage of relations where the form of place is not attached and the content of the assemblage is mobile, or nomadic. Intentional community as linked to what a body can do, to a multiplicity of modes of bodies that take such communities beyond the long list of types and their imagined places. Ranji’s words express the inseparability of communities from their becomings outside of place or locality in a geography of desire. Such desire for community engenders change – in whatever form – triggers community as a territory where the processes of marking a territory constitutes home or a world, as a little bit of order out of the chaos. In this sense, both the territory and the marking are ongoing movements in duration.

Imperceptible differences constitute ‘possible worlds’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 17) and the women of those worlds. Individuation and singularity, rather than identity or common sense notions of correspondence, subtend the women and their worlds as

\textsuperscript{165} Any space whatever is a term that Deleuze (1986, p. 111) as that space that is engendered through singularities, space as a haecceity ‘freed from conventional location within a totality to which all spaces can be related’ (Lorraine, 2005, p. 165). Deleuze distinguishes movement from space where space is seen as time past. In this sense the any space whatever emerges from time passing, from movement, from journeys.

\textsuperscript{166} I use the term ‘Indian’ here to avoid the regional cultural group which is too strong an identifier of the location and perhaps the community. I would claim that ‘Indian’ culture is a violent invention of the West.
they fold in movements ‘varying and branching out, taking new forms’, unsettling what ‘seems fixed’ (Deleuze, 1995, p. 157). On the one hand, the fold denotes a way of expressing the singularity of contemporary intentional communities as worlds, folding back onto themselves, creating new designs and architecture – given the social and political movements of the times – in an attempt to understand and meet the demands of the earth. On the other hand, the fold denotes the ways that questions concerning the intermingling of the environment, feminism and spirituality: or nature, god, subjectivity: or the organism, the sign and the subject and the composing forces that twist and fold them into new shapes are fabulated and caught in duration.

Each woman slips into a world as a collective assemblage in a twofold way: on a movement of individuation or subjectivisation and on her becomings-community, expressing her individual world that ‘subsists as an event’ in time (Deleuze, 1990, p.111) in the collective enunciations and in the experiment of community. It is a worlding held open in variation and movement, in the in-between, where her actualisations and counter-actualisations of a world emerge in the creation of collective assemblages. Bicycling into particles of sand, circle singing/dancing as an event in the location of Clear Creek Community and an international conference of Motherhouse chapters are memories of love stories, not just with people but with worlds. Such memories are entwined in the processes of fabulation that Deleuze (1995, p. 174) suggests as a new politics to replace notions of utopia.

In the following chapter I turn to the interweaving of social, material and semiotic flows in the women’s eco-spirituality. I suggest that spirit and nature create part of a transformative edge or border world in the eco-spiritual dance that the women engage
in. I broach the sense of the Self and the ways that it is subjectivised and
deterritorialised through the forces of such flows: the signs that can be rendered as
part of some regime of signs; the collective enunciations that subtend the sense of the
subject-in-process; nature as a creative force connecting with every other force,
connecting with spirit to producing an in-between border world.

In the following chapter I argue that while each intentional community, to the
common sense perspective might seem to have a common or binding form of
spirituality – for example Catholicism, Bhakti Yoga, Neo-paganism or whatever – my
realisation that in fact spirituality is not a glue, not something common, is brought
into view in the stories of the women in each of the three communities all evincing
very different kinds of spiritualities from each other.
CHAPTER 5
THE ECO- SPIRITUAL DANCE AND SPIRITUAL EXERCISES

Introduction

‘The subject invents and believes; it is a synthesis of the mind’ (Deleuze, 1991, p. 92). 167

‘What can I be, with what folds can I surround myself or how can I produce myself as a subject?’ (Deleuze, 1988a, pp.114-115).

Spirituality is often seen as the glue of intentional communities. It is seen as imperative for the wellbeing of individuals, of communities and of the earth and interconnected with moves for change.168 Even in secular communities, such as Clear Creek Community, spirituality is part of the pluralist mix of community life and, it

---

167 In Empiricism and Subjectivity: an Essay on Hume’s Theory of Human Nature. Deleuze (1991, pp. 85-104) presents a discussion of the given and subjectivity in Hume’s work where the unknown powers of nature that presuppose the appearance of the given, need to be ‘thought’ in harmony with the subject. The subject is ‘defined by the movement through which it is developed. The subject reflects and invents’. In terms of eco-spirituality that movement is a dance between the subject and signs. Such a dance encompasses the collective enunciations of any given form of spirituality such that the subject moves within a collective, a Sangha, a spiritual tradition that comes from some reinvention or repetition of past spiritual traditions to create the new.

168 There is no conclusive data available concerning whether or not most intentional communities are religious or spiritual in nature. What is clear is that they offer an alternative way of life, often incorporating alternative spiritualities, whether or not the community designates itself as spiritual or secular. For example, the very dated information on North American communities (504 of them) 35% report themselves as spiritual or religious and the remaining 65% report themselves as either do not specify or claim to be secular (Fellowship for Intentional Community, 1996). Suffice it to say, two of the communities involved in this project were ‘spiritual’ communities and one of them was ‘secular’ in its organisation but many of the residents engage in spiritual practices and have strong spiritual beliefs and across the three communities secularism is rife in the sense that the demands of worldly words are imperatives that intervene in each of the communities. However, this is not the concern of this chapter but something that is necessarily the case in modern societies to a greater or a lesser extent.
could be argued, that the avowed permaculture of that community has spiritual underpinnings as it draws on Buddhist notions of ‘rightness’. Spirituality is presupposed as one of the elements of community, incorporating a force or higher power – such as the Divine, the Goddess, the Mother, Nature – that transcends any individual Self, yet, at the same time is immanent to ethical journeys of self-realisation, change and the determining of a True Self. A spirit-rich life is seen as one that places attention and energy into creating new, ethical selves and alternative modes of living in worlds, moved by the transformative desire for love, creativity and beauty. Spirituality is seen as a yearning for something beyond the everyday that offers transformations of worlds and individuals.

Spirituality, in intentional communities, however, is so much more than glue. It moves beyond the yearning to fill the empty interior of the Self with an esoteric power or otherness. It encompasses transformational New Age countercultural moves to change not just one soul at a time but to change the world. It is more than a turning away or the uncoupling from the sacred institutional churches (Prior & Cusack, 2008,

---

169 The work of Anne C Klein (1995) and Peter Clarke (2006), frames questions of subjectivity and the self through a sense of the changes in the concept of God in New Age Spiritualities. They are indexical as humanist analyses of the True Self and the constitution of subjectivity and spirituality. For example, Clarke discusses a wide range of New Religious movements using a global approach utilizing the work of Roland Robertson (1992,) who suggests that religious issues are foundational to ‘self-identity and the meaning of being human’. It is not that such approaches are without interest, but I have taken a different trajectory; one which undertakes an analysis of post-human, nomadic spiritualities, traversing different theoretical terrains. Semiotics is one such domain and I argue, following Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 184) that semiotic regimes are constituted in desiring machines where desire is the plane of immanence. This trajectory and its lines of movement, its singular points engenders a Self which is a series of partial or fractured “I’s” emergent from Chaosmos (Boundas, 1996, p. 14) in a becomings-world. Not, however, as Boundas claims as an already ‘always’ but as an emergent transforming series of fractures. And not the equivocal self/subject of psychoanalysis, as the gap ‘gap or not all, of being’ (Colebrook, 2004b, p. 285) but thought as the emergence of sense or the sense-event and the emergence of the in-between of relations and their terms, giving sense beyond a self, beyond a state of affairs into an actualization of a the virtual repeating infinitive (Colebrook, 2004b, p. 285) with its incorporeal effects – that is, ‘to green’ as a positive symbiosis of spirit-matter – when the positivity of ‘the determination of the virtual content of an Idea’ is ‘differentiation’ along with its equally positive ‘actualization of that virtuality’ which is ‘differentiation’ (Deleuze, 2004, p. 258).
p. 271) or from tradition and religion in the name of some socially just, millenarian future (Heelas, 2009). It is more than a post-traditionalism or a post-Christianity where what is sacralised is selves (Houtman & Aupers, 2007, p. 309), and those who seek spiritual experience outside of institutional forms such as churches (Possamai, 2005; 2007) and who no longer read or listen to ‘the word’. Turning away from ‘the word’ changes the problem to one of turning to worlds that incorporate spirituality as one movement or intensity generating new modes of existence and new assemblages full of eco-spiritual machines ‘closer to animals and rocks’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, pp. 74-75). Spirituality, then, is a force and a singular point of a dynamically immanent potential and its actualisation (Deleuze, 1990, p. 113, see also Bogue, 1994, pp. 5-10). Spirituality becomes visible as a singular point attached to a problem or a constellation of problems when it is actualised in rituals, practices and passions. Its very existence emerges out of the sense that although we do not yet know what a body (any body) can do, we know that it is endlessly expressive and that expression has a parallel form of content, of invention and belief. The invention of a new earth, the earth of breathing rather than breath, of passional dance, moving meditation rather than transcendental Spirit, perhaps, presents the possibility of a contribution to the event of the invention of a people to come.

The event is important in any discussion of singular points as forces of the production of subjectivities or as driving regimes of signs. The event of becoming spiritual, in each of the women’s stories is an actualisation of spirituality in some way. For Deleuze such an actualisation of forces or of the singular point is ‘inscribed the flesh’ and the body must endure and ‘mime what effectively occurs’ so as to give ‘truth’ through distance – through telling and retelling the story – and in doing this effect a
counter-actualisation. The event and the encounter with the event of spirituality allows for the actualisation as it occurred and its counter-actualisation as it is fabulated.

To indicate something of the range of inventions and beliefs in the women’s stories regarding alternative spiritualities and the alternative process of subjectivity linked to whatever spiritualities an analysis incorporating regimes of signs or the formalised expressions of spirituality, is used, in this chapter. I play with the notion that inventions and beliefs are repetitions\textsuperscript{170} or imitations of prior spiritualities twisted into some kind of compatibility with in the context of contemporary intentional communities and their experimental, millenarian desires for themselves and for liveable worlds. Clearly, such regimes of signs implicate regimes of expressing bodies in the ecological assemblages of intentional communities. Regimes of signs are more than language as they are inseparable from all of the domains of a given assemblage (and all of its overlapping assemblages) and incorporate collective enunciations and the doubling of the subject, where the subject who speaks, that is, any one of the women ‘recoils’ into the subject who is spoken of or the subject of the statement – in a community, a world or spirituality (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 143). Subjectivity as an ongoing spatio-temporal experimentation or process\textsuperscript{171} emerges through whatever we ‘encounter’. ‘Something in the world forces us to think. This something is an object not of recognition but of a fundamental ‘encounter’. Such an encounter is

\textsuperscript{170} A turn to new spiritualities, is also a return to the problem of spirituality; spirituality already there and still yet to come, rendered as alliances and not filiations, seen not as a return of the repressed but a return of difference engendered through such repetitions, experimentation, and metamorphosis.

\textsuperscript{171} Braidotti (2006, p. 134) refers to ‘The subject as a spatio-temporal compound which frames the boundaries of processes of becoming.’ This is a useful sense of the subject as a collection of elements implicating much more than any identitarian sense of the subject. At this point I stick with a processual notion of the subject, which sees singularization or counter-actualization as stronger for its fragmentation rather than diminished (Guattari, 2009, p. 289).
an encounter with a sign (Deleuze, 1994, p. 176). Encounters and signs forming semiotic systems are brought into view in any analysis of mixtures of regimes of signs. Spiritual becomings emerge, as unexpected modes, from the connections of bodies, signs and domains. Spiritual becomings, then, implicate both the collective enunciations of individuals and groups and their rituals and practices, producing what can be thought, said and done but also producing unexpected, aleatory affects.

Spiritual journeys or eco-spiritual dances are passional dances, where a moving, breathing body struggles to emerge or merge and create something new – a Self, a vision, a world – from folding in transformative, dynamic or nomadic, alternative, spiritual practices and beliefs. Such a dance is one of exercises or practices that constructs a mode of existence, expressed in assemblages. The regimes of signs of assemblages create worlds and they can be used to analyse and actualise the circumstances producing subjects-in-process in the midst of the reterritorialising ‘remembrances’ of ‘singular memory’ (Parr, 2006, p.130) of spirituality. If spiritual worlds and women emerge out of the creative, rhizomatic forces of ecological assemblages, shaped by the interceptions of ‘semiotic flows, material flows, and social flows, simultaneously’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 25), how are such flows coded and recoded in intentional communities in a spiritual semiotic? If the subject is ‘defined by the movement through which it is developed’ and also, added to this, if the subject reflects and invents and in doing so transforms the given in this very movement (Deleuze, 1991, p. 92), what does this mean for the production of subjectivity and the synthesis that occurs in the mind between the world, its flows, and the recodings of spiritual invention and belief within regimes of signs? How can we show the ways such flows and their recodings pass by inside of each woman and
her worlds in terms of a regime of signs? These questions about alternative spiritualities are especially resonant in the context of the alternative communities. It is not simply the private interiorised world of the Self and a shifting of codes that is brought into question but the encounters of the forces of ecological relations.

The question of alternative spirituality arises in the processes of invention of the new Spiritual Self in late capitalism. This spirituality, in a Deleuzean and Guattarian sense, is a new concept (1994). It can be used to produce new becomings; new ways of speaking, new subjectivities, new collectivities. It reconfigures beliefs in an assemblage such as an intentional community. The spiritual expression of intentional communities emerges through the force of the regimes of signs and the pragmatic systems of those assemblages. Spirituality is traversed, complicated and translated (Levan, 2007, p. 52) by inextricably interwoven flows of semiotics, matter, spirit and the social, wherein bodies metamorphose via incorporeal transformations in becomings-other, opening the way for such flows, with their bodies, words and actions, to be analytically teased apart. Belief in a divine or spiritual force, often mediated through the figure of a translating guru and his or her mediators (Deleuze, 1995, p. 125; also in Levan, 2007, p. 53), and expressed through words and style, pervades common sense in intentional communities. Beliefs can effect a line of flight into the inventions of new spiritual selves for becomings-other.

---

172 Regimes of signs are the semiotic systems of assemblages, where expression becomes a regime of signs and the content of the assemblage becomes the pragmatic system of actions and passions. Spirituality is created from both of these aspects of the assemblage (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 555).
Spirituality is a haecceity, like desire, implicated in the assemblages of intentional communities, where individuals enter into compositions directing the transformation of things and of subjectivities and becomings (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, pp. 288-290). Spirituality is spirit as breath, a fog, a wind, a belief: not made of points or things, but directing them. It is not paradoxical, then, to suggest that spirituality is a form of creativity that acts as an expressive, catalytic function for those individuals and communities presenting a spiritual dimension to their collectivity. Spirituality is a politics of desire as transformative relations (Goodchild, 1996, p. 41) that signals a prelude; to community, Nature, the Self, becomings-other. Like music and its affects, spirituality seems inseparable from involution, as the dissolution of forms (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 294; Hainge, 2004, p.39) and the concomitant lines of flight, captured, recoded and reterritorialised in the content of the refrain-prayers-rituals-signs of the individuating subject (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 288). Even though it is impossible to know when spirituality begins, it too is always doubled in its journeying and in its capture in the landscape of ‘whatever’ face – of the despot, avatar, prophet, guru, leader – or sign (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, pp. 330-331). The sense of (the plane of) transcendence entering (the plane of) immanence, only to be recaptured in a new formation (the plane of organisation) underpins my analysis of the women’s stories in this chapter (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 297). The problem I

173 Tarde (1903, p. 149) in The Laws of Imitation sees desire as a real force, ‘At times, it is a passing breeze; at times a whirlwind’. It’s work varies ‘but it never pauses in its incessant labour of regeneration or revolution.’ Such a force as desire drives invention, piles it into transformational processes and shapes belief.

174 I referred to Deleuze and Guattari’s analysis of divinity carried out in What is Philosophy? in the introduction to this thesis. See in particular fn. 26. Also they discuss God as the disjunctive syllogism ‘from which all secondary realities are derived by a process of division’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 13). Deleuze discusses God/antichrist as the disjunctive syllogism, the prince of all modifications (1990, pp. 295-297) where he suggests that all that is inclusive and affirmative, ‘an infinity of predicates’ is disjunctive. Smith (2010, p. 112) suggests that Deleuze’s theology is akin to Bergson’s in that he sees God as ‘an infinite creativity, not a creator’, which works with the diverse sense of spiritualities or Nature in the women’s stories.
will address revolves around whether Spirit, the Breath, permeates or captures Matter. Does it turn Nature into a new ground or does it create something altogether more transformational and experimental?

Spirituality, as an *alternative* spirituality to that found in established religions, is an element in an ecological politics of desire, rather than a single, adhesive or uniting substance. Such a politics belongs to a generative pragmatics concerned with shaping the ways that we live in the world and the stories that we tell. It also belongs to a transformational pragmatics that creates new combinations within any regime of signs, seen as ‘any formalization of expression’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, pp. 153-154). The spiritualities voiced and enacted by the women in their stories appear in a multiplicity of constitutive signs taken as expressions of their intersecting worlds (Deleuze, 1993, p. 4). In these worlds, the women take up a ‘new variety of a mixed semiotic’ (O’Sullivan, 2006, p. 317) or a new syntax or style (Levan, 2007, p. 55). The semiotic is framed, usually, by a passional postsignifying or subjective regime of signs but incorporates other regimes in this mixture. Such a mixture of regimes allows for the incorporation of various styles of transcendence and their affects, given the vast array of signs or points of subjectification (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 142, p. 147).

How does such a transformational ecological politics drive alternative spiritualities? How do the stories of the women and the statements they make about spirituality enter into the domains of regimes of signs and affect regimes of bodies? What are the politics of alternative spiritualities? What is the pragmatics of subjectivities in process and are they transformational becomings-spiritual?
Spiritualities are invented. Spiritual inventions are drawn from the imitations of virtual archaisms, perhaps from traditional religious texts and practices, mixed with various philosophies and anthropologies or from some perceived need for other-worldly connections or to believe in something greater than what we are. This is not to say that they are ‘made up’, as in telling lies, but that they are fabulations that function as that which both fits in given circumstances and operates on us so that we can become something other. The embrace of the forces of alternative spiritualities creates something other, such that a process of subjectivation or resingularisation occurs. Through an analysis using Deleuze and Guattari’s regimes of signs, it is possible to move beyond the commonsense of spirituality as social glue, or as a process of socialisation, and we can draw out the implications of the purpose of spirituality and its expressions, beyond the social, into the processes of subjectivity of ordinary women – and to see where this takes us. Events overtake us and are always, surprisingly, slightly more than our actions, especially when invention and belief include the esoteric or arcane and the supernatural.

I sat in the homes of many women or they sat in my temporary home in their communities and we discussed spirituality. Spirituality is not always a comfortable subject and it is not my own natural milieu. What struck me again and again were the signs of spirituality interwoven and repeated through all of its expressions and the politics or pragmatic of such, seemingly, mimetic experimentation. A low table in a room (do not put your tape recorder there, that is an altar), upon which rested some sticks, a small bowl of stones, three feathers and a scented candle; the burning incense; the posies of flowers around a particular tree. The offering bowls of fruit; the necklace with the figure of the Goddess; the gestures to books of ancient knowledge
or self help, mysticism, reinvented in the last few decades; careful arrangements of living spaces to allow for the positive flows of energies; the meditation cushion or the yoga mat rolled up in the corner and so much more were all signs of spirituality. The signs of spirituality, on display and more subtly present and the sense of spirituality as this or that of spirituality (haecceities) shifted my perceptions of the women and their stories and of the place of spirituality in each community. The affective force of the vast array of signs of alternative spiritualities associated with each of the communities suggest that even where there are designated, core spiritual beliefs, the individual manifestations of such beliefs are wildly eclectic, seemingly signifying endlessly divergent spiritualities, with no single origin but rather a series of aleatory loci that generate signs. Beyond such practices, there is the emergence of sense or the expressibility of spirituality as an event.\(^{175}\)

The signs of alternative spiritualities potentially implicate signs, objects, rituals, practices and expressions as points of subjectivation and with becomings-subject and becomings-spiritual.\(^{176}\) But can such a claim hold? Are such spiritualities imitations of past forms or of fragments of past forms, grafted onto experiments with community? Why have they emerged? Do they arise simply as countercultural, oppositional forms in sharp juxtaposition to the materialistic and corrupted world of late capitalism,

\(^{175}\) Here I am using the language of Deleuzean circular propositions, designation, manifestation and signification and the supplementary ‘sense’ which opens up the circle of the proposition through its expression. It in the expression of the proposition that sense inheres or put another way it, sense inheres in the proposition as it is expressed (Deleuze, 1990, pp. 12-22).

\(^{176}\) ‘Ideas are designated in the mind at the same time as the mind becomes a subject. In short, the effects of the principle of association are complex ideas: relations, substances and modes, general ideas. Under the influence of the principles of association, ideas are compared, grouped and evoked. This relation, or rather this intimacy, between complex ideas and the subject, such that one is the inverse of the other, is presented to us in language; the subject, as she speaks, designates in some way ideas which are in turn designated to her’ (Deleuze, 1991, p. 101). The ideas of spirituality thus both designate a subject and in turn are themselves designated. Each woman’s ideas of spirituality are expressed in her story but also designated in the signs (substances and modes) of a spiritual life with which she surrounds herself.
where religion is corporatised, bureaucratised, institutionalised and seen as morally repugnant by many? These questions are not new. There are analyses of and answers to these questions.\textsuperscript{177} What creates something new is to experiment, as I am doing, with concepts and theories, such as those of Deleuze and Guattari, and to open other paths and to open up difference.

Alternative spiritualities are political expressions of generative recuperations of past spiritualities and religions that fit particular circumstances and processes of subjectification. At the same time, alternative spiritualities implicate the mixtures of various regimes of signs and the ways they become translated into one another (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, pp. 153-154).\textsuperscript{178} However, their effects are not simply open to understanding. Translations, circumstances and processes of subjectification are all open to chance. I begin the second part of this chapter on spirituality with Claire’s story but first give a short introduction to the spiritual journey of the Motherhouse because it is that world that she makes love with.

\textsuperscript{177} Tarde (1903, p. 74) offers generative imitations and imitative imitations as respectively fruitful repetitions and as the propagation of inventions rather than sterile dead ends. His sense of imitation moves mimesis into the realms of becomings, rather than accepting it as irrelevant to becoming. There is no model for becoming in the sense that as becomings occur both the becomings and the subjects of any becomings change. So, while alternative spiritualities emerge from the rearticulation of prior belief systems and practices they are not copies of those beliefs systems but rather part of the invention of new spiritualities and new, pragmatic productions of subjectivity. Such invented spiritualities need to create a series of stories that can be built around one another, just as they need to fit their time and to replace previous dogmas and rituals (Tarde, 1903, pp. 175-176) if they are to be successful.

\textsuperscript{178} Although I do not take up the work of Irigaray on spirituality and the breath, presented as the first cultivated, autonomous action after birth, the notion of the breath from yoga and Roman Catholicism pervades alternative spiritualities. I see it as part of those processes of imitation that Tarde is theorizing and an example of the ways that a feminist pneumatology has been developed and the ways that alternative spiritualities have entered academic feminisms and feminist theologies.
The total experience – Claire from the Motherhouse

Claire belongs to the Motherhouse community. The Motherhouse offers a different way of life to orders of women religious within the Church hierarchy, and indeed any parish or congregations, where the hierarchy of the Bishop and the priest and their patriarchal, magisterial roles remain entrenched. While the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) – the Aggiornamento – introduced ecclesiological and liturgical changes, participation by the congregation and sermons produced from mass texts and in the vernacular, these practices already existed in the Motherhouse, together with use of sacralised modern art forms. The Motherhouse was an intentional community of lay apostolate women. It was a religious community, whose members worked to save the world by example and as the world changed so, too, did their community. There were many unintended consequences for the community. The acceptance of ecumenism was an exciting change but the expected changes to the Church’s position on women priests, homosexuality and contraception did not occur. The clergy was and is still regarded as superior in essence to the laity – and to women. This remains part of the continuing disenchantment of Catholics with the Church (Greeley, 2004, p. 76) and with Motherhouse members. Vatican II opened the way for structural, democratising change in the Motherhouse, which produced an exodus of the women who formed the nucleus of the community. They wanted lovers, husbands, families and careers outside of the community and they wanted to run their own lives and not be answerable to a defacto Mother Superior and her lieutenants. The community was forever changed. It is now radically inclusive of all religions, spiritualities and notions of the Divine. With the inclusion of other expressions of spiritual life, new points of subjectification are possible. When such expressions are added to and become part of
the process of becomings-other, the possibility of mutation occurs along with a change of codes, as a process of decoding and recoding, such that the forces of the earth – rites and religion – compose a different semiotic regime. The orthodoxy of the nun or the lay apostolate of the early Motherhouse was one of significance (the signifying regime) with a despotic centre endlessly emitting signifying chains of signs, hierarchically organised and interpreted by the apostolate, endlessly reinterpreting the signifier, the despotic blockages to any line of flight and its negative sign of those who leave (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 124, p. 150). The head of the lay apostolate group stood in for priests, bishops and so on, up to God. She was the despot. Following the period of organisational change and democratisation, a state of transformation emerged, which continues into the present. The women, who live there, like Claire, do not need a despot anymore, or the use of collective nouns like nuns or women religious. Under a post-signifying, passional semiotic regime of signs women begin their own lines of flight and find their own points of subjectivation along those lines, establishing their own passional relations with signs.

Claire’s spiritual story is a return to Catholicism. However, it is not a return to the same style of Catholicism that she experienced in her youth, but rather a mystical Catholicism, following theologians such as Thomas Merton. Her return to religion arose out of an event: the death of her father.

_I started off in New York._
_Raised a Catholic,_
_Practised it very devoutly_
_Until it came to me that it didn’t make sense,_
_Intellectually._
_And pretty much wound my way out of it_
_And into eventually what became a feminist community in New York City,_
_Where I also began to develop as a poet._
And then one day my father went to sleep
At actually the same age that I am now.
At 53, he went to sleep and he didn’t wake up the next morning.
And it was such a shock that it really,
I suppose,
Brought up the big questions.

And one day soon after his death
I was in a bookstore - a religious bookstore.
A New Age type place
And picked up a book by Thomas Merton
And just thumbing through it
And in the course of looking through it
Began to have these old feelings from when I was back in church.
And back in those days that I might like to be a nun
But of course that was ridiculous.

And I had been searching through the years for another form of spirituality
To somehow substitute for the depth and quality and total experience
That I experienced through Catholicism
And could never find it through those explorations.

So I’m reading this book
And it’s evoking for me those old feelings
And I started to think woohoo maybe I could be a nun
I thought don’t be absurd you don’t want to be a nun (laughing)
I thought maybe I could work for nuns.
And the image that came to me was somehow
Something kind of monastic,
And prayerful,
And quiet.
And I could like clean the floors
Or, you know, cook for them.
Yeah, me cleaning for glory (laughs uproariously).
It was an image you know?

I could work for nuns.
I wouldn’t have to be one of them
but I could be in that environment.
And none of that fitted with my rational understanding
but the image was gripping for me.

Claire, who was and is a performance poet, reads a book in a New Age bookshop,
following the death of her father and is gripped by the image of a monastic, prayerful,
quiet, ascetic life. While the image was gripping; the reality of such an existence was
absurd. The conjugation of Claire and nun into Claire-the-nun, or Claire-cleaning-for-glory is a mixture of predicates and subject/bodies with such odd, presiding singularities that she is unable to realise out of the image; there is no suitable religious assemblage for her to connect into or within which she can become such a spiritual subject. For Claire, there is no form of expression and no line of subjectification and no form of content that works until she finds the Motherhouse. The Motherhouse encourages Claire-performance poet-mystical Catholic-ecumenical member to flourish.

Claire’s story is one of ‘turning away from’ the Roman Catholic Church because it didn’t make sense intellectually. The betrayal implied in Claire’s story is the double betrayal of the passional regime (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, pp.138-140). Claire is betrayed by the lack of sense and she turns from that lack of sense. Her flight is from a proscriptive religious culture of dogmatic orthodoxy, to a series of other points on her line of flight; other cultures such as the feminist community, where she developed as a poet, and the broader literary community if New York. The event of her father’s death is a shock, which effectuates a turning back to Catholicism but to a mystical expression of the faith, one that is ‘particular to content’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 130).

Claire’s fantasy of becoming a nun is riveting for her in the moment but also, juxtaposed with her worldly life, funny and very funny in the retelling. It is also an image that incorporates the figure/face/power of the nun in a Catholic girl’s life as part of a predetermined system of signs and order-words that creates spiritual control. Mysticism, in contrast, has the self at the centre: not a despotic god with the face of a
nun. Yet, Claire is attracted to the image. In her story, she wound her way out of Catholicism into feminism and into a feminist community and then moved on from the feminist community into the larger literary community. At this point, the shock of her father’s death opens up the big questions and she feels compelled to look again at the fruit of the tree of Christianity.

For Claire the sign of the religious bookstore is a sign, along with other signs, such as, the sign of the New Age type place, the book, Thomas Merton, feelings, the church, a nun – all become referential signs of her spiritual search and its culmination in Catholicism. In this sense, Catholicism becomes a signifier shooting out signs – albeit mystical ones in this event – that complicate the semiotic system of the passional regime of signs and its focus on a semiotic subjectivisation produced through any sign whatever (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 142). The signifying regime of signs, where all signs are centred on a despot, who must have, as a counterpoint a subjected/subjugated other (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 124), can be mixed with other semiotic systems or two regimes can exist in tandem. In this case, the post-signifying regime and the redundancy of its signs is concerned with ‘subjective resonance’, whereas for the signifying regime, redundancy is concerned with the frequency of signs (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, pp.146-147). Claire had been searching through the years for another form of spirituality. She had looked at alternative spiritualities, but none had been enough. Thomas Merton, the Trappist monk, and his book double as signs in a signifying regime spiralling out from a mystical Roman Catholicism. He is an interpreter of this regime of signs for those on
the outside of the inner circle. As a sign, of a spiritual experience, he offers a new point of subjectification in a postsignifying regime of signs. In this regime of signs, the ‘book has become the body of passion’ and rather than having an oral character, a territory, an externality, the book is internalised. Rather than a stultifying process where the book is unchangeable, through the mystic tradition, ‘interpretation’ re-enters through the other side of Roman Catholicism (Deleuze & Guattari 2004, p. 140).

The sign that all other signs refer to, the ‘supreme signifier’ in Claire’s story, is the tree of Roman Catholicism that is rendered as culture with branches that had been previously unknown to her. In a passional twist, Claire becomes the interpreter of the priestly interpreters within the progressive mystical branch. She rediscovers a spiritual form of expression and form of content, the all of that of a subjective Christianity.

So I’d lost touch with my culture
And so it reminded me of the culture I’d come from.
In the course of being there it was a very beautiful thing.
It was a very difficult thing
But for a time I eventually came around again,
To give a little look again at Christianity.

---

179 Throughout his life Merton studied a variety of Eastern religions, particularly Sufism, Taoism Buddhism and towards the end of his life he attempted to synthesize Catholicism and Zen Buddhism but all of his writings express various forms of mysticism. For Claire what is important is that he was a Trappist monk and so within the Catholic Church but that he was a mystic devoted to God as love, not a parish priest devoted to dogma and the control of the lives of the members of his parish.

180 Sherman (2009) in his article ‘No Werewolves in Theology? Transcendence, Immanence, and Becoming-Divine in Gilles Deleuze’, argues against Peter Hallward’s reading of Deleuze as a ‘contemplative mystic’, claiming at the same time that Hallward is ‘right to discern a flight from bodies, relations, and politics in Deleuze’ (2009, p. 1). My thesis offers an alternative analysis to such claims. Hallward’s reading of Deleuze and Sherman’s appropriation of it and its inversion (that is that Deleuze’s mysticism is what is redemptive for his - and Guattari’s – work) argues that Thomas Merton in his embrace ‘contemplative and theophanic elements’ and ‘recuperation of transcendence’ offers a richer alternative to Deleuze and his immanenist theophany, one that is open to saving the ‘world of bodies, politics and relations’. What Sherman perhaps shows is that Merton is open to a Deleuzean reading of becoming but more that he is an Anglo-American writer – telling a tale – pushing a becoming (Deleuze 1998).
Because I liked the fruit of this particular tree and this tree was Christianity, Specifically Catholicism.

And what I found is that, or my understanding of what I found was, that this was a particular stream of Catholicism, the progressive mystical stream that has always existed And it was a stream that I never knew of growing up.

And that the Motherhouse itself is associated with other groups And various movements that have existed in more recent history.

But I liked that and began to re-understand
What is prayer,
What is sacrifice
What is sin,
What is original sin,
What is poverty
All of that.

The signifying chain of ‘whatever’ signs, of her earlier religious life, expressed through a conservative Roman Catholicism, become ‘shifters’, that is, ‘personal pronouns and proper names within the subjective postsignifying regime of signs (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 147). For Claire these ‘shifters’ include Merton, the Motherhouse, Catholic Workers and so on. Claire, through the study of mystical, progressive, liberal theology, understands anew: prayer, sacrifice, sin; and poverty. Her re-understanding for example, signals the mix of the two semiotic regimes, indicating the ‘movement of deterritorialization’, where she leaves the territory of the signifying regime – the signs that emanate from the whole despotic system of the church, static Catholic religion, priest intercessors – for another, the passional regime – centred on prayer, the impossibility of original sin, the pure point within, and the belief in a true self181 – in a line of flight. The signifying regime attempts to

181 The points of subjectification within a mystical Catholicism come from Merton. Merton is a in a shopping centre when he has an epiphany about life, his life of monasticism, of superior religious beings and the life of ordinary people. This quote, taken from his book Contemplative Prayer, denies the conception of original sin and asserts the place of contemplative prayer in contemporary life. Prayer
reterritorialise or capture and return of every sign to the centre of significance. The postsignifying system expressing deterritorialisation, which fractures those ‘relations of significance with other signs’, enables Claire to find a series of points of subjectification in the *culture* and through its translations by Merton she enters into a mystical experience of the Self. Thus, she enters into ‘a positive line of flight’ away from the signifying regime (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, pp. 147-148). Claire accepts her Catholicism as a *culture*, not simply a static religion, which has formed her psyche and her *response to life*. This stance allows her to move out of the Church and make the spiritually disparate Motherhouse her *congregation*:

> So I accepted that the Motherhouse would be my church,  
> My congregation,  
> Eventually became my family,  
> My job,  
> My community.  
> I was in love with the Motherhouse, so it was also my lover.  
> It just hooked, eventually, into every aspect of who I was.

> And some years later I got my education  
> And an introduction into Marxist analysis  
> Through one of these nice old ladies  
> With a bun in the back, you know.  
> Very subversive people  
> Living in an apparently mainstream context.  
> I thought that was kind of interesting.  
> They were sort of passing as normal  
> But they were utterly subversive at the core.

is seen as giving peace and strength and these gifts to the individual need to be used not to evade life but to engage with its problems. ‘Then it was as if I suddenly saw the secret beauty of their hearts, the depths of their hearts where neither sin nor desire nor self-knowledge can reach, the core of their reality, the person that each one is in God’s eyes.... But this cannot be *seen*, only believed and “understood” by a peculiar gift.’ Furthermore, ‘Again, that expression, *le point vierge*, (I cannot translate it) comes in here. At the center of our being is a point of nothingness which is untouched by sin and by illusion, a point of pure truth, a point or spark which belongs entirely to God, which is never at our disposal, from which God disposes of our lives, which is inaccessible to the fantasies of our mind or the brutalities of our own will. This little point of nothingness and of *absolute poverty* is the pure glory of God in us. It is so to speak His name written in us, as our poverty, as our indigence, as our dependence, as our sonship. It is like a pure diamond, blazing with the invisible light of heaven. It is in everybody, and if we could see it we would see these billion points of light coming together in the face and blaze of a sun that would all the darkness and cruelty of life vanish completely….I have no program for this seeing. It is only given. But the gate of heaven is everywhere (Merton, 1973, p.158)
And they had an agenda
But their way of approaching it wasn’t to take it head on
But rather to seep in sort of
And work within what was there.

For Claire, her acceptance of Catholicism, as part of what formed her psyche and her responses to life and her religious impulses, not just as a natal *culture* but as a *religion*, follows a betrayal or a turning from the Church as such yet she turns back to the Motherhouse as her *congregation, family job, community, her lover*. Subversion becomes part of her spirituality and her life in the Motherhouse. It is a subversiveness that will *seep in sort of and work within what was there*, in the way that her *education* and her *introduction to Marxism* showed her it could be. Claire belongs to that subversive strand of mystical Catholicism that engages in social justice work, environmental and anti-war campaigns, and that has a commitment to continuing self realisation. In a sense, the book, *‘the body of passion’*, is a generative element in the mixture of her regimes of signs and a singularity presiding over her actualisation, her becomings-spiritual that is a multiplicity of books. The signifying regime of Catholicism is transformed and translated for Claire, through Merton and through mysticism as a point of subjectification. She experiences metamorphosis in her expressions of spirituality. Pragmatics as ‘*diagrammatic,*’ ‘particle-signs’, ‘unformed traits capable of combining with one another’ and returning to concrete assemblages; the Motherhouse (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 161). The Motherhouse, which Claire *loves*, is her point of subjectification. It is also the assemblage through which, all that she expresses, all of her passions and ritual practices become forms of content and forms of expression passing into and out of each other.
Rose, whose story I take up in detail in the following section, offers a way into the chaos of alternative spiritualities. Her community, Bonville, is open to all spiritualities and religions. There was an Avatar and a Guru, whose words are still used to frame Bonville as a Yoga entity – and learning to hear those words, is like learning another language – however, the originary vision for a spiritual community is one that is challenges by the forces of the outside at every step.

Once in a while I got a confirming sentence – Rose from Bonville

Rose came to a nascent Bonville as someone who found the lack of spirituality in the outside world shocking. Her outside world, in the first instance, is a secular, modern India. She felt unable to go along and fit into the boxes. Her encounter with Bonville is expressed as serendipitous or unconscious and is placed alongside her feelings of otherness in the world. The story of Rose is a complex one that could be read as a series of chances and agentic choices which led, not to a ‘good life’ but to series of violent, territorial encounters and unintended consequences. Or it could be

182 The world for Rose at this time was a post-colonial India remained caught between secularism and the forces of a Hindu matrix, of ‘morality, spirituality and purity’ that contained a ‘religious specificity that was never recognized’ (Srivastava, 1998, p.122). In a sense Sanjay Srivasta’s point holds to this day given that the rise of a conservative Hindu nationalism is a distortion of that very Hindu matrix and the appropriation of yoga and other spiritual forms by the ‘West’ and reappropriation of yoga in India as a consumer opportunity (Askegaard & Eckhardt, 2012) does not so much recognise the religious specificity of yoga as market it.

183 It is impossible to do research in India and have sub-continental friends and colleagues without approaching a sense that there is no monolithic ‘Indian’ culture. Hinduism is similarly different according to caste affiliation, the urban/rural divide, language – there are 18 official languages in India – and researching in an Indian state meant that I was well aware of the tensions between the locals and the politically, linguistically dominant Hindus at the national level. As well there are many other segments of the Indian population that fit none of these categories and they pass through and sometimes live in Bonville, alongside a variety of Europeans and North Americans and other people from the antipodes. As well there is a constant and growing flow of volunteers, inters, guests and tourists

184 This Aristotelian sense of praxis as ‘properly oriented towards an end’, and in the case of agentic selves ‘towards the agents good life’ it is part of the ‘prior gridding’ of the faciality machine ‘that
read as a version of the postsignifying or passional regime of signs, where turning away from a situation of betrayal effectuates a reprieve and alternative subjectifications through relations with passional signs (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 142). In this reading, Rose turns away from the betrayal she experiences in the new, secular, modern, master-plan for India created by its post-independent leaders and in turn she betrays this new India through entering a line of flight by turning to a spiritual life in an intentional community. Once there, the community betrays her, as do her neighbours and she eventually finds an unexpected spiritual and material reprieve in Nature (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 142). Yet, things are never so simple and we must try for another reading of what happens to Rose.

*I suppose you could say that I was led step-by-step to Bonville.*

*I was not happy in the world as it was*
*I could not deal with it somehow*
*And it was shocking to me.*
*I would say the lack of it (spirituality) in the world was shocking to me*
*And I could not manage it.*

*And it was not a conscious decision for me to come to Bonville.*
*I did not read about it and say ‘here is where I will go’*
*But I just happened to be in Bonville in my 27th year, I think,*
*And when I was here I still could have gone back to (the city).*

*I was even offered a good job with lots of money etc.*
*And I took the decision that I would go,*
*And something inside of me cried.*

*And in Bonville I did not know what I was going to be,*
*Because there was no money,*
*No security.*
*Nothing, nothing, nothing.*
*It was all blank and confusing*

makes it possible for subjective choices to be implemented’. Yet if we go beyond this what do we go to? For Colebrook (2005, p. 4) it is the liberation ‘of movement from an external end.’ Rather, ‘events in terms of their power’ are not their always already determined ‘image of life’ but that which constitutes the potential for ‘becomings’ or counter-actualisations’. So here the eco-spiritual dance ‘bears a power to become other than that which it already is.’ Here, ‘dance is a confrontation with life as a plane of open and divergent becomings.’
And when I took the decision to go back something was crying
And I simply had to phone to say I do not come.
I could not go along.
I mean, I tried my best
But I was always not fitting into the boxes
And the structures.

And then I had this experience of wellbeing,
I cannot explain it
But it is a strong experience.
So I stayed.
And I am still here.

And when I read the Avatar
I felt that I was a legitimate person,
That here was something for which I was legitimate.
I could work for what was said in here.
I could dedicate my life,
And feel well,
And feel honoured, feel honourable.
So I think this is why I stayed.

Rose sets up a series of micro-events that led her step-by-step to Bonville, yet there is
the suggestion that she is led. Is this encounter a mystical leading by a divine force, or
is it her fragmented but growing consciousness leading her to wellbeing or her
concealed self? Both can be true for Bonvillians. 185

Rose juxtaposes her chance encounter with Bonville to the offer of a good job, money
and a life in another city and then shifts to the nothing offered by Bonville. On the

185 I heard these issues expressed in several ways but the most unambiguous statements came from
discussions I had with Hanna and Chandra about the ‘cosmology’ of Bonville. For them, the divine
force is always behind your actions and always leading. We all begin our spiritual journeys with a
masked, fragmented consciousness and a soul-spark of the divine force, which through yogic self-
realisation, leads to social and spiritual evolution. Ignorance of the divine force is the cause of suffering
but it is the work of the soul-spark to discover the spiritual being within and the work of the individual
to manifest the spiritual self, or in another sense to ‘surrender’ to the divine forces. This vital surrender
incorporates the calm, content and joy that work brings. 185 An alternative but not dissimilar analysis
can be made from Deleuze and Guattari’s claims that desire is invested in infrastructure or a social
formation and individual investments of desire are already invested in and driven within a social
formation. The unacknowledged Hindu ‘matrix’ of ‘morality, spirituality and purity’ (Srivastava, 1998,
p. 122) drives another, minor thread within her social formation.
verge of leaving, she turns or is led to turn, from a materially comfortable future life outside Bonville and only then experiences sensations of wellbeing, honour and legitimacy. Rose exemplifies the postsignifying regimes turning away from the bureaucratic and political signs encapsulated in the boxes and structures radiating out from the many layers and signs of secular, capitalist modernity. Her betrayal of the betraying modernity and secularism in India and the embrace of a line of flight, away from what makes her cry inside, becomes positive for her wellbeing.

The break in her life, following her encounter with Bonville, is expressed as three intensifying repetitions: a stylistic gesture that Rose employs throughout her story. Rose did not know what she was going to be in Bonville. There was no money, no security, nothing, nothing, nothing. It was all blank. Her choice is to return to a ‘normal’ life with some material and economic certainty, where her points of subjectification would direct her into conforming in a self-doubling (ecolalia) of the subject (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 143). That is, if Rose goes to a good job, money, as the subject of the enunciation – get a job – she then becomes the conforming subject of the statement with a job. Staying for the unknown becomes her passional point of subjectification that creates her first line of flight from the normal. Staying can be coded as a sacrificial moment in duration where the spiritual self overtakes the profane self of normative existence. The event of staying, or going, is presented as an intuitive choice between two worlds and two packets of signs: the ‘normal’ shocking world of the outside and the paradoxically blank/nothing, yet spiritual, world of Bonville and wellbeing.
Rose weaves elements of her past and present into her remembering and in this way creates a singular durational tale that itself reaches into an India that continues to change, into the writings of a long dead Avatar and into the past and present workings of her community and her life there. Rose draws on a qualitative, virtual multiplicity of a ‘whatever’ spiritual world, a mobile past and space to show the forces shaping the formation of her subjectivity in the taking on of a new style of life. The writing or the ‘word’ of the Avatar becomes a point of subjectification for Rose on her line of flight (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 143). It fills the nothing of the community with a new code launching a new passional relation with the sign of the ‘word’. The new code formed from the writings of the Avatar cuts the flow of the nothing into understandable forms, giving it content. The sign of nothing becomes filled with the incorporeal sign of well being, translated into the sign of the writing, which provides legitimacy and honour for Rose. However, she is not effectuated as a subject-devotee. The Avatar is not the (despotic) centre of a signifying regime; so much as one of Rose’s many shifting points of subjectification that coexists within her post-signifying regime of signs.

As the story of Rose unfolds, the forces that challenge her transformation to a legitimate person spoil her spiritual sense of wellness and honour. What emerges in

---

186 The potential value of the singular memory ‘does not surface until the moment when memory takes place’ that is the potential value is actualised in remembrance (Parr, 2006, p. 130). Every woman’s story in this thesis draws on a pre-personal past and actualises elements of that virtual, always beyond her story, which allows fabulation and the actual story as an instant of fabulation.

187 Devotees exist in Bonville. They may be devoted to the woman Guru or to the man who was the Avatar. Hanna was a devotee of the Guru for many years (she went about her days listening to tapes of the Guru with headphones) but turned away from her study of the words of the Guru to work with the dogs. ‘There was much of disillusionment...’ she would say and she told me many hair raising stories of life in the community ‘not for publication’ she used to say but to orient me, to protect me, partly from the worst prejudice against ‘mentalists’ intellectuals and partly from my supposed naivety. I tucked away her stories and watched and listened even more acutely. She introduced me to many of the injured souls of the community but to just as many of the powerful women of the community.
her story, in the first instance, is the disappointment she feels with other Bonvillians, whose everyday profaneness crashes into her sense of a spiritual world. At this point, Rose turns aside from Bonvillian society, in a sense setting aside the overt world of the spirit and its questionable spiritual whiteness. She turns instead to the joy in the hard work of regenerating and greening the degraded redness of the land in the creation of a forest.

There was much of disappointment.

Their (other Bonvillians) behaviour
Was not then fitting to what a spiritual person would behave
So, in a way, I started not to fit also in the Bonville society.

But I immediately took to the land,
And it was just barren earth,
And this work to be done.¹⁸⁸
There is the joy from it
And then in this connection
Because of the joy,
The hard work would be done.

The land becomes Rose’s new passionate point of subjectification. The land is a force driving her in directions she did not foresee. The land functions as a haecceity, where everything becomes this land: work, wellbeing, happiness, spirit and matter. The land

¹⁸⁸ Being ‘white’ or ‘whiteness’ refers to the habitual wearing of white garments by spiritual people in India. Chandra, for instance, was critical of those who sought not to soil themselves with hard work but who instead sought to become ‘sages’ and wear only white.

¹⁸⁹ Rose claims that this is probably the same experience as Hanna. Hanna as my main ‘ethnographic informant’ in Bonville and arranged my first meeting with Rose. Having passed through some trials by fire Hanna had become a loving (and loved) ‘outsider’ in her own community. She was seen as eccentric because of her passion for dogs above humans. Rode understood this preference herself and had a great deal of sympathy for Hannah and her work. For many community members dealing with dogs and their diseases was disgusting, ‘abject’, leading to a projection of polluted ‘otherness’ in the sense that Kristeva (1982) and Grosz (1994) theorize, extending the work of Mary Douglas (1970). What is problematic with the binaries of purity and pollution or the ‘abject’ is that such categorizations are always predicated upon presumptions of the stasis of always-already existing categories, such as woman, abject, slimy, otherness and the division between human/animal. Without Hanna the research in Bonville would not have been possible and whilst I was wary of the rabid dogs and dogs with obvious diseases that I met while in her company, I did not ‘project’ those aspects of ‘dogness’ onto Hanna’s becoming-dog, perhaps because she treated the diseases as curable or not and was not afraid to euthanize a dog who was painfully dying of rabies.
interweaves with her divine purpose. The still unspoken words of the Avatar concerning Shakti remain points of subjectification that encode and direct her emerging subjectivity. In this way, her grievances concerning the community become transformed into something joyful. Rose speaks of the connection of spirit-matter. The hallmarks of Rose’s double turning away, from Indian secular society and from the disappointing Bonville community, are followed by her betrayal by, and of, Bonville and the reprieve that working the land gives her. This journey into and out of worlds signals the ‘passional line of the postsignifying regime’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 142).

The intensity of Rose’s spiritual and bodily wellbeing is open to the forces that shape her. It waxes and wanes through the telling of her story of her work with the land. The sign of the land and hard work take her focus from the world of the spirit to that of matter and back again. Her ongoing story emerges as a series of movements from one segment of her life to another. The point of the land and her joy in it shifts her perspective. It forces her to think of the ways that spirit and matter pass into and out of each other in her life.

*So then you know,*
*What is the spirit?*
*What is matter?*
*What is what?*

*Once in a while I got a confirming sentence.*

The ongoing complications of the spiritual and the profane in Rose’s world present a politics of milieus and their borders. In a continuation of betrayal, rather than an ongoing joyful subjectification arising from spirit-matter linked to working the land,
Rose moves into a contested territory. In this move, the work of deciphering codes and their relations to signs begins once again as Rose is violently forced to remap her subjectivity.

*We had here lots of problems.*
Apart from the climate, land degradation
The poor neighbours, the village neighbours.
We have different values and different situations?
Different perspectives?
And each one had to do what he had to do.
I had to protect my trees
And they had to feed their goats.
But this was a really, really tough thing.

*There is also not the same idea,*
Of respect and property,
*For the Bonvillians,*
Or for me.
And for them they are just here
And there were no fences before,
They just came and went.
And anyway it was all their grazing land.
Of course, the owner was absent.

And then when people like me were really determined to work
And can work the land,
Turning the red earth back to green,
There were many conflicts.

*So it is quite a tough situation.*

On the one side of this *situation* are Rose and her isolated micro-community of one woman and her dog and on the other side there are local villagers, their villages and their goats. Each protagonist is in a territory that is claimed by the other; the villagers in terms of de facto usage and the community in terms of de jure ownership. Such claims express incompossible worlds that emerge out of different perceptions of the event of community. For Rose, Bonville owns the *land* that becomes the passional point of her life, whereas for the villagers, Rose, as Bonville, challenges their
traditional land use rights, their freedom of movement and their livelihood. What emerges is a contested territory with borders that constantly shift as day merges into night: in the day, Rose creates her forest and fences out her village neighbours and in the night the villagers invade, break down fences and steal what they can. Each protagonist is perceived as invading, recoding and remapping the territory of the other; and each protagonist has a grievance against the other.

Rose and her working of the land becomes part of a series of ‘points’ of conflict for the villagers. The villagers become part of the point of subjectification for Rose in the subjective semiotic of Deleuze and Guattari (2004, p. 142), which consists of ‘the double turning away, betrayal, and existence under reprieve.’ Rose turns away again from her community. She is again betrayed by her community and with her rejection, betrays them again in turn. In her turning to land, to her isolated corner, she turns away from a betrayed and betraying spirituality, not once but many times and meets in herself the sides of herself and of these she says, *I did not know(them) and they were terrible.*

*And in this work I met in myself the sides, which I did not know,*  
*And they were terrible,*

Rose is both a part and a cause of her subjectification and – in nonparallel ways – the villagers are a part of and a cause of her subjectification. Rose speaks of her struggle to endure, and the terrible sides of herself. She talks of the intensity of the pressure of the large numbers of villagers, who terrorise her and of her inability to retaliate, not just because of the unequal forces at play but because of her idealism. Rose shows the impossibility of idealism in her situation; she is, in the eyes of the villagers, the
catalyst of the situation and she is also a lone woman catapulted into ongoing, guerrilla skirmishes. Here, Rose is ‘the point’ that produces her own ‘opposition’ (Colebrook, 2005c, p. 203).

So there were many years this way when I was like that
And I became very alert, very alert to every sound and everything,
My training came from here.
I’m being attacked,
I’m being attacked,
I’m being attacked.
It was almost like they would suck my life and my energy and my blood out.

And I have cursed the gods
What is this for a life?
What is promising?
This tough thing?

Me, a woman, single, and I have to face
Day after day these similar attacks
And if I let go they rage my place the ground,
And if I don’t let go then I’m exhausted
And I’m exhausted
And I’m exhausted
And I’m exhausted.

And I understood a lot about life.
I came for something idealistic.
I was made to roll in the shit (laughs) okay.

For Rose, the work makes the toughness of life visible Deleuze, 1988a, pp. 64-65). Her garden-forest-territory is a spatio-temporal haecceity. Her story of this corner creates not only a healing earth but durational conflict over that earth that waxes and wanes as day becomes night and returns to the day. Repetition here designates the intensity of her awareness of the terrible sides of herself and of the tough situation.

190 In Rose’s story the night is the worst time for the siege laid by villagers to her territory. Yet, Rose is not the only Bonvillian to experience villager incursions into their farms, gardens and houses. She is not alone in her experiences and although this is her history/story, for other women these are ongoing battles today.
Rose’s exhaustion arises from her struggle to hold onto legitimacy and honour, from the end of joy and the shock of disrespect for herself, womanhood, ownership, and Bonville, expressed in the bitter fight for territory. She is a woman alone and unprotected in the work to produce a sacred space that remakes the barren earth into a fruitful forest in her little corner of Bonville. The villagers struggle to oust her, physically, violently and through her, oust community. The community fails to support her, in this time, through these attacks and this tough situation and it is in this time that she loses sight of the distinction between matter and spirit. The passage of matter and spirit into one another becomes, for Rose, her reprieve. However, there is more to her story before we can get to the moment of her reprieve.

The terror of the terrible sides is underpinned by the terror of her life in the midst of hostile villages where her difference and her work makes her a target. Yet she persists in her work, even in the face of the recognition that her idealism has not survived unscathed in the carving out of the territory that this corner denotes. For, although Rose laughs about rolling in the shit; it is tied to her fight to survive and to continue her work of regenerating and greening the land in such a violently contested, fluid territory. She laughs about the memories of the past cost of changing the colour of the land. The cost of the land’s transformation produces her emerging sense that spirit and matter are indivisible. She sees this terrible time and her survival and the shame of her self-defence as the cost of her transformation. In Rose’s view, only her acceptance of the terrible events transforms her subjectivity and engenders her new becomings-spiritual. She also laughs because out of this terrible time and this terrible battle she understood a lot about life. She understands that life is a politics of affect and sympathy and that desire creates not a counter-attack but new assemblages, new
reterritorialisation not driven by humans or the law but rather by nature. Rose perceives this period of creation, of rolling in the shit, of having to have her nose pulled down into the shit as vital to her becomings-other. 191

Rose becomes a preternaturally alert woman in counterpoint to the forces of the villagers, which she links with her becomings-spirit-matter, in the event of her worlding that becomes the battle for a territory. This world emerges out of the fuzzy aggregate of matter and functions – trees, earth, shit, planting, defending, descending, surviving – that subtends her life for a long time. The promise of well-being descends into hell and re-emerges into an uneasy coexistence that is only made possible through the assemblage of Rose-trees-work-Nature that is produced alongside the incompossible world of the villagers and their assemblage of villagers-goats-forage-theft-Nature. Rose sees that while Nature that has solved the problem Nature has been forced to green in the maddening struggle of the emergence of a world, not for control, of it.

*Nature has resolved it, more or less by itself,*  
*Because now there is plenty.*  
*If the goats come and eat a little bit*  
*It’s not crucial any more like it was then.*

191 Being made to roll in the shit could be read as a breaking down of boundaries, the law, and the social and cultural rules of a spiritual community and Rose’s battle could be read as one to reassert control over a territory and over a self. Such a reading opens the way to the abject, to abjection (Douglas, 1970; Kristeva, 1982; Grosz, 1994) and the problem of bodies and the socio-cultural. Any such reading (Grosz, 1994, p. 203, p. 198), provides an equivocal sense of women and abjection whilst acknowledging that the bodies of men are equally implicated but at that point in social theory ‘unpresented’ and ‘unspoken’. Such a sense runs against the grain of this thesis because it is equivocal. Equivocality emerges when difference is posited between elements or types in retrospect and where one term in the relation of the signifier-signified, the signifier is the ground of the other and ‘produces, constitutes and orders its other’ (Colebrook, 2004b, p.294). Rose is not presenting herself as the ground, especially the spiritual ground against the shit of matter. Rather, Rose presents herself as in a world that has incompossible parts, and in a territorial battle where those incompossibilities are only resolved at any level by Nature. It is not Rose the Subject against the Other of the villagers but their terrible battle (Deleuze, 1990, p. 100) between two types of force (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 354) which drives everything into the shit.
But I’m glad that you have come at a time when most of the anger is gone

I understood (laughing) it was detrimental to me!
Out of selfish reasons I said,
I have to look for other ways.
Maybe take my life somehow into my own hands,
Not expect anything from others because this was killing me
Of course.

Voila!
You wanted a spiritual story (laughing).
I don’t know.
All the spiritual stories are here.
I hear birds and butterflies
And how wonderful life is.
Very rarely people speak about so...
I don’t have any confirmation that this –
To admit all these things –
Is spiritual.
I don’t have this.

For Rose, the land or Nature is the sign that allows her to learn the matter-spirit connection when spirituality seems to betray her. The joyful events and passions in her life and work in Bonville emerge in the midst of the contested territory of her world192 and in the mutation of its codes within a hostile environment. Rose enters into a mutation where memory is almost annulled in a block of becoming,193 leaving her point of subjectification for a line of flight, where Nature dispels the terrible sides

192 It is in the territories, the assemblages of the communities that nomadic deterritorializations and reterritorializations and becomings-other emerge. It is in the territory where such travels by intensity, rhythms of the breath, sounds, speeds, potentials and forces such as the attack, attack, attack of Rose and her world become ‘continuums of intensity’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 78), coded, and organized into forms and substances and doubly articulated (forms of content and expression) neither presupposing the other but reciprocally presupposed, on the plane of immanence.

193 In a sense, Rose represents the invading force for the villagers and as such she is the equivocal central point which offers a privileged story or a ground for what occurs but she steps back. Rather than her reterritorializing moves winning the guerrilla skirmishes it is Nature. See Colebrook’s insights into the ‘majority’ and the face of the majority (male) is complicated in a post-colonial situation such that Rose is centred as the one who takes over an already occupied territory, in the name of an outside ‘law’ and at the same time allows equivocity (2005, p. 203) and complicates it in her inability to ‘hold’ the centre, or the point.
of herself and the violence of the villagers and creates an asymmetrical block of becoming (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 324).

Rose offers a story of her own transformation and a becomings-spiritual that is a symbiosis of spirit and matter. For her, spirituality is a new abstract machine in the assemblage where the regimes of signs and bodies are unconfirmed but intuitively palpable. In saying, *All the spiritual stories are here. I hear birds and butterflies and how wonderful life is.* Rose evokes the plane of immanence and its virtuality. She says, it is *all* here, which implicates not only the present nature of duration where all of the past is contracted into the present (Deleuze, 1998b, p.91) but also where duration is ‘only the most contracted degree of matter’ and where ‘duration is like a naturing nature, and matter a natured nature’ (Deleuze 1988b, p. 93).

Rose’s story of her spiritual journey, into and within Bonville becomes one of joyful transformation against terrible odds. Pearl’s story of her spiritual journey into and within Clear Creek Community provides a strong contrast.

**Signifying Chains – Pearl from Clear Creek Community**

Clear Creek is not a spiritual intentional community as such. While permaculture does have an ethical framework that, as I have already indicated, is subtended by quasi-spiritual forms, the focus on spirituality has emerged more strongly within permaculture itself and for some of those in the community who yearn for spiritual connection with the earth and who yearn to transform the social world to save Gaia. Pearl arrives in the community seeking her own spiritual answers and finds a spiritual
home, for a time. Pearl’s story signals new, unexpected ways of thinking about spirituality for me: Tupperware parties as part of a mixed regime of signs, and of blocks of becomings-spiritual which implicate, enfold, the non-human; and becomings-spiritual as fun. I return to the idea of pleasure and the Tupperware parties later in this section on Pearl’s spiritual journey.

As she says, Pearl was involved, in the beginning, before her spirituality became dormant. She participates in a complicated series of spiritual rituals and practices and she enters into blocks of becomings-spiritual and creates a new passional subjectivity through a multiplicity of circles or chains of signs from different regimes of signs.

_In the beginning yes,_
_There, there were lots of..._
_Spirituality in the community,_
_Especially among the women._
_We had women’s full moon meetings._
_And we’d just meet_
_And we’d massage each other_
_And we’d talk_
_And we’d howl at the moon_
_And dance_
_Those sorts of things were quite common._

_We had a funny group_
_The CCCWA we called ourselves._
_And we’d have these crazy country women’s meetings_
_Where we’d all dress up_
_And we’d go along_
_And we’d have Tupperware parties._
_It was just so much fun._
_It was silly and it was fun._
_And the two gay guys who live here_
_They insisted on dressing up as women_
_And coming along as well._
_They wouldn’t be left out._
_And so that made it even funnier._

---

194 The Clear Creek Community Country Women’s Association was a parody of the Australian Country Women’s Association. I do not take up the part of Pearl’s story where she talks about the two gay guys who attended the Tupperware parties. I can see several readings of this event but I feel I cannot do the event justice in a line or two.
So that was a lot of fun.

Pearl’s becomings-spiritual is a transformative folding in of many bodies and souls into her body and soul during women’s gatherings held at the full moon. The symbolic rituals draw on the power of the moon as a vital force for emergence – all of nature grows according to phases of the moon and most strongly during the full moon – and opens the way for action on all matters, whether they are individual or collective. Women ritually encompass the moon, the fullness of the moon, the powerful vitality of the moon, and the ritual of acting in certain ways under the moon as a woman, with other women produces renewed, transformed selves. Full moon rituals can be either cleansing or release rituals, where the previous season, is ritually burned away in fire and washed away in water, opening the way for transformation of the self and worlds. Pearl’s spiritual story encompasses massage and talk with other women in such a way that it engenders a sense of emergence. She invokes a becomings-spiritual that drew other bodies into her own, other souls into her own, and the unfolding and enfolding of whatever energies, all under the full moon. The moon is the aleatory singular point, Pearls’ point of subjectification, in the transformative forces of the rituals and part of a ‘packet of signs’, ritually radiating from in the moon, which ‘detaches from the irradiating circular network and sets to work on its own account’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 134) as a composing force of her spirituality. It could be argued that this is also a presignifying regime in that it produces ‘forms of corporeality, gesturality, rhythm, dance and rite (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 130). Pearl composes and is composed by a ‘movement-potential and a materialization potential of thought – the possibility that thought might become both something else and something new’ (Kaufman, 2001, 85).
For Pearl, and many of the women in this group, New Age Spirituality and play is an escape, a line of flight, from the abstract machines\(^{195}\) of the despotic signifying regime of signs of traditional institutionalised religions. New Age Spirituality is a line of flight into those abstract machines, such as Goddess worship, Paganism, which can ‘pilot’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 157) the presignifying presubjective, polyvocal signs and ceremonies at the full moon attached to a specific time and place. In this regime of signs, the ‘presentiment of what is to come’, the intrusion of the State or static religion, some centralising powerful signifier, drives the moves against those elements. The full moon ceremony is an insistence of different forms of ‘corporeality, gesturality, rhythm, dance, and rite’ which ‘coexist with the vocal form’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 130). Such a heterogeneous regime of signs generates movement, howling, dance, all of the rites that flow from a full moon; and the collective and polyvocal nature of a response to such a moon. As an escape, the incorporeal non-human becomings, imbricated in howling at the moon, dancing, massaging, talking, are mixed with the passional postsignifying system where the moon is a point of subjectification that disrupts the existing modes (the of organisation and stratifications) of such religions through New Age forms of Alternative Spiritualities.

\(^{195}\) In this sense abstract machines play ‘a piloting role. The diagrammatic machine does not function to represent, even something real, but rather constructs a real that is yet to come a new type of reality… Everything escapes, everything creates – never alone, but through an abstract machine that produces continuums of intensity, effects conjunctions of deterritorialization, and extracts expressions and contents’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 157). What I am suggesting throughout this thesis is that there are many overlapping abstract machines, in the abstract machines of intentional communities; those of permaculture, the ‘Bill Mollison’ abstract machine, those of ecofeminism choose a proper name of an kind of ecofeminism, the spirituality abstract machines from Christianity Buddhism, Hinduism, Islamism, through to all of the variants of the New Age spiritualities and all of the proper names and their composing forces and affects. ‘The abstract machine connects a language to the semantic and pragmatic contents of statements, to collective assemblages of enunciation, to a whole micropolitics of the social field’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 8). I take up such thinking at various points in this thesis.
Pearl’s story suggests a mixture of regimes of signs or at least some jumps between those regimes by the women in the event of their gatherings. It is not that the women are colonising a presignifying regime of signs but rather that a new mixed regime of signs is being formed through the transformation and translation of that other regime. The women’s becomings-spiritual offer collective enunciations, which Pearl renders as her transformative part in a collective process. Howling at the moon, together or separately, is a gesture and a rhythm that coexists with the massage, the talk and part of the full moon event where the vibrations of the voices reach out to the moon, in concert. Howling is a spiritual ritual forged in the connections made between all of the elements and the qualities of the event: of the women and their voices, the landscape and the moon. Such an event is not tied to a despotic signifying regime of signs. The face of the moon is not the face of the despot as such; rather, it is a transformed and translated face from pre-Christian mythology that engenders fun. Mixed in with the ‘primitive’ presignifying regime of paganism and Goddess worship is the sense that the moon is a force of nature connected with the postsignifying passional regime; the moon is the point of subjectification in the event of the full moon and the rituals which surround it. Moon worshippers do not ‘face’ sacrifice, a God of Judgement, who sacrificed his only son to absolve the sins of mankind. Perhaps they betray such a God, such a son, in their turning away from that God and

196 A transformational statement marks the way in which a semiotic translates for its own purposes a statement originating elsewhere, and in so doing diverts it, leaving untransformable residues and actively resisting the inverse transformation... It is always through transformation that a new semiotic is created in its own right. Translations can be creative. New pure regimes of signs are formed through transformation and translation (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 151).

197 A concert is being performed tonight. It is the event. Vibrations of sound disperse, periodic movement go through space with their harmonics or submultiples. The sounds have inner qualities of height, intensity, and timbre. The sources of the sounds, instrumental or vocal, are not content only to send the sounds out: each one perceives its own, and perceives the others while perceiving its own. These are active perceptions that are expressed among each other, or else prehensions that are prehending one another: “first the solitary piano grieved, like a bird abandoned by its mate; the violin heard its wail and responded to it like a neighbouring tree. It was like the beginning of the world....” (Deleuze, 1993, p. 80).
his son or perhaps their point of subjectification is not so much pre-Christian but anti-Christian and Pagan, if indeed, it is serious at all and other than fun. Given that Pearl juxtaposes the incompossible world of Tupperware parties and full moon rituals, her story suggests that fun was the catalyst for such spiritual practices and passions.

Pearl’s story also raises questions about the individuality of each woman, where incompossible worlds – the women and the moon – are connected and positively expressed in each other in the passions and practices of their becomings-spiritual.198 Their ‘individuality designates a multiplicity’ where that ‘individuality designates a multiplicity.’ For Pearl and the women-moon, ‘Each is simultaneously in this multiplicity and at its edge and crosses over into the others’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 278). 199 The events and affects of becomings-spiritual are expressed in a series of multiplicities, which are conjugated in the abstract machines of spirituality and the moon. Such events and becomings intersect all of the assemblages or becomings, signs, segments, and vibrations that compose them, and open them up to transformation. Such concrete assemblages incorporate the regimes of signs that traverse the women, and that the women jump in and out of through their practices and passions. Such an intermingling of milieus is the basis of spiritual territories. For

198 Rather than there being ‘genuine borders between incompossible worlds’, that prevent there being a chaotic world where ‘divergent series are endlessly tracing bifurcating paths’, the worlds of the women and the moon and the landscape are exemplary of such divergent series and bifurcating paths that keep singularities (worlds, Beings) open (Deleuze, 1993, p. 81).
199 When Deleuze and Guattari (2004, p. 278) discuss Virginia Woolf’s Waves as ‘vibrations, shifting borderlines, inscribed on the plane of consistency as so many abstractions. The abstract machine of the waves.’ The abstract machine of the moon, the subtlety of its pulls, its tidal powers, is in relation to the individuality of the women and the multiplicities which implicate their names. For example, each of the characters in Virginia Woolf’s Waves have a name, their ‘individuality designates a multiplicity (for example Bernard and the school of fish). Each is simultaneously in this multiplicity and at its edge and crosses over into the others.’ This is what I see in Pearl’s story and the other stories told by the women each is ‘simultaneously in this multiplicity and at its edge and crosses over into the others’ – where each multiplicity is a concrete assemblage – ‘a becoming, a segment, a vibration. And the abstract machine is the intersection of them all’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 278)
Pearl, the abstract machine of spirituality and her point of subjectification is the full moon. The full moon incites gatherings where the women and their actions are encompassed by and in a full moon. The thought of a full moon becoming, vibrating, is inscribed onto the plane of consistency and moves into the women with all that a full moon designates, filling up their becomings-spiritual manifested in their actions, passions and full moon rituals.

The Tupperware party suggests that God (or the Holy Trinity) is not Deleuze’s abstract brain, a marrow or tongue (Shukin, 2000) but rather that God is plastic. Tupperware, human-made, an assemblage designating a plastic consumerist domesticity and femininity. Tupperware becomes an abstract machine of fun where fun as liminality. It becomes the focus or point of the group passions and a collective practice of communitas. The collective passions – not of alterity (or the sexless, bare existent of Turner’s (1995) alterity) as such – but of parody that engenders a paradoxical divine connected to a paradoxical feminine that is spirituality as fun. The juxtaposition of the two abstract machines in Pearl’s story is also paradoxical: the ‘serious’, wild becomings-spiritual, the affects, imbricated in a full moon alongside the fun of a Tupperware party.

As Pearl says: Those sorts of things were quite common. These common events and notions were implicated in spirituality within her community, not as a common sense,

---

200 In this sense God is a process, a plastic process. God as Tupperware is fun. ‘Even God desists from being a Being who compares worlds and chooses the richest compossible. He becomes Process, a process that at once confirms incompossibilities and passes through them’ (Deleuze, 1993, p. 81). The incompossible worlds of women, Tupperware and spirituality. Deleuze is suggesting here that the ‘play’ of the world ‘diverges’ ‘Beings are pushed apart, kept open through divergent series and incompossible totalities that pull them outside, instead of being closed upon the compossible and convergent world that they express from within’ (Deleuze, 1993m p. 81).
or a good sense but, Deleuze’s sense as ‘common to bodies, either to all bodies (extension, motion and rest) or to some bodies (at least two, mine and another).’ Events then that are common to bodies in the sense that two or more bodies form ‘a composite body’ (Deleuze, 1988, cited in Swiboda, 2004, p. 115). Pearl is suggesting the composite bodies, of the women, a moon, a landscape, or the women and Tupperware and a home; the common notions, of blocks of becoming, which the abstract machines intersect through various points of subjectification and through various regimes of signs. Pearl’s story implicates aspects of various regimes of signs, of practices and rituals, gleaned from a transcendental plane expressing other times and places. Other cultures are evoked along with re-inventions of those past cultures and spiritualities and reterritorialise memory to deterritorialise the present.

There is a becoming-animal, women howling at the full moon (the abstract machine of the full moon) in the becomings-spiritual. The tides of the full moon, the vibrations of the women howling in counterpoint to the pulls and pushes and the vibrations of the moon are all at work here. The moon, as a dynamic, nomadic singularity creates a multiplicity that presupposes or acts as a predicate for women massaging each other, and their spiritual rituals and practices of care, love, spirit, comfort, and sensuous relations. Time is important here. The phases of the moon, its ellipses: the movement through time and space of the moon, the resonance of the moon with past cultures, with biodynamics, a sign: the moon as a spatio-temporal dynamism that drives a multiplicity. Yet, each woman is more than a subject in this particular multiplicity. In Deleuze and Guattari’s terms every character is more than a subjective individual because: ‘Each is simultaneously in this multiplicity and at its edge and crosses over into the others’ (2004, p. 278). Each woman engages in a subjective semiotic
subtended by an array of points of subjectification – the moon, Tupperware – and they tend to engage and simultaneously disengage (betray) the spiritual code that they embrace in what is called: ‘a double turning away, betrayal and existence under reprieve’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 142).

The bodies engaged in the full moon event pass into and out of each, traversing the borders of one body or another. For example, the body of the woman is traversed by the body of the moon, women massaging and being massaged traverse the surfaces of each others bodies, the body of the moon is captured in the rituals and the event of the full moon drives the event of the howling at the full moon. Pearl also tells the story of other spiritual practices that the women engage in, the other groups or multiplicities that they border and constitute. The fun of their own country women’s association is told as spiritual stories where the signs of the gatherings and the rituals surrounding them – the irreverent, secular rituals of play, of ‘dressing up’ and of gay men insisting that they be included in a women’s event, seemingly about the banal activity of selling Tupperware – generate joyful passions out of these floating points of subjectification.

Rhizomatic links, interconnecting lines, or borderlines are being produced here that connect the women as they experiment and where the effects of their actions, practices, rites and passions produce the ‘incorporeal effects’ of spirituality.

Pearl’s rendition of becoming-spiritual is a multiplicity, entangling and bordering not only the other women involved in the rituals but a block of becoming of all of the bodies: the moon, the earth, the night, music and dance. The transformative interweaving of the many signs, selves, borderlines, bodies, lines of flight that each is engaged in, produces alliances between all of the bodies/souls in a rhizomatic
entanglement, implicating all of the liminal borderlines between such multiplicities, such becomings, and such regimes of signs.\footnote{So it is ‘the self as threshold, a door, a becoming between two multiplicities. Each multiplicity is defined by a borderline functioning as Anomalous, but there is a string of borderlines, a continuous line of borderlines \textit{(fiber)} following which the multiplicity changes…. A fiber stretches from human to an animal, from a human to an animal or to molecules, from molecules to particles, and so on to the imperceptible. Every fiber is a Universe fiber. A fiber strung across borderlines constitutes a line of flight or deterritorialization. It is evident that the Anomalous, the Outsider, has several functions: not only does it border each multiplicity, of which it determines the temporary or local stability (with the highest number of dimensions under the circumstances), not only is it the precondition for the alliance necessary to becoming, but it also carries the transformations of becoming or crossing of multiplicities always farther down the line of flight. Moby Dick is the \textit{White Wall} bordering the pack; he is also the demonic \textit{Term of the Alliance}; finally, he is the terrible \textit{Fishing Line} with nothing on the other end, the line that crosses the wall and drags the captain … where? Into the void… (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 275).} The women’s gatherings provided safety, given the risks of becomings-other incorporated in ritual practices. But there is more. There is the way in which the gatherings are lines of flight, part of the assemblages of desire. Women experiment with spirituality together, not only at the full moon gatherings but in the surprise of the \textit{fun} gatherings where the women not so much strip and cross a threshold naked in a transformative ritual of transformation but strip and \textit{dress up as women}. As I indicated in the introduction to Pearl’s story, she challenged my thinking about spirituality for me. Tupperware as a spiritual \textit{sign} made me laugh – just as Pearl intended – Tupperware parties as sacralised spatio-temporal dynamisms was a new thought for me. So was thinking of such points of subjectification as part of a \textit{fun} regime of signs. Pearl’s way of expressing spirituality had her entering blocks of becomings-spiritual with human and non-human plastic through the rituals of exchange of plastic objects. This was indeed a becomings-spiritual as \textit{fun}.

While pleasure and play are attached to transformative rituals (Turner, 1995) but within the borderline, in the tangled fibre of a Tupperware party, it seems that a twist is added that suggests that it is not pleasure as such (as an endpoint of actions) but a
series of actions that reveal an assemblage of desire and its lines of flight. Rather than a line of flight that implicated a ‘stripping’ of clothes and thus a ‘levelling’ of status, the line of flight was one where the women, and two gay men, were marking their bodies with the accoutrements of a form of femininity that was not ‘normal’ within the community – but rather anomalous. Where is the line of flight in a Tupperware party? Where is the deterritorialisation of self and the reterritorialisation of memory? Perhaps the deterritorialisation is one that takes up and disrupts molar practices of femininity and masculinity. The fun and play the women, and two gay men, enter into challenges the order-words and anxieties about femininity and masculinity in their various desiring assemblages. As such, this would be a line of flight that is a safe passage into becomings-spiritual.

Pearl talks of the women’s experiments with spirituality as *birthing things* or as the becomings of passage. Such *birthing things* included Pearl changing her name, quite unexpectedly. Deleuze and Guattari suggest that it is within presignifying regimes that name changes occur when the names are used up – a form of cannibalism

---

202 I am aware of the links between the anthropological work of Victor Turner on liminality, ritual, rites of passage, the ‘stripping’ and ‘levelling’ processes that are seen as moving from structure to anti-structure but there are many differences between Turner’s work on rites of passage and becoming. For instance Deleuze and Guattari see the self as the threshold, the limen, rather than (a) space as such, and although the self is folded into a body we do not know what a body can do. And the processes of actualization and counter-actualization depend not upon the possible in a given cultural formation but are outcomes of the actualization of the virtual.

203 Deleuze and Guattari argue that it is in presignifying regimes where, ‘the sign owes its degree of relative deterritorialization not to a perpetual referral to other signs but rather to a confrontation between the territorialities and compared segments from which each sign is extracted (the camp, the bush, the moving of the camp).’ And importantly for women changing their names ‘Not only is the polyvocality of statements preserved but it is possible to finish with a statement: A name that has been used up is abolished, a situation quite unlike the placing in reserve or transformation occurring in the signifying semiotic’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 130). Several of the women that I interviewed in Bonville had changed their names to fit with their conceptions of new lives, new selves, new communities or new spiritualities. Rather than seeing such presignifying moves as ignorant or repressive but as a way of fighting off the signifier, the despot, a form of polyvocality that seeks to forestall the looming threat of the signifier, patriarchy, the State. And of course I have changed all of the names of the women in this study in an attempt to protect their identities.
‘eating the name, a semiography that is fully a part of a semiotic in spite of its relation to content (the relation is an expressive one)’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 130).

So the women have done a lot of things together
Birthing things, really.
I changed my name
When I came.
And I never expected to change my name
When I came it wasn’t something that I necessarily approved of,
Thought it was an odd thing to do
But P came to me in a meditation one day in one of these groups
And I thought, that sounds a hell of a lot more interesting than plain old X
so I became P.
And that felt absolutely right

Pearl’s disapproval of name-changing is swept aside by the transformational practices and passions, the birthing things that accompany a mixture of the postsignifying semiotic and the presignifying semiotic. A line of flight from the signifying regime – the naming by the father, the Christian Church, the family – and a ‘polyvocality of forms of expression particular to content’ irrupt when Pearl is meditating and the new name comes to her. The middle is that milieu where we find ‘forms of corporeality, gesturality, rhythm, dance and rite…’ and the passages between the middle of such birthing things (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 130). It is in the middle of spiritual practices that a new “I” emerges for Pearl, constituting a spiritual event which is actualised in a new, significant name.

Name changes were unusual in Clear Creek Community and the Motherhouse but not so unusual in Bonville. Such becomings of passage are lines/fibres that create a bundle of lines/borderlines/limens, only loosely structured as rituals, massage, talk, howling, music, dance, dressing-up, or performance of a particular type of femininity. Here, rituals are not so much an experience of pleasure but an expression of desire, an
expression of fun. The women are not so much initiates, transformed into whatever howls at the moon but experimental multiplicities. Such multiplicities are constructed from the singularities or haecceities that shape those who talk, touch, dance and howl, and in doing it all enter into becomings-spiritual. Such translations and transformations of regimes of signs create new regimes of signs in a transsemiotic (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 151).

The self, the relation to oneself, of self to self, folds in the materiality of the relations of composing forces (Deleuze, 1988a, p. 104), and signs as the points of subjectification: the bodies, the night, the moon, the dress, the Tupperware, the fun. Rather than arising out of a determined individuality and identity, subjectivity is seen as ‘the right to difference, variation and metamorphosis’ (Deleuze, 1988a, p. 104). As well, the lines, the borderlines and the lines of flight are connected to the assemblage and lines of flight are ways out of assemblages. Women engage in practices to create new borderlines. They engage with new regimes of signs to induce transformations and with other composing forces in their becomings-spiritual, where many of the rituals are everyday, mundane ways of entering into what Turner (1967; 1969; 1995) calls moments of communitas but that I would refer to as becoming-community, which is not a teleological moment, or the endpoint of ritual, but a point in ritual;

204 Here I am thinking of the way produce is generated in each community, for instance the way that Janine makes yoghurt for sale the Clear Creek Community from the milk that is also produced in the Biodynamic dairy in the community. The ritual of making yoghurt is one of the ways that she engages in becoming-community, in a transformation that produces her as part of the life of the community and as offering a service to the community – perhaps as moments of communitas that do no produce an identity, or lock her into an assemblage such as yoghurt-maker. In this sense the yoghurt is a passional line – a point of subjectification. This is a very simple set of actions tied to the borderlines, the fibres of deterritorialization – where making yoghurt produces an act of community. The vector here is the path to community. In Bonville the size of the community allows a far greater tangling of the fibres, borderlines. There are many small businesses which turn agricultural products into food for community members. The production of yoghurt and other products are businesses on a larger scale. For the Motherhouse that gesture is not confined to the community but reaches out beyond the community such that the products of the garden cross many borderlines into the lives of many people in the nearby city.
one that is part of the process of transformations of the assemblages of which the women have been prisoners (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 276). What occurs is an open process or a becomings-community, in the event, never a telos.

Spirituality for Pearl is a dormant force. Her desire for spirituality is spent. She has retreated from any group or individual expressions of spirituality. Whether spirituality or its rituals and practices betrayed her or she has betrayed spirituality is not part of her story. She simply said that she hoped it might return one day but she was not hopeful. Jessie, from Bonville is, in contrast to Pearl, driven by her belief in a divine future for all of mankind.

**Zen Companions on the Path – Jessie from Bonville**

Jessie lives in a pioneering micro-community with friends. They are building their community from what was a small block of land belonging to the community. When Jessie speaks of her collective as companions on the path – as Sangha – she is...
expressing a collectivity or a ‘collective individuation’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 143) that is a different becomings-spiritual; where home as Sangha is a series of practices, actions and passions in relation with the earth and Nature. Her micro-community is sacralised as the milieu of spiritual practices imbricated in a regime of signs. Jessie and her companions have a designated, constructed space for singing and dancing to music. The doing of these defines the place but the singing and dancing defines a collective becomings-spiritual. The practices, rituals and passions of such becomings are transformative for the micro-community. As well, becomings-spiritual are imbricated in a mixture of regimes of signs connected to Sangha and sense of the path. Massumi’s (2002a, p. 6) definition of the path is that is ‘is not composed of positions’ but is rather a ‘dynamic unity.’ Such spirituality is a block of becoming, an assemblage, a multiplicity, perhaps even communitas.

What we’ve been trying to create
The environment for transformation,
For collective transformation,
And also you are living together on land
So we see also developing a relationship to Nature
and relations.
You know and our relationships to each other.
And I think
What I feel we’re trying to create is an environment,
Which supports and nourishes each other
I think the spiritual aspiration of sharing
I think Sangha,
This idea of Sangha,
Is perhaps the clearest way of expressing the things
We are trying to create.

and spiritual – a divine anarchy. Puttick’s analysis of Buddhism is also challenged by Anne Carolyn Klein’s (1995) work in Meeting the Great Bliss Queen: Buddhists, Feminists, and the Art of the Self. Klein’s work suggests not only the incommensurability of much of feminism and Buddhism but also those points of productive connection. Although her theoretical trajectory is different to mine (her focus is on identity and the Self and the potential intersections of feminism and Buddhism) I would suggest that much of her discussion of the Self and mindfulness leaves the Cartesian cogito aside and is also attuned to the contemplative self/soul of Deleuze.

206 Other micro-communities that I went into often had a similar spiritually intensive space, sacralized by the ongoing, regular spiritual practices that bodies engaged in, in their becomings−spiritual. One of the sacred spaces in Clear Creek Community was a ‘women’s healing place’ that is believed to be an Indigenous women’s place.
A way we can support each other,
In our spiritual development and being.

We can be honest.
And also an atmosphere of connected development
Is something else that we’ve identified
As what we are wanting to do here.
We support each other in our spiritual practice
Which includes,
You know,
Our physical beings and living in a healthy way,
Eating in a nutritious way,
Exercise and Yoga.
And I mean
These are just some of the practices that we do
And are open to doing together.
Meditation, we sometimes do together
And singing.
Yes
Sharing the earth together
We share about our lives together
Sometimes in a somewhat sort of structured way
And yes
It’s just kind of home as Sangha²⁰⁷

The richness of Jessie’s song with its various repetitions or ostinato of home as Sangha resonates and interweaves with the practices and passions of a fierce becomings-spiritual that is not other-worldly but productive of a world. This world is an ecology of relations in a milieu that centres on transformations, collective transformations through connected development, expressed within the creative translations, or foldings, of a passionale of regime of signs. Home as Sangha²⁰⁸ engenders the variable points of subjectification, those ‘packets of signs’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 134) that are the originary things of the postsignifying regime of

---

²⁰⁷ Sangha is a Buddhist idea of the spiritual group – of companions on the path – the path to enlightenment. It is used in Vipassana Yoga as well as other Buddhist forms of spirituality. It is also an idea used by Jains.

²⁰⁸ As a micro-community the Sangha can be seen as an organism, with a body made up of many parts, the members, the passions and practices, organic life such as the land, the trees; the forces constraining and engendering the Sangha. However in this chapter focuses on the expressions and ‘semiotic system’ the regimes of signs’ of the assemblage and to an extent the ‘pragmatic system’ of ‘actions and passions’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 555)
signs and part of ‘collective assemblages of enunciation’ that create ongoing processes of subjectification or Jessie and her companions. Jessie’s micro-community takes seriously their gestures, their practices and passions for Yoga, exercise, dancing and planting trees, as part of their spiritual life shaped by the abstract machine of Yoga.\footnote{\textit{Abstract machines or bodies without organs – this is desire. There are many kinds, but they are definable by what occurs on them and in them: continuums of intensity, blocs of becoming, emissions of particles, combinations of fluxes} (Deleuze & Parnett, 2006, p. 78)} The desire for transformation both of spirit and nature in her micro community connects the signs as points of subjectification into an experimental becomings-spirit-nature.

Jessie’s \textit{Sangha} practises a form of Yoga that incorporates a strong evolutionary sense, and also engages with \textit{Nature} as part of \textit{collective transformation}. Their transformations are concerned with the ways they \textit{can support each other}. Yoga is often construed as centred on the individual and the attainment of ‘perfection’ through various practices or ‘packets of signs’. Food becomes a point of subjectification in \textit{eating in a nutritious way} – a form of vegetarian diet – meditating, exercise, practising a form of yoga as dynamic discipline, and dancing and singing for the self and the collective. All of these plurilinear, passional lines of a postsignifying regime of signs, intermingle with the spiralling lines of a signifying regime of signs, descending from the Avatar and the woman Guru of Bonville. Each regime of signs connects and conjugates with each other, each contains ‘fragments’ of the other, (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 132) and potentially destabilises any given regime.

In the presignifying regime of signs, many expressions are both part of and undermine the signifying regime of signs. So, too, the countersignifying semiotic or nomadic
regime of signs, which is ‘polemical or strategic’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 151), translates and destabilises the mixtures of semiotic regimes, such as those taken up in the Sangha. Yoga is seen as a form of and a necessary practice for the world that is to come when all of humankind achieves a consciousness that is Divine. Such interminglings intensify and extend what a body in the throes of becomings-Divine – as a series of milieus or ecologies – can do. Bodies becomings-Divine or becomings-anarchic are denoted in movement and rest in relation to the earth and in experimentation with a range of points of subjectification (food, song, dance) that are practised and encountered in Jessie’s micro-community.

Jessie leaves the ‘I’ almost as soon as she begins to speak, and moves to the ‘we’ of her micro-community within Bonville, as Sangha. In this sense, as a subject of enunciation, Jessie emerges from the points of subjectification that constitute her Sangha. Their individuation and their thinking are collective, which coincides with the reality of the community. As a spokesperson for her micro-community, Jessie becomes a subject of enunciation, who embraces and is determined by the points of subjectification of her community. She retreats into the subject of the statement in ‘the postsignifying passional line’ as ‘a line of subjectification or subjection’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 143). Jessie speaks through and enfolds that line of subjectification, of the Sangha, which is the individuated ‘origin of the passional line of the postsignifying regime’ of her community. She becomes both the subject of enunciation and of the statement and in this way, she becomes a doubled subject. These are the particular and collective passional lines of her community, of her/their

---

210 Divine anarchy is seen as retrospective and teleological within Yoga. It tallies with the notion of the virtual in that it is seen as the potential of humankind, as a posthumanism, where what is virtual is consciousness. Divine anarchy within Bonville does not negate organization but organizations are open to change given their usefulness and are expected to be ‘progressive’.
becomings-spiritual through practices, rituals and passions. Rather than there being a Guru or transcendent power (a signifying, despotic regime of signs), who is obeyed, there is a point of subjectification in the Sangha and all it entails, which creates the doubled subject of the postsignifying regime of signs. Jessie as doubled subject (of enunciation and of the statement), accepts the processes of ‘normalization’ of her given reality and she lives as a companion on the path. In this way, new forms of dynamic subjectification are created through conformity to a given reality that incorporates a ‘packet of signs’, specific to that reality and self-regulation (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p.143).

Jessie’s words are ‘extracted’ from indirect enunciation (the murmurings) of the collective assemblage of the becomings-spiritual for her Sangha and all of Bonville These indirect enunciations are able to be spoken of by one of their number. Indirect enunciations of shared spiritual aspirations, connected development, suggest an evolution that is both spiritual and social, drawn from the heterogeneous signs created and translated in their spiritual practices and passions in creating worlds. In Jessie’s worlds the Sangha does not just worship a transcendental Divine but attempts to bring the transcendental plane into their world.

Such enunciations also express, in effect, new order-words, which countermand the order-words of the secular, the unsustainable, the mentalist worlds that the Sangha has left behind, spoken as a murmuring of the collective assemblage (Deleuze &

---

211 Bonvillians use that term mentalism when they are referring to those who engage in intellectual or academic work, or concentrate on the world of the mind. It is not a complimentary term and it suggests that the person who lives this way is misguided, not open to evolution and the acceptance of the Divine into a body transformed by the practice of yoga. It sits alongside vitalism, which in Bonville suggests the unnecessary attention paid to the body and bodily appetites.
Such order-words might be connected to: development, evolution, supramentality, spiritual practice, Yoga, meditation and healthy living, all bundled up in sharing.

The Yoga practised in Jessie’s Sangha is predicated on a move beyond habit in evolutionary terms (those habits of life that allow us to evolve), such that a higher consciousness develops through a conversation in the world and through the ‘packet of signs’ which ‘detaches from the irradiating circular network and sets to work on its own account’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 134). Many other forms of Yoga suggest that the understanding of the interiority of the Self/Spirit is the ground for the attainment of perfection and is possible only by withdrawing from the world, whereas the form of Yoga practised in Bonville is dynamic. The body and mind transform or evolve freeing the spiritual self, not only out of the world on a transcendental plane but in the world, creating divinised worlds on the plane of immanence. In this process, supramentality becomes possible, a new supraconsciousness that emerges out of habit, seen in Yoga as animal humanity. The mind is seen as the locus of supralmentalism, yet it is through the practices of the body as a temporal dynamism, in concert with the mind, thought, and in the event, that such metamorphoses can occur.

212 The Bonvillian form of Yoga was a response to colonialism, rather than a simple return to Hinduism and as such it rode a line of flight away from the despotic signifying regime of the colonizers into the passional subjective postsignifying regime of signs. Paradoxically it incorporated European philosophy, Theosophy and a reading of the Hindu Upanishads as an expression of the and as such can be rendered as a postsignifying regime in its turning away from and back to Hinduism, European philosophy and respectively but finally in its existing ‘under reprieve’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 142).

213 The notion of habit utilized in Yoga has some resonance with the notion of habit discussed by Deleuze (2004, p. 94), however Deleuze sees habit as part of the array of passive and active syntheses and significant in that it is not through acting that we acquire habits but in contemplation – that is change occurs in the mind, or the ‘contemplative soul’ and that the self and behaviour are formed through contemplation. And that ‘Habit draws something new from repetition.’ Within Yoga habit is seen as that which must be overcome, transformed into, and within becoming-divine as a becoming that is focused on more than self-transformation or the collective subjects’ interiority and is connected instead to a becomings-other in the formation of a world; an ecology of relations.
The actions and practices of Jessie, and all those who live in her Sangha, are part of the process to bring the divine into themselves and into their world. Spirituality, or the processes of divinisation, is partly a state of affairs, that is, a way of living in the world, which has ‘incorporeal effects’. For example, the collective practice of Yoga produces a Sangha, which is an incorporeal effect that is actualised in the group. Such effects result from the actions and passions of bodies but exist in excess of them. The virtual of spirituality and the actualisations of becoming-spiritual are implicated in Jessie’s Sangha. The notions inherent in Yoga require a passional apprenticeship to decipher the open-ended packets of signs, denoting an immanent divinity. Jessie’s story expresses the ways in which the divine is brought down into, or expressed through the events of the mundane. In the event of the Sangha Yoga is incarnated and its incorporeal effects arise ‘in excess’ of that which is practised. Events that create becomings-other include: the ways that they eat; what they eat; their eating together; their dancing together; their meditating together; their planting trees together and their political attachment to a divine anarchism.

In Jessie’s Sangha, the transformational practices are collective expressions as well as individual points of subjectification. Such a ‘package of signs’ is drawn from the writings of the Guru, partly framed in the language of Yoga, and produces practices of yoga, meditation, healthy living. These practices denote passional lines of flight from the dominant culture of a capitalist ‘West’ and create an extension of spirituality into Nature as a part of collective transformation, development and of the spiritual aspiration of Sangha. Significantly, their practices of sharing are linked to the earth and to sharing the earth together, we share about our lives together...it’s just kind of
home as Sangha. In their understanding, the earth is more than a territory that needs defending and ordering, and more than an organism that needs tending and repairing. The earth is not simply a body but an event with incorporeal effects. Jessie and her companions form a Sangha, which incorporates the earth as an environmental project to be repaired. The earth becomes a passional point of subjectification that forces transformational action, especially because it is in crisis. The earth is acted upon and such actions change the nature of the earth and the nature of those who act (Deleuze, 1990, p. 4-5). In this sense, the earth becomes an actual and an incorporeal spiritual home and the actors become an incorporeal Sangha.

Jessie’s words express the sense of companions on the path of the spiritual journey ‘effected without relative movement, but in intensity, in one place: these are part of nomadism too’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p.421). What nomadism offers to the spiritual journey is the sense that it is about the in-between. Rather than a journey to a place that is marked as spiritual in the world of intentional communities it a spiritual or transcendental movement within that community.214

In Jessie’s story of spirituality she enters a becomings-spiritual that is an ecology of relations where the composing forces of her ecology are drawn into and expressed in, her micro-community of companions. She enters a becomings-divine through the sacralisation of a series of very material practices, such as group dancing, group tree

---

214 Many of the women who are members of Bonville have relocated from European countries, the Americas, Australia, New Zealand, as well as other countries. They have become migrants on a ‘yoga visa’. Such processes of migration exist in the Motherhouse and Clear Creek Community (although some of the migration is internal migration within their own countries). In a sense, the flows of human movements around the world are paradoxical as they create the spiritual journeys of the women yet there is a sense that the women have to do the ‘work’ of community to ‘make’ a place for their spirituality at the same time as they are searching for a place that affectively is spiritual. In becomings-spiritual, sacralisations and territorialisations of the earth occur.
planting and through her work on the charter of her community draws counter-actualisations from the virtual field. Composing forces create ‘the actual’ of becoming (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 112), which for Jessie is becoming-Sangha.

Becomings-home, becomings-community, becomings-sustainable and becomings-spiritual are all underpinned by the folds of friendship. Such folds indicate various bending and twisting movements of forces folding and unfolding bodies – beyond the human – into a ‘we’.\[215\] It is not simply the experience, or sense, of subjects and objects or of spirit and matter but their incorporeal effects in the present and in the various actualisations of beings and their worlds, in blocks of becomings where the music and the dance pass into the dancer or the tree-planter and the tree form an alliance. It is, as Jessie says, a collective production of worlds and subjects where you are living together on land, in the present. The composing forces and flows of territorialisation and deterritorialisation are part of the earth’s constitution, part of the constitution of the organism and the subject. Living together on land is suggestive of the actualisation of community on reterritorialised land as an incarnated spiritual home in with a series of passional points of subjectivation, that produce emergent subjectivities. There is also an excess just as significant as the incarnation of subjects and organisms effectuated in the incarnation of spirit or the incorporeal and the imperceptible produced in the actions and passions of the members of Jessie’s micro-community, which turns a group of people into Sangha.

Rosalind’s story brings into view a very different, individual style of alternative spirituality to Jessie’s collective Sangha.

\[215\] In this sense, the worlds of intentional communities ‘appear as loci; in other words, not simply as places in space but as complexes of relations of proximity… The whole constitutes a virtuality, a potentiality… incarnated in actual organisms… according to comparative speeds or slownesses which measure the movement of actualization’ (Deleuze, 2004, p. 234).
Looking for signs – Rosalind from the Motherhouse

Rosalind’s story of spirituality is part of generative experiment – a pragmatics\(^{216}\) – drawing on and mixing several regimes of signs. Her time in the Motherhouse community encompasses the metamorphosis of the community from a Roman Catholic lay apostolate community into a spiritual, ecofeminist community, focused on social justice and the environment. Roman Catholicism is a religion that Rosalind has been betrayed by and that she has turned from. She uses the words of a Buddhist friend to express her view of religion, when she repeats his words, stating: religion is the wastebasket of spirituality.

\[
\begin{align*}
I & \text{ love the songs and the music and some of the words.} \\
I & \text{ miss some of the words.} \\
I & \text{ miss some of them that were just there in your life.} \\
I & \text{ I mean I have other things to take some of its place but.} \\
A & \text{ good friend of mine SL} \\
He & \text{'s written a lot on death and dying} \\
And & \text{ he’s out of the Buddhist kind of tradition} \\
But & \text{ he always says religion is the wastebasket of spirituality} \\
And & \text{ I think that’s true.} \\
I & \text{ think it’s true.} \\

& \text{ Spirituality’s a different thing,} \\
& \text{ I think.} \\
& \text{ I’m not a religious person but I’m deeply spiritual.}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{216}\) Remembering that pragmatics incorporates the generative component, the transformational component, the diagrammatic component and the machinic component (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, pp. 160-161). All of these components are to do with mixture, intermingling and combination; the passing into and out of each other of forms of expression and forms of content in concrete assemblages, on strata, and as evidenced in a postsignifying regime of signs. The Roman Catholic Church is an abstract machine but for Rosalind there are only the residues.
(Religion) would keep me from being spiritual.
I really don’t want to join in
I do some ritual in the Native American kind of tradition
But, you know.
I have my smudge sticks there.
I smudge my house you know.

Yeah. I take my walk every day,
To look for signs of what’s in my universe.
That’s what’s important to me.

The residue that subsists/insists of religion, for Rosalind, is one of certain particle-signs that resound in bodies as the songs and the music and some of the words. These are only some of the intensities of Roman Catholicism’s existent abstract machine (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 161) incorporating a long history of ritual and signs. For other women from Rosalind’s community the rituals and signs are important, whether or not they follow the religious teachings and precepts of Roman Catholicism.

In Rosalind’s story she says very strongly that she misses the words. *I miss some of the words. I miss some of the words that were just there in your life.* She has other things to take some of its place, but... the words, having lost the force of order-words, or passwords, or as points of subjectivation, are passional, loved leftovers. Rosalind is deeply spiritual and draws her line of flight from Roman Catholicism into the mysticism and magic realism that she calls the Native American tradition. Her spiritual practices and passions have shifted beyond that which she misses, into another tradition. When she says, *I have my smudge stick there. I smudge my house, you know,* she is revealing her new point of subjectification and the sticks and the practice of smudging are not only presupposed in the Native American tradition but signal her turn from religion and the recuperation of spirituality.
Rosalind walks every day and looks for signs. Signs in the natural world, signs of life other than human, weather signs and signs of change in her garden, are her universe of signs. The action of the walk and the signs are what is central to her life, together with the becomings-spiritual she enters through ritual in the Native American kind of tradition. Although she misses some of the songs, the music and some of the words of Roman Catholicism, she really doesn’t want to join in something that would keep her from being spiritual.

Rosalind turned from Christianity as a signifying regime of signs to the intermingling regimes of signs of a mythic presignifying regime, which, in Rosalind’s world, is plural, polyvocal, and without a centre, authority or shaman. Such a regime of signs is focused on earth-bound, corporeal forms of expression, ‘gesturality, rhythm, dance, and the rite coexist with the vocal form’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 130). Rosalind incorporates this spiritual regime of signs and its freedom – in that it struggles against ‘universalizing abstraction’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 130) – with the subjective, postsignifying regime. Her points of subjectification are the smudge sticks and nature. Rosalind’s daily walk and her witnessing are her gestures to the cosmos and the signs

---

217 Rosalind was a woman with a disability, who did not actually walk but took a ritual walk looking for signs in her universe each day. She was not accepted as a member of the nucleus at the Motherhouse when she was younger because of her disability. She thought that it was because there may be a financial cost if she had been fully accepted. This remains the case in the contemporary situation as all institutions must now by law provide for access for those with a disability in the United States and Rosalind has fought hard for such provisions to be made. And certainly when she was a young woman there was no order of nuns that would take a person with a disability. Throughout her story of her connections to the Motherhouse she was intent to show that it was not religion that kept her coming back to the community but friendships with long histories. Also the community has always been involved in education work, the environment and work for justice and she felt that a continued connection kept her abreast of what was going on in the world outside of mainstream media.

218 The Shamanic traditions magical realism and mysticism and Shamans are a part of Native American traditions but Rosalind was uninterested in any voice of authority/God that would interfere with her spirituality. Her the version of Native American tradition was selective, full of passional signs and
are a ‘packet of signs’ that have detached themselves from the signifying regime of
Christianity to a cosmology of signs designating her universe; such a regime of signs
offers a positive line of flight from Christianity seen as a religion and the wastebasket
of spirituality; Rosalind has turned her face from anything other than the signifying
words, songs, music after the betrayal of her faith, her life, following the event of
Vatican II. She is not the only woman from the Motherhouse to seek an alternative to
Christianity after that event but she is the one whose rituals and practices follow
Native American Spiritual ways.

The Shamanic traditions magical realism and mysticism and Shamans are a part of
Native American traditions but Rosalind is uninterested in any voice of authority/God
that would interfere with her spirituality. Her version of Native American tradition
was selective, full of passional signs and about her intimate connections with the
natural world. The sense of the Shaman as a link between worlds – the real and the
magical – is not part of her story (Faris, 2012).

One sign that becomes one point of subjectification, in the emergence of a passional
line, in Rosalind’s story is the smudge stick, which is a small bundle of dried leaves of
sacred plants tied together. It is lit and then the flame is extinguished to create smoke
for purification ceremonies, or gestures, for individuals, or rooms, or as in Rosalind’s
case, her house.²¹⁹ For Rosalind, smudging as a spiritual practice and passion is a

²¹⁹The spirits of various plants are seen as positive composing forces: cleansing individuals, objects,
ceremonial tools, or spaces, of negative energies; replacing negative energies with positive energies,
clearing negative emotions; restoring balance and peace; drawing in loving energy and spirits; taking
messages to Gods or Spirits; stimulating psychic awareness and prophetic dreams; creating boundaries
and providing protection for individuals and places; and for sacralizing individuals and spaces.
Smudging is used before other spiritual practices and often after them as well. There are many internet
flight from *religion* as the *wastebasket of spirituality*. The ritual is part of her turning away from, rather than confronting Roman Catholicism, which Rosalind felt betrayed her and that refused her full entry into a religious order because of her disabilities.

The double betrayal for Rosalind enters her story when she turns away from the Motherhouse after Vatican II. Her reprieve is her return through an alternative spirituality. Her story is the story of the Motherhouse at the same time as it shows all of the ‘traits of the subjective semiotic’, which is the double turning away and the establishment of a new point of subjectification. Rosalind’s point of subjectification becomes those signs of an alternative spirituality *the Native American kind of tradition*, which offers her a spiritual ‘existence under reprieve’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 142), coupled with the way she pays attention to natural *signs* in her environment.

Lesley’s spiritual story, which comes next, is one of circle dancing and astral travelling.

**When it comes I’m ready for it – Lesley from Clear Creek Community**

_I’ve danced all my life._
_I just love dancing_
_And until I found circle dance I hadn’t really found_

...
What I was looking for.
Just folk dances that are easy to do and powerful

I love teaching, I love people
And I love teaching it
And because you can’t really do circle dancing by yourself
And it was just lovely to be able to share that with people.

At the end of each dance you just stand quietly in your circle
And I used to say ‘just feel what that dance did for you
And just have a minute’s silent feeling.’

Lesley offers a dancer’s sense of circle dance as easy, powerful and meditative. She loves it and she loves teaching, sharing and people. Her sense of self emerges, at least partially, from the collective, affective milieu of circle dancing. It is her point of subjectification, the vector in her passional line of flight as she sought what she was looking for with others and through love. The circle dance is the form of dance that she loves and has embraced as powerful, while she turns away from other forms of dance. The form and style of the dance suit her and its practice transforms her in a dancer-teacher-moving rhythmic circle of bodies. The strong, therapeutic, meditative dance offers a connection to a neighbour – not as ‘the illusion of the classical weightless body’ (Colebrook, 2005a, p. 12) – but as that joyful, meditative, learning body creating a powerful, dancing milieu within a territory220. The circle of the dancers, wherever they may be, gather the forces of the territory, creating a powerful centre within their movements. Such a centre becomes another point of subjectification.

220 In Deleuze and Guattari’s terms the dance is a territorializing factor, teaching/professional milieu, part of the passional ‘work-function’ but also ‘rites and religions’ (2004, p. 354).
My interest here is not simply in the practices of various forms of meditation in Pagan or Buddhist spirituality, or Neo-Hindu Yoga or Christian spiritualities but in the singular, aleatory point of meditation, where such practices may be seen not as ‘representing’ such spiritualities but as the expressions of what the body can do; those things in a Spinozist sense, that we do not know, and that engender blocks of becomings-spiritual.

Circle dancing is often associated with various combinations of New Age rituals and feminist versions of traditional religions. It is also often seen as an alternative to prayer rituals and traditional religions, or a fusion of both worlds (Aune, Sharma & Vincett, 2008, pp. 142-143). However, Lesley is not part of any traditional religion and for her, circle dance is about a dancing-teaching self. Her love of dance and the dance itself create a territory, not to keep out the chaos (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 353), so much as creating the ‘grouping or dancing of bodies’ (Colebrook, 2005a, p. 13). Their movements create a territory and a potential deterritorialisation in the “moment”: ‘becoming-expressive of rhythm, the emergence of expressive proper qualities, the formation of matters of expression that develop into motifs and counterpoints’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 355; also cited in Colebrook, 2005a, p. 13). The rhythmic movement of circle dancing produces compositions from our bodies in counterpoint with music. As in learning (Deleuze, 2004, p. 241) our singular points are placed in counterpoint with other components of the dance and the music and the repetition of elements. The rhythmic movement of circle dancing bodies create varying speeds, intensities and affects. Dancing is a rhythmic spatio-temporal dynamism that sets us in motion and that generates expressive qualities that can be
diverted, as Colebrook (2005a, p. 13) argues, from ‘striving and function’ to become ‘inhumane’. As Lesley says:

Some of them are meditative  
And in one of the dances one time  
I went astral travelling.  
I didn’t know about astral travelling  
But that’s what it must have been.  
I found out about it later.  
But I felt the cord and I saw the cord  
And I did come back  
Of course I came back,  
I’m here (Laughs)

But it was just so wonderful.  
It was a dance you did.  
You formed a circle  
But you weren’t holding hands.  
So I was right over here instead of being in with it.  
I’d closed my eyes  
And just totally went with it  
And ohhh it was a wonderful feeling.

And I haven’t intentionally,  
I’ve sort of;  
I suppose I’ve tried to do that again  
But when you try, you don’t do it.  
So - all these things I’m just finding out  
When it comes to me  
I’m not going to courses,  
It’s just when it comes I’m ready for it.

Lesley is moving at a different speed in the dance – a meditative speed – her eyes are closed, she is not holding hands and the force of the dance creates a new affect. The dance has her travelling on an astral plane with a cord that she felt that attached her to the earth and brought her back. It is not her physical body that travels, but perhaps her contemplating mind/body. Such experiences are seen as out of body experiences: the
corporeal body is left behind and the ‘mind’, ‘consciousness’ or ‘soul’, travels.\textsuperscript{221} Astral travel is seen by experienced astral travellers as voluntary or spontaneous and for Lesley, it has only occurred spontaneously. The silver cord that attaches the incorporeal traveller to the corporeal body is said, by some sources, to be invisible, although other sources claim that the cord is visible. \textsuperscript{222} Lesley felt the cord and it was partly this and her description of her sensations to others, who had an explanation for her experience based on such a description, that convinced her that she had travelled on an astral plane. Her description links with those of altered states of mind produced by drugs, delirium and hallucination, but circle dance was the catalyst for Lesley’s altered state of mind/body. Dance is the originary point of subjectification for Lesley. Dance is what she loves and it produces the ‘moment where dance becomes expressive of something other than the dancer (Colebrook, 2005a, p. 13). The passional sign of the dance is incarnated in dancing bodies and out of that composing moment, in the corporeal, rhythmic movement, an incorporeal body is produced. This event was ‘out of body’, away from other bodies and above those bodies. Lesley’s perception of her experience is new mode of perception. Such a new mode of perception is produced in the meditative act of dance, encapsulating the meditative movement of Lesley’s body/mind, the meditative gestures of the dance, the circle of the dance, the rhythm of the dance, the music, and the rhythm of the music and the perceptions of the mind/brain.\textsuperscript{223} The dance, on this occasion, produces an unexpected

\textsuperscript{221} Deleuze (1994, p. 241) suggests that ‘Learning... means composing the singular points of one’s own body or one’s own language with those of another shape or element, which tears us apart but also propels us into hitherto unknown and unheard-of world problems.’ Lesley grapples with the event of astral travel and attempts to comprehend something new. The ‘singular points of her body are in composition with something ‘other’ that she has to find a name for.

\textsuperscript{222} The Pagan Man Website offers an explanation of astral travel that suggests that it has occurred and does occur in all cultures. The cord that attaches the traveller to the corporeal body is said to be invisible, in Deleuzean terms an invisible composing force that is both felt and a belief.

\textsuperscript{223} The discussion of mind/brain/body, particularly in psychological terms, is not what I am following here.
becomings-other. Lesley did not intend to astral travel and she cannot astral travel at will. In this sense the dancer in this sense becomes the dance (Colebrook, 2005a, p. 9) and the dance is astral travelling. Circle dancing produces Lesley’s becomings-astral traveller, at the same time as dance the object of her point of subjectification. It is through dance and song that the possibility of a new subjectivity emerges and through which she previously discovered her partner and her world. The dance, its signs and the act of dancing in a meditative state as a becomings-spiritual, produce the dancer. The events and those points of subjectivation in the passional lines of flight create Lesley as an astral traveller, not as an identity as such, but rather as a becomings-spiritual.

The ways in which such subjectivations occur is through movement: that is, they emerge out of meditative states, whether the bodies are moving rapidly, slowly or not at all; the movement and rest, the speeds of the body along with gestures, sound and rhythm constitute such perceptions and the subsequent subjectivities. The assignation of meaning, the naming of such states is, of course, another matter.

Lesley’s statement that she has experienced astral travel during a circle dance, for instance, is underpinned, not only by the movement of her body with other bodies, in the dance or circle or the rhythm or the music of the dance, but in the sense that the dance is a component of her spiritual voyage. It denotes the process of ‘entering’ the community as a world and the dance as her passional line, her point of

---

224 I am thinking here of Deleuze’s work on Hume and the subject, the mind, consciousness in *Empiricism and Subjectivity* (1991) and *Difference and Repetition* (2004, p. 90) where it is ‘the mind that contemplates’ or perceives. For Lesley it is in her contemplation of the repetitions of the movement of the dance, the sounds and rhythms of the music that her ‘perception’ or ‘experience’ occurs.
subjectification. The dance as a singularity in the ‘emissions of singularity’ is also the
 genesis of her astral travel: a new line of flight. Lesley takes her ‘direct discourse’,
 extracted from indirect discourse, from the ‘collective assemblage’ of the dance, New
 Age spiritual thinking and her community. Her statement and her voice express
 incorporeal transformations as part of ‘assemblages of enunciation’ in connection or
 conjugation with such ‘a regime of signs or a semiotic machine.’ As such, the story
 and Lesley’s autopoiesis compose a process of subjectification drawn from the
 ‘collective assemblage’ and from the heterogeneity of its ‘regimes of signs’ (Deleuze
 & Guattari, 2004, p. 93) and an imperceptible becomings-spiritual.225

So the dance, the rhythm and the music fold Lesley into becomings-other – in a
 becoming where the woman dancing and in the body of the dance – she enters an
 incorporeal line of flight through the dance and up and out of the dance that she is still
 dancing, and becomes the suspended-by-a-rope-astral-traveling-dancer-woman.
 Lesley is a becoming-astral traveler where emissions of singularities, the changing
 movements, sounds and rhythms, preside over her becomings-other, recaptured in her
 story of astral travel. Such a becoming is imperceptible to all of the other dancers: an
 incorporeal effect of the event of the circle dance; a becoming that is an emission of
 particles that produces a new “I”, a new “Self”. Yet, as she says, the dance produces
 the event of astral travel, which she is unable to replicate at will.

In the next section, Chandra expresses another kind of spiritual journey into and
 within Bonville.

225 Lesley is actualizing and counter-actualizing by drawing on emissions of singularities, such as
dance and astral travel as potentialities that direct us all to ‘the field of the transcendent’ (Deleuze
1990, pp. 102-103).
Zigzags towards Something Spiritual – Chandra from Bonville

Chandra’s journey to Bonville and within it over a number of years is an experiment. The experiment is not simply to ‘eliminate forms and persons’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 167, p.312) but also to work for the whole world. She begins:

Let’s see.

I dropped out of university
I was like a psychedelic person, never really a Hippie,
I wasn’t partying with it, it was serious stuff.
But then I moved to Morocco, Spain, England, Germany, and then
Going farther East.
And I only heard about Bonville when I got a lift with somebody that was
Coming here, over the border from Pakistan to India.
But I, I didn’t, mean I’d heard about it but it didn’t turn me on or anything.
They told me something.
Actually, we were all so stoned
Very difficult to remember.

Psychedelic subcultures in the United States at the time that Chandra speaks of, given that she was not a hippie and not partying with LSD, were in part an outgrowth of university experiments, mostly with graduate students using psycho-active drugs for psychological and spiritual growth.\(^{226}\) That subculture is connected with what is now called ‘entheogenic’ culture, which is associated with ‘becoming divine within’: a return to the notion of the ‘spark’ of the divine within. Chandra’s story shifts into a

\(^{226}\) There are still experiments in mind altering drugs carried out in the United States of America. The research that I have read about is with Peyote and the Native American Church, and carried out by a medical researcher with funding from the USDA. The purpose of the research is to see if drugs of this sort interrupt alcoholism.
traveller’s tale at that point, where drug use was no longer bracketed as serious stuff but became the state of being stoned in a drug assemblage that inhibits memory.
While she offers this road trip as the point of her first knowledge of Bonville, the community was not her destination at this time. She wanders, zigzagging around India, bicycling across the North moving from Ashram to Ashram. Moving from one point to another is a process of conjugation, a connecting of the dots of Chandra’s deterritorialisation, her line of flight from her country of origin.

And then I wandered around India, 
Rode a bicycle across the North. 
I went from Ashram to Ashram 
Looking for – something. 
I knew there was something here 
But I didn’t have a very clear idea of what. 
Something spiritual.

But I, again, it seemed to me that if it was really true, 
That the world was an illusion, 
Then when we got enlightened we’d disappear 
And nobody was disappearing, 
Really they were still hanging on, 
Being Swamis. 
And it seemed it didn’t hold together 
That illusionist theory, 
Which was the main thing that one heard in the Ashrams.

Chandra’s understanding of Eastern spiritualities at this time was centred on the illusory nature of existence. Becoming enlightened supposedly meant the disappearance of incarnated being. Yet, as she said, nobody was disappearing. Really they were still hanging on, being Swamis. Here, the event of enlightenment, as Chandra understood it, is seen as a failure. Chandra rode a bicycle across the north. I went from Ashram to Ashram - looking for - something. The bicycle, the Ashrams, the failed enlightenment that she rejects, are all part of the rich swarm of signs in this
section of Chandra’s story of her search for something. Something spiritual. She
continued:

But then I came here
Where there were some people, who were staying, whom I knew from Spain
And as I just got,
I mean it was just barren, you know,
But something about it I liked.
I thought ohh that I think that could work here.
I like working and if I work here it will be for the whole world.

Now that is just as silly as thinking that people should disappear
And why don’t they
But I thought it was very sensible
So I thought, okay I’ll stay.
Because of the woman Guru,
I don’t know whether I believe in this Guru or not
But by working for her,
The totally inconsistent thing is,
By working for her,
By working here
She will make it that I am working for the whole world.
And I want to work for the whole world.
So there I was.
I stayed.
So I stayed.

And yeah so, that Idea
That I could work for the whole world by working here
I liked very much.

So here everything I did
Even if it was just milking cows,
(which is what I was doing)
That was all for the good of the world.
Then I believed it and it made me very happy
And so I’ve been here ever since actually.

Chandra changes direction and instead of continuing her search for something
spiritual she stays in Bonville. She shifts her focus from the West to enlightenment in
India (the double betrayal) and then to working for the woman Guru because that is
working for the good of the world (the reprieve). Her point of subjectification in the
community becomes work for the good of the world. The work is ‘whatever’ work and at this point it is milking cows; later, she works as a community development officer but maintains her sense of working for the good of the world. What is produced in Chandra’s story of this part of her spiritual journey – and she is greatly amused by her past ‘self’ – is a subjective semiotic where the action of milking cows is not only a sign of good but also a passional line of flight from her former existences (office worker, Ashram seeker). Her work is both an induction and a “normalisation” into Bonville and a counter-actualisation for Chandra. She becomes part of creating a new kind of world in her doubling as both the subject of enunciation – as she tells her story – and the subject of the statements of life in the community (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 143). Chandra, as the doubled subject, is obeying herself and in doing so, creates a new series of joyful relations. She discovers more of what the body can do with other bodies, such as the happiness of milking cows and creating another world through doing good, working for the world.

Again I’ve taken refuge in not thinking about things a lot
Because I’m here in Bonville
Where the spiritual system is very universal
But it’s definitely deistic.
I mean there’s the woman Guru 227
And there’s
Like it’s as universal as you can get with Yoga
And Bhakti Yoga.
You’ve already done some background on that?
But I don’t feel very Bhakti,

227 The pronouncements of the woman guru who was the founder of Bonville are in Chandra’s view central to Bhakti Yoga where the love of God is Love – service to the Divine is central to the process of the unity of the bhakta (devotee) and God and where everything is taken to be a manifestation of the Divine. Bhakti Yoga is understood by devotees to be the quickest route to the Divine – food, sex, sleep, attachments are all seen as unimportant. Only surrender and devotion to the Divine is important. The form of Bhakti Yoga takes at Bonville, as a part of their form of Yoga, suggests that it is necessary for a new species to evolve for unity with the Divine to be experienced but in the meantime surrender to the Divine is the way forward. Vipassana by contrast to Bhakti Yoga is not deistic; it is a path, a process of a moral life, a right livelihood, control over the mind and developing insight into one’s own nature ‘self-purification by self-observation’ and that self-observation involves long periods of meditation and other acts of self-discipline (http://www.dhamma.org/en/arts.html)
That’s not very strong.
And the technique that worked for me is Vipassana,
Which is quite the opposite philosophically.
So I’m sort of doing these two things at the same time,
Which is fine as I’ve been doing it very arduously, both for many years,
Fine,
But I never thought about it.

Now, last year I got a really strong urge to think about it.
So I’d been studying the founding guru with more care
And studying Buddhism with more care
And they are not compatible
Intellectually
But they are certainly compatible the way I’m living them.
So that I don’t know whether I’ll be bright enough
To write something about that
Or speak about it
Or if it will make me enlightened
You know come right to the end
Eekkkk!
I don’t know.
I hope something, we’ll see.

Chandra’s becomings-spiritual is not expressed in the Bhakti Yoga she assigns to the wider community of Bonville but by Buddhist Vipassana Yoga. She turns from Bhakti Yoga because of its propensity – as Yoga of devotion to the Divine and to human unity – for a religious or even deistic form. Vipassana Yoga is a form of Indian Buddhism, centred on meditation, whereas the philosophy of Bonville’s Avatar,

---

228 Buddhism is often rectified into a spirituality that is more compossible with Western notions of a strongly individualistic Self (Gross, 1993), the embodied feminist, Buddhist self (Tomm, 1995) or the innate awareness of self available through Buddhist practices (Klein, 1995, p. 73, p. 172) complicated by the sense that ‘one is dependently constructed, yet singular’ in the Western sense of individuality rather than the Deleuzean sense of singularities as emissions that ‘preside of the genesis of individuals’. Although Klein offers a sense of the individual as ‘never simply one’ and not only a ‘function of a relationship’ with the other, particularly an oppositional relationship with the other (Klein, 1995, p. 102). Klein’s (1995, p. 104) sense of self, which she sees as connected to Buddhist notions of mindfulness, is ‘subjective processes as distinct from subject positions’ and where ‘forms of subjectivity’ are named and honoured as such. Such subjective processes are taken in this thesis to be those processes of subjectivation as the origin of a passional line engendered in the event (of deterritorialization, of flight), though emissions of singularities, not by the Self, the “I” or the subject as such.
which still permeates the community, integrates elements of Hinduism.\textsuperscript{229} The Yoga that comes from it is close to Bhakti Yoga. As Chandra says, these are not compatible systems – intellectually. Yet, she argues that the two systems work together on a pragmatic level and draws on these two particular forms of spirituality to create her ‘subjective semiotic’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 142). In the terms I am using, her spirituality works for her at the level of what a body can do when it is in the throes of the search for enlightenment.

Meditation gives Chandra a change of pace from her very busy work life in Bonville, where she continues to work for the good of the world. It offers her a slowness of speed that incorporates the many minute protocols of Vipassana in mindfulness. A traditional meditation or ‘sit’ lasts for ten days, which is the required length of time for a full meditation. It lasts for at least ten hours a day, with no conversation during the whole period. The first three and a half days are anapana meditation, focusing on the breath, while the following six and a half days are for Purifying the Mind. Chandra does not necessarily ‘sit’ for ten days as is traditional when she meditates, for, although the practice is not complete without purifying the mind, there are no rigid rules, just ways of paying attention to the ‘flow of experience’ through self observation. The ‘sit’ is followed by a return to an ‘extroverted life’.

\textsuperscript{229}Clarke (2006) claims that such forms of spirituality as those which are produced within Bonville are ‘neo-Hinduism. This form of Yoga, although it is partly based on Hinduism, is, as I have suggested elsewhere, an integration of many philosophical traditions.
Such practices of subjectivation are an art (Deleuze 1995, p.154) and imbricated in becoming-other, becoming attentive, mindful, in the Buddhist sense. Yet it is more than this. Chandra’s ‘sits’ are not caused by the challenges of her life, although they are linked to a sense of ‘health’ for her and her micro-community, where knowing yourself is considered vital for health. 230 What the ‘sits’ suggest is a becoming-imperceptible in order to make imperceptible the perceptible. 231 Perhaps this is what Buddhist meditation is about for Chandra; she is witnessing in stillness the impossibility of her separation from her world. Perhaps the illusion of existence that she dismissed after her first encounters with Swamis, is the more traditional Buddhist sense of illusion: the illusion of individual existence. In meditation, ‘Nothing is left but the speeds and slownesses without form, without subject, without a face. Nothing left but the zigzag of a line’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 312).

In the next section, I return to Clear Creek Community and the story of Janine’s spiritual journey. She offers a careful, thoughtful story, which expresses and brings into view some of the spiritual plurality of her community and her own sense the natural world as spiritualities’ only possibility.

230 Chandra’s micro-community held a weekly meeting called Share. The meetings, like the ‘sits’, are about self-knowledge and acceptance. This is an integral part of self-focused spiritualities, especially meditative spiritualities. Yet these meetings are also about changes of speed and what a body can do and the joyful passions that can be practised in such meetings of bodies. The members of her micro-community meet for self-knowledge or enlightenment. Monday evening we get together for what we call Share and that’s where we speak about what’s going on inside. And there is a formula for that which is that you speak to the circle and there is no answer from anybody, everybody just listens very carefully to what you’re saying and you tell, well to some extent what you think you think people would need to know about the goings on within you, or even deeper just what is welling up from within you.

231 ‘A whole rhizomatic labor of perception, the moment when desire and perception meld’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 312).
You just sort of float – Janine from Clear Creek Community

Janine lives in Clear Creek community. Her story of spirituality is different from many of the other women in the three communities; it is one of turning away from Christian religion and turning to Nature as her consolation and to Wilderness as what she must have. Her story draws the threads of spirituality and nature together, not as some sacralisation of the outside, or of a static nature, but as the only thing that she can offer as an answer to the unsayable of affect and desire.

When people start asking questions
About spirituality
I have some trouble answering that question.
I was brought up in a religious family, you know.
When I was about 21 or something like that,
I lost my faith in the Christian religion.
And I was at great loss.
And you know my life was sort of devastated really.
I mean that sort of put a meaning in life.
And, and my family
Everybody around me was part of it.

As life went on I just sort of realise that my comfort,
The thing that gave me consolation when I’d lost this other,
Was Nature.
I knew I had to have Wilderness, close at hand.
And that’s about all I could say about it
And and I still think that I still feel that.

I mean there are other things that give consolation too
And would add to your spiritual life,
There’s no doubt about that and
That includes, that would include,
You know, your contact with people
And your contact with Nature
With music for instance and the arts in general

But Nature’s very, very basic.

So you know when they ask me,
People,
What I’ve found a bit living here
is that people come here searching for something
And they tend to,
They want you to say things about your spiritual life,
Which is going to give them,
Oh I don’t know,
Which is going to bolster something that they want.
I never feel I have the answers for them,
I don’t talk about it much.
And I’m inclined to think that,
I would never ever become dogmatic about any area of religion
Or any spiritual thing now,
I don’t think ever.

Janine’s story, in one sense, concerns loss of religious faith, which is not an
uncommon story in the contemporary world. Ziolkowski (2007, pp. X-xi) calls this
phenomenon the ‘modern crisis of faith’, and contends that faith is ‘hard wired’ into
humans and thus must be replaced by ‘surrogates’. Although the language and the
project differ, Prior and Cusack (2008) also suggest that the uncoupling of
institutional religions from people’s lives, presupposed by a growing individualism
and prosperity, drives the sacralisation of secular forms, such as football. For Janine,
the event or betrayal, through which she lost her faith, was particular to her and
caused a very personal repudiation or betrayal of a betraying religion. She does not
couch her loss of faith in terms of any general sense of ‘modern crisis of faith’. The
pain of the loss is personal for Janine, especially because it also implicated her family
life, which was devastated. Rather than a ‘surrogate’ faith, or the sacralisation of
some secular forms, such as contact with people, music, or the arts, she offers, when
put on the spot about spirituality, her consolation in Nature. Janine, in turning to
Nature, framed as Wilderness, expresses it as a point of her subjectification and as a
reprieve, and although a relationship with an array of potential signs incorporated in
Nature is implied in this turn, Janine does not enumerate these potential signs. She
offers instead her unease with spirituality where its undertones of dishonesty, false
bolstering and people’s dogmatism, is just a lot of talk. It is almost as if the unsayability of religion and spirituality renders Nature and Wilderness unspeakable too, except as a consolation and a need.

What Nature or Wilderness, as a passional point of subjectification, permits Janine is an escape or reprieve – from the devastation of her original loss, the ongoing serial betrayals of people who insist that spirituality is necessary for life – Nature ‘puts everything else to flight’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 142).

But I find,
I react against the attempt to gather us together,
In another sort of spiritual....
You know the New Age Religions leave me cold.
I find it just as repulsive as, as,
As the Churches, almost.
Though I do think that they,
There is a rationale to their having grown,
You know, developed.
But you know I just find the same sort of dishonesty,
Although I feel it’s a dishonesty and not and not, not,
You know that a lot of it’s just superficial
People sort of bolstering one another
And a lot of talk and

And I mean
It just seems to me that life,
This is something that I feel,
That, you know,
You just have to launch yourself into it and,
And the amazing thing is that you seem to float (laugh in voice).
You don’t need to be grabbing this and grabbing that
And, and, and,
Life just goes on and you survive
And you’re happy mostly.

I have the feeling that within this community,
Those of us who won’t talk about being spiritual
Are put in a different camp from those who will.
We’re not quite good enough.
There’s that same (laughing)
Trying to put a guilt trip on us a bit.
And there’s an urge to say to us:
What is your spirituality?
And they want us to tell them.
And this is what I find.

I don’t know what to say to them.

Janine feels pressure from within her community, as well as from visitors, to own some form of spirituality, which makes her very uncomfortable. With regard to others, she said simply that for those who come searching for something, she has none: I don’t know what to tell them. For Janine, the sense of spirituality is unsayable; her abhorrence of Christian religion leaves her outside of any such rendition of spirituality. The unsayable (apophatic) of spirituality for Janine is linked to the betraying God of Judgment and the Christian Church that she in turn denies. It is only in the thing called Nature, or Wilderness, that any form of spirituality is sayable (or kataphatic) and immanent to Nature, manifested in the wilderness that is close by her. The idea of Nature – the body of the wilderness – affects and intermingles with Janine and the ‘distinctive points’ of her body and constitutes ‘a problematic field’ (Deleuze, 2004, p. 205) of spirituality. Spirituality is that problem about which she does not know what to say. The transformation of spirituality into something other that exists only outside of her community is what Janine she must have: Nature as consolation and I knew I had to have Wilderness, close at hand.

For her, Nature as wilderness is the limit of any sense of any kind of spirituality.232

Here, Wilderness is a thing, a body that Janine must have close at hand, although she

---

232 Susan Power Bratton (1988, 1992), who is a Christian ecotheologist, has written on the wilderness and early monasticism and on the love of nature as agape. Parallels are sometimes drawn between intentional communities and monasteries and indeed some women religious have moved into practical forms of ecospiritual or ecotheological practices. For instance, a group of the Dominican Order of nuns set up and run Genesis Farm (Godfrey, 2008). As Bratton (1988) points out it is the relationship with the wilderness that is linked to spirituality even when the person who enters the (purifying) wilderness is not Christian. Here the wilderness is seen as outside of ‘worldly concerns’. For Janine, the
does not say what the wilderness is – rather, she says that she does not want to give up the level of comfort that she has inside her community. For Janine, permaculture and *man* still *take too much* and so not represent nature in her eyes. She is *not willing to give it all up for the sake of letting Nature come back*. Nature and wilderness are, in this reading, shown to be the outside, the thing, the body, that permaculture is not. The designed community and permaculture are signs of a betraying culture for Janine, while the wilderness is Nature and her reprieve. The community and the wilderness are constituted as incompossible worlds in her story. Nature is seen as kept out or too controlled by permaculture, whereas wilderness is *in* Nature. Maintaining a relation with wilderness allows Janine to continue to live within a permaculture framework, even though she thinks that permaculture betrays nature and is not sustainable enough.

The human capture and control of Nature within permaculture is Janine’s concern. She thinks that the logic of the environment precludes ‘man’: *when you think logically about the environment there seemed to be no place for man in it. Or certainly not… the way he behaves now.* For Janine, in terms of permaculture, *man still takes too much for himself.*

Community and culture as *consolation* and the *Wilderness* becoming the point of subjectification makes Janine’s turning away from the world outside of the community. Turning to the community is a flight only made possible for her by the closeness of the point or the sign of the *Wilderness*, of her passionate line in her subjective regime of signs (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 142). With regard to any spirituality that she can admit to, wilderness is what she *must have*. It replaces religion or faith, yet, it is also that thing she somewhat guiltily betrays through permaculture

---

wilderness is a vital counter-balance for the actions of ‘man’ and her need for wilderness are coupled with her worldly concerns, yet both are historically constructed with the meaning of nature and wilderness differing through time and across cultures (Latour, 2010, p. 476).
by not letting *Nature come back* on her block. Wilderness is always elsewhere. The signs that constitute wilderness for Janine are absent from her story but somehow presumed or understood as counterpoints to Clear Creek, the designed permaculture community that she lives. Paradoxically, Janine’s disillusionment with permaculture – which is perhaps a failed surrogate faith – is complicated, on the one hand, by her own need for comfort and, on the other hand, by the way her life is predicated on the need for the coexistence of wilderness as an outside needed for her consolation.

**Nomadic Spiritualities**

There is a complicated journey between subjectivities in process and becomings-spiritual. It is possible to pass from one to the other through the fabulation of states of affairs and the effects of duration as encounters of bodies and their mutual transformations, where the sense of time becomes more than linear time and more like time out of step, empty time or time unhinged (The Aion) and, also, where identity disappears (Deleuze 1994, p. 355). It is in the continuous encounter of bodies that individuations and singularities emerge driven by haecceities. When Deleuze and Guattari (2004, p. 289) warn against, ‘an oversimplified conciliation, as though there were on the one hand formed subjects, of the thing or person type, and on the other hand spatiotemporal coordinates of the haecceity type’ they open up the kinds of encounters and thinking of becoming. Here, subjects ‘become events’ entering into composition with whatever becomes the spiritual; in an assemblage that is a haecceity.

---

233 Bergson’s sense of the continuous movement of the past as it ‘gnaws’ into the future and the famous waiting as the sugar dissolves into the glass of water signals duration. This is a duration that is radical when we think of the encounter of one body with another and the transformations that occur.
Each woman is an assemblage where she encounters a haecceity, which she also becomes and creates a composition.234

The becomings-spiritual of all the women are expressed as the events of nomadic spiritual journeys. This is not simply because the women have undertaken actual zigzagging journeys – they have – but because nomadic235 spirituality enfolds ‘teaming [sic]… anonymous and nomadic, impersonal and pre-individual singularities’ (Deleuze 1990, pp. 102-103) such as Rose hearing the birds and the butterflies, which actualise her nomadic becomings-other.

Becomings-other are imbricated in ‘spiritual voyages effected without relative movement, but in intensity, in one place: these are part of nomadism’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 421). Spiritual voyages, effectuated and affected in intensity, in circumstances associated with passions and actions that deterritorialise and reterritorialise, subtend the women’s stories of spirituality.236 Nomadic spirituality is virtual, and its singularities and potentialities are actualised as difference. The

---

234 Becomings: ‘You are a longitude and latitude, a set of speeds and slownesses between unformed particles, a set of nonsubjectified affects. You have the individuality of a day, a season, a year, a life (regardless of its duration) – a climate, a wind, a fog, a swarm, a pack (regardless of itsregularity). Or at least you can have it, you can reach it’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 289).

235 Nomadism or “nomad thought”, or transversalism, is the movement or the creative process between the virtual and the actual that is not located in ‘the edifice of an ordered interiority; it moves freely in an element of exteriority. It does not repose on identity; it rides difference. It does not respect the artificial division between the three domains of representation, subject concept and being; it replaces restrictive analogy with a conductivity that knows no bounds. The concepts it creates do not merely reflect the eternal form of a legislating subject, to the extent that they can be said to have one, is only secondary. Rather than reflecting the world they are immersed in changing state of things’ (Massumi, 2004, p. xii). Massumi is here designating the force of nomad thought and the ‘arborescent’ model of thought, which he sees, following Deleuze and Guattari, as produced within phallogocentrism. The nomadic spirituality that is produced by the women and taken up in this chapter is linked to the women’s immersion in the ‘changing states of things’ as Massumi claims but I would add that it is also linked to their becomings-spiritual and their becomings-imperceptible.

236 This returns to Deleuze (1991, p. 103) on Hume in Empiricism and Subjectivity and twists through the ways that Deleuze in concert with the women force me to think about subjectivities and their stories. The discussion centres on the notion f association, circumstance and affect, where Deleuze acknowledges that Hume (and Freud and Bergson) knew that associations are superficial in a way that circumstances are not but still he thought that associations needed to be explained too.
spiritual voyage is ‘an infinite succession of local operations’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 422). Such a sense of the infinite suggests that there is ever more becomings-spiritual; not simply as what is possible, shaped out of past religions, or religious forms, but the actualisations of difference in duration.

To meditate as Chandra does, or astral travel as Lesley does, implicates ‘a singularity-event’, which is both constitutive, relational and presupposes mixtures. In this sense, becomings-spiritual are effected through meditation or astral travel. Meditation and astral travel constitute the ‘expressed’ of the worlds and events of individuals. Such singularities ‘subsist’ in Deleuze’s terms ‘as an event or a verb or in the singularities and which preside over the constitution of individuals’, ‘are now the analytic predicates of constituted subjects’ (Deleuze, 1990, pp. 111-112). In such events, the singularities that form each woman enter constitutive relations: Chandra meditates; Lesley dances and astral travels; Rose builds a forest, withstands a siege and finds balance; Rosalind smudges and observes the signs; Claire loves, performs and prays; Janine enters the Wilderness; Pearl seeks spiritual fun and Jessie embodies a new collective spirituality.

As these mixtures of analytic predicates and relations are brought into play in individuals, we ‘conjugate the distinctive points of our bodies with the singular points of the Idea’ in order to form a problematic field’ (Deleuze, 2004, p. 205). To

---

237 For Deleuze the Idea is multiplicity (Deleuze, 2004, p. 243). And in his discussion of the dice throw (sky-chance) Deleuze says that the die on the dice are the singular point and that singularities emanate from such aleatory points and that rather than be forced by the laws of probability into wins and losses, chance occurs in each and every throw ‘the whole of chance into one time’ every time (Deleuze, 2004, p. 248). I have used the notion of the dice throw in chapter 3 to discuss the ways in which women embrace the event, even in the face of its aleatory nature, as a necessity. Robyn Ferrell (2003, p. 272) also discusses this in her article on Derrida and Deleuze ‘Hume Reads Freud: Empiricism as Rhetorical Event’ and their divergent ‘philosophical habits’ concerning a radical empiricism that she uses in a
meditate, or to astral travel, is to connect with a problematic field of esoteric spiritualities and as such is part, not only of an assemblage, but the abstract machine that is effectuated by such an assemblage, ‘simultaneously semiotizing matters of expression and physicalizing matters of content’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 162).

In this sense and in this chapter, spirituality is a problematic field from which emerge synthetic, divergent, incompossible worlds (Deleuze, 1990, p 115). Such a transversal, spiritual voyage is positive, and productive of metamorphoses. Nomadic spirituality, like all nomadic thought, and autopoiesis ‘does not repose on identity; it rides difference’ (Massumi, 2004, p. xii).

In her article “Mutant Spiritualities” Jo Nash (2006) offers an interpretation of the transformations of bodies that occur through dietary practices such as fasting, using a Deleuzian-Guattarian lens where she frames ‘mutant spiritualities’ as the ‘return of the repressed’ of ‘secular materialism’. The research that Nash has carried out on internet sites catering to those who fast and experience states of ecstasy, seeking among other things, new age enlightenment, resonates with the sense of ‘oceanic feeling’ that is part of this chapter on nomadic spirituality. Nash (2006, p. 215) names such a state ‘trans-Oedipal bliss’ and engages in an analysis of such mutant spiritualities through Deleuze and Guattari’s work on anti-Oedipus and suggests that such spiritualities are ‘a function of a subjectivity that has exorcised the desires associated with Oedipus, has become deterritorialised, de-oedipalised, and instead becomes a nomadic assemblage of singularities that does not invest desire in objects as such, but in life, here and now, in pure immanence.’ She further claims that ‘the trans-Oedipal subject can evade pathology even on the social margins, as they remain aware that the Oedipal subject is in the majority, but instead ‘surf’ the Oedipal trajectories that compel a certain model of social organisation’ further suggesting that the trans-Oedipal subject threatens the continued reproduction of the capitalist system calling on reactionary and revolutionary modes and their investments of desire, respectively fitting into the dominant class interests or acting in a transversal way to cut across blockages generated in gender, race as well as class. The thesis that Nash presents is a compelling one, especially as it traverses and supports many of the claims made in this chapter. However, I do not incorporate the Anti-Oedipus trajectory, and I do not see that nomadic spiritualities are framed by the either/or of subversion of narcissistic pathology. And the association of such spiritualities with the ‘return of the repressed’, of ‘secular materialism’, with the event those ‘mutant spiritualities’ offers a direction that I do not wish to follow. In place of the ‘return of the repressed’ I offer an analysis which sees spirituality as an event: a positive, productive, experimental process that is part of becoming: an eternal return of difference, not sameness, not to do with the repressed spirituality of secular materialism, or the return of the repressed but the constitution of the new, of change, of a pragmatics of experimentation created in a mixture of regimes of signs. For instance Deleuze and Guattari (2004, p. 167) refer to anorexia, along with ‘Yoga, Krishna, Love, experimentation’ as the process of becoming the BwO, not the return of the repressed. Carrette and King (2005) argue that ‘spirituality’ has been co-opted and recuperated by within neoliberal capitalism as a marketing tool using individualist and corporatist values. They claim that this has been a ‘silent takeover’ of spirituality. This resonates with Nash’s sense of spirituality as a new form of consumerism. These are cogent points to make and there is doubtless contagion of such majoritarian forces in the fields of spirituality. However, nomadic spirituality can be seen as the lines of flight from such majoritarian forces as Anomalous forces rather than recuperated forces. This is not to say that the communities stand outside of capitalism, or that they have not incorporated ‘Eastern’ beliefs, or to deny that their spiritualities may be recuperated and attached to market practices.
The events of becomings-spiritual are actualised and counter-actualised\textsuperscript{240} from singularities ‘in diverse manners at once’ (Deleuze, 1990, p. 100) in the worlds of the women – such that meditation or growing forests, for example, are events that effectuate the incorporeal transformations of Chandra and Lesley. Such spiritual voyages and worlds are ‘teaming with anonymous and nomadic, impersonal and pre-individual singularities’. Worlds that in their openings up allow us ‘to tread at last on the field of the transcendental’ (Deleuze, 1990, p. 103). In those movements and intensities, spiritual journeys, as events, are actualised and ‘expressed’ and effect incorporeal transformations: becomings-other in an ecology of relations. In the words of the women, spirituality generates \textit{fun}, and \textit{evolution}, and \textit{fulfilment}, and \textit{mindfulness}, and \textit{love}, in the events of their lives, in their expressions of spirituality: in their becomings-spiritual. Such becomings are imbricated in an ecology of relations; bodies of thought intermingle with the bodies of the women, the bodies of the earth and the cosmos, generating an eco-spirituality. Sira’s garden is the place of her intensity. Her garden is a composing force for the processes of her becoming-

\textsuperscript{240} Guattari calls these processes of actualization and counter-actualization, singularization and resingularization. And there are claims that Guattari focuses on the production of the subject to a greater extent than Deleuze (O’Sullivan, 2006, p. 310), however, I do not agree that Deleuze’s work is less open to ‘encounters’ with ‘lived elements’ or offers ‘colder and more abstract conceptual manoeuvres’ (O’Sullivan, 2006, p. 310). Singularization and re-singularization are part of the emissions of singularities that ‘preside over the genesis of individuals and persons’. Guattari is attempting to transcend ‘the synthesis of the person’ through resingularization calling upon not simply the figure of ‘the person’ the process of resingularization, or counter-actualization of the virtual, of ‘potential’ (Deleuze, 1990, pp. 103-103).
spiritual; the place of *a certain focus, certain attention, certain consciousness*. Bodies of thought engendering practices, rituals and passions are folded into the bodies of the women and their communities as events, framing their spiritual states of affairs and effectuating becomings in blocks.

Such an ecology of relations, incorporating and implicating the forces of the earth and the multiplicity of the *and* rather than of the terms (Deleuze, 1995, p. 44) implicates and incorporates a world created through pragmatics; language, mixtures of regimes of signs. Nomadic spirituality, connected with nomadic subjectivity and voyaging, suggests that a nomadic countersignifying regime of signs would underpin becoming spiritual and that is part of what is open to and intermingled with other regimes of signs: presignifying, signifying, postsignifying, and crystalline regimes.

In an autopoietic ecology of relations, the stories of the women implicate the creative pragmatics and materiality of their actions and passions. Their collective enunciations,

---

241 Remembering that ‘the English and the Americans are just about the only people who have set conjunctions free, by thinking about relations…. AND is neither one thing nor the other, it’s always in-between, between two things; it’s the borderline, there always a border, a line of flight or flow, only we don’t see it, because it’s the least perceptible of things. And yet it’s along this line of flight that things come to pass, becomings evolve, revolution takes shape’ (Deleuze 1995, p. 45).

242 Each of these regimes of signs is taken up or alluded to within this chapter. Simon O’Sullivan (2006, p. 317) suggests that we cannot, for instance, return to the so called ‘primitive’ presignifying regime, for example paganism, but that we can draw upon it to produce ‘a new variety of a mixed semiotic’. I would argue that this is the case within the mixed semiotics of each community, each assemblage. And Michael Goddard (2001, p. 54) argues that following Deleuze’s approach in *Cinema 2: Time Image* that ‘mysticism can be understood as a practice which actualises a prediscursive seeing and hearing, a vision and a voice that otherwise would have remained virtual and which constitutes an ecstatic experience of the outside.’ I would argue that esoteric spiritualities do ‘use’ the past, and mixtures of regimes of signs or assemblages of collective enunciations but through the third act of the passive synthesis, beyond the theatre of the variable living presents of which passes habit and memory as ‘it causes the present to pass’ (Deleuze 2004, p. 101) and an active ‘embedding of presents themselves’ in a passive synthesis of memory where the past is contemporaneous and coextensive and pre-existent with the present and where the past ‘insists with the former present’ and ‘consists with the new or present present’ (Deleuze 2004, pp. 103-104). In this way for example, paganism is able to insist in the past and consist in the present present. And in the third act in the theatre of the passive synthesis ‘the present and future are in turn no more than dimensions of the future: the past as condition, the present as agent…. The present is no more than an actor, an author an agent destined to be effaced; while the past is not more than a condition operating by default’ (Deleuze 2004, p. 117).
the collective assemblages of enunciations, or mixtures of regimes of signs, become imbricated in the event, effectuating such incorporeal transformations, and becomings-spiritual. The women are in the throes of fabulation, as they tell their stories, share and exchange expressions of becomings-spiritual within their assemblages, territories and milieus. Their stories intermingled with the mixtures of regimes of signs implicated in their becomings, treading ‘the field of transcendence’ or the creation of a world. Such actualisations and counter-actualisations emerge out of an intensive, virtual, spiritual voyage, a nomadic becomings-spiritual as transcendence – as a plane of thought that is projected onto the plane of immanence – (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, pp. 88-89). These actualisations and counter-actualisations effectuate incorporeal transformations in an open, autopoietic ecology of relations, which designate an open world, conjunct, adjacent or overlapping and bordering all the worlds. The idea of spirituality here is an intensive multiplicity, generated from the force of relations, particularities and singularities that are incarnated in individuals in the mixtures of regimes of signs, in real assemblages. Spirituality is actualised from the virtual through the real intermingling of bodies, signs and statements and the ‘emissions of singularities’ constituting their relations and powers: pragmatics, making a rhizome, entering a block of becoming (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p.277) in the event, on the immanent plane of Nature-thought.

243 ‘Semiotic systems depend upon assemblages, and it is the assemblages that determine that a given people, period, or language, and even a given style, fashion, pathology, or miniscule event in a limited situation, can assure the predominance of one semiotic or another’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 132). Again in this chapter, assemblages are forms of expression and forms of content passing into and out of each other constituting social formations and the forces of the earth.

244 ‘Only when the world, teaming with anonymous and nomadic, impersonal and pre-individual singularities, opens up, do we tread at last on the field of the transcendental’ (Deleuze 1990, p. 103).
The problem of spirituality, in this sense, is not merely a form of transcendence, where the body/soul dualism is maintained in the “Self”/“I”, or identity, suggested as the basis for the shift from, and the desire for, the incarnation of a Transcendent God to an internalised God in what are called subjective spiritualities (Clarke, 2006, p. 3). Rather, it is a transcendence that is empirical and pragmatic; a mixture of regimes of signs, dependent on an assemblage and its ‘miniscule events’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 132). Spirituality becomes a transcendent field to be trodden as it is actualised and counter-actualised. The transformations and translations of the virtual are effectuated serially in zigzags in the lives of the women as they zigzag towards and away from incarnated and territorialised spiritualities. Becomings-spiritual implicate a vitalism, rather than simply a materialism that admits the complexity of body/spirit engendering a plurality of transformative nomadic spiritualities in a world.  

A becomings-spiritual is engendered that struggles to move beyond the “I” and the “Self”; where lines of flight are blocked, or botched in reterritorializations, which capture and segment such lines. A becomings-spiritual counter-actualises the ‘I’ and

---

245 Although the new social movements of the 1960’s and beyond have been seen as implicated in the processes of secularization of religion and spirituality, in any originary or genealogical explication the Western Enlightenment or modernist insistence on reason, truth and science were seen to have begun such an uncoupling (Clarke, 2006). However, there is another trajectory out of the Enlightenment that is important in this thesis and that is the lines of flight offered by Nietzsche and Bergson away from rationality ‘truth’ and positivist science carried on in the work of Deleuze and Guattari and others. However this has been complicated in post-secularization in contemporary life where social movements can at the same time incorporate a spiritual dimension that may draw on traditional Indigenous, Buddhist, Hindu, Christian belief systems or mixtures of those with social justice, environmental concerns and so on (Carrette & King, 2005, p. 180; Anderlini-D’Onofrio, 2005; Apoifis, 2008). There is now a move to a post-secularization (Braidotti, 2008) that has been foreshadowed within new social movements such as the environment movement, feminism, the New Religious Movement, the New Spiritualities Movement and the New Age Movement, and so on that interrogate and attempt to move beyond identity politics. This is complicated by the notion of engaged spiritualities such as the Buddhism taken up by Anne Klein (1995) is one that incorporates feminism is replicated in the lives of the women in the three communities who engage in ecofeminism, and environmental politics The problem of spirituality, where spirituality moves across religious and secular formations, as a post-secularism, is taken up in this chapter.
the ‘Self’ through ‘emissions of singularities’ (Deleuze, 1990, pp. 102-103).\footnote{246\textsuperscript{}}

Singularities such as ‘the moon’ are pre-personal. They ‘preside’ over the constitution of persons (or subjectivities in process). They are also linked to intensities such as the full moon and to the sense of the moon as virtual or a potentiality that is actualised in the living presents of the women in a spiritual practice, in rituals, a signs and in the timing of the visit to ‘the sacred grove’.

A nomadic voyage implicates duration, such that a body/spirit is not split into a binary opposition but forms a continuum where matter and spirit pass into and out of each other. Both are composing forces.\footnote{247} They are both tendencies\footnote{248} that are continuous

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{246} The section of Logic of Sense (Deleuze, 1990) that discusses singularities as the genesis of individuals and persons quoted here underpins what is being suggested in this chapter: ‘Singularities are the true transcendental events… Far from being individual or personal, singularities preside over the genesis of individuals and persons; they are distributed in a “potential” which admits neither Self nor I, but which produces them by actualizing or realizing itself, although the figures of this actualization do not at all resemble the realized potential. Only a theory of singular points is capable of transcending the synthesis of the person and the analysis of the individual as these are (or are made) in consciousness.’

‘We seek to determine an impersonal and pre-individual transcendental field, which does not resemble the corresponding empirical fields, and which nevertheless is not confused with an undifferentiated depth. This field cannot be determined as that of a consciousness…. A consciousness is nothing without a synthesis of unification, but there is no synthesis of unification of consciousness without the form of the I, or the point of view of the Self. What is neither individual or personal are, on the contrary emissions of singularities insofar as they occur on an unconscious surface and possess a mobile, immanent principle of auto-unification through a nomadic distribution, radically distinct from fixed and sedentary distributions as conditions of the synthesis of consciousness. Singularities are the true transcendental events… Far from being individual or personal, singularities preside over the genesis of individuals and persons; they are distributed in a “potential” which admits neither Self nor I, but which produces them by actualizing or realizing itself, although the figures of this actualization do not at all resemble the realized potential. Only a theory of singular points is capable of transcending the synthesis of the person and the analysis of the individual as these are (or are made) in consciousness.

We cannot accept the alternative which thoroughly compromises psychology, cosmology, and theology: either singularities already comprised in individuals and persons, or the undifferentiated abyss. Only when the world, teaming with anonymous and nomadic, impersonal and pre-individual singularities, opens up, do we tread at last on the field of the transcendental’ (Deleuze, 1990, pp. 102-103). Singularities such as ‘the moon’ are pre-personal. They ‘preside’ over the constitution of persons (or subjectivities in process). They are also linked to intensities such as ‘the full moon’ and to the sense of ‘the moon’ as virtual, potentiality, actualised in the living presents of the women in a spiritual practice, in rituals, a sign in the timing of the visit to ‘the sacred grove’.

\textsuperscript{247} See where Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 212) claim ‘the soul (or rather the force).’

\textsuperscript{248} Elizabeth Grosz (2004, p. 198) in The Nick of Time discusses duration as both a given and a waiting, where in terms of the waiting and desire it is clear that everything is not given at once, yet it is a continuity (the sugar/matter takes time to dissolve, the body/desire wait impatiently in duration). And where ‘Matter in its totality participates in duration, and it is for this reason that life, too, must extend itself temporally. Not everything is given at once.’
\end{footnotesize}
in duration but where duration, as both singularity and multiplicity, produces difference in the event (Grosz, 2004, p. 182). Such duration is emergent from the virtual and is at the same time an enfolding of the past and unfolding of the potential of the present into ‘whatever’ actualisations. The actualisations of incarnated spirituality are in a duration that is emergent from the open Whole, or the Chaosmos. Such durations implicate becomings produced from chance; the throw of the dice as a multiplicity which incorporates the social, the cultural and the political and their metamorphoses.

The pragmatics, or politics, of the regimes of signs that subtend spiritualities are there in the ‘connecting of dots’ carried out by the women, of the lines of flight and the ways they extract asignifying ‘particle-signs’ on the plane of immanence and actualise their potential. Practices, actions and passions of becomings-spiritual, are reterritorialisations and stratifications that mark. In this way, place is sacralised, rather than being sacred as such; and the sacred is a moving feast of sacralising practices,

---

249 Grosz (2005, pp. 110-111) in her chapter discussing ‘Deleuze Bergson and the Virtual’ points out that duration is ‘never a matter of unfolding an already worked out blueprint or simply the gradual accretion of qualities which progress stage by stage or piecemeal over time…. It is the insertion of duration into matter which produces movement.’ Whilst I would use slightly different language to suggest that duration and matter are mutually imbricated within one another in an ecology of relations the discussion offered by Grosz is a very fruitful one ‘inserting’ a Deleuze-Bergson twist to evolution which is central to the many forms of Yoga that the women of Bonville are touched by or part of. I take this up in more detail within this chapter.

250 Prior and Cusack (2008, p.271) suggest that it was the uncoupling of the sacred from ‘institutional churches’ that permitted the experience of the sacred ‘through what were previously ‘secular’ activities, including sport, rock music, psychoanalysis and sexuality.’ And where in the analysis of Prior and Cusack ‘Individualism and prosperity combined to encourage a focus on personal transformation as the primary religious process.’ The practices, actions and passions attached to permaculture, organic gardening, social justice, the mixing of Eastern and Western forms of spirituality seem to all be a part becomings-spiritual that have arisen from the uncoupling of the sacred from institutional churches but there is also a sense of a collective becomings-other that engenders becomings-spiritual. However, whereas Prior and Cusack argue that it is gay bathhouses that are a transformative space for gay men, I would want to suggest that it is their practices/passions/actions/bodies/souls that are the territorializing forces that constitute transformative spaces. Here the gay bathhouse is the sacred tree or grove where all of the forces of the earth meet (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 354). And that these are transformations or becomings are virtual, sacralised spatializations in duration rather than spaces as such, and blocks of becomings in which the presence of many men is imperative for the incorporeal
passions, and semiotic systems. The spiritual passions, practices and beliefs of the women move through homes, gardens, meditation spaces, groves of trees, hilltops, walks, kitchens, and compost heaps. The signs or the marks of a collective becomings-spiritual, becomings-community are drawn in territorial markings and anointed milieus. Such milieus are where indexical components move from functional components of spirituality or religion to expressive elements (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 347). The transcendent plane of the sacred becomes folded into the creation of new life or spatio-temporal dynamisms, beyond the simply human. Rather than sacred place or space being seen as transformative and thus implicated in the constitution of identity, the actions and passions of bodies/souls mark and thus sacralise or spatialise place/space; in the event. The asignifying ‘particle- signs’ in the tactility of a woman’s foot on the land she was to buy, connected with her amusement that I saw the tug of the land as an indication of spirituality, becomes expressive of a subjective regime of signs; a point of subjectification.

The exemplification of my claim in the introduction to this chapter, that spirituality acts as a catalytic function for those individual and communities expressing a spiritual dimension to their collectivity, instead of showing the spiritual unity and sameness of the women’s spiritual stories, shows the multiplicity of signs and the mixture of regimes of signs implicated in their inventions of a spiritual subjectivity and the transformations in their beliefs in their becomings-spiritual. Spirituality is paradoxically invented anew in intentional communities, at the same time as it marks and drives the invention of the intentional community and the production of new effects ‘which result from the actions and passions of bodies but which live in excess of them’ (Ansell Pearson, 2000, p. 128).
subjectivities. What underpins such inventions and beliefs, however, is desire, which is a force that generates transformation and the capacity to think and to be affected. These capacities emerge from the forces of life that make thought and action imperative. Invention and belief connect through the disenchantment with the present and through enchantment with elements of the past, all in the name of the future to come.

In the following chapter sustainability, captured in the perhaps quixotic notion that everything gardens is expressed as a sense-event that produces a series of becomings—garden in the work to become sustainable in the lives of the women. The three communities all work towards a sustainable future and the women express the various ways in which this is possible. In the move from spirituality to sustainability I need to point out that there is a strong claim made by the women that spirituality and sustainability are necessary elements for a future.
CHAPTER 6
CREATIVE, UNKNOWN ASSEMBLAGES OF SUSTAINABILITY: EVERYTHING GARDENS

Sustainability in a garden

In this chapter, I argue that intentional communities and the women, do not represent the concept of sustainability but rather that they are, in a Deleuzean sense, both expressing and actualising sustainability as a multifarious process of dynamic forces – of movements and measurement (entropy) – while they are also ‘dramatizing’ both the visible and invisible forces that affect sustainability in the productions of their cultivated worlds (Deleuze, 2004, p.11, p. 271, p. 308). Such worlds are worlds of symbioses of humans and ‘ecological’ gardens; they implicate not only the soft technologies of permaculture, biodynamics and organic gardening but also the politics, beliefs and passions of the gardeners of those worlds. Ecological gardens are

---

251 Deleuze argues in *Difference and Repetition* (2004) that it is in dramatization, in movement, that any concept is actualised and this underpins his invention of spatio-temporal dynamisms, of singularities that move through space and time, encouraging the use of an ethological ethnography where the ways that time and space are inhabited and the affects that are engendered in these processes express life. Sustainability is in this sense an Idea, or concept, that is dramatized, actualised and incarnated in the assemblages of intentional communities. The thinking of sustainability in this thesis is also imbricated in a Deleuzean argument about the ways that differenciation is a local solution to a problem. ‘Each differenciation is a local integration or a local solution which then connects with others in the overall solution or the global integration’ (Deleuze, 2004, p. 262). There is ‘the local differenciation of parts, the global formation of an internal milieu, and the solution of a problem posed within the field of constitution of an organism’ (Deleuze, 2004, p. 262-263). A Deleuzean sense of an organism open to the ‘self’ of a ‘thousands of little witnesses which contemplate within us’ is what informs sustainability. It is a sense where all energies or ‘excitations and reactions’ (Deleuze, 2004, pp. 96-97) suggests that sustainability as difference is created out of an unknown repetition of the unknown assemblages.
open assemblages that act as bridges between the natural and the artificial. Such
gardens are constructed to work with the natural world in ways that are specific to the
forces of climate, bioregions, communities and micro-milieus. The micro-milieus of
gardens are the immediate focus of gardeners beyond the human – insects, weeds,
animals, fungi, microbial soil life. Each garden in itself ‘takes part in an entire
becoming’ that is, a sensory becoming, realised in the connections of the garden-
house assemblage (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 180). Sensory becomings connect
into a pragmatics or politics of the becoming of sustainability and its actualisations in
the context of intentional communities. A garden includes the organic and the non-
organic, the visible and invisible and the expressible and the inexpressible. Every
element in an ecological garden, including the house, is in counterpoint on a plane of
composition (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 186). The example of the oak’s plane of
composition is apt for a garden because it is the ‘force of the acorns development and
the force of formation of raindrops’, which for Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 186),
are seen as composing forces. The germination of the acorn emerges from invisible
forces that are realised in the tree. The composition of a garden relies upon its zones
or sections, its planes, for its sensory becoming. I am suggesting that any woman,
with her lines, her planes and her shapes in such a composition is a part of the
becoming.

Sustainability, in the stories of the women, from Clear Creek Community, the
Motherhouse and Bonville, is produced in the connections of territories, houses,
gardens, forests, fields, and global beyond. Each community renders sustainable life,
or a politics of livability, visible in new and different ways, and ‘brings things to
light’ sustainability as part of a ‘regime of light’ (Deleuze, 1988a, p.65). Within each
community, sustainability becomes an expression of sense-events imbricated in passwords and their subtending order-words. Such forms of expression produce variable transformational styles, milieus and durations, which affect, in turn, the metamorphosis of subjectivities. Sustainability hinges on the events of aleatory assemblages and blocks of becoming imbricated in a symbiosis of nature and culture that produces wild differences.252 Such events and unknown assemblages of nature-culture engender a multiplicity of becomings-other, such as becomings-garden. Such becomings-garden are not the same as sensory becomings, which are aligned with art and its affects and percepts (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 183). Becoming-garden is a transformational movement aligned with a concept – in this case the concept of sustainability – such becomings form relational assemblages with any number of aleatory elements A woman, becoming-garden, donates elements or properties of herself, such as her ‘movements and rests’, to a garden and takes elements of the garden into herself. In a garden a woman, among other things, walks, works, dreams, eats and sleeps A garden, in turn, draws a woman into its territory and donates elements of itself to her, such its ‘movements and rests’, and takes elements of a woman into itself (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 284).253 The garden takes the work of the woman, the design of the woman and plays with it. The woman takes the work of the garden and lives through it. In this sense, it is not so much the ways in which the constitutive discourses of sustainability have opened new folds for both the landscape

252 Such symbioses are often seen from a perspective of human control, co-evolutionary work suggests a different trajectory, one that sees symbiosis as created by bacteria. Mrya Hird (2008, para. 13) claims ‘The point is for sociologists to recognize that bacteria weave all organisms into material, cultural and social co-constructions through ongoing symbiotic and symbiogenetic relations.’ Deleuze and Guattari (2004, p. 263) call such co-evolutionary work ‘involution’ as blocks of becoming ‘between heterogeneous terms’ not a filiative, hereditary evolution but an alliance, a ‘becoming communicative or contagious’. The claim that becoming is involutionary, involution is creative.’

253 Deleuze and Guattari use the case of Little Hans to exemplify the affective nature of elements in an assemblage where becomings occur.
and the women but that both are spatio-temporal dynamisms that enfold the potential for sustainability in a becoming-garden.
Sustainability is expressed as variable, dynamic processes in the stories, passions and actions of each woman intermingled with gardens. Their nomadic journeys within the shifting assemblages of gardens in intentional communities engender symbiotic connections, expanded beyond human points of view.

There are important challenges to the usefulness of sustainability as a concept. Halsey (2006, p. 61,) suggests that sustainability needs interrogation and may need to be effaced (as part of Nature and Society, in the same way that Nietzsche did to God and Man). Parr’s (2009) analysis on the hijacking of sustainability also questions the misuse of sustainability culture in the militarization of life and the misuse of sustainability to support the inexorable growth model of capitalism. The highly recuperative nature of sustainability does not, necessarily, mean that it loses its potential as a transformative tool. The heterogeneous nature of sustainability – the way that it is expressed and made visible – creates gaps in the field for other forms of sustainability to be produced. Braidotti (2006, p. 148) insists that sustainability is a whatever of becoming: ‘that ‘whatever gets you through the day’ whatever life-support, mood-enhancement system one is dependent on, is not to be the object of moral indictment, but rather a neutral term of reference: a prop in the process of becoming.’ What gets women community members through the day is the event of sustainability as difference and this is a difference of a symbiotic nature – that implicates co-evolutionary analyses (Hird, 2008) and not just the human. Sustainability is not only imbricated in all levels of their lives, including those of the passive synthesis, or ‘habit’ but their lives become experimental events of the present,
for the future. I use the term involutionary because it expresses alliances, rather than remaining captured by the filiative processes driving evolution, even the parallel forms of evolution expressed in co-evolution (Saguaro, 2006, p.226; Pollan, 2004, 2006).

The ‘whatever’ of sustainability for food production, linked to food security, is expressed in an intentional community’s blocks of becomings-garden (incorporating small farms, food forests, and protective green belts) engendering an ecocentric and biocentric becomings-other. At the same time, social permaculture – the form of permaculture practised by many iconic permaculture practitioners, such as Starhawk – is focused on social justice as a way to empower the lives of the people through the building of ecological communities. Such community building occurs around the world and recognises the preconditions of local and global poverty and seeks to ameliorate them at a grass roots level (Walker, 2013).

When Bill Mollison (1988, p. 17), one of the founders of permaculture, states: ‘Everything gardens’ he offers a figure (2.2) showing a world that extends to the horizon and beyond, where the actions, the movements and rests of gardening, produce a world as a garden.254 Rather than seeing gardening or cultivation, as a

254 Mollison’s (1988, p.17) figure is unrelentingly rural but permaculture and organic backyard farming are increasingly taken up in town and cities as well and has never left many cities in ‘developing’ or Third World countries and the ‘West’ where there remains a productive environment of backyard farms (Hardoy, Mitlin & Satterwaite, 1992, p. 138). Also farmers markets, Community Supported Agriculture and the low miles movements and the return of backyard farming to towns and cities further blur the lines between country and city in the ‘West’. Sandilands (1999, p. xii), a Lacanian ecofeminist critiques the private sense of what she calls ‘green consumerism’ as an ‘eco-litany of saving, scrimping, buying, choosing, mulching, repairing, insulating, economizing, squashing, shovelling, reducing, reusing, and recycling.’ Her claim that women’s environmental action is still located in the private sphere is at odds with in of the actions that she enumerates when they are taken up by states, city councils, local rural councils and large multinational corporations. It is, perhaps, a peculiarly ‘Western’ view to not see waste as a resource, or a potential food source for animals, watering source for farms. The alternative has been to date to see waste as something to be dumped
human only intervention in a landscape and a garden as a human, artificial, yet complex ecosystem (Gleason, 1994, p. 13, Allen, 2002, p.14), Mollison renders a garden as that which is produced by everything within it and without it – human and non-human – which creates the conditions for experimentation, involution and alliance necessary for a block of becomings-garden. What is within and without such garden-assemblages are both visible and invisible bodies and things and their events, including composing/decomposing forces and the diagrams or abstract machines of the virtual of sustainability.

Mollison’s statement that everything gardens brings a territorial assemblage into view. It shows the marking out and making of the garden in a singular, but still ‘whatever’ way of gardening that implicates the both expression and the content of permaculture, biodynamics, or organic gardening as sustainability. For example, food production is an expression of every ‘gardener’ in a permaculture and organic garden but not ‘the object of every gesture’ (Massumi, 2002a, p.73). In gardening for food ‘the gardener’ is seemingly ‘the subject’ of gardening and food is the object. ‘But if by subject we mean the point of unfolding of a tendential movement, then it is clear that the’ gardener ‘is not the subject of the’ action; the food is, or complicating Massumi’s position here, I want to argue that ‘the food’ is also the gardener. It is common sense, ‘every permaculturist knows’… that a forty centimetre long daikon radish ‘digs’ the soil as it grows. The tendential movements in this scenario are not only collective they are pre-personal, the radish territorialises, embodies qualities, is

_________________________

with potentially negative consequences for those environments that receive the waste. The long list of actions that she decries is taken up and is increasingly being taken up around the world on both a public and private scale (Clough, 2004, p. 169). In a sense, the ‘back to the land’ movement is occurring in the cities too, incorporating new green technologies to manage modern high technology worlds, such as cooperatives providing the knowledge and the technology for free wireless internet access, and developing innovative uses for solar technology (Rowe & Aichele, 2010, p. 30-32).
expressive because that is its habit. It grows in counterpoint with the soil, water, the sun. It is not only that a garden is complicated by being mostly non-human, it is a territorial assemblage that is a state of affairs and an event with transformative force, effectuating becomings-garden. In intentional communities it is the whole of the assemblage and beyond that is part of the garden. It is not only each individual house-garden-farm and the food that it potentially produces but their connections and intermingleings in worlds, with the earth and the cosmos.

Gardens open gardeners and the earth to the cosmos;\textsuperscript{255} they mitigate the effects of climate change, they cool the earth, sequester carbon and keep greenhouse gases from escaping into the atmosphere. Everything gardens, bringing to the fore the concept of \textit{élán vital}, which is ‘the temporal explosive force of life… a zone of indetermination …’, where organic and non-organic matter is imperceptible in its difference and where the actualisation of life is undecidable, as suggested by Deleuze, following Bergson (Olkowski, 2002, p.4). The zone of indetermination, the interval, or in-between, is where change occurs, where the new is produced and where gardens grow. The gardeners, and the explosive life forces in a garden, inhabit a multiplicity of movements – of the climate, the weather, the compost, the worms, the water – and their virtual tendency is toward a point where the garden is the milieu, not just of food, as powerful as that is, but life as such.\textsuperscript{256}

\textsuperscript{255} Just as the stagemaker’s song described in Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 184) opens to the cosmos (Bogue, 2003, pp. 165-166).

\textsuperscript{256} A house-garden is a ‘ritual monument of an animal mass that celebrates qualities before extracting new causalities and finalities from them. This emergence of pure sensory qualities is already art, not only in the treatment of external materials but in the body’s postures and colors, in the songs and cries that mark out the territory. It is an outpouring of features, colors, and sounds that are inseparable insofar as they become expressive (philosophical concept of territory’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 184).
How can all of sustainability be expressed in woman-garden? Only in the mapping of composing and decomposing relations, only given what affects each thing and its aggregations: ‘each point has its counterpoints… a thing is never separable from its relations with the world’ (Deleuze, 1988c, p. 125). The relations of women-house-lot garden-food-forest-field folds in every point and counterpoint of those relations, taking into account the capacities and attributes of each thing. Becomings-garden are co-evolutionary worlds: all of the bodies in a garden, their movements and rests, their powers of affecting and being affected, all of the composing forces and elements of matter and function are folded together in co-evolutionary, or involutionary process of gardening. I argue, in this chapter, that the composing, designing forces of bodies, including those of humans, are connected with the composing, designing, gardening forces of the cosmos and that there is a process of emergent co-composition that is both visible and invisible in every garden.

Sustainability has its own material, social and semiotic flows made visible in intentional communities. The women’s stories move around the issues of what can be said about sustainability and its visible presence. Permaculture, organic gardening and biodynamics are practices of sustainability, which produce visible signs. Each community has a different history, they all have different ways of practising sustainability and each woman has her own story of sustainability.

Difference is a virtual field that contracts through repetition and as such is ‘between the degrees of a repetition which is total or totalizing’ (Deleuze, 2004, p.358). It is important to note that not all that is virtual, not all that is potential, or immanent, is actualised because ‘the virtual is an infinite series of potential past and future states
in every actual, present body’ (Wiley, 2005, p. 92, fn. 24). The actualisations of the concept of sustainability – in the bodies of the communities, in the bodies of the women, on the land, in their gardens, in their communities as gardens – transform into embodied, sensory becomings, which are ‘the becoming of otherness caught in a matter of expression’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 177). Such becomings make worlds in gardens. Sensory becomings are expressed as possible worlds realised alongside the virtuality that is sustainability and its event. Becoming something other is rendered in the in-between of repetition, in difference. Difference is the ‘secret’ that is in-between the repetitions, as a series of becoming-something else that constitute the ‘whatever’ of becomings-sustainable in an endless series of ‘as ifs’. It is as if the woman becomes a folding of the garden; as if the garden was a folding of the woman; as if the house were a folding of the garden; as if the house-garden-woman were a folding of the earth and the forces of the earth and the cosmos and all were connections in an emergent, mutated assemblage of sustainability. These all create an ‘asymmetrical block of becomings’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p.307). The becomings of the block and their expressiveness take up all of the in-betweens of a garden that are also becomings, not pre-existing terms or forms. The doubling of becomings of the garden-gardener-house/house-gardener-garden allows a transformation of all in a series of configurations twisting becomings-other out of assemblages. The transformative force, here, is desire as life intervening in the states of things and affairs expressing sensory, sonorous qualities beyond the functions of the assemblage. The garden ‘renders visible’ such sensoria and ‘nonvisible forces’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p.377). The constellation of nonvisible forces of

---

257 This is a poached, folding of Deleuze’s Foucault (1988, p. 97) into my own thinking and expression of the fold.
germination in an apple seed, for instance: as Deleuze and Guattari (2004, p. 378) comment ‘When forces become necessarily cosmic, material becomes necessarily molecular, with an enormous force operating in an infinitesimal space’: forces such as duration, intensity, density but also elemental, symbiotic natural forces. Deleuze and Guattari (2004, p.364) name the machinic processes that act on elements, such as those in a garden, that are coexistent and heterogeneous and shape gardens as ‘constellations of singularities’, which are ‘selected, organized, stratified – in such a way as to converge (consistency) artificially and naturally’ into an assemblage of new becomings, into ‘a veritable invention’ (Deleuze and Guattari 2004, p 448) of a becomings-garden.

The garden, as a sensorium, is a paradoxical centre of sense and senses and as such, is a series of points and counterpoints that interact to engender symbiosis and transformations. A garden as a sensorium is a series of enfolding, catalysing points and counterpoints, the heterogeneity of which arises from the numerous bodies, both organic and inorganic, that constitute a garden and its existence through the ‘forces of folding they harness’ (Deleuze and Guattari 2004, p. 378).

A garden, as a sensory cog in the territorial, collective assemblages of becoming-garden, is more than a state of things (or affairs) and is not simply a term, or a thing,

---

258 The elements of wind, water, earth, fire are formative in varying ways, in the processes of becoming-garden. Deleuze in The Fold discusses the elements as spiritual forces in art (1993, p. 122).
259 This is what Massumi, (2000a, p. 71) calls a part-subject – rather than a quasi object or catalytic object-sign. He suggests that a ‘part-object’ as a catalysing point may be called a part-subject (Massumi, 2002a, p.71). Whilst I enjoy Massumi’s Deleuzean rendition of the soccer game the language that he enjoins does not fit well with the expressions of the women.
260 Not only is the lacewing larvae a voracious, even cannibalistic, eater of the guts of its prey, such as whitefly, mealy bugs, thrips, mites, scale but they also in their adult phase eat pollen and honeydew and are part of the processes of fertilization (Allen, 2002, p. 140). From the ‘point’ of food, to the ‘counterpoints’ of pests and predators there is such a mixture that it is difficult to untangle and even more difficult to decide where humans fit.
in a relation but a ‘being in the middle’ and the ‘being of becoming’. A garden becomes in its own right, presupposing *singularities or spatiotemporal haecceities* (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p.447) beyond the actions, or mixed with the actions, of women. Such a way of seeing a garden, as more than encapsulated in its ‘term’ open to relations, also implies a heterogeneity of relations that exceed already determined relationships in becomings – relations such as those of garden/woman gardener or of wild nature/garden or ecosystem/designe ecosystem or even of paradise, Eden, utopia, cornucopia in a garden are all open to becoming-garden.

Sustainability as permaculture, biodynamics, backyard farming or organic gardening, presupposes the terms of gardens. However, I am suggesting here that becomings-garden are incorporeal effects of such states of affairs or material practices. Such effects generate aleatory transformations, so that such pre-determined versions of gardening open to experimentation, and where what the bodies of a garden ‘can do’ are unknown. In this way, the garden is not presupposed in advance, as it would be if were simply a relational term – an already constituted form – a dictionary definition of a garden. There is no doubt that each woman’s story moves beyond the garden as a given – traces the garden as a separate form – taking up more than any dictionary notion of a garden as a ‘plot of ground devoted to the cultivation of useful or ornamental plants’. The women’s fabulations or tales of gardens, where the intercessors can be more than human, use not only the common and good sense of sustainability but also turn to what a garden as a sensorium expresses in its symbiotic becomings.
The house/garden/gardener/composing forces, of the earth and the cosmos, are intensely, unknowingly, symbiotic. The assemblages that they form, although presupposed as designed by and for humans as human territories, not only frame a territory but at the same time produce something that escapes human control and capture. Something is produced that is in excess of the territory. The paradox of design where informal styles are taken up and codified as attempts to domesticate and organise ‘wild’ ecosystems and nature – as they are currently perceived – is that designs implicate some perceived past, or other of a space that is considered to be barren, empty or cleared. Such retrospective perceptions frame present and future actions generating not only new codes and styles of gardening, but also new passions for designs and actions that are seen as producing a good and common sense sustainability that ‘makes sense’.

**Becoming-garden as a sense-event and a cultivated assemblage**

Nature as the earth, as Gaia or as the Mother, is the bedrock of sustainability for those who garden. This is nothing new but is a ‘shift from a nature always already there to an assemblage to be slowly composed’ (Latour, 2010, p. 477). Sustainability, of the communities and the women is, therefore, other than the hijacked sustainability of the juggernaut of expansionist global capitalism, which seeks every nook and cranny of existence within which a profit can be made or where the goal of sustainable growth simply transmogrifies into another, different economic opportunity.\(^\text{261}\) For those

\(^{261}\) *Our common Future* Report (1987 also cited in Parr, 2009, p.1) was the recognition, from governments and the United Nations of the global need for growth that is not harmful in the present and to future generations. *Back to Our Common Future* (2012) is a current United Nations report, which shows continued environmental problems coupled with continued dissension in scientific ranks.
living in intentional communities, sustainability is not simply the ethical, political and ecological dilemmas of the sustainability and continued development of global, late capitalism that is in question but rather, the sustainability of the earth and of life, incarnated in the intimate work of a garden.

Becoming-sustainable is a geophilosophical micropolitics, a multiplicity of ‘styles’, foldings and molecular lines of flight, made possible through the politics of life as a ‘swarm of intensities’ or prepersonal composing forces that collide to constitute difference (Colebrook, 2002b, p. 46; Deleuze, 2004, p. 322) and the multiplicity of individuations and subjectivations that are possible in given formations and through perceived intensities of movement, speed, rhythm, gesture, energy and style. Becoming-sustainable is not simply reducible to living in an intentional community, gardening, working the land, not using chemicals, doing permaculture or organic gardening, or to the many other elements of permaculture and the eco-politics of being organic or sustainable. Sustainability forms a rhizomatic or a continuous, networked assemblage of open-ended becomings and as the outcomes of the desire for an ethical relationship between the earth, nature and the social, that is, an ethical response to, an ecopolitics that brings into view composing forces constitutive of becoming-garden. Sustainability as becoming-garden is not a reduction. It is instead an expression of a problem of becoming sustainable rather than sustainability as such. Furthermore, the problematic\textsuperscript{262} of sustainability presupposes subject formation, the

\textsuperscript{262} Deleuze inverts the movement from the question to the apodictic, as is the case in the dominant strand of philosophy to the movement of the problematic to the question. In his discussion of the problematic he suggests that we begin with the problem rather than the question or the apodictic as the only response to events which appear in the form of questions and is related to power. The power to question is the power of decision and the power to reduce the social field to that of the terms of the question. In terms of the problematic it is chance that is the imperative not the question. (Deleuze, 1994, p.247-248). It is chance that constitutes the singular each time.
forming, being formed, subjectivated, the subject as ‘derivative of the outside, conditioned by the fold’ (Deleuze, 1988, p.106) and the problem of becoming, as ‘the ensemble of the problem and its conditions’ and as that which ‘with its extra-propositional nature does not fall within representation’ (Deleuze, 2004, p. 247-248). Sustainability is also located in the concept as a solution, where the problem is ‘found on the plane of immanence presupposed by the concept’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, pp. 80-81). Everything to do with the problem emerges on the plane of immanence, just as everything to do with the solution can also emerge from that plane. What is important in contemporary intentional communities is their desire to design and organise for sustainable life.

In this chapter, I interpret sustainability as both the materiality and visibility of gardens and their incorporeal events that translate them beyond any single territory in their expression and their sense (Patton, 2007) generating a series of sense-events. Such events are never a single instance but always a process of wild variation in a machinic assemblage. As a conjunction of flows an event of sustainability in a garden of implicates every potential for sustainable life in its incorporeal interventions in life, such that we become other, in duration, as the layering of time in a series of ‘meanwhiles’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 158). The event is both movement and theprehension of objects such that the eye and the hand prehend the earth in its actualisation into a garden and in the milieus of the gardens that intentional communities, for example, become (Deleuze, 1993, p. 79). States of affairs are not the same as the event or sense but they are ‘inseparable’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p.
Gardens as sustainability are events, expressions and states of affairs; they are also the milieus that any sustainable territory ‘bites into’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 347).

Deleuze sees sense as ‘pure event’ (Deleuze, 1990, p.19). Sense and event are positioned in the ‘in-between’ of propositions and things. They are two dimensions of the same plane, ‘two sides of a plane without thickness.’ Here, ‘Sense is both the expressible or the expressed of the proposition, and the attribute of the state of affairs... it is the boundary between propositions and things’ (Deleuze, 1990, p.22).

Sense is central to the relations of the virtual and the actual where the virtual exists in order to be actualised and produced through actualising of difference from sense-events. As such ‘the rules of the actualization of the virtual’ are ‘rules of difference and divergence: The actual does not resemble or represent the virtual that it embodies.’ The actualisation of the virtual expresses ‘differenciation’ (Deleuze, 2004, p. 258). Deleuze suggests that although the event ‘has an essential relationship to language...language is what is said of things.’ Events are sense as language rather than ‘its spatio-temporal realization in a state of affairs’ (Deleuze, 1990, p.22). For the women, the sense-events of sustainability as gardening are assembled in milieus, where the rhythms of their mutual becomings are expressed in their stories of sustainable life.

---

263 The event is actualized or effectuated whenever it is inserted, willy-nilly, into a state of affairs; but it is counter-effectuated whenever it is abstracted from states of affairs so as to isolate its concept’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 159). The events of sustainability, of a sustainable life, are both a function of intentional communities and events. Living sustainably is an attempt to be worth of the event amor fati (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 159).

264 Boundas (1996, p. 86), in his explication of the virtual and the actual, states that the possible is not akin to the virtual. The virtual is real and the possible is a representation of the real in a limited way for ‘the limitation which affects the relation between the possible and the real, it is as if the real were what survives the abortion of many possibles.’
Intentional communities as political or pragmatic responses to contemporary problems of sustainability are territorial assemblages. The territory of intentional communities is formed from a series of layered milieus, or elements of milieus. Milieus are constitutive affects, blocks of time movement that are both active and passive in nature and constitutive of intensities. They are affective multiplicities of sustainability made of the signs and colours and sounds, the expressions and the qualities of the milieus in the territorial assemblages of the gardens and the communities (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 347). The qualities of intensive difference of becoming-sustainable and sustainability as permaculture and as organic gardening, as an assemblage of becoming-garden, are connected by desire, by the investment in organic gardening and permaculture not as a representation of sustainability but as directly invested intensities, the qualities of the images of sustainability, not the images themselves. Such qualities, attributes and capacities are part of open assemblages but pertain to quotidian issues such as dealing with waste, capturing water, providing shelter, habitat, and food on the block: that is, women taking collective responsibility for living sustainably in a particular place, given the presuppositions of the world and its environmental crisis.

Sustainability is a sense-event in intentional communities imbricated in the milieus of the gardens expressing life. Sustainability is thinking the earth through bodily encounters with the earth. It is a process that does not simply generate ongoing relations but also engenders transformations within desiring machinic assemblages, such as intentional communities. Sustainability emerges as a line of flight, a zigzagging borderline, away from a globalising capitalism. For many intentional communities sustainability is a seminal password, engendering soft lines of flight
away from their locations in an unsustainable global capitalism into varied processes of experimentation directed at living softly, greenly and sustainably, with low entropy, on what is perceived to be a finite earth caught in ecological, entropic events (Mollison, 1988, p. 15, Lovelock, 2010). The creation of sustainable communities generates sense-events that are neither linear in nature, nor simply realisations of the possible; rather, they constitute hard or soft paths to energy use, creating high entropy or low entropy (Mangun & Henning, 1999, p. 94). Such paths zigzag, run parallel and designate an in-between, producing the ‘whatever’ events of sustainability. The passwords and pathways of sustainability, as deterritorialising forces are, however, reterritorialised in a heterogeneity of post-signifying passional regimes of signs in a series of possible actions that not only creates worlds and transforms subjectivities but also threaten to turn the password of sustainability into a new order-word.

All of the women’s stories, their sense-events, are imbricated in the mixture of the horizontal and vertical axes of the assemblage. The events of sustainability are a

---

265 Mollison (1988, p. 81) claims the event as all that is possible and realizable but he does not perceive or acknowledge the virtual and potential of events and the creation of the new in their actualization. ‘There are no new orders of events, just a discovery of exiting events. Every event we can detect is a result of a preceding event, and gives rise to subsequent events’ (Mollison, 1988, p. 81). Such events are possibilities, not virtualities open to actualizations (Deleuze, 1993, p. 79). Mollison (1988) sees only the state of affairs and not the concomitant incorporeal transformations. Sustainability has been captured by the globalising capitalist market and nature has been measured and contained once again in an effort to create new commodities and new markets (Sullivan, 2010). There are intentional communities that fit into the capitalist market economy, such as gated communities, and their exclusionary elitist nature and the private ownership of land suggest that they are outside of the discussion of sustainability that I undertake in this chapter.

266 This chapter incorporates an analysis of the interviews that the women and I did together and the field work that is unfinished as part of the doubled horizontal axis of the assemblage. The assemblage is seen as having two axes, one horizontal and one vertical. On the horizontal axis there are two sides that of ‘a machinic assemblage of bodies, of actions and passions, an intermingling of bodies reacting to one another’ and on the other side is ‘a collective assemblage of enunciation, of acts and statements, of incorporeal transformations attributed to bodies.’ The doubled vertical axis of the assemblage is where ‘the assemblage has both territorital sides, or reterritorialised sides, which stabilize it, and cutting edges of deterritorialization, which carry it away’ (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004, p. 97-98). Even in the midst of the women’s expressions of sustainability and its bodily affects it is impossible to separate out those territorial elements of the vertical axes.
mixture of events and territories (Lecercle, 2002, p. 186). The horizontal side of the assemblage takes up the affective, the actions and passions of the more than human subjects-in-process engendering transformations. The vertical axes of the assemblage incorporate the territorial sides, with its reterritorialising sides and deterritorialising ‘cutting edges’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 98). Both sides function together in desiring machines, for example, the garden as a sustainable community-machine, engendering becomings-sustainable and the garden as an ecosystem within a series of ecosystems.268

A garden, as a virtual element and a series of potentialities in the assemblage of intentional communities, is inseparable from the house and the territory. It is too simple to define a garden as bounded and cultivated by humans. Rather, an actualising of differenciated, virtual diagrams implicating geology, hydrology, climate, and the air, soil and water presuppose the fields of scientific, folklore, and archaic knowledge, implicated in such diagrams. In addition, all of the ‘wild’ elements of an ecosystem engage, not simply in mutual interventions in such ecological systems but also in a process of autopoiesis. An ecosystem as a desiring machine is a community of living and non-living elements that are more than the lists attached to any naturalistic rendition such as ‘air, water, soils, soil organisms, plants, molluscs, insects, fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds, mammals and humans’ (Gleason, 1994, p. 13). Ecosystems also include connecting elements such as woman-gardener-house-tools-block-plants-roads-fences-landscape-climate-hemisphere-community. These elements are the bodies or forms of content and the expressions of such an assemblage.

268 Desiring machines, then, ‘are not so much the creatures of man as the creators of men, other animals, their societies, and everything else besides: to think otherwise betrays a humanistic idolization of contemporary technology’ (Mullarkey, 1997, p. 442).
As well, gardens are the deterritorialising forces in each of the communities. A garden is ‘defined by its active and passive affects…. These affects circulate and are transformed within the assemblage’ given its ‘optimal’ and ‘pessimal limits’ (Deleuze and Guattari (2004, p.284) and what that garden assemblage of bodies can do.\textsuperscript{269} A long list of actions and practices produce the ‘optimal limit’ of a sustainable garden but the main action of a garden, as an action on an action, is to grow, as a genesis of life and sustainability: seeds, plants, soil, soil fertility, food, life, worms, micro-organisms, imaginations, thought, knowledge, art and literature. The ‘pessimal limit’ of a garden is attached to the forces of nature, the elements, in the sense of the earth, climate, water, and past and present social forces of management as they interact with the multiplicity of forces. For instance, a garden fails because a fence fails, because there is drought or flood, or because the soil has been exhausted or polluted because of misguided or poor usage, or expropriation and exploitation of natural resources. Both the optimal and the pessimal limits of gardens show the ways in which a garden becomes: in what it ‘can do’.\textsuperscript{270}

Each woman is part of a block of becomings-sustainable. Each block of becomings-sustainable is taken up in an assemblage of connections and relationships with lovers,

\textsuperscript{269} Deleuze and Guattari discuss the life of a tick in terms of the optimal and pessimal limits of their lives. The optimal limit is death after the feast the pessimal limit is expressed in the long fast as the tick waits for a mammal to feed on. Optimal and pessimal limits vary have an ethical dimension, according to what a body can do (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, pp. 283-284). In terms of the garden assemblage of bodies there is a chaotic number of bodies, with extra emergent bodies always having to be taken into account. Such bodies are not only emergent in fact but also and emergent in thinking. Such a chaos of bodies drives the transformations of what ecological sustainability is and how such shifting perceptions shape the pragmatics of sustainability.

\textsuperscript{270} A garden is also a spiritual becoming; the folding of the elements of the body of Nature-the garden, into the body of the woman, their unfolding and refolding ‘a spiritual force exerted on the body’ (Deleuze, 1993, p. 122). Once again this is a sense of the transcendental, the idea, and the concept of the forces that are exerted on bodies.
houses, gardens, land, the roads, the fences, tools, plants, seeds, food production, community shops and markets and the community itself. The different and fluctuating feelings and views about their communities or aspects of their communities and sustainability emerge in the stories of each woman’s garden. Gardens are real and becomings-garden are real. In this sense, in becomings-garden women are not gardens; although they may experience gardens as a point of subjectification it is not about imitating or creating subjective, intentional imaginaries of gardens. In becomings-garden women and garden are not materially equivalent assemblages, especially if gardens are imagined as analogous in an essentialist way to woman, as nurturing or productive forms. Rather, it is the differential donation of each gardeners’ body and the body of the garden – of her ‘elements with the relations of movement and rest, the affects, that make it’, and also the donation of each garden’s ‘elements with the relations of movement and rest, the affects,’ – that make the relationship between the assemblages of women and gardens a becoming-garden, where ‘forms and subjects aside’ (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004, p.284). Becoming-sustainable as becomings-garden donates the energies of both bodies and constitutes them as an assemblage moving beyond the limit, the thresholds of each body, transforming what a body ‘can do’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 283).

Such notions of becoming complicate the forms of sustainability that are taken up and expressed by women and gardens, at the same time as they complicate the potential becomings of women as something other, expressing sustainability as a positive multiplicity implicating the problem of sustainability. Sustainability seen as a captured, molar form maintaining capitalism remains implicated in such
transformations. Sustainability as a body of thought, as a series of actions and as an event has pessimal and optimal limits. If sustainability is used to change consumer behaviours without optimising the survival of all bodies, then sustainability has a different meaning for each body. Sustainability has limits. The question is whether it is a pessimal or an optimal threshold. It is possible to think sustainability as a positive way of intervening in a self-organising nature, in all of its elements including the human species, to increase the optimal limits. Sustainability is both molar/transcendental and also molecular/immanent, or experimental, and attempts to become something else, opening the way to becomings-other creating the ‘production of a new subjectivity’ (Deleuze, 1988a, p115).

The open, fluid assemblages of becoming-garden are a becoming-garden of each woman and each garden, given all of the bodies that such a becoming might entail and their practices. Such an assemblage is where the garden becomes productive and yields its produce and where each woman becomes productive, designs and labours (mulches, composts, plants, plans, worries, harvests, shares). The implication that is

---

Sustainability is seen as a ‘weasel word’ in some of its applications. Greenwashing by multinational corporations is one of the forms of sustainable practice that has come under fire in recent times. Critiques of green consumerism for instance simply articulate it to the personal sphere of ‘saving, scrimping, buying, choosing, mulching, repairing, insulating, economizing, squatting, shovelling, reducing, reusing, and recycling’ (Sandilands, 1999, p. xii). The politics of sustainability, in this view, must be about radical democracy and something other than the personal. Such a separation of the personal and the political negates their relation and forgets that both are open to political composing forces, where in turn ‘emergence, mutation, change affect composing forces, not composed forms’ (Deleuze, 1988a, p. 87). Subjectivities are transformed in the grip of the event and its affects in the in-between of relations. In this sense relations have their own ontological status effectuating change. Consuming is an event, which incorporates a state of affairs effectuating incorporeal transformations that are not presumed in advance and have unforeseen outcomes. When it is green consumption the colour green is relational: here greening is a vector of circulation. To say that a product is not green, that the public has been duped, sees capitalism/subjects as trapped in reproduction of fixed forms and contents and not engaging in the production of the new. This position further sees only a mediated, controlled ideology as the centre of greening. A Deleuzean analysis suggests that relations and their expressions are affective, not simply veiled ideologies, or blind obedience to order-words. It is not the composed forms of capitalism and subjects that are affected but composing forces themselves, in the event, creating transformations (Massumi, 2002b, pp. 7-8).
the ‘secret’ of these repetitions is linked to the ways in which each woman’s problem is ‘ameliorated’ and a ‘way out’ opened ‘that had previously been blocked’ (Deleuze and Guattari 1978/2004, p. 284). In this sense, the ‘problem’ is that of sustainability. One way to address this problem is to enter an assemblage with a permaculture or an organic garden, which provides food produced outside of the matrix of capitalism and global corporations that increasingly control the production of food. Where the singular ‘relations of movement and rest, the affects’ compose a response to the problem of sustainability, then that is the movement and rest of sustainability. In this way, each woman can cultivate her way out of the problem of sustainability (in a sense whether she gardens or not) by cultivating an assemblage, a becoming-garden of herself or her community, and by cultivating connections and becomings that are part of interconnecting assemblages. Such an assemblage takes up the two axes of the assemblage, expression and content, linked to the doubling of becoming in the fold. The expressions of the women, the expressions of the gardens, communities and wider communities, and all of their implied contents, and their mutual donations in the processes of passing into each other, all become interleaved.

Sustainability is usually taken to be the political and practical response to the fast approaching limit of life on earth. Yet, in Deleuzean terms, the limit is always an unreachable limit and a threshold (Braidotti, 2006, p. 140), opening onto experimental becomings-other. Becoming-garden is one way of becoming-sustainable that is entangled with permaculture, biodynamics and organic approaches in an ensemble of sustainability. Permaculture is an open-ended system of sustainability as it sees the human species, with all of its cultural and social practices, as needing to work with nature as part of its desiring designs. Suggestions that permaculture is anthropocentric
because it does not see human beings as nature but as culture/designers are blurred by any ethological reading of species and the ways in which they design in and through nature. Organic gardening, by itself, is more limited, more to do with the realisation of the possible and a repetition of traditional methods using natural, not synthetic, inputs. Permaculture has incorporated organic gardening in its methods but provides, through its virtual design – a design that hovers over a surface or a landscape, always in a state of realization – and elements of intensive and extensive creativity that are not found in organic gardening in the same way. Allen proclaims:

‘A permaculture garden is a designed ecology based on natural principles. It looks at gardens as a whole, not just at its parts. It’s not just a collection of plants, but an integrated community within which humans have a sense of place’ (Allen, 2002, p.14)

Allen’s definition of a permaculture garden takes up the garden as a ‘designed ecology’. What is presupposed but not discussed in her assertions is a foundational notion of a garden as a placed, fixed object that is adjacent to a house but it also suggests, as Allen’s entire book confirms, the garden as an assemblage implicating more than the earth, plans and plantings in such a finite space. The event of a garden is localised in a place but an environment or milieu is any-space-whatever, brought into view as a place through the principles of permaculture design. Permaculture gardens exceed foundational notions of gardens as segments of the earth growing plants. Permaculture gardens are milieus of potentialities and their actualisations are predicated on such potentials. The emergence of such gardens is predicated on more than the codes of permaculture and organic gardening.
Allen’s view of permaculture as a designed ecology resonates with the beliefs of most of the women living in Clear Creek Community and to a lesser extent to individuals and micro-communities within Bonville and to Joanne from the Motherhouse. However, the question of a determining design is not necessarily opposed to a permaculture garden as an open system (Protevi, 2001, p.3) that is also self-forming or autopoietic. The design escapes the control of the designer in its realisation because so many of its elements are outside of her control. Along with the particularities of any given site, ‘the actual qualities and extensities, species and parts there are spatio-temporal dynamisms. These are the actualising, differenciating agencies’ (Deleuze, 2004, p. 266). In this way the everyday practices and passions of the women are encoded in permaculture. The affects on bodies and passions of the forces of a garden and its design are made visible in Allen’s description of her design process.²⁷²

‘When I designed our garden seven years ago, I appreciated and imagined less than I do now. Yet, even then, clarifying the design basics helped me get started. I walked around scantily clad at night to feel the cool and warm spots of the garden (not recommended in mid-winter Tasmania). I talked with neighbours about prevailing winds and rainfall patterns, noted the sun’s angles and set out to understand the land in order to work with all of its subtleties. I paid attention to things like frost, wind, pests, the brutal summer sun, rampant weeds, and even, I confess, rampant ego. I fertilised my mind’s garden with Buddhist teachings on patience (2002, p. 70).’

Each permaculture garden design is a virtual differenciation or actualisation (Deleuze 2004, p. 258) and a local solution, which is transformed in the processes of its actualisation as a living structure, or a designed ecology.²⁷³ There are concurrent

²⁷² Jenny Allen (2002, p. 70) in her book, Paradise in Your Garden, offers many blocks of becomings-garden as a spiritual event (and many points of subjectification). For example she says, ‘Here the design basics are the covenant of permaculture. Mollison’s (1988) most important text is his Permaculture: a Designers’ Manual.’ And design is accompanied by an ethics that resonates strongly as Buddhist.

²⁷³ ‘Each differenciation is a local integration or a local solution which then connects with others in the overall solution or the global integration’ (Deleuze, 1994, p. 262). There is ‘the local differenciation of
processes interleaved in the actualisation of the permaculture designs as gardens. In this sense, the field of constitution of the virtual garden is the lot, the block, the farm where the garden emerges.

Through the stories of the women, the event of sustainability, the sense of sustainability becomes a series of doublings of counter-actualisations of sustainability, as ‘indirect discourse’ – ‘the reported utterance within the reported utterance, an order-word within the word’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p.93). Sustainability becomes a sense-event in unknown assemblages – where the processes of subjectivation and becomings-other emerge, as a potential opening to, and their folding, unfolding and refolding of both the earth and the cosmos. The words within the order-word of sustainability are permaculture, sustainability, biodynamics, and organic approaches. The expression of the order-word is also an event of sense: the sense of sustainability that affects the bodies of and in the woman and the house and the garden, which generates incorporeal transformations of women and gardens, transforming subjectivities. All of these processes engender the connections drawn from the in-between of their incarnated relations generating a micropolitics (Deleuze 1995, p. 45) of sustainability, and what I suggest is an element of becomings-garden of women and a becomings-woman of gardens.

Collective ethics are part of the processes of sustainability, which circulate and produce each community, whether permaculture is practised or not. Everything needs to work within the existing topographies, with animal and plant species and with

---

parts, the global formation of an internal milieu, and the solution of a problem posed within the field of constitution of an organism’ (Deleuze, 1994, p. 262- 263).
elements ranging from the boundaries to the designed structures (buildings, roads, and dams) and those elements that are ‘natural’, such as rivers, hills and gullies. As well, there are ‘spatio-temporal dynamisms’ that are ‘the actualising, differentiating agencies’: sun, moon, climate, gardeners, designers, the women in this study, who are themselves ‘proliferations of intensities’, ‘singular qualities’ (Colebrook, 2002b, p. 44-45) implicated in the extensions of the collective becomings-other of ‘women, gardeners and designers’. Mollison’s (1988) work on permaculture is informed by the many fields of science as they have been shaped by chaos theory and complexity theory, as well as Indigenous knowledges and Eastern philosophies. Permaculture is a part of a movement towards sustainability. Becoming-garden suggests much more than the production of food and food security. This is linked to the ways in which the world’s resources are used and their circulation. Food produced close to home in a way that is integrated into the environment as a created, involuted, natural system and circulated close to home reduces the energy costs of food production and distribution. It also increases each community and region’s food security.

Gardens, in particular permaculture and organic gardens are both visible diagrams of sustainability and as dynamic fields of sustainability. They are inseparable from the gardener and become part-subject at the same time as the gardener becomes garden and part-object, dissolving the frozen subject-object dualism and challenging the notion of human being as the dominant subject position and also challenging anthropomorphic renditions of sustainability. Such a view of the relation of garden and gardener, steps outside of any foundational notion of either, and sees them as imbricated in an immanent relation that is a mutual becoming – a becomings-garden of the women and their communities and beyond. The relations of such a becoming
are in the connections, in the in-between: it is not the designer-gardener determining the topography or the natural limits of the environment but rather the reconfiguration of such relations occurring (Deleuze, 1995, p. 45; Massumi, 2002a, 72) in the processes of becoming and which take account of change outside of the negative dialectic where either the designer/gardener is seen as the foundation of a garden or where the topography determines a garden (Massumi, 2002a, p. 68-69).

Further, sustainability as a ‘politics’ that ‘precedes being’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 225) in intentional communities, is imbricated in an involutionary symbiosis with invisible borderlines between Nature and culture. Such a symbiosis and its emergent, more-than-human communities are worlds-in-process, confronting unsustainable worlds and their milieus. Experimental worlds as assemblages offer passage, ‘extracting a territory from the milieus’ of the strata (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 554). Such assemblages, territories and milieus of the three intentional communities are the spatio-temporal dynamisms where sustainability is dramatised and co-composed as an environmental problem. Sustainability becomes a rhizomatic, aleatory series of desiring, and productive connections between bodies. As a concept it reveals a problem that frames bodies (organic, inorganic,) and the composing forces, beyond the human, which generate affective energy, or entropy, and difference (Parr, 2005, pp. 232-233).

Sustainability in process is where relations are not predicated on the common sense of recognition and identities – permaculturists, sustainability and biodynamic

---

274 I would argue that these are the ‘passive syntheses’ the given that is ‘forgotten’ in everyday life. As Colebrook (2001, p. 20) states, ‘The passive syntheses are the very forces of life, the given itself, capable of yielding a history, politics and aesthetics.’
practitioners, organic gardeners – or on the hierarchies and sameness of good sense but rather, on the virtual and on pre-individual singularities and spatio-temporal dynamisms that actualise circumstances and sense-events effecting becomings. The focus of the women’s stories concerning sustainability, permaculture, biodynamics, organic approaches and sustainability are imbricated in common and good sense. While those who practise one code or the other exclusively see their own code as either the common sense or good sense of sustainability, an integrated sustainability takes from all of the codes without constructing a hierarchy. 

Sustainability is a ‘whatever’ of becoming (Braidotti, 2006, p. 148) that implicates the ways we move, and are moved within, and affect, and are affected, by the environment, the milieus of life, such becomings engender new relations, new connections and new becomings in the symbiotic relations of the in-between of nature and culture. Such a symbiosis suggests an encounter with sustainability as a process, as productive relations, rather than any recognition (Deleuze, 2004, p. 176) of sustainability/unsustainability, or shallow/deep sustainability that is embedded in

---

275 Biodynamics uses the energies of the cosmos and the earth itself to govern its cycles as well as the phases of the zodiac, particularly the zodiacal phases of the moon. It is also concerned with the expansion of consciousness. Organic approaches are seen as ‘common sense’ adaptation to nature, following nature’s own remedies for soil and pest problems. Biodynamics is focused on intensifying not only consciousness but intensifying nature, especially in their ‘preparations’ made from composting certain natural elements at specific cosmological moments and in particular ways. Biodynamics is closely connected with the work of Rudolph Steiner and anthroposophy. Permaculture uses some of the methods of biodynamics (the flow form) and permaculturists also often combine the biodynamic preparations as amendments for soil. In all of the forms of sustainability in intentional communities there is a mixture of organic approaches, biodynamics, and permaculture. Biodynamics and permaculture are more totalized systems, yet organic approaches permeate both of those systems and have come to saturate common sense approaches to sustainability in everyday life. Permaculture blurs boundaries, puts aside linear practices of planting and conceptual zones mix and blend into one another; whereas there is some perception that biodynamics can be close to a religion (McFarland Taylor, 2007, p. 203).

276 Shallow sustainability and deep sustainability is a dualism that has been developed in Deep Ecology (Naess 2007) and now permeates much work on sustainability. For instance shallow sustainability is where corporations state a commitment to ‘sustainability’ yet engage in unsustainable practices, such as shipping organic food products across countries or around the globe, or manufacturing organic products from factory farm animals, or producing chocolate from ingredients reliant on the work of children who are slaves. Deep sustainability is seen as questioning the provenance of all goods in the
objects, or signs, such as an intentional community. An encounter with sustainability\(^{277}\) is a sensible event between nature and culture that forces thought and new practices with the potential to transform humans into becomings-other. The cultural separation between culture and nature is undone in becomings-garden, which returns us to the question of just what ‘that by which the given is given’, can be as it is realised in the symbiosis that is the imperceptible becoming of sustainability as a ‘whatever’ becoming.

Becomings-sustainable, as becomings-house-lot-garden-foodforest-farm is an involutionary practice and politics that engenders a ‘plane of composition that is not abstractly preconceived but constructed as work progresses, opening, mixing, dismantling, and reassembling increasingly unlimited compounds in accordance with the penetration of cosmic forces (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p.182). Such imperceptible forces – ‘gravity, heaviness, rotation, the vortex, explosion, expansion, germination, and time’ – are made visible by the ‘percept’ and engender not only the plane of composition but also the ‘compounds of sensation’ in the ‘contrapuntal, polyphonic, plurivocal compounds’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 188) that appear in the stories of the women and are rendered perceptible in their expressions of becomings-garden. Such becomings are not only localised processes but also processes in duration.

\(^{277}\) Such a crisis in sustainability is not simply the result of a generic globalization but of capitalist globalization (Skilair, 2005, pp. 55-64). When Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 106) refer to the universal market in capitalism it is because they see it as the dominant abstract machine, or diagram, and as what is presupposed in the global environmental crisis. In all of its manifestations it is an event of capitalism – an event of the globalizing capitalist market. The micro-ecopolitics, the molecular becomings of sustainability, in intentional communities, challenge what has been ‘realized’ as a by-product of, and in, the universal market of capitalism.
Unknown assemblages of sustainability are actualised out of the virtual, implicated in and drawing on, the abstract machines of sustainability, interleaving assemblages and their varying actualisations. The virtual diagrams of sustainability, of permaculture and environmental sustainability are produced in the actualisations of assemblages. Such diagrams are, in Deleuzean and Guattarian terms:

‘lines of continuous variation, while the concrete assemblage treats variables and organizes their highly diverse relations as a function of those lines. The assemblage negotiates variables at this or that level of variation, according to this or that degree of deterritorialization and which variables will enter into constant relations or obey obligatory rules and which will serve instead as a fluid matter for variation’ (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004, p.111).

The women’s stories express the capture and repetition of the ‘obligatory rules’ and the connections between the ‘fluid matter for variation’ in their realisations of sustainability within the frameworks of permaculture, sustainability, biodynamics, and organic approaches. Yet, even the assumptions of the ‘obligatory rules’, for example of gardens, are framed divergently within their stories of sustainability, mapping the events and the relations between things that engender becomings-other.

Such diversity is enabled in the rhizomatic, or randomly connecting, affective forces of desire that produce bodies open to intuition and not simply the reason of common or good sense. Such intuition complicates and undoes the good and common sense of

---

278 Sustainability is linked to movements and calls for ‘backyard farming’ and has been for many decades. It has been seen as a ‘secular’ movement in need of a reminder of a Creator and Christian joy in creation and stewardship (Wilkinson and Wilkinson, 2001, p. 7). Bonville is a spiritual community, as is the Motherhouse, yet both, in different ways, welcome politics, science and technology into the problem of sustainability. Oddly enough, it is in Clear Creek Community, which is a ‘secular’ community, that the sense of Spinoza’s Deus sive Natura (God or Nature)is strongest; not as a putative pantheism/atheism but in the sense of a single substance of bodies given that we do not know what they can do (Deleuze, 1988c, p. 17).
the presupposed bifurcation between nature and culture, the bifurcation between the forces of life and its control or organisation (Giffney & Hird, 2008, p. 3).

Permaculture: it just made sense – Carla from Clear Creek Community

Yeah, I had a choice to do or not
But it’s difficult not to be influenced by permaculture
Because it’s such a logic way of living
And it makes so much sense.

So of course, for me, I saw the sense of it
And that’s the way how I want to live too.
I had to learn of it when I came here.
Yeah, yeah I applied it to my new block ...
Because it just made sense.

Carla becomes an apprentice of permaculture on her arrival in Clear Creek Community because it just made sense. Here, Carla speaks of permaculture as a very specific, systemic logic of livability. She sees permaculture as the solution to the unspoken problem of sustainability; she presents a break with the common sense of an outside world where the problem of sustainability is one that can be solved with ‘natural solutions’ for capitalism, that is a capitalism based on a sustainable developmental model,\(^\text{279}\) rather than adapting life to ‘immanent ecological

\(^\text{279}\) Natural Capitalism Solutions, for example, is a business system that offers a way into natural capitalism. (Hawkin, Lovins & Lovins, 2013) which attempts a sustainable overall system rather than just having sustainability as one of the elements in the bottom line of a business. Natural Capitalism appeals to a niche market and not to what Deleuze and Guattari (2004, pp. 501-522) call the axiomatic of capitalism, which is presented as capital freed from land and the concomitant machinic enslavement of free workers. Capital in their view always exceeds its limits, for production for the market, for the
knowledges’ (Sullivan, 2010, p. 18) and the good design possible using such knowledges. For Carla, permaculture is the answer for, the pass-word\textsuperscript{280} to, sustainability. Her determination to practise permaculture appears to express ‘good sense’, which in Deleuze’s terms is ‘distributive’ so that Carla moves from ‘the least… to the most differentiated’ (1990, p. 87), that is, from the least differentiated notions of sustainability to the most differentiated, to the microperceptions and actions that make up the event of permaculture for Carla. Living sustainably, for Carla, becomes focused on permaculture as the response to the problem that connects all of the elements of the problem. Her permaculture design integrates the house, garden, zones, sectors, climate, matter, and aesthetics, as a series of instances\textsuperscript{281} of the designed house-lot-garden that is not just wonderful to see but also that makes sense:

\begin{verbatim}
And also it makes sense you know
The way how you face the sun,
The way how you facing the North with building,
And at my place I built a dam in front of the house,
Because it’s just so wonderful to see
But it has also these permaculture advantages of having the sun,
The heat of, the warmth of the sun into the house.
And I plant,
It makes sense,
To have my veggie garden close to the house,
So I’ve done that.

And the trees I’ve planted further away;
The fruit trees a bit closer by.
And I designed the house,
Like in permaculture way because it makes sense.
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{280} There are ‘pass-words beneath order-words’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 204, p. 122).

\textsuperscript{281} Sense is always an effect produced in the series by the instances which traverse them’ (Deleuze, 1990, p. 92).
What makes sense for Carla is a permaculture that functions in a multiplicity of directions, continuously extending and re/producing sustainability in the milieus of her house-garden. The non-sense of a world without permaculture gives so much sense to permaculture: a world without permaculture is a paradoxical world that necessarily produces the need for permaculture (Deleuze, 1990, p. 71). Her house is immediately ‘deframed’ in her story by her garden and her dam because her line of flight out of that other non-sensical world opens her permaculture world onto the garden-cosmos (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, 187).

For Carla, permaculture is an event of sense that draws on the virtuality of ecological knowledges and produces sense. This not only underpins the good of permaculture, so that Carla has no thought but to follow the direction of permaculture even without knowing of it. She claims: even if I wouldn’t know about permaculture I would have done it like this. She moves from an unspoken politics of livability and sustainability to the permaculture design of her house-garden. Carla expresses permaculture as encounter with sense (Fitzgerald & Threadgold, 2004, pp. 410-411) not so much as an encounter with an unfamiliar world but as a flight from the nonsensical familiar. She blends her home and her garden in a permaculture design so that the distinction between them as separate bodies is blurred in their touching (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 178; also cited in Fitzgerald & Threadgold, 2004, p. 410). Her encounter with the sense of permaculture extends into her house and its ‘entire becoming’. Her house opens into the garden becoming part of the forces of the garden: the breezes are captured by the sun facing windows; the passionfruit will protect the house from the

---

282 ‘Nonsense is that which has no sense, and that which, as such and as it enacts the donation of sense, is opposed to the absence of sense. This is what we must understand by nonsense’ (Deleuze, 1990, p. 71).
sun. Carla’s depiction of her house is one of the house as an ‘entire becoming’ of ‘planes’. Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 180) describe this as ‘life, the “the non-organic life of things” where the house, dam, garden, sense and Carla are drawn as planes into a block of becoming appears non-organic. Carla expresses an encounter with sense that offers both the foresighted, good sense of a single direction, that is, the direction of permaculture and common sense, the sense of recognition. Common sense takes diversity and incorporates it with a particular unified form, and becomes a permaculture house-garden foreseeing the future (Deleuze, 1990, p. 75-76). Common sense produces recognition and identity of the self and the “I” (Deleuze, 1990, pp. 77-78) as a permaculture “I”. However, it is a sense that complicates these forms of sense in sense-events that produce not only subjectivities-in-process and a plurality of zigzagging paths but becomings-garden. The extension of the house-garden into an experimental block of becoming is possible because of the phenomenological encounter between all of the elements and their structuring within the sections of the house, the garden and within the frame of permaculture (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, pp. 178-179; Deleuze, 1990, p. 4).

*I like to have a lot of light in the house
So everything is faced north
And I built it also that it’s... heat resistance,
That it’s good insulation of the walls,
I built a straw bale house,
And it is fantastically insulating.

Yeah, well, my bedroom works,
I built the North side of my house,
It’s all glass, so because it’s all glass...
I haven’t gotten to it,
I haven’t gotten to curtains there yet.
So,
And the passionfruit still needs to grow in summer.

I had the roof,
Like sun would come into the house too much,
But now the passionfruit is growing
And next summer wouldn’t be as strong as that.
So I had that heat
But I had all the doors open,
I had windows and I had cross breeze,
So that worked okay and it is quite warm
But it’s not too warm.

Carla has taken up permaculture design principle as a sensible way of living in a difficult climate and as part of living in a permaculture community. Prolonged observation of the natural world always precedes any actual construction work or planting and Carla observes and learns from her surroundings, and she is always ready to adapt. When Carla says *Even if I wouldn’t know about permaculture I would have done it like this* she is folding in the forces of her world, into her house-garden. For her sustainability is expressed through the relationality of her house-garden as an ecosystem or milieu. For Carla, her milieu (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 345) is the ‘block of space-time’ that her house-garden-self express. Her house and garden are her intimate material world, where she folds in the forces or energies of the climate, which her garden and house both act to mitigate. Her movements through her house and garden, and her stories of them keep the chaos of the outside at bay.

The forces that are imbricated in Carla’s becoming-garden and their affects include the thinking of permaculture, with its design principles, its zones and sectors and organic methods. Such forces are expressed by her through the connections of compossible, moving bodies and their intensities, which create permaculture assemblages that incorporate the elements of the northern orientation, the glass, the

---

283 See the definition of the milieu in fn. 3. Here I have used the elements of the milieu to place Carla in her milieu.
sun with its light and heat, the seasons, the straw bales and their low embodied energy, their sustainable production and their fantastic properties of insulation. Climate as a central composing force in the Australian environment is managed in Carla’s story with green technologies that require forethought, observation, and design, as well as continued action. The planting and growing of the passionfruit vine, for example, keeps out the northern summer sun that rides hot and high in the sky and lets the low-arcing, winter sun into her Southern hemisphere home. Her dam works as a moderator of temperature for her home, as a water supply for her garden and as an aesthetic element. The placement of doors and windows allows cross-breezes so that the heat of the day clears away more rapidly.

The interaction, of the outside and the inside of the house-garden, manages the composing forces of climate in a permaculture home. Houses built to suit the climate are more than ‘walls that cut off’ or ‘the window that captures and selects (in direct contact with the territory)’. They are more than the provision of ‘the ground floor that wards off or rarefies (“rarefying the earth’s relief so as to give a free path to human trajectories”) more than ‘the roof that envelopes the place’s singularity’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 187).\(^\text{284}\) A house is more than the composite system of frames, with all of its planes, sections and compounds composed ‘in accordance with the penetration of cosmic forces’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 187-188). A house-garden is an extension of a house and garden interacting with the forces of the world.

\(^\text{284}\) In this section of What is Philosophy?, Deleuze and Guattari (1994, pp. 187-188) are engaging with the work of Bernard Cache and what they call his architecture of the frame.
Carla expresses the relationality of her house and garden in the movement between the design, the planting, the sun, the heat and the glass to create a milieu. The house is connected to, and works with, the elements. The composing forces of the garden, and by extension, cosmic forces, produce the house, its elements and its potential to frame life. The outside folding into the inside and the inside unfolding into the outside together forms an ongoing composition, where the dismantling of the frames produces the in-between, allowing them ‘to relate’ to ‘their intervals rather than to one another and to create new affects’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 187-188).

Carla offers permaculture and its books, its design principles, its zones and its construction as sustainability as sense and as a series of sense-events. Her everyday life is a zoned-becoming-house-lot-garden that folds in permaculture as a social and environmental process and constitutes part of the unknown assemblage of sustainability. The virtual potential of becoming-garden does not cease with the implementation of the design because the implementation of the design has a self-organising dimension that resists stasis. The assemblage of becoming-garden is ‘a lived’ – not a static – form of content.

**Permaculture as an order word – Pearl from Clear Creek**

**Community**
Pearl’s story complicates permaculture as a diagram of designed sustainability, implicating the transformation of her subjectivity and in her becomings-other as other than an individual woman becomings-garden.

*Oh permaculture. Oh yes, that word.*

I’m one of the people
Who would vote to have permaculture taken out of the name of our village....
I try to follow the main tenets,
Which is not using chemicals
And all this sort of stuff.
Really do my best within what I believe permaculture is trying to say
But it still comes down to working the land,
And I have to tell you,
I hate gardening....
I know; I feel really guilty,
We are here and we are supposed to be growing our own food
And becoming sustainable.
I would starve to death if it had to rely on me
And growing my own food.

Pearl experiences permaculture as an order-word. According to Deleuze and Guattari (2004, pp. 118-119) the order-word operates, within language, by going in two directions at once. As an enunciation the order-word drives ‘the condition of possibility of language’ and it also ‘defines the usage of its elements’. The order-word is both a death sentence – either literally or symbolically – and the call to flight at one and the same time (or as Deleuze and Guattari say it is ‘an assemblage’). Permaculture for Pearl expresses death and her response is to flee. Her order-word assemblage: permaculture as gardening on her block with her belief that permaculture will lead to her death becomes an incorporeal transformation.²⁸⁵ Her becomings-

²⁸⁵ Deleuze and Guattari (2004, p. 119) state that the although the transformation is ‘instantaneous’, ‘What preceded and follows it may be an extensive system of actions and passions, a slow labour of bodies; in itself, it is neither action nor passion, but a pure act, a pure transformation that enunciation fuses with the statement the sentence.’ They continue that ‘death is everywhere , as an ideal,
sustainable are shaped by a virtual assemblage of permaculture beyond what Pearl (and some other women in this study) expresses as the realisation of the im/possibility of gardening rather than as a range of potentialities for sustainability actualised in becomings-sustainable that must be more than working the land. Actualisation of the virtual is not reductive and Pearl’s becoming expresses sustainability as more than the possibilities of actively gardening on her block.

Pearl’s response to sustainability as permaculture as gardening is an expression of ambivalence and aversion to the ways it codes her community, yet she tries to follow the ‘main tenets’. Pearl’s paradoxical response employs the spectre of death in conjunction with working the land to grow food. On the one hand, Pearl is a ‘collective singularity’ taken up in a collective assemblage of sustainability in Clear Creek Community where its most common, actualisation is the permaculture garden.

On the other hand, Pearl hates gardening. The response her community to the problematic of sustainability, as ‘a state of the world,’ in environmental crisis, is framed in terms of that word – permaculture.

Actualisation of sustainability as a garden, this garden, that garden, presupposes the virtual (Massumi, 1992, pp.36-37) – in this case, the virtual assemblage of

\[\text{uncrossable boundary separating bodies, their forms, and states, and as the condition, even initiatory, even symbolic, through which a subject must pass in order to change its form or state.} \]
\[\text{Pearl, refuses the order-word of permaculture and flees in place, like a very good Deleuzean nomad.}\]

\[\text{Work on oneself, in as much as one is a collective singularity; construct and in a permanent way re-construct this collectivity in a multivalent liberation project. Not in reference to a directing ideology, but within the articulation of the Real. Perpetually recomposing subjectivity and praxis is only conceivable in the totally free movement of each of its components, and in absolute respects of their own times—time for comprehending or refusing to comprehend, time to be unified or to be autonomous, time of identification or of the most exacerbated differences} \]
\[\text{‘…only an ethico-political articulation – which I call ecosophy – between the three ecological registers (the environment, social relations and human subjectivity) would be likely to clarify [the ecological dangers that confront us]} \]
\[\text{(Guattari, 2000, p. 27).}\]
sustainability as permaculture as gardening in community. In the relations between these terms, the potential ‘whatever’ of becomings-sustainable, outside of the garden, emerges into a garden.\textsuperscript{287} A garden and a woman, in this sense, are multiplicities, intensive virtual assemblages, of becoming-garden, that are immanent. As such, their virtuality is a past-future of the present – a becoming-garden that is, in its actualisation a durational process ‘of genesis and annihilation, of movement across thresholds and toward the limit’ (Massumi, 1992, pp.36-37). Given that the virtual is ‘actualised by a process of creation’ and the ‘possible… realised by limitation’ (Deleuze, 2004, p. 262), the garden of Pearl is limited by what she sees as possible. Her block is, in her view, not conducive to growing a garden. In this sense, there can be no becoming-garden for Pearl:

\begin{quote}
I happened to choose a lot
Where it’s almost impossible to grow anything
Because the animals just think
It’s one big lunchtime feast.
And the minute I grow one lettuce somebody’s eaten it
And it’s not me.
\end{quote}

For Pearl, gardening is an annihilation, a death sentence, an order-word. Paradoxically, her block is a significant part of the becomings-garden of her community: it is a wild-life corridor, a breeding ground and a haven for helpful, predator insects, trees and other plant life act as heat and cold sinks, which mitigate climatic variation and as such are essential to the health of food gardens.\textsuperscript{288}

\textsuperscript{287} The indefinite article is that which does not ‘lack anything’ and ‘expresses the pure determination of intensity, intensive difference. The indefinite article is the conductor of desire’ (Deleuze, 2004, p. 182).

\textsuperscript{288} Food security has become a focus within globalization and the developing, developmental global food regime. Schanbacher (2010) argues for localized food sovereignty as a way to achieve local control and equity in terms of food security. It is a sense of the global environmental crisis and the
For Pearl, sustainability as permaculture makes neither ‘good’ nor ‘common’ sense289. The lack of such sense in the everyday personalised practices of permaculture is difficult for Pearl in that she hates gardening but feels guilt for her inability to embrace permaculture wholeheartedly. Instead of the empowering intervention into permaculture (or perhaps the gaining of a Permaculture Design certificate which qualifies permaculturists to practise permaculture design), Pearl has received an experiential fail. Her attempts to garden have failed. She has been unable to take up the good sense of permaculture as a single direction towards sustainability and normative or common sense actions in her community and in this sense her garden-house fails as a milieu for sustainability. The good sense of permaculture, seen as gardening, which draws on an encyclopaedic version of past knowledges and practices to create a different present and a sustainable future (Mollison, 1988), ‘expresses the demand of an order according to which it is necessary to take up one direction and to hold onto it’ (Deleuze, 1990, p. 75). What emerges from Pearl’s story is that such good sense goes from the most differentiated versions of permaculture as open-ended ecological sustainability, to the least differentiated version, in which permaculture is gardening. Good sense, as direction, orients ‘the arrow of time’ where the most differentiated is that which is the originary systemic past; the least differentiated is the future (as telos), where the present is that in which the past/future are relationally established in the determined present; in this case the present of Pearl’s life in an intentional community where permaculture is the foreseen; the future. The good sense of permaculture is predicated first on a past where the forsaking of traditional agricultural practices, along with the unsustainable

exploitation of resources and the emergence of consumerist capitalism, has produced a global environmental crisis that creates chaos. It is also predicated on a permaculture future where chaos is given a ‘little bit of order’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 201). In this way, permaculture is the expression of the tendency for a particular, designed, form of order in an open, disorderly, sustainable system.

Good sense presupposes distribution and direction (Deleuze, 1990, p. 78). On the one hand, it distributes (a limited) diversity and provides, for example, in terms of sustainability, the past, present and future inexorable directions of the present global environmental crisis with an apocalyptic future forces us, on the other hand, to choose the direction and distribution of an active permaculture, as a sustainable system or ecopolitics. The point that Deleuze is making about good sense, is that it captures the potential of difference by allowing, not only a limited diversity of answers to a problem but obscuring the pre-conditions of a problem. So, instead of working with an individual, like Pearl, for whom permaculture does offer a positive option, we look to sustainability as a capturable object or a static proposition, rather than the processes of the necessary conditions of the future. Through good sense, the singular is transformed into the regular, the remarkable into the ordinary (Deleuze, 1990, p. 76). Pearl refuses the good sense of permaculture; she refuses the transformation into the regular and the ordinary of permaculture in the context of her own community. Good sense is a ‘sedentary distribution’, which presupposes another distribution, in that the problem of an environmental crisis presupposes a prior non-crisis. Also the problem of permaculture presupposes an environmental crisis now and into the future that permaculture can mitigate or ameliorate.
Pearl’s rejection of permaculture is not only a rejection of the direction/s of permaculture, and thus of good sense but, also of the common sense of permaculture. She does not recognise permaculture as gardening as a possible identity (Deleuze, 1990, p. 77). Common sense is complementary to good sense which ‘foresees’ (Deleuze, 1990, p.78) and as such, is able to postulate future states of affairs, given those of the present and the past. Common sense is expressed both subjectively and objectively so that in the former, various elements (such as ‘the soul’ and the ‘differentiated organs of the body’) are taken over and ‘brought to bear upon a unity which is capable of saying “I”’ (Deleuze, 1990, p.78). In the latter, common sense takes over a particular diversity and designates the unity of a specific form of object, or identity, such as permaculture garden or permaculturist. Yet, Pearl only appears to speak herself into an oppositional “I” who hates gardening when she states, I hate gardening from within a common sense that unifies self which says “I” ‘perceives, imagines, remembers, knows….breathes, sleeps, walks and eats…’ (Deleuze, 1990, p.78). Yet, the common sense of Pearl as a subject and the good sense of the distribution and direction of sustainability as permaculture are only possible if her story begins, not with her story, but with the assemblage of bodies and events that constitute becomings-sustainable.

Yet Pearl, who hates gardening, and many of the other women in this research project, who engage in gardening as a valued part of doing sustainability, as either permaculture or organic gardening, are part of ‘a multiplicity of dimensions, of lines and directions at the heart of the assemblage’ where collective assemblages constitute singularities, haecceities, the ‘thisness’ of each woman’s acts and utterances of sustainability constituting the ‘spatio-temporal dynamisms’ of the embryonic or
larval\textsuperscript{290} ‘subject’ (Deleuze, 2004, 267). Such spatio-temporal dynamisms utter speech acts which have performative force presupposing the field of intelligibility (Massumi, 2002, p.9) of sustainability, as well the force of affect is brought to bear on bodies becoming sustainable and the force of the event as it bears on becoming sustainable as becoming garden. Such becomings occur where ‘the planes of transcendent organization and immanent consistence’, do not represent a duality but are part of the whole or ‘the univocity of Being’ (Deleuze & Parnett, 2007, p. 132-33).

Pearl resists elements of the forms of expression of sustainability at the same time as she acknowledges the assemblage of sustainability as they both are constituted in her community as a collective assemblage. Such collective, continuous assemblages are implied through enunciation (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 89), seen as an illocutionary force linked to the molar order-words and the indirect discourses of ‘becoming sustainable”: Pearl resists becoming-garden in its contracted form as gardening. Pearl shows succinctly the paradoxes of sustainability in an intentional community that is concerned with becoming-sustainable at the level of the non-unitary, dynamic (nomadic in Braidotti’s sense) subjects/subjectivations as a force among composing forces ‘capable of various intensities and inter-connections and hence of becomings. These processes are territorially-bound, externally oriented and more than human in span and application’ (Braidotti, 2005-06, para. 19). The stories of the women indicate the autopoiesis of the eco-politics of sustainability in the

\textsuperscript{290} Deleuze uses the term ‘larval subject’ and this resonates with his, and his and Guattari’s, fascination with insects and animals, that is, with ethology in its dictionary definition and in the expanded sense of Deleuze and Guattari. In becomings-garden the species to be taken into account are many. If I think of the women/’subjects’ of my research as the orchids then I am the wasp, if I think of them as predators in their gardens this suggests the many incarnations of women in their becomings. For instance, their becomings-insect when they observe and applaud the work of predators in their gardens, such as ladybirds, as they suck the life out of aphids and protect vulnerable plants.
‘swarm of intensities’ that is, the politics of life (as more than the human), at the same
time as they express the complexity of sustainability as a paradoxical series of sense
and as incorporeal forces. For Pearl permaculture as sustainability as gardening
operates as an order-word that is flown from, for the other women in Clear Creek
community, Bonville community and the Motherhouse permaculture, along with
organic gardening, operates paradoxically as a series of both order-words and
passwords or the potential for capture or lines of flight. The forms of content and
expression of the order-words and passwords and the series of paradoxes that are
engendered in the lives of the women, pass into each other (through folding,
unfolding) as becomings in the interval or the in-between of repetition which is
difference.

**Where is the permaculture – Beth in Clear Creek Community**

*Well my question was,  
‘Where do we go to see the permaculture?’  
People say, ‘Everywhere’.  
‘People have got it on their blocks’  
But it didn’t answer my question.*

Beth is a recent arrival in Clear Creek Community. Her refusal to see permaculture
and to be spoken for in the name of permaculture constructs her as ‘an unrepresented
singularity who does not recognise’ and as somebody who refuses an ‘everybody
knows’ (Deleuze, 2004, p. 63) notion of the signs of permaculture. Her questions
about where permaculture was to be seen is presented, in the answer, as a calling into
question the permaculture nature of the community and as an opposition to or
limitation of, the existence of a visible permaculture in the community, rather than
bringing into view and sense of difference. Beth wants permaculture to exist as a visible diagram of signs and bodies (Sorensen, 2005, p.122). She wants visible, abundant food forests, visible permaculture gardens, visible water systems and visible organisational elements. Her sense of permaculture demands a visibly articulated permaculture of structures. She wants the substances, forms, codes, milieus (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 553) to all shout *permaculture*; Davis Village in California, where there is a long-standing permaculture village with all of the signs of permaculture on show is perhaps her comparator, whereas sustainability as permaculture is also located in the difference between its repetitions. Sustainability is made up of all of the differences inherent in every repetition of what permaculture might be.²⁹¹

Beth’s story, of her initial encounter with permaculture at Clear Creek Community, forgets the social activist and social outreach work that many women permaculturists engage in. The visible structures of self-managing, zoned gardens and food forests, and blocks of land designed to incorporate all of the principles of permaculture are only one facet of permaculture as a state of affairs. Other facets of permaculture that underpin social permaculture include what are called the invisible structures of permaculture. These are the institutions that are necessary for communities to exist, such as cooperatives, banks, land trusts and so on. Visibility is only one of the marks of sustainability. Attention to the invisible structures of permaculture has grown in importance over the last decade. Social permaculture is concerned to apply the principles of permaculture to the invisible structures of ethics, trust, laws, finance. In

²⁹¹ The invisibility of permaculture at Clear Creek Community for Beth concerns the difference between ‘bare’ and clothed or complex repetition. The former is a mechanical repetition of the elements of a permaculture design, the latter is repetition with disguised differences. Both forms of repetition may exist in a situation but hidden differences are more difficult to ascribe an identity or sameness to.
this sense it is about developing, at a grass roots level a politics of livability. Social permaculturists, such as Judith, from Clear Creek Community have pioneered permaculture practices beyond their own gardens, while using the principles of permaculture to develop social relations in connection with ecological ones. They travel internationally and work with developing communities, teaching not only permaculture design courses but also running workshops on human relationships, the legal requirements for setting up communities, the democratic processes and structures needed for communities.292

**Visible permaculture – Janine from Clear Creek**

Janine sees the system of permaculture as not very systematic and in a sense this is an acknowledgement of the multiplicity of the ‘natural’ ecosystems that permaculture is introduced to but also the singularities of her own block where she has difficulty implementing a full permaculture design for her garden.

> Well I have to say that it’s been much harder here to grow veggies  
> Than it was where I have been anywhere else  
> And that’s because of the wild life.  
> That, and I mean, I inherited this house, which didn’t,  
> Hasn’t really got a good spot, close to the house, for growing vegetables.  
> So my veggie garden is, you know, too far away,  
> Which isn’t permaculture,

292 As a collective assemblage or an ‘aggregate formation’ where ‘expression-content formulations have a tendency to drift over time’ (Massumi, 2002b, p. 10), sustainability has experienced such a drift that the expression of the garden or the food forest of permaculture, is now challenged by some of the teachers and practitioners of permaculture at the same time as it has been celebrated by others and further entrenched as a partial solution to sustainability. In terms of organic gardening the system of intensive organic gardening developed in 19th Century France market (Beck & Quigley, nd. para. 1) permitted the production of enough produce for large cities on small areas of land.
You know it 'tisn’t a good design as far that goes
And of course being on my own this,
What people are doing is putting up these great fences,
Up and down to keep the bandicoots out
And you know I just can’t do that.

So I do the best I can.
And you know I do my best
To at least provide myself with better stuff.
But it’s been hard.
The fruit I’ve been,
Done well with.
You know I get lots of,
I get my bananas and pawpaw and citrus and so on.
I’ve done better with fruit here than I have in other places
Because the tropical places are good for fruit.

While Beth was comparing Clear Creek Community to an ideal model of a permaculture community, Janine is comparing her house-lot to an ideal permaculture design. For those entering an intentional community, in contemporary times, the recognition of permaculture allows a critical eye to be cast over what is and is not permaculture. The sense of permaculture as designing sustainable, self-replacing system, with a set of principles and techniques to apply those principles is always dependent on context. What is included and what is excluded from permaculture shifts between every single lot of land or community. The emphasis, within the field of permaculture, shifts according to what works in any given context and with the current politics of sustainability. However, a lot is designed in zones so that the most visited zones, such as a vegetable garden are close by and the least visited, such as a wildlife corridor, is furthest away. Janine is concerned about what she identifies as the visible permaculture that fails on her block. Her house is not perfectly aligned for solar efficiency, her vegetable garden cannot be placed close to her house because of shade trees and there are raider animals who steal her garden produce but she is not
willing to use large fences to exclude them. In the previous chapter, Janine confessed that although she thought ‘man’ took too much from nature, even within a permaculture setting, she was not willing to give up all her comforts. The compromises she is willing to make in her garden form an ethical response to its limits. In the context of her community Janine practices those other invisible forms of permaculture ethics based on care for the earth and care for people, distribution of surplus and limits to population and consumption (Mollison, 1988, p. 2). These ‘ethics’ always differ contextually. Janine’s perception of the limits of permaculture, in her garden and in general, is complicated by what permaculturist do.

There are now many educators, practitioners and adherents working in a variety of milieus, from apartment balconies to broad acre farms. A search of the World Wide Web using a search engine such as Google reveals more than two million hits. Yet there are permaculture gurus. Mollison (1988), for example, offers an encyclopaedic introduction to permaculture as an abstract machine or as potential design systems for a multiplicity of potential permaculture assemblages, from the balconies of flats, to vast areas of modern day farming aggregates, to designed ecovillages villages and suburban backyards. Design systems are virtual, taking into account the potential of the individual designer, and the ecosystemic limitations of any given assemblage, in terms of what can designed even inside the design principles and ethics of permaculture, in a collective assemblage that includes the ‘unknown’ of the territory of the space to be constituted as sustainable. In Clear Creek this means to be permacultured. The design process is a deterritorialising and reterritorialising space in the design processes and a destratifying and marking of place with the whole of community design and the designs produced for the residential lots. Such designs shift
in their execution due to the composing forces that are outside of the control of the designers. Janine’s case, illustrates this when she speaks of the weeds that blow in from the ‘outside’ and trouble the community. Janine’s need to weed over her ‘fence’ shows the leakiness of her block. The weeds, too, are nomadic, traversing any territory within the community and all outside territories. They remind us that self-developing systems slip out of control.

**Every conceivable function – Ranji from Bonville**

Ranji is a lifetime worker in the environment movement. She is the *focal person* for the organising group for sustainability, particularly linked to food production and instrumental in coordinating first of all *the organic farmers*.

*Well in Bonville,*  
*Put in the context of Bonville,*  
*Where we’re trying to fill every conceivable function*  
*In the best possible, sustainable way*  
*With only a handful of people*  
*To kind of provide the main impetus for organisation and direction*  
*Most people have more than one job*  
*And most of us who are very involved in promoting and organising*  
*We spend an enormous amount of time in meetings.* *(Laughs loudly.)*

*It’s pretty diverse the work actually*  
*But since 8 years*  
*I’ve been the focal person for coordinating the Bonville organic farmers*  
*So when I started doing that 8 years ago*  
*There wasn’t anybody really holding together*  
*As we started to do it*  
*We formed a kind of a group of coordinators*  
*And formed a membership of our group*  
*And policy for membership*  
*And guidelines for the organisation.*
Ranji is the *focal person* in Bonville for the organic farmers (and for a lot more), there are other people coordinating other aspects of sustainability work in the community but she is responsible for the organic farmers. The division of labour in Bonville, and the creation of specific organising groups with their endless meetings is a serious business in Bonville. It is the business of attempting to fill every conceivable function in a sustainable way. Ranji desires the organisation and direction of sustainability conceived as affecting every aspect or every function of community life. For her, the realisation of sustainability depends on an overarching group of coordinators, who draw the boundaries of, and around, every *function*. Her group is, in Deleuze and Guattari’s terms an assemblage or desiring machine (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 323), plugged into the *organic farmers’* assemblage. Her coordinating role is one of promoting and organisation but presupposed by the need to survey and control. Such surveillance is non-coercive but functions to produce a group out of a disparate number of farmers in an attempt to promote sustainability among Bonville farmers and in a more general sense to control the elements of sustainability in Bonville. Such committees are structural elements in the expression of community sustainability where the visibility of the farms is what permits their surveillance and control. For as Deleuze states concerning visibilities (1988a, p. 65): ‘as statements are inseparable from regimes, so visibilities are inseparable from machines.’ Visibilities are more than the materiality of the farms and the farmers. In this instance, the farmers are expressed as such through their use of organic farming methods. Their visibility is conjured up as what hits the eye (Deleuze, 1988a, p. 60), which is then taken as an encounter with the materiality of sustainable farming practices.
While Ranji invests her life in sustainability it is on the organisation of it and this event both produces the incorporeal transformation of people into coordinators and organic farmers. Sira is an organic farmer and, for her, Ranji’s work is distant from the day to day struggles of farming in the community.

Not by my timetable – Sira from Bonville

Organic farming and gardening in Bonville is limited by the climate, the site, the soil, water availability and the relations between the poochies, the plants, the gardeners and the forces of the outside. Sira farms and gardens in her desire to bring the land into balance.

You know the earth,
The earth here has been ...
Wrecked,
Basically,
And ...
It will be healed
But not to my timetable
And not very quickly.

Sira speaks of how she came to her current garden with some practical experience and close links with farmers in the Farm Group, who share knowledge and experience.

The work, however, was to be uniquely hers. She desires ‘to not only produce food for the community, but to do so in a way that brought the land into balance and renewed its fertility’. When I met Sira, she was struggling to grow vegetables in a sustainable

---

293 Poochies is a local word that is used generically for an insect pest.
way with raised garden beds. It is clear that organic gardening in situ is only the beginning of any sustainability processes for Sira and for Bonville. Sira’s story, seen as expressing an assemblage, demonstrates range of composing forces that constrain her gardening. For example, the methods of distribution of garden produce are not collective and the issues surrounding freedom of choice mean that many people refuse to eat what can be grown in the community and buy in food produced unsustainably. This might mean long food miles or food grown with unsafe chemicals and often both of these things. Economic exchange is complicated in Bonville as there is a local currency – something that many intentional communities experiment with as a way of stepping outside of the capitalist ‘system’ – yet organic farmers still need to engage with the outside and its currency. As well, in this initial period of her garden’s development Sira lived as a lone woman on her farm and was under siege.

In effect, sustainability as organic gardening begs the question of the forces composing sustainability. First, at the level of the two abstract machines of capitalism and community, the reactive forces of consumerism have captured the emerging middle class of India and the inhabitants of Bonville. In Bonville, the difficulties of sustainable food production have been taken up by its farming group, of which Sira is a member, and they have embarked on a campaign to ‘badge’ organic produce from Bonville. There been a move towards acknowledging what grows as healthy produce, given the climate and other constraints.

Raised garden beds are considered important in tropical gardening where the growing season can be short and water is one of the most difficult of all elements to control. Raised beds stop the beds from flooding in torrential rain, mulching them prevents moisture evaporating, and any watering and fertilizing system can be very specifically targeted.
Sira story expresses a complex relation with her community, her garden, and her own capacities to garden, given the exigencies of climate and the state of the earth. For her, the desire to heal the earth and to produce food for her community with consciousness and energy exists alongside her understanding of the issues of the environmental global crisis and drives her desire to take up alternative technology and to make a difference through her actions: through her becoming-garden. In opposition to such desires are the practical and political issues with the local villagers, (of fences, thieving), along with the difficulties of the climate, and the growing consumerist orientation of her community.

Climate is an effect beyond temperatures. Sira speaks of hurricanes that destroy sections of her garden and her plants. The force of storms brings the rain into her capsule, which, like many other simple homes in Bonville, is open to the elements and human forces in the guise of thieves. These events all affect her life.

Over a period of time, Sira developed a desire to work with the earth, to garden organically. Her engagement with the earth, in this sense becomes a realisation of those possibilities. Her desire to connect to the energies of the earth through organic gardening is a sensory becoming. Sira spent time in several micro-communities in the

---

295 A capsule is a small hut that has sometimes has a floor of palm tied together and attached to the frame, or a concrete floor, and often concrete half walls with a keet palm roof held up by large granite pillars and a framework of Casuarina timber. There are no windows but may be concrete decorative panels that let the light in or wooden shutters that are held up during the day. Sira’s capsule had been dismantled and brought into her new community from her previous community within Bonville. Such dwellings are considered important in living lightly on the earth, in terms of sustainable housing. The open air design means that they are often cooler than enclosed houses. Houses which have walls, windows, doors, plumbing and tiled roofs are called pukka houses. Sira had some pukka building made to house her computer and other items that needed to be held securely. She also built such a room for her youngest daughter and her daughter’s computer. The doors are decorative metal, somewhat like wrought iron, rather than solid doors.
Bonville community and, as she says initially, she tried to begin organic farming in the wrong micro-community within her community. There was opposition in the first community that she helped ‘pioneer’ to the keeping of animals, especially cows, to provide the manure as fertiliser for organic gardening. This opposition was a sad, limitative force, the pessimal limit that inhibited Sira’s attempt to become-garden in that community within the larger community and to further the becoming-garden of the whole community. The way into organic gardening for Sira was long, complex and singular. She began gardening organically for herself, her family and her immediate micro-community and realised her desire to work with the earth – a desire to farm organically – but she found instead that she wanted to grow vegetables for Bonville; for the whole of the community, bringing a certain level of awareness and love to the work that she does. She sees her garden as a place of special energies coming from both the earth and loving creation.

For Sira, the acts of healing the earth and bringing it back into balance are predicated on what Colebrook (2005, p. 10) calls ‘powers to’ actualise what Sira sees is the only way to produce more food, yet, organic gardening and farming in Bonville is also limited by the counter-actualising ‘powers to’ of the forces of the climate, the site, the soil, water availability and the relations between the poochies and the plants, the gardeners and the outside. The composition of these forces actualises the event of Sira’s garden as an assemblage of all of its elements and also produces the moments of awareness and love that counter-actualise it into the multiple event of her becomings-garden (Deleuze, 1990, p. 161; also cited in Colebrook, 2005a, p. 11).
Sira is under siege not only from poochies – that have no one to represent them in a garden situation\textsuperscript{296} – but also the neighbouring villagers, who are often careless or hostile, in their approaches to her, and her garden. Timber trucks knock down her fences and all she gets is a shrug; goods and tools are stolen from her, her land is used as a thoroughfare. The water line is cut and an argument ensues\textsuperscript{297}

\begin{quote}
Oh I’ve had loads of stuff stolen
And just this whole thing of really feeling besieged all the time ...
(Someone) said “Can’t you find another word for ‘siege’
You use it rather a lot, and ‘insecure’.”
But I mean, that’s how I feel.
It’s how I feel.
\end{quote}

In terms of Bonville itself, she faces the problem that she names the ‘no one wants what I can grow issue’. Other communities deal with this problem by not having so much choice and this was so in Bonville in the early days, when the reality was eat what was produced or starve. Now ‘market forces’ are a factor there making being financially self-sufficient with the community much more difficult.

Sira’s concern with financial sustainability, as a farmer/vegetable grower in Bonville, is based on the high cost of production and although her community sets the prices for vegetables, it is difficult to cover the costs and to find regular customers. She overcomes some of these difficulties by using a mixed-bag scheme where she sells her

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{296} I am alluding here to Latour and work on the political representation of those and that which cannot speak, which he sees as necessary until we learn the ways to understand them and they can speak for themselves. See his article ‘Will Non-Humans be Saved? An argument in ecotheology’ (2009)
\textsuperscript{297} Australian eucalypts and casuarinas, along with cashew trees have been planted as cash crops in this and many other areas of India. These cash crops have been encouraged by the Indian government but because they leach the goodness out of the soil – eucalypts in particular are allopathic – it has meant a further decrease in the fertility of the soil. It has also meant that local villagers grow less food crops for immediate consumption and instead rely on purchasing food that they used to grow. Sira’s garden is not only on land where cash crops have stripped the soil of its goodness but there has also been a long history of using DDT on the poochies prior to Bonville’s acquisition of the land.
\end{flushright}
organic produce in set-priced, mixed-bags – no matter what amount of each specific vegetable – to people who appreciate the qualities of her vegetables that comes from their being grown with awareness and love. For her, this practice intensifies the energy.

I sell it in these mixed bags to individuals
Who want organic vegetables
And that turned out to be really nice,
You know because I sort of pick it and when I pick it
I know it’s going to an individual
And that’s really nice actually,
I really like that.

The paradox of Sira’s sense of sustainability is that she grows with love and awareness but has to set a fixed price on it because of the need to be financially viable. Along with other micro communities in Bonville, Sira relies on outside volunteer labour. Students come from other countries for internships and education in organic gardening and permaculture and there are all kinds of travelers and backpackers who work for their keep.

**Design and Fabulations of becomings-garden**

Design, virtual design and its actualisations taken together constitute an event that is interactive and relational with the actual environment that is subtended by the virtual potential of any design that may be created. In this sense, the actual is not a resemblance of the virtual but an actualisation of potential in a creative, differenciated
relationship. As such, it is distinguished from the process that takes the possible to the real. The design/designer, as the ‘bearer’ of the order-word of permaculture may attempt to proceed from the possible and come up against the limitations of the realisation of the design. The design/designer, as the bearer of the password subtending the order-word of sustainability, may engage in a line of flight and create a form of sustainability. On the one hand, it is possible to design a functional/molar permaculture garden, using scientific and social frameworks connected into design principles provided by permaculture texts and design courses and to overlay a design over specific areas of land. On the other hand, an experimental/molecular version of permaculture may produce a self-organising garden. In this sense, the design/er is an assemblage, a multiplicity that converges with other assemblages and understands the notion that an open ecological system needs to be self-forming to be sustainable (Protevi, 2001, p.3).

At Clear Creek Community, for example, the areas of land designed by lot owners are around an acre. The intensive qualities of every block, its topography, aspect, and flows, are taken up within codes and actions that engender sustainable milieus connecting into a territory. Here, gardens with intensive differences become extensities of the collective, desired sustainability of the community. A permaculture design with set, repeated features is created anew in each actualisation of the design elements in each lot. These intensifications are multiplied into extensions of the elements of a collective, rolling permaculture, subtended by a highly pragmatic ethics of care, which are enacted in Clear Creek.
Bonville, in contrast to Clear Creek Community and the Motherhouse, has a master plan for the whole of its community. It is based on circles, beginning with the sacred site in the centre and radiating out. It was devised by architects in consultation with the woman guru and includes residential, commercial, manufacturing and farming zones that are all ringed by the forest zone. Within these areas there are new developments in technology being implemented, such as new building technologies and designs, and new green technologies. The Motherhouse began as a working farm and although there have been attempts to redesign the farm plan and to retrofit its buildings the energy required to reinvent a sustainable community modelled on an ecovillage is yet to take hold. What the Motherhouse does have is an outward focus on environmental and social justice politics, which leads them to create coalitions with groups who use their facilities, thus keeping the community alive.

Each community frames a different micropolitics of sustainability. They reclaim the land, work the land organically, without synthetic chemicals, mulch to retain the topsoil, manage moisture, and build humus in the soil, and compost and using organic amendments to build soil fertility. Designing gardens are core actions and components of the repetitions of gardens in each of the three communities. The singularity of every garden component, zone, or section, is part of a becomings-other of the garden connected to every woman in these expressions of their garden milieus. Their becomings-garden, resonate with the in-between, or milieus, of repetition. Women move between the elements of a gardening assemblage. Such an in-between is a made up of milieus, which express the various dynamic assemblages of sustainability as virtual potential and its multiplicities of actualisations, where territories are marked as gardens.
A garden is a realisation of design and style and also an actualisation of the forces of variation endemic to a garden, such as: aspect, slope, soil, climate, weather, weeds, pests, longitude and latitude. These elements and a gardener are their actual conditions along with the conditions of a garden as a lot, plot, block, or a farm: a fenced, captured and contained area of land ranging in size from many hectares to window box. Such elements allegedly presuppose all possible variations of a garden and its organisation. However, because such zones are also conceptual, they suggest the potential, or the virtual that always exceeds what is actualised. The actualisations of a garden include fences that demarcate the area of the garden; the fences indicate boundaries and dynamic edges. Fences often indicate private property. As a marker of private property, the fence is an intuition of the virtual and a real system of production. As an edge, the fence creates a multifunctional edge effect, where two worlds overlap. The overlap can increase productivity, which happens in some natural ecologies, where there is an increase in diversity in what becomes a mixed milieu. Here, the edge acts as a transition zone for a range of species and activities such as trade (Mollison, 1988, pp.79-80). Or, in communities such as Bonville, the edge can become a series of violently contested border worlds and a direct challenge to a politics of livability. Movement in the garden is supposedly confined within its boundaries. However, the boundaries of a garden are leaky and movement is often chaotic and unpredictable, producing violent cartographies – and such cartographies extend beyond human worlds.

The movement of a garden includes uncontrolled and the uncontrollable: the blowing of seeds, the movement of insects, birds, animals and people as well as elemental
forces into and out of a garden. The literal permeability of gardens suggests that the
conventions and styles of design are pulled toward the wild: that ‘nature’ escapes
control. The fence is a physical limit of the garden and also a productive edge, whilst
the zone is a plastic, conceptual limit. The movements in a garden differ according to
both the zone within which the movement occurs and the success of the fence in
inhibiting movement of elements seen as unwanted in the garden. Permaculturists
recommend zigzagging fences.

For Sira, fences are vital to prevent the free access of villagers through her garden but
they do not stop *poochies* or hurricanes. She has experienced considerable conflict
over the way that her newly erected fence blocked a traditional right of way. Although
Bonville owns the land, the path through it had been forged by customary use over a
long period of time. The reality of legal ownership is thus placed in conflict with the
possibility of continued customary usage, because continued movement through time
and space is forestalled (Parr, 2005, pp. 9-10).

A garden as an assemblage of bodies is defined by its potential for movement and
rest: movement which is symbiotic, germinal, and fecund. The potential of a garden is
virtual rather than simply a state of things. Components of a garden such as beds,
paths, and watering systems direct and induce the action that occurs in the garden and
are connective gears or cogs in a machinic, desiring assemblage (Deleuze & Guattari,
1986, pp. 81-82). An optimal range of movements can lead to a successful and
sustainable gardening, growing and harvesting of food for all of the species that need
it. As a cultivated, designed ecosystems, a garden has multiple, connecting
components such as garden beds, plants, paths, seats for rest and contemplations,
structures for shade, shelter, storage and propagation, compost and mulch heaps. All of these elements induce certain movements and actions such, as mulching, digging, planting, watering, composting and manuring and these are filled with the potential for change and variation. Even though it seems counterintuitive, in the face of an actual garden, the action in the garden is ‘groundless and limitless, taking place above the ground-limit and between’: it is a ‘field of potential’ (Massumi, 2002a, p. 72).

The potential of a permaculture, or organic garden, is not simply food, but a connection of energies from a myriad of bodies and their movements and rests. A garden is both a concept and a percept and an affect: it is both philosophy (of the territory) and art, as the framing and deframing of a garden-house articulation. When Sira says that her produce is special, she means by ‘special’ its energy created out of awareness and love. Sira’s statement is not a personal statement about gardens but a spiritual, collective one that is connected to an assemblage where self-sufficiency (as well as amenity and aesthetics) is folded into spirituality. No garden is containable within its limits of the block or plot and the fence; it constitutes, not just a limit, but also a threshold. For the poochies, a garden is both a stationary and moving feast; they are part of the war machine that nature operates in a garden. For, when the soil is not healthy enough, plants are not strong enough to fight off pest attack. Humans then tend to rush in to save ‘their’ produce and forget to wait for predator insects or birds – which are always a step behind the poochies – to emerge. Sira engages fully in the battle against poochies. Pearl is defeated by the something that eats what she grows. Joanne knows that the soil presupposes the health of the garden, allowing the plants to defend themselves and be strong enough to wait for the reinforcements of natural predators.
A synopsis of the ‘Farm Manager’s Report’

For Joanne, from the Motherhouse, the forces of history, climate, soil, contemporary ecopolitics, feminism as ecofeminism, Roman Catholicism and spirituality are all been composing forces in her work as the farm manager for the Motherhouse. The shift from an industrial or factory model of farming, which focused on inputs and outputs, has evolved into a system where the inputs come from the farm as much as is possible and the outputs circumvent the middle person of commerce.

For the Motherhouse, folding, unfolding and refolding of the outside into the community-garden-farm assemblage takes the form of the Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) program and as such, the goal of the garden is to feed many families from an extended form of backyard horticulture. Joanne, as the farm manager, who runs the Motherhouse CSA program, sees the turning of some of their pastureland into an ecovillage with a permaculture basis as a way of making the land more productive without taking cropland out of production. There is a strong sense that permaculture is a more productive, more diversified ecosystem that creates a greening and cooling the earth, one garden backyard at a time, or one farm at a time and in this way intensifies sustainability.
Changes affecting the Composing forces of Sustainability –

Concluding thoughts

The relation between a woman and permaculture or organic gardening (as a machinic assemblage) is a singular event, an haecceity. It is an event that, in the singular processes of actualising, produces subjectivation. The emergence of being as perpetual becoming proceeds both from events and from haecceities or singularities. The question of becoming is thoroughly complicated by the singularity or haecceities of sustainability as virtual potential and its multiplicitous actualisation, in each woman’s life, given her singularity and her singular context as event. Implicated in each woman’s story is the form of her response to the ‘ideas, events, intensities’ of sustainability as ‘these bridge of repetitions’ (Piercey, 1996, p. 3) that become incarnated in sustainability as expressions of sustainability, permaculture and organic approaches.

Each woman’s body has been struck by the force of expression (Massumi, 2002b, p.7) of sustainability, by the pass-words and order-words of permaculture or of biodynamics or organic gardening but she has not been made or reproduced as those forms of sustainability in her everyday life. At the level of the mundane, a woman gardens or does not garden. Her central view of a sustainable subject as a composed form is always more than that of a gardener. Her expressions of becoming sustainable is not simply becomings-garden, but part of the whole community as a garden as an event. The event of sustainability, the sense that the women make of it and the way that their lives and their communities bring sustainability into view are all implicate the ways that: ‘Emergence, mutation, change affect composing forces, not composed
forms’ (Deleuze, 1988, p. 87), where the ‘irreducible outside’ relates to composing forces.

Sustainability as permaculture is a concept and as such connected to a problem. As Deleuze and Guattari state: ‘All concepts are connected to problems without which they would have no meaning and which can themselves only be isolated or understood as their solution emerges’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 16). The problems of sustainability as permaculture are centred on the global ecological crisis that is to be countered with an intense and extensive local action that incorporates every facet of life. Permaculture provides an ethics of life in which care for the world, care for people and distribution of surplus, along with population control are seen as the preconditions for a sustainable social and natural ecology. Permaculture also encompasses a set of discourses, a series of statements, practices and actions that are defined as ‘doing permaculture’. The concept of sustainability as permaculture is expressed in the event of sustainability as permaculture and the concept of sustainability as organic gardening is expressed in the event of sustainability as organic gardening. Such events are aptly construed as an haecceity by Grosz (2005, p. 159) when she claims that haecceities, ‘do not form systems but induce intensities, do not cohere to form patterns but function as modes of affection, and as speeds of variation.’ The modes of affection that each woman presents are those of an event within an event. She sees herself as affected by the processes and practices of

---

298 There is almost a sense of intense calibration of local actions. Part of the focus on the local is intended to undo the reliance on global trade, which is seen as a gross waste of resources and labour as well as a stripping away of local knowledges and capacities for self-reliance.

299 Here it is the Spinozist affect/affection that is used by Deleuze and Guattari (2004, p. xvii) as l’affect ‘an ability to affect and be affected. It is a prepersonal intensity corresponding to the passage from one state of the body to another and implying an augmentation or diminution in that body’s capacity to act. L’affection … is each such state considered as an encounter between the affected body and a second, affecting, body (with body taken in its broadest possible sense to include “mental” or ideal bodies).’
permaculture that she encounters in her daily life; she is affected by what she sees as the impossibility of acquiescence, complicity and composibility. The intensities that are induced are magnitudes of forces and potential differences without which bodies would remain empty. They would be unaffected by the flows of sustainability in its various guises, including permaculture and by the elements of its passage (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 174), through each woman’s life and each community, through the collective assemblage.

The zones of permaculture and organic gardening become fuzzy lines in their actualisations. There is a movement between zones and a blurring of lines, such that it is not always easy to tell the house from the garden and within which everything gardens. The very beds of the garden are guilds, which are beneficial mixtures of plants, rather than the monocultural, marching linear rows of the same plant. The movements between the zones of the garden concern, not just the intensification of the production and consumption of food, but also the intensification of the habitats of a myriad of species, their procreation and aggression are all desiring forces constituting a garden. Supposedly, food is the product of the movements and rests of the bodies of a garden as a collective assemblage, yet in intentional communities a garden produces sustainability.

300 This is also what the Green Sisters in the United States of America call pluraculture – that intermixing of species that grow symbiotically together. They also use this in the sense of their ecumenical spirituality (Gottleib, 2004, p. 620: McFarland Taylor, 2007, p. 206). Such a sense of sustainable culture dovetails with permaculture and is a way of incorporating all of the elements of permaculture and more but remaining separate form formal permaculture affiliations.

301 Just after Deleuze and Guattari (2004, pp.74-75) discuss Foucault’s analysis of the prison which in some ways informs my discussion of a garden, the state that “Signs are not signs of a thing: they are signs of deterritorialization and reterritorialization.’ So a garden, a prison is a sign of the territory and the movements within and without that territory. The prison is a thing, form, the garden is a thing, form, a form of ‘content on a stratum and… related to other forms of content.’ However the prison and the garden ‘do not refer back to the word “prison”’ or garden ‘but to entirely different words and concepts, such as “delinquency” and “delinquent,”’ sustainability, environmentalist, ‘which express a new way of classifying, stating, translating, and even committing criminal acts.’ Or acts of sustainability. “Delinquency” is the form of expression in a reciprocal presupposition with the form of content “prison”. So in this sense sustainability is the form of expression in a reciprocal presupposition with the form of the content garden.
compost, soil, water, plants, are living matter arrayed in an orderly chaos that presupposes a good harvest intermingled with the forces of climate, insects and disease that may, or may not, destroy the harvest. The collective tending of the beds of vegetables even if it is done with awareness and love may be to no avail. As Pearl says we are supposed to grow our own food, we are supposed to be sustainable.

Taking food is the desiring force of a garden, rather than sustainability as an ecology of relations is a paradox that exists to varying degrees for each woman within each community. For Pearl, the personalised production of our own food – as permaculture, as sustainability, and permaculture’s impossibility – is paramount. Yet, for other women in her community – Janine, for example – the limitations of their blocks, or the demands of their work outside of the community, mean that they put their energies elsewhere, without guilt.

For Louise, permaculture appears as the retrospective basis of her previous gardening activities. It was only at Clear Creek Community that this style of gardening was named, codified and framed for her as permaculture. Yet, becomings-garden is more than realising the possibilities grounded in a prior sense of gardening. It also incorporates a collective assemblage that includes collective individuations, which effectuate and expose catalysing points and counterpoints in becomings-garden. There can be no becomings-garden or sense of ‘everything gardens’ without the notion of the fold. Deleuze’s interpretation of the Leibnizian fold, as variable, curvilinear shapes and forms (a deformational topology) such that a world is folded in a garden making it a monad (Kafala, 2002, paras 1 and 23). In this way, the assemblage of the garden frames becomings and subjectivities, as it enfolders anything expressive of the
gardener and the garden. If ‘everything gardens’ then the symbiotic expression of
gardening transforms a garden from a simple function, such as feeding its inhabitants,
or giving pleasure to its inhabitants, to producing sensory qualities.302

In Sira’s story, the desire to produce food consistently to achieve income and food
security is common sense in Bonville, while doing it sustainably is good sense.
Becoming-sustainable as gardening (or small acre farming) is accompanied by the
introduction of solar pumps, drip irrigation and in some cases, the conversion of waste
products into biogas for cooking. Yet, Sira is unusual in that she prefers not to use
paid village labour but do the work herself, with volunteers and interns. For most
Bonvillians, food production relies on such village labour, so even when it is their
garden, or their farm, they are the stewards, rather than the gardeners. There is no
sense of guilt anywhere in Bonville about not having an intimate relationship with the
earth and gardening. Such work is seen personal or vocational; only one of many
ways to manifest what is to come. Rather than food as a functional outcome of a
garden, a garden constructed as an expression of permaculture, biodynamics,
sustainability, love and awareness. Sira is not gardening as a function of food but as
an art that joins her poetry and other artwork.

302 Such a production of sensory qualities: ‘It is an outpouring of features, colors and sounds that are
inseparable insofar as they become expressive (philosophical concept of territory).’ ‘Every morning the
Scenopoeta dentirostris, a bird of the Australian rain forests, cuts leaves, makes them fall to the
ground, and turns them over so that the paler, internal side contrasts with the earth. In this way it
constructs a stage for itself like a ready-made; and directly above, on a creeper or a branch, while
fluffing out the feathers under its beak to reveal their yellow roots, it sings a complex song made up
from its own notes and, at intervals, those of other birds that it imitates: it is a complete artist’ (Deleuze
& Guattari, 1994, p. 184).
The women and the gardens pass into each other. Sira double digs a bed and raises it in the organic way. The bed has poor soil and fertility from past abuse; the bed sulks and refuses to enfold the seeds or seedlings and be the genesis of healthy vegetables. Sometimes the double-dug beds are composted, mulched and rich in fertility and produce vegetables in abundance but there are not enough birds and beneficial, predator insects to war against the *poochies*. The surrounding area has been poisoned with pesticides and herbicides for many decades and the balance of life has been interrupted. Sira anguishes over the question of balance in her garden, in her life and in the wider environment. Her becoming-garden is fraught with the difficulties produced in a self-organising system where breakdowns in environmental health have occurred and are still occurring. Sira becomes-garden: the garden folds into her and she moves through the garden. The garden is in her, Sira is subjectivated in the folding in of the outside. The garden consumes much of her time. She passes into the garden early each morning, she digs, weeds, plants, pours cow urine on the beds. Makes compost with waste from the garden and cow dung, plants seeds and pots up seedlings in her greenhouse. Sira also speaks of her continuous contemplation of the garden. She lives the garden’s fortunes on a daily basis, in the sense that it occupies her imagination and takes up her energy.

For Pearl, at Clear Creek, it is as much that the outside as the forces of the land, animals, the climate and the trees, which enfold Pearl in her failed attempts to become-garden, which have constituted a becoming-garden that is not a garden that is
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303 Endosulfan is still a chemical that is widely used to spray cashew crops by the local cashew farmers who live in the edges of the Bonville wider community even though it was banned in a neighbouring state, Kerala in 2001 because of its links with birth deformities and other health problems. Many locals in the surrounding villages and Bonvillians are made ill every year when the spraying occurs. Rose is one of the women who actively campaign against the continued use of such chemicals because it affects her health.
productive of food. Pearl’s garden could be seen as a wild garden. Or, in permaculture terms, a garden that functions for the wider community as an outer zone such as zone four which is partially managed, as are parts of Pearl’s garden, or zone five, which is ‘an unmanaged or barely managed wild zone’ where ‘we observe and learn’ (Mollison, 1994, p.11). Pearl’s garden, along with the gardens of each of the women, in this sense, does not stand alone, outside, but as a fold of the community.\textsuperscript{304}

Joanne, who is the farm manager for the Mother House, speaks of having to rest their farm land after many years of conventional farming that included regular applications of synthetic chemicals such as fertilisers, pesticides and herbicides. The land did not maintain fertility when organic farming was introduced nor recover fertility quickly once the fields were rested. Much of the land is no longer farmed. The certified organic vegetable gardens are extensive and have been gardened organically for many years, but there are still waves of problems (bugs, disease) through specific beds and in specific vegetables. Becoming-garden for Joanne includes the becoming garden of participants in the Community Supported Agriculture program (CSA) that the Mother House participates in. This program includes up to one hundred and fifty families, who all pay a small amount of money to share the produce of the organic gardens and the risks of producing organic vegetables and fruit at the Motherhouse; they either pay more or give time to the work that is needed to keep the garden going. Each

\textsuperscript{304} Deleuze claims that ‘I do not encounter myself on the outside. I find the other in me.’ This is ‘an interiorizing of the outside’ and not a ‘reproduction of the Same’ rather it is a ‘repetition of the Different…. It is never the other who is a double in the doubling process, it is a self that lives me as the double of the other doubling’ (Deleuze, 1988, p.98). This is a folding, a becoming, where the transformation occurs in the encounter which may be an enfolding, unfolding, folding. The ‘repetition of the Different’ is what is experienced, constitutively, when each woman encounters the forces of sustainability as gardening as an assemblage (as expression as a ‘semiotic system’, a ‘regime of signs’ and as content as a ‘pragmatic system’, as ‘actions and passions’) (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p.555). Becoming is folded in the assemblage of the woman-garden as becoming-garden.
participant in the CSA program receives a box of vegetables each week of the
growing season. They are part of Joanne’s becoming-garden and the becoming garden
of the community, at the same time as each participant has their own becoming-
garden through their participation in the CSA scheme and their ingestion of the
contents of their food boxes grown in the gardens at the Motherhouse.

Becoming-other, in this case becomings-garden, draws on a notion of being that is
beyond the contraction of human being. Becoming in this sense avoids the capture of
representation. That is women do not become garden represented by designing and
building gardens but express their becoming in the design and building of gardens as a
materialisation of the virtual as becoming-garden, which implicates the assemblage of
the garden as a becoming. Such a becoming incorporates the literal garden as the field
of the assemblage. The women’s becoming is becoming-garden as a response to a
problem, the quotidian, micropolitical problem of sustainability.

For many of the women, the force of and affects of, the collective assemblage of
‘whatever’ experimental sustainability creates new assemblages of desire that vary in
the ways that ‘human, animal and thing’ are assembled (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004,
p.440), such new assemblages create, in turn, new forms of expression and make
sustainability visible in new ways. The forces for a sustainable life in each
community focus on the ethico-politics of design. Study of the tenets of permaculture,
as a design system for maximal sustainable use of local environments, requires a
thoughtful observation of landscape and care about the effects of relationships
between patterns and functions on species assemblages and the earth. Connections
between elements and the synergistic use of energy within designs implicate the care
for ‘human, animal and thing’ assemblage in any implementation of a permaculture
design. However, sustainability as a virtual abstract machine is actualised in the struggles of becoming-sustainable beyond permaculture, as I have shown in the stories of the women from Bonville and the Motherhouse. For those communities, sustainability encompasses many different forms of becoming-sustainable.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

Intentional communities and ‘the proliferation of possible worlds’

Intentional communities are part of ‘the proliferation of possible worlds’ we make love with (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 293). The women inhabitants of such worlds make love with them and so, too, do the researchers of such worlds, becoming mutual and multiple points of collective subjectification. Such love is not a romantic or courtly love but a political, passional love, sometimes full of the twists and turns of possessive or torrid affairs, about issues and interests, about the landscapes of not only the face of the lover but the landscapes of the worlds themselves. Sometimes, of course, it is a quiet, steady love or even a cool, analytical love but it is always love and always focused on the present in the name of the future. Such love is immanent and made visible in the stories of the women, as sonorous movements in time (Lingis, 305)

305 The case of the proliferating possible worlds is a central problem on the radical, political agenda, hence – ‘the proliferation of possible worlds’ (Alliez, 2006, p. 166) and my obsession with those worlds.
2004, p. 282), as a multiplicity of voices, (Olkowski, 1999, p. 29) or as spatio-temporal events.

I stated in the introduction to this thesis that my project began in the middle of the becomings-other of intentional communities. I see such communities as folding in whatever outside exists in the context of each community. I have tried to give a flavour of those communities without the detailed descriptions that would reveal their identities. I want to conclude my thesis by stating again that this in only the middle and that the forces of the outside, made visible in the actualising and counter-actualising in the fabulations of the women about themselves and their communities now present an even more urgent world situation than when I began.

Intentional communities implicate a multiplicity of interleaving bodies, always beyond the human – organic, inorganic, and anorganic – always in the unending act of turning away from, or deterritorialising, mainstream formations as part of a politics of soft subversion. Turning away is driven by an often urgent desire to create new liveable worlds and provides the impetus for an ongoing reterritorialising in an elsewhere outside of the mainstream. The need to experiment with spirituality and sustainability in new worlds – in what are always leaky territorial assemblages always in the middle of expression – and the desire to create not just a new home but also a future drives the production of intentional communities.

Intentional communities are ‘an expression of a potential that pre-exists the actual’ community, woman or thing and this thesis expresses the ways that such elements become ‘as a potentiality that is brought into being only as it acts or exists’
(Colebrook, 2005a, p. 8). The act of encountering and witnessing such acts of becoming or actualisations of existence of potentiality, demands a micropolitics: I provide this through a storying or fabulation of women caught in the middle of a series of ecologies of relations. The social, material and semiotic flows of such ecologies are driven by expressions of interests in the future, not as a utopia, but rather as an experimental life.

Intentional communities are a flight from the logics of late capitalism; they are a flight from the seemingly intractable, yet dynamic and problematic issues of race, class, gender, sexuality, species and the environment but an experimental flight bent on acting otherwise. Intentional communities are produced out of events and plunge us into worlds of problems and political ‘issues of concern’, which bring ‘us’ together (Latour, 2007, p. 815) as potentiality. They transform the pragmatics of life by experimenting with the sense-events of community, spirituality and sustainability. Intentional communities become micro experiments producing possible solutions. The solutions are never certain but always concern the potentiality for association between what is taken to be the personal, the natural, the spiritual as they intertwine and always repeating, and in that repetition producing change.

Community as an event becomes the embodied, assembled ‘screen’ for the chaos of the events of women’s lives (Deleuze, 1993, p. 76). The sense women make of those events implicates, as I have tried to show, not just events in themselves – Catriona fled her natal country following the financial collapse of that country and the loss of
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306 Latour (2007, p. 816) complicates ‘the personal is political’ slogan of second wave feminism but I do not resile from this way of thinking but complicate the personal through that which he says we need to speak for/represent until it can speak for itself: ‘new non-human entities’.
her career, home, life partner, Ria arrived in the community after a spiritual experience and Marta had a ‘green’ epiphany – the community is an event and as such is has duration within many periods, concerning many lives. As an assemblage and an event, a woman has a date, a time of arrival and of staying or going. The path of each woman is an event, and the threads of that event, become knotted in the networked conjugations that are the (different and differing) events of each community.

When Deleuze and Guattari state (1983, p. 4) that they accept no distinction between man and nature, it is because they refuse the division created through, and about, the ongoing capitalist relations of production with its determinist division between nature and culture. In their view, as interconnected desiring machines, we have a multiplicity of connections – and that having demands, as Latour (2007) suggests, a political, ethical responsibility. Deleuze (1990) suggests that we need to be worthy of the event – with all of the elements of life. As open assemblages we plug into inorganic life and have an ethical responsibility for that too, just as it has a connection-responsibility to organic life. A radical politics emerges from this proposition – Nature is not the unchanging ground of culture (of the feminine, race, disability, sexuality, class and so on through all of the layers of identity formation) or the outside (the landscape, environment, ecologies, the wilderness, the planet, the universe) as such. Rather, nature is the plane of immanence: nature is non-human and human, always-already cultural too, and plugged into the inorganic and anorganic it is, ‘the eternal custodian of the universe’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983). From this emerges the cosmopolitics of that universe as the political cosmos (Stengers, 1996, cited in Latour, 2007, p. 816). In a cosmopolitics the complexity of each community expresses the universe, rather than the reverse (Tarde, 1893/2012, p.37) and in doing so arrives at the in-between of
spirituality and sustainability in women’s lives within intentional communities’ expressions and their materiality.

Of course, intentional communities are designed communities. As such they can be designated as both function and art put to a political purpose, but functions and the affects of art are forces that always escape control, which suggests that the design is always in a process of transformation. Communities grow and shrink; the women’s sense of community shifts in concert with their experiences of community modes of existence and their encounters with the bodies of community. Communities are created, in their many forms, out of an immanent ecology of relations, which includes a range of politics or pragmatics that incorporate and express the materiality of territories tied to perceptions of a future. Clearly the poochies in Sira’s garden experience different future prospects with her than they would over the fence, where toxic chemicals drive production and force mutations of organisms. The function of the fence has a border or threshold politics of its own – generating a series of differential relations – that precedes those very functions. Design is the art of forces, of ‘sensory qualities’ visible in the actions of colours rendered in becoming and in infinitives, the action of green as it regenerates land for instance or the colour of birds as they fill a gap expressed in an ecosystem, or offer consolation as a vital part of nature. Sounds orient living beings to home, to a lover, to comfort, creating that little bit of order in their repetition. Sounds offer a thread of comfort in that sudden descent of black night in India and in the darkness of rural communities without street lighting. Movements and different speeds and rhythms of bodies, articulated in assemblages, mark and frame the territories as they occur and drive the mapping and patterning of those territories into intentional communities.
The ‘sensoria’ of each community, garden, house, and bodies, escape the design through movement, which draws further, wild design. For instance, wildlife in the garden that keeps singing, humming and whistling is part of the ongoing movements creating a territory. This is what Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p.184) call the refrain. They state, ‘the whole of the refrain is the being of sensation. Monuments are refrains’. In this sense, intentional communities are refrains and monuments, ‘haunted by the animal’. As functional designs of territory-house-road-habitats, communities often incorporate perceptions of the environment and the patterns of the landscape ‘haunted by animals’. They can also be captured through ecological, environmental and sustainability sciences – and in the case of gated communities they can be captured by militarised technologies (Parr, 2009) – but their very existence is a proof that the dissatisfactions of late capitalism engender various responses to the recent past and the present and show deep concern for the future. Other sustainable worlds are possible. Living a collective, experimental life in ecovillages and spiritual communities expresses possible paths into those worlds.

Territories are where women live their lives; women ‘stake out a territory’, although this is unexplained in their actualisation; ‘rather the territory implies the emergence of pure sensory qualities, of sensibilia that cease to be merely functional and become expressive features, making possible a transformation of functions’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 183).307 Chandra, for instance, becomes a ‘development worker’ with the surrounding villagers at Bonville because she perceives the issue of poverty

307 ‘Every territory, every habitat, joins up not only its spatiotemporal but its qualitative planes or sections: a posture and a song for example, a song and a color, percepts and affects. And every territory encompasses or cuts across the territories of other species, or intercepts the trajectory of animals without territories, forming interspecies junction points’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 185)
beyond her community. She extends her territory by drawing a line out of the treelessness of it. The problem is brought into view through of the absence of trees. She is driven by a political or pragmatic ‘issue of concern’, for an extended collective consciousness, translated into action, which shaped not only many years of her life but also opened up territorial boundaries and created many overlapping, ongoing transformational elements with the villages that continue into the present, such as employment, education and working with women. For Chandra, the event of Bonville is implicated in the neighbouring village life with all its poverty being ‘in the way of’ the white purity of spiritual life and complicating, enriching and intensifying that life as it is extended into the villages. She sees the work with village people as part of collective consciousness and something she can do because she has been poor and dirty herself. Chandra finds others from her community doing this work as well and the work grows from that. When a natural disaster struck the area several years ago the community and the villagers did not seek any government help. They had everything cleaned up within days and the rebuilding work well under way also. This is effective micropolitical action that has grown out of what might have become a relationship of dependence and ongoing underdevelopment. Such an event, a life event, where the community becomes-village and the village becomes-community exemplifies not only a particular situation but the ways that the given, life, gets ‘in the way of theory’ and forces thought.

Intentional communities go beyond the simply functional and beyond the experience of the individual and expressions of style through the comingling of multiple events and multiple, intersecting durations. Each element in the assemblage – the territory, or home, and its milieus – is transformed and marked through the forces that make a
community live (Ballantyne, 2007, p. 81). Every new configuration of an assemblage has its territory, its semiotic regime of signs, its pragmatic system, its deterritorialising function and its effectuation of abstract machines; all producing new qualities and new subjectivities and becomings, such that each self, function, sensoria, emerge as transformed in the processes of the multiple articulations of the assemblage.

Such transformations are functional. Territories are formed with all that a territory implies. Transformation is more than seeking the thresholds through which a woman can leave one oppressive, exploited or unproductive life for another or experience a realisation of self or wellbeing and legitimacy or of being home and safe, although these are all matters underpinning lines of flight from the order-words of capitalism – get a job, be a girlfriend, lover, mother, breast feed a baby, worship handbags, focus on tinkering with the codes of your private life – and so much more. The events of the transformations of a series of territories into Bonville, the Motherhouse and Clear Creek Community also transformed the surrounding landscapes and the lives of those inside and outside of the communities, the surrounding farmlands and the nearby cities and towns. An ecology more extensive than the ecological, environmental impact of small designed communities emerged as a politics.

Intentional communities are modes of existence on the plane of immanence that exemplify and intensify ecological problems and solutions. There is not only a greater will to act there is often a greater capacity to act in an ecologically conscious way. Prolonged and quiet observation encourages working with the forces of the natural environment. In this way communities express a being-for and a being-with the
environment. They act for sustainability with a focus on living lightly on the earth and they act to allow the environment its power of acting. As Smith states, ‘What an ethics of immanence will criticise, then, is anything that separates the mode of existence from its powers of acting – and what separates us from our power of acting are, ultimately, the illusions of transcendence’ (Smith, 2007, p. 68).

Life, as a field of exchange challenges and contaminates the elements alternative lifestyles, such as intentional communities. If Land becomes a commodity (Polanyi, 2001, p. 187, cited in Sullivan, 2010, p.110) it shifts to an exchangeable matter of private property. The earth as a force is once again obscured in potentially endless capitalist economic transactions. The same holds for spirituality, which has also become a commodity to be exchanged. Yoga, for example, is exported to ‘the West’ and re-imported to India in the form of books, and electronic media, which dominates the market (Liberman, 2008, p. 110); Shamanism, Goddess worship and New Age spiritualities become a matter of commodity fetish and capitalist exchange, which obscure the forces of spirituality. Desire is obscured in the relations of exchange and this in turn effects the separation of culture and nature, where women are seen as anomalous and in between the two poles. The issue becomes one of a new plane of immanence where women, – like men, are gendered, sexed, and variously embodied – ‘live nature as a process of production’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 2). Sian O’Sullivan calls this an ‘animist ‘immanent ecology’ or being ‘earthed and embedded with its ‘environments’ – ‘environment’ here being the ‘Plane of Nature’ that is a plane of proliferation, peopling and contagion’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, cited in O’Sullivan, 2010, pp. 112-113). Rather than casting this as a phenomenological approach, as O’Sullivan does, I see the Plane of Nature of an intentional community
as both an inorganic system as well as an organic system of prepersonal singularities subtending desiring machinic production. As such, it is always open to expression (Deleuze, 1995, p. 67), in which nature and culture are always-already politicised but open to transformation. A new plane of immanence, concerned with the problem of believing in this world ‘in its possibilities of movements and intensities, so as once again to give birth to new modes of existence, closer to animals and rocks’, becomes the ‘most difficult task’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, pp. 74-75). This is not the task of creating a utopia as such but the task of ecological experimentation, which extends in all directions, so that community is seen as more than human. The achievement of such a politics would mean extending community not simply beyond its boundaries but extending the community within to the ‘other than human’. The task becomes, then, one where beliefs and inventions are productive and transformational at the level of subjectivities-in-process and becomings-other, and where ‘animals and rocks’ also enter into such becomings.

The anomalous becomings of communities and the women within them are predicated on the worlds that they live in: their own and all of the overlapping worlds including that of a global late capitalist system. It would be easy, but inaccurate, to say that intentional communities are nothing more than a reactionary, hopeless flight from the everyday real of capitalism. Intentional communities are part of the experimental
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308 ‘The problem would change if it were another plane of immanence. It is not that the person who does not believe God exists would gain the upper hand, since he would still belong to the old plane as negative movement. But on the new plane it is possible that the problem now concerns the one who believes in the world, and not even in the existence of the world but in its possibilities of movements and intensities, so as once again to give birth to new modes of existence, closer to animals and rocks. It may be that believing in this world, in this life, becomes our most difficult task, or the task of a mode of existence still to be discovered on our plane of immanence today. This is the empiricist conversion (we have so many reasons not to believe in the human world; we have lost the word, worse that a fiancée or a god). The problem has indeed changed. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, pp.74-75).
irruptions that subversions of capitalism engender and they are also open to capture and incorporation into late capitalisms adaption and survival. In contemporary times, many of the experimental and forward thinking options concerning sustainability have grown out of the search for self-sufficiency and self-reliance.

Self-reliance, or ‘doing it for ourselves’ ranges from saving niche ecologies, the regeneration of forests and bushlands and political campaigns to saving ourselves through the self-help, self-surveillance of the doubled subject. We adopt alternative, healthy styles of life and self-medication, provide our own health and pastoral gurus, solar passive principles in housing, generate our own electricity or put it into the grid. We reduce, reuse and recycle, not just waste or objects, but ideas of self-governing and institutions. So much of what intentional communities attempt to do is incorporated into the neo-liberal, user-pays, self-surveillance axia of late capitalism.

Soft, green technologies metamorphose into opportunities for capitalism. There is a seemingly inexorable inevitability to the adoption and adaptation of experimental technologies, at least by sections of capital. Yet, experimental intentional communities set out to change the world. The unintended consequences of their experiments are what bring new issues to the fore; unintended consequences of women’s lives are what constitute life.

The women’s fabulations of their worlds express nature as productive desire, connecting and conjugating its flows through the flows of their own lives and communities. The forces of the cosmos or of nature are folded into an ethical symbiosis where the desire of the women is to be worthy of the event. This would be
a global event embracing joyful passions, an experimental ‘whatever’ of sustainability that is an ethico-politics that precedes being as a ‘being of becoming’.

Becomings-other and their fabulations – those creative, political moments where we ‘catch someone in the act of telling tales’ (Deleuze, 1990, p. 125) and where haecceities, such as sacralised Tupperware, the moon, dance, rocks and *poochies* direct a flight or path, undoing common and good sense – constitute aleatory movements towards new worlds. Intentional communities offer glimpses of such small, involuntary becomings and fabulations. They realise worlds not based so much on designs and plans, but on a belief in the ongoing little revolutions or ruptures in worlds, or worlds without an endpoint. Making love with worlds becomes a sense-event implicating ruptures, break-outs and crack-ups as vectors for transformations both singular and collective. We need to remember how to create worlds because it is in the movement towards them that we constitute ‘the people to come’. Such worlds are not utopias as that unreachable location, but modes of positive existence, which is attached to the potentiality of and the yearning for community. Each of the communities is an irruption of becomings, coming out of the circumstances, the historical preconditions of a global capitalism and its depredations and misfirings. Spirituality and not sustainability was the catalyst for the establishment of Bonville and the Motherhouse. That said, though, an environmental and ecological sense grew out of the events of establishing a community in Bonville while, in the Motherhouse, concomitant rise of ecofeminism and a collapse of farming systems produced an ethical and spiritual transformation. For Clear Creek Community, their beginnings are steeped in the belief in an environmental and economic collapse and their desire to design their way out of this burgeoning crisis.
The environment, or milieu, is, of course, an element central to the stories of worlding in this thesis. An ecology of relations of such worlds would be denuded without some sense of the territory and the milieu and the ways that they are implicated in intentional communities. However, environments are not represented in static places as such but expressed as falling in love with worlds. The express movements and memories of passage through time and space and are marked in passing moments of spatial and cultural territorialisations that are always pried open in the becomings-other implicated in those processes of falling in love with a world. Yet, a world is evoked by more than human traversals of space: it is a response to the composing forces of nature, no longer able to be seen as ‘the nature that we live in’ or that which is designated as nature, but as the nature that is indistinct from humans, and co-created with humans. The erosion canyons of Bonville created in the in-between of the relations of historical land clearing to remove tiger habitat and then later for agriculture and monsoonal rains make up an assemblage of tigers-colonials-monsoonal winds-rain-agriculture-canyons. The green architecture of sustainable houses are intensifications not only of their materials and designs – concrete instead of scarce wood, small, patterned dwellings and clusters of dwellings sharing resources – but they are also intensifications of the processes of exchange between residents given the understanding that matter needs to circulate and that residences are not only private property but signs of livability.\footnote{There is no private property in Bonville or the Motherhouse. In contrast, Clear Creek Community is 'a real estate deal'. Houses there are bought and sold on the open market. Many intentional communities have entry requirements for new arrivals and shares are not sold unless the newcomers are seen as ‘suitable’ for the goals of the particular community. Bonville is much more complex in terms of housing. There is an acute housing shortage and new members, once welcomed on the basis of a perceived spirituality are now screened over long periods and need to have private resources to survive.} Green architecture uses local materials,
sustainable, climatically appropriate design and creates a built environment that encourages sustainable community and communal living. Becomings-other, through falling in love with a world are produced in spatial design realised in durational movements which occur in time rather than space itself. The coding and recoding of milieus, qualities and are central components in worlding. Worlds in this sense are ‘moments’ or ‘mobile sets of duration’ because movement ‘happens between objects or parts’, which ‘expresses duration as a whole’ (Deleuze, 1986, p. 11). After all, contemporary intentional communities can be produced as any space whatever, as forms or expressions of qualities (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 355) that span blocks of flats, suburban blocks and streets, taking over roads, vacant block and that create a series of predicates for new, dynamic ways of worlding and of the consolidation of assemblages of fuzzy aggregates and blocks of becomings. Such becomings-other transform the processes of subjectivation into little machinic assemblages, the components of which are often quite serendipitous and open to change.

Intentional communities are produced by, and produce in turn, a positive ‘whatever’ of sustainability. One outcome of such sustainability is an experimental apprenticeship mode of community, spirituality, sustainability and so on. The ‘whatever’ of sustainability is encountered through a process of careful observation – in various ways of paying attention to signs – of the weather, climates, topographies, geographies, and to past and present sciences of the land. Sustainability exceeds the women’s stories, their passions and practices, and produces unknown connections and conjugations of given systems, designed using permaculture, biodynamic and organic approaches and becomes part of the aggregates or assemblages of an autopoietic sustainability, always open to the aleatory moment and escaping (human) control.
Such approaches are organic at the same time as they are alloplastic – they are inseparable – symbiotic. Any organism, including the human, even in its wildest becomings, articulates elements of the given biological and social formations in an even wilder series of unknown doublings and exceeds any given forms in their metamorphosis.

The marking refrains of the territory are more than those of the women. They are the refrains of birds, butterflies, kangaroos or snakes that are all too often missing in the contemporary world of habitat and atmospheric destruction. There are the unseen elements of the soil, the particles because for all of their invisibility, the commensals and parasites are present at all times and no less endangered through anthropogenic changes. The communities in question, Bonville, Clear Creek and the Motherhouse are fuzzy aggregates, fuzzy zones or places that offer spaces where other worlds emerge, worlds that may be culturally, spiritually, economically, socially and ecologically sustainable in their eternal returns of community as difference, a difference that is always becoming as a biophilic becoming other.

Intentional communities are, in a sense, fabulations, where the notion of ‘the community’ itself has agency. Such communities render their elements and forces visible and sonorous in movements and sound. The disparate elements of sustainability and spirituality achieve some consistency in the intentional community as fuzzy aggregates. The assemblage of such disparate elements, as they are rendered discernible, generates the assemblages of intentional communities in a fine balance of territorialisation and deterritorialisation.
Intentional communities are territorial assemblages, within geographies, topographies, landscapes and milieus. They are assemblages that are drawn by what Deleuze calls the ‘cutting edges’ of abstract machines. ‘Abstract machines or bodies without organs – this is desire. There are many kinds, but they are definable by what occurs on them and in them: continuums of intensity, blocs of becoming, emissions of particles, combinations of fluxes’ (Deleuze & Parnett, 2007, p. 78) Deleuze also discusses abstract machines as being ‘like the cause of the concrete assemblages that execute its relations; and these relations take place ‘not above’ but within the very tissue of the assemblages they produce’ (Deleuze, 1988a, p. 37).

Abstract machines are maps, diagrams, models that produce the relations of intentional communities. Abstract machines ‘make the territorial assemblage open onto something else’ – deterritorialise – and the abstract machines of intentional community, permaculture and ecofeminism create consistencies within disparate intentional communities. Abstract machines open assemblages, such as intentional communities, onto other assemblages ‘the molecular, the cosmic; they constitute becomings.’ In Deleuze and Guattari’s terms ‘Every abstract machine is a consolidated aggregate of matters-functions’. They are singular and immanent and effectuated ‘in forms and substances’ within the assemblages (2004, p. 562). Yet, intentional communities are complicated further because they are also fuzzy aggregates, where the assemblage is open onto new worlds in a constant folding of deterritorialisation and reterritorialisation and where the elements of the assemblage are rendered more, and other, by desire. If community itself is the abstract machine of intentional community, rather than utopia, then community can be the diagram of sustainability and spirituality.
How do intentional communities and women and the environment and spirituality and sustainability become conceptualized anew? They hit you over the head with other ways of thinking. I think this is perhaps what Deleuze (15/04/80) expresses in his lecture on Liebniz when he says, ‘That’s what it is to need a concept – to have something to cry about! One must find the concept of that particular cry.’ I have been engaged in a thinking that has been very noisy and violent. It has been noisy because noise is often considered as that which is outside of closed systems and some of the elements of my research can be seen as outside of the supposedly rational systems of thought, of capitalism and globalisation. However, in engaging in an apprenticeship with Deleuze and Guattari, such blows to thought have forced me into productive lines of flight and into experimentation.\textsuperscript{310} I think such lines of flight are conjugated with, the sonorous tone and mood of those cries and blows and become entangled, as so many elements in a desiring machine, and escape the fixed elements of the terms of the research project.

At the time Rosalind and I met, there was another long-time member of the Motherhouse staying in the House of Passion, where I was located during my time in the community. Tina had also been deeply affected by Vatican II. She had left the community for a period of time and now came and went, involved in a variety of projects, not the least of which is the Ecovillage project for the Motherhouse. Tina argued very passionately for a return to Roman Catholicism and in particular the Motherhouse’s version of liturgical day and year – that is, a return to the originary

\textsuperscript{310} Here I am thinking of Louise when she was woken from sleep by a blow to her head when the ‘concepts’ that she needed for flight were arriving thick and fast and she needed to wake up and write them down.
religion of the community and its rites and practices. She felt that what the Motherhouse needed was a return to origins. Yet, for the young women interns who came from a nearby liberal university and did a three month internship in the organic gardens as a part of one of their courses, and who were possible recruits to the community, such return to origins would have been difficult. They were not Roman Catholic; the spiritualities that they *honoured* were diverse. Nadia, one of the garden interns, said to me one day when we were working together in the gardens that she simply could not be part of a church that did not honour her choices and her lesbian sexuality.

Sexuality was a thorny issue for the Motherhouse, too. In a sense, the lack of connection between spirituality and sexuality was seen as a problem that remained open. As Rosalind said: *We do it quietly. This is the first time a lesbian couple has lived in residence. Out. In the history of the Motherhouse. There’s been lesbians here before, but not out-out.* There is a conflict between religion and spirituality and sexuality that is still, after many decades, being expressed within the Motherhouse. As Alice told me, sexuality is not discussed, only *alternative lifestyles.*

Such an immanent transcendental field is pre-individual and impersonal, a nomadic distribution of singularities in events. Singularity in events such as astral travel, voices howling at the moon, bodies dancing under the moon or drumming under the moon emanate from aleatory points such as the dance and Lesley’s body spinning in the dance. In their nomadic distribution and movement singular events direct the actualisation of worlds; worlds that are singular in themselves. Individuals are actualised in dynamic assemblages of individuation, open to and framed by the pre-
individual source, the movement of the bodies, the moon, the full moon, the
meditations, the practices and rituals and the aleatory singular point of the ways in
which pre-individual singularities are presupposed in assemblages. Assemblages
implicate the ‘constellation of voices’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 93) and the
voices of the women. Singularities\textsuperscript{311} are the forces that uphold the feathers on the
arrow in the bow of the Zen bowman as it flies. Singularities are Tupperware in the
hands of the women as a force of fun or the rhythmic and sonorous forces of music
engendering the dance as the force of a collective ritual or the force of an out of body
experience. They are in excess of the ‘I’ and the Self but are implicit presuppositions
of the “I” and the Self, traversing a threshold; deterritorialising.

To put it another way, the women in all of the communities are composed in relation,
as singular foldings and unfolding, as the in between of the relations of ‘assemblage
haecceities’ which are the ‘milieu of intersection of the longitudes and latitudes’
(Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 290) of bodies, movement and rest, of multiplicities.
For any of the woman, the territory of the community, the territories of the villages,
the villagers, the treeless land, the caravans, the cooperative structures, the communal
areas, the sacred points, the tree planting, the tree planters, the builders, the diggers of
holes, the poverty, the needs, the lacks. All of these actions and things constitute
terms without any vital relation to each other but which, through association with
collective consciousness, become externally related to each other, as passional
relations constituting percepts, affects and sensations becoming subjectivities. They

\textsuperscript{311} ‘No, singularities are not imprisoned within individuals and persons; and one does not fall into an
undifferentiated ground, into groundless depth, when one undoes the individual and the person. The
impersonal and pre-individual are the free nomadic singularities…” (Deleuze, 1990, pp. 140-141). Such
‘free nomadic singularities’ are presented in all of the stories of the women as engendering their
becomings-actualised from the virtual. And they are linked through ‘imperceptible borders, through the
and (Deleuze 1995, p. 45).
express the compositions of bodies as longitudes and latitudes, which intersect on the surface of the territories. Each woman enters into a composition with the landscape and becomes a collective formation ‘comprising singularities distributed haphazardly’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 69), with a belief in a collective consciousness that, because of its nature, forces her beyond the boundaries and the immediate demands of her community into a wider sense of the collective. Her sense of collective consciousness is framed by the context of each community or their state of affairs, and her perception of it and each woman enters into a long period of collective transformation that extends beyond her community into something other.

**Becomings-spiritual**

Becomings-spiritual implicate particular inventions and intensities that are affective, sensuous and erotic. Bodies and thought or bodies and souls are composing forces, actions and events, suspended in the air. They are working, resting, fasting and feasting bodies and souls, controlled and uncontrolled bodies and souls, abstinent and sexually engaged bodies and souls, bodies and souls imbricated in the flows of the earth, the flux of Nature, and its design in gardens, homes and communities.

Becomings-other occur in ‘time out of joint’, where the time is unhinged in the *Aion* (Deleuze, 2004, p. 355) in the flows of the repeating creation of a garden (paradise) where everything from the rocks to the trees, the mongoose, the snake, the kangaroos, garden are seen to spiritualise community. Spiritual invention, as a politics, precedes becomings-spiritual. Becomings-spiritual implicate ritual practices and passions, which mark bodies, souls and territories through ritual practices and passions; the rhythms of dance, meditation and prayer create territory, where composing forces
engage with other composing forces, always in movement, always in ecologies of relation, so that, ‘it is the entire assemblage in its individual aggregates that is a haecceity’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 289).

Some of the processes that bodies and souls are engaged in are in tension with spiritual practices and passions. The outer limits of spirituality can be exceeded and expressed in incorporeal effects, rather than simply leading to changes in any forms of spirituality – although, this happens as well. I am thinking here, again, of Pearl, from the Clear Creek Community, who said that her spirituality was now dormant, totally dormant, as an expression of the metamorphoses of her passions, of spirituality and of sexuality. Her alliance with the bodies of moon-women-earth and the practices of massage-dance was transformed into something else: dormancy, which left room for other types of becomings. Becomings are produced, beyond those that signal ‘nocturnal deterritorializations’ or an overflow of the system of signs (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 128) of a traditional, institutional religion or spirituality and they are becomings that jump from one regime of signs to another in the organised circles of signs where ‘what counts is less this circularity of signs than the multiplicity of the circles or chains. The sign refers not only to other signs in the same circle, but to signs in other circles or spirals as well’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 125). A

---

312 *It is only under certain conditions that strata can be said to include signs; signs cannot be equated with language in general but are defined by regimes of statements that are so many real usages or functions of language. Then why retain the word *sign* for these regimes, which formalize an expression without designating or signifying the simultaneous contents, which are formalized in a different way? Signs are not signs of a thing; they are signs of deterritorialization and reterritorialization, they mark a certain threshold crossed in the course of these movements, and it is for this reason that the word should be retained (as we have seen this apples even to animal “signs”) (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 75). This is of course given that strata are *forms and substances, codes and milieus...the abstract components of every articulation*’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 553). Given this sense of a sign within a regime of signs it is the movement, the crossing of the threshold that is marked
proliferation of signs, and the intermingling of various regimes of signs, is imbricated in the lives and the stories of the women and in alternative spiritualities.

Alternative spiritualities are not simply a rejection of institutionalised religions. For some women the expressions of institutional religion are abhorrent. Their actions and practices are focused on living in the community in an everyday sense and making a difference in terms of the environment and sustainability. Their spiritual practices are transmuted into a subtle, yet passionate connection with Nature – with all of the composing forces of Nature – and so living lightly on the earth with the forces of the earth. The tree or grove within their territories is a manifestation of nature in the Spinozist immanence of Nature or God, and in this sense, they refuse the face of God. For other women, the practices of institutional religions have been supplanted by alternative practices, alternative ways of thinking, new spiritualities, and new points of subjectivation, which in turn lead to new becomings that affect both the body and soul/forces of thought. For yet other women institutional religions have been transformed such that the ‘face of God’ is no longer ‘despotic’ but a mystical transcendence or a Divine that may also be ‘the face of the Goddess’.

Desire engenders the connective, productive forces of worlds, such as spiritualities, in transformative subjectivations and transformative becomings-other. Paradoxically, at the same time, in its capture, or its conjugation, desire is segmented into territorial

---

313 ‘Religion is, in this sense again, a kind of overstride of the imagination, a fiction, and a simulacrum of belief. It invokes a spoken repetition and an oral or written tradition. The priest speaks and the miracles rest on human testimony, however, the miracles do not immediately manifest a reality, but claim for themselves the fitness that, generally, we are accustomed to find between testimony and reality. Or again on the proofs for the existence of God that are based on analogy between machines and the world, religion confuses the general and the accidental. It does not see that the world has but an extremely distant resemblance to machines, and that it resembles them only in terms of the most accidental circumstance… (Deleuze 1991, p. 74).
assemblages, where it is codified, stratified and displaced onto fixed objects, things, subjects, organisations and territories (Thanem & Linstead, 2006, p. 46). Yet, the assemblage also implicates potentially transformative worlds. What subtends the women’s stories of spirituality is movement between the productive, transformative force of desire and its displacement into supposedly fixed spiritualities, marking space and place and the bodies therein, which are in turn continually exceeded in becomings-other. The women’s stories express becomings-other in collective enunciations, or regimes of signs. These aspects of assemblages are not the same and do not represent each other. For Deleuze and Guattari, content and expression, whilst they can exist in reciprocal presupposition and are part of the same ‘abstract machine’, are separate. An intentional community, and its spirituality, a woman and her spirituality, are not equivalents, even if the community and the woman are both seen as ‘spiritual’. Spirituality is linked to a regime of signs (a series of statements): a community is linked to an assemblage of bodies. Bodies, or contents, intersect with regimes of signs but they are not one and the same thing.

This is the case, even when, like Clear Creek Community, they are not spiritual communities as such. The differences in the collective sense and expression of divinity/spirit between and within the communities can be underpinned by perceptions of divinity as transcendent and the divine spirals down onto the plane of

314 Deleuze and Guattari (2004, p. 74) provide a discussion of the prison and delinquency that is pertinent to this sense of expression/ regimes of signs, series of statements that exist on a given stratum and content as the assembled bodies, including the architecture and the physical buildings of a prison with its prisoners and guards: the prison machine. The prison and delinquency presuppose each other, are in a reciprocal relation to each other but are in no way the same. I am suggesting that this is also the case with intentional communities and spirituality and also sustainability. The machinic assemblages of the communities enfold bodies and flows of desire and the processes of subjectification that accompany regimes of signs.
immanence\textsuperscript{315} into opened subjects, objects and practices or by an always already immanent divinity saturating the plane of immanence. Both are produced as ‘a synthesis of the mind’ (Deleuze, 1991, p. 92). Indeed, for those who eschew divinity, Nature often takes the place of the idea of the divine and in this way a spiritualised Nature is produced.

The actualisations and counter-actualisations of such spiritualities, their structures, relationships and singular points merge into spiritual experiments with old and new practices, old and new forms of expression and content to form new spiritual assemblages. Practices such as channelling, holding séances, reading Tarot cards, and other cards of fortune, using various tools for divination, from the most complicated uses of Feng Shui, to throwing the I Ching, or to the simple use of a pendulum are not new but they connect and conjugate to create something other. Such ritual actions range from play and fun to intense spiritual encounters, and produce singular and collective becomings and launching new subjectivities-in-process. Such collective spiritual enunciations and practices express various becomings-spiritual that counter-actualise traditional world religions at the same time as they can exist alongside, and often intersect with world religions. Belle, for example, was a Christian astrologer living in Clear Creek Community. Reading peoples’ charts and giving life advice was her pastoral role.

\textsuperscript{315} I referred to Deleuze and Guattari’s analysis of divinity carried out in What is Philosophy? in the introduction to this thesis. See in particular fn. 26. Also they discuss God as the disjunctive syllogism ‘from which all secondary realities are derived by a process of division’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 1983, p. 13). Deleuze discusses God/antichrist as the disjunctive syllogism, the prince of all modifications (1990, pp. 295-297) where he suggests that all that is inclusive and affirmative, ‘an infinity of predicates’ is disjunctive. Smith (2010, p. 112) suggests that Deleuze’s theology is akin to Bergson’s in that he sees God as ‘an infinite creativity, not a creator’, which works with the diverse sense of spiritualities or Nature in the women’s stories.
Whilst alternative spiritualities, or what Zizek (2001, p. 12) calls the ‘New Age ‘Asiatic’ thought is a global phenomenon, it is not a single, static form, with a static content of thought simply open to capture, or produced by capitalism as the new illusory ‘hegemonic ideology of global capitalism’. Alternative spiritualities are actualised out of the virtual and generate ‘the singular points that belong to them’: they are open to experimentation and transformation, shaped by their genesis and their determination and experiments create spiritualities always in flux, over a range of settings and levels, including intentional communities, and global capitalism. The composing and decomposing practices and actions of the women remain complicated in their nomadic spiritual journeys that are both open to lines of capture and segmentation in mixtures of regimes of signs but beyond to lines of flight.

The changes in the women’s practices, actions and passions are shaped by and in their machinic assemblages where the forces of material ecologies and milieus of their communities connect with the forces of spirituality that transform the earth, and those prior centres of religion. These changes are created as the women themselves traverse the landscapes constituted out of those forces and relations, expressing spirituality and reshaping it in their blocks of becomings-spiritual. In this sense, the bodies and souls are a multiplicity expressing a becomings-spiritual that is not located in a single person as such and that takes on myriad of points of subjectification through the mixture of regimes of signs in the event. For example, the walking meditation or prayer maze at the Motherhouse was constructed with the opening up of the
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316 Deleuze (2004, pp. 260-261) in his discussion of the virtual makes the point that ‘the elements, varieties of relations and singular point coexist in the work of the object’ that is in this case spirituality ‘ without it being possible to designate a point of view privileged over others, a centre which would unify the other centres.’ And ‘there is thus another part of the object which is determined by actualisation.’ And it is in the actualization that the local appears, that singularities ‘preside over the genesis of individuals’ (Deleuze, 1990, pp. 146-147) – such as spiritualities and persons
community and is a sign of alternative spiritual practices. The existence and reverence for an Indigenous women’s healing ground in Clear Creek Community, which is taken as a place of power and becomings for women offers a sign of spiritual power in the land for women. Bonville has its concentric circles leading to the MM, the building-space-sign which designates the community’s relationship with the Divine alongside and intertwined with villages and temples. All of these examples make visible, not space as such, not landscape as such, but those composing forces that constitute the spatialisations of space (Deleuze, 17/02/1981) and the materialisation of spiritualities as relations, which are liminal with unassignable borders in a close embrace of the earth (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 354).

The profusion of borderlines/thresholds/fibres imbricated in the spiritual practices and the rituals of the women are indicative of the unassignable borders and the openness, between nature and culture (Massumi, 2002, p. 237). The passages between mixed regimes of signs and on the path to becoming imperceptible indicate the in-between through which such spiritual nomadic journeys proceed, and the ways that the lines of flight or deterritorialisations of the women are captured, or reterritorialised in the communities. Becomings-spiritual in each of the communities undo attempts at the closure of such unassignable borders and such incompossible worlds, into homogenised formations that have assignable borders and composed of compossible worlds. Such desiring compositions of spirituality do not ensure the unity of each community or enable the capture of spirituality so much as they create aleatory encounters connections with an open series of bodies and signs of spirituality.

---

317 Many intentional communities have such a sacred space, or spaces, although they may be used differently depending on the types of spiritualities that exist in each community and as well such spaces can be designated as sacralised spaces on an ad hoc basis, in the moment.
Contemporary spiritualities are composed through the virtual, continuous, ecological relations that implicate Nature-God. The phases of the moon are crucial, not only for women’s gatherings and their rituals but also for gardening and farming. The art of building, designing and marking frame the movements of the earth around the sun in solar passive design and such design becomes transformational, and through solar energy, opens the forces of Nature to a segmentation and capture that functions for sustainability and not exploitation. Spiritualities have the potential to incorporate more than an anthropocentric spirituality, where humans need to see they are a part of nature and not begin to express its silences and not *take too much.*

In the event of a spiritual encounter, an incorporeal transformation of the body occurs – the dancer turns into the astro traveller in *the event* of the circle dance. The women are blocks of becoming-spiritual *in the event* of Nature-thought; in the event of an ecology of relations where vitalism implicates the inorganic, too, as it is incorporated into all of the elements that create spirituality within an assemblage. The ongoing repetition of types of spiritualities as ecologies of differential relations incorporates cultural and political issues into territories as the centres of religions or spiritualities. Their reterritorialisation resonates with the everydayness of the women’s stories and their spiritualities. However, such territorialisations are inextricable from their deterritorialisations and reterritorialisations and this is what the communities can be seen to suggest. Such mixtures are inextricable on the plane of immanence; Nature-thought is the repetition of nature in types of culture, which expresses a nature-culture
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318 Lesley Dema (2007) offers a spirited defence of inorganic life against accusations of a naive neovitalism. I am not going to rehearse her analysis here, which draws on “The Geology of Morals” chapter of *A Thousand Plateaus,* but I agree with her claim that inorganic life in Deleuze and Guattari’s work is the assemblage, with its “partial objects that enter into monstrous couplings, experimental alliances, unnatural participations, and rhizomatic structures” (para.3).
continuum that nonetheless sees that the material, spiritual and cultural are not the same and suggests, according to Massumi (2002, p. 237) that ‘Habit lies at the hinge of nature and the [se] divergent process lines of culture….The borders between nature and culture are actually unassignable.’ Spirituality, here, is a rhizome with unassignable borders, a tangle of fibres and a mixture of regimes of signs that subtend lines of flight and becomings. Such ways of thinking about the women and their communities has given me a deeper, richer grasp of the ways that ecologies are so much more than nature.

Working with the earth as an abstract machine is one of the ways that women, who are ecofeminists and environmentalists, enter into the rituals and practices of gardening. They use permaculture or organic practices as part of their becomings-spiritual: as spiritual work. Going into the garden is a ‘levelling’ ritual. Crossing the thresholds of the home to the garden is a going into a territorial ‘sheaf constituted by the forces of the earth’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 354). The garden draws all of the milieux of the territory together and provides the centre of the territory in a tree, a grove of trees, which becomes sacred space for some of the women where they do their spiritual work. It is a centre that gathers and problematizes the ways that we use the earth and the ways that such everyday practices are linked to life. Gardens are marked as the earth’s sacralised space in an otherwise productive territory and in them all of the forces of the earth gather move through a territorialising function to design the garden as art. The spiritual territorialising of the garden all of the forces of the earth gather in a becoming-spiritual that is connected with the art of becomings-garden (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 345).
A woman, for instance, not only marks her territory by going into the garden but she also experiments with spirituality. Many women go into the garden almost every day, weeding, planting, harvesting, watering, feeding and mulching the earth, following the seasons, following and teaching organic and permaculture practises – sacralising the earth in a pragmatic spirituality that is a repetition of entering as a repetition of events. She signs the earth into a territory of ecofeminism and organic gardening practices as part of the spiritual practices and rituals of her daily life. In the zigzags between the organism of the garden and herself, the other women and the community, her work is the inorganic too, as all that passes between organisms – a combination of the ‘slowness or heaviness of matter with the extreme speed of a line that has become entirely spiritual’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, pp. 550-551). Her territory, home and milieu are permeable; they are always open to outside people, who, in the Motherhouse, work in the certified organic gardens or to the community as it works for better, healthier lives, and where the sacred is expressed through gardening. Her work with the forces of the earth, the soil and the plants and her co-workers, is an ethico-political transformative act that incarnates the incorporeal of an honourable living and in so doing the becomings-spiritual constitute a domain. This domain is also an abode or a territory where becomings-spiritual zigzag and create and open ‘worlds teaming with anonymous and nomadic, impersonal and pre-individual singularities’ (Deleuze 1990, pp. 102-103). When many of the women spoke about their spiritual connections, they passionately reinforced the significance of gardens and gardening.

319 The Buddhist notion of ‘right living’ has permeated many intentional communities and is an integral part of permaculture.
Each leaky world is only available to us ethnographically because the women told their stories, revealing a world of semiotic, spiritual and material flows ‘passing by inside each subject’ (Deleuze, 15/04/1980, Deleuze, 1990, p. 8). In this sense, each world, with its spectrum of potentially transformative forces, is actualised in the elements of the actions, practices, rituals, and passions, of the women – and all of the inhabitants and components of their gardens – and translates into the affective habits of spirituality and the ethnographic habits of presentation. Such habits are drawn from the effects of aleatory, pre-individual singularities that intermingle in a simultaneously profane yet sacralised territory, which may be as small as a tree planted, the ritual of a daily walk, of a candle in an alcove, or, alternatively, as large as a hillside climbed by thousands in an annual pilgrimage.

I learned a great deal about spirituality in the continuing processes of entering the compositions of each of the intentional communities, the compositions of the women and the fabulations that have been made. What I have argued in this thesis is that there are myriad ways to be spiritual and that some spiritual sensibility underpins sustainability.

**Becomings-garden**

---

320 Deleuze uses the Stoic sense of the event as that which is happening, articulated with what is said aligning it with Zen Buddhism or American nonsense, such as the statement by Chrysippus that when we say something it passes through our lips so if we say ‘chariot’ a chariot passes through our lips. Added to this the chariot is not simply an object, it has a virtual sense, a history, a use, a politics that is actualised in a particular world. Words, ideas also make up the worlds that pass through our lips so that when Rose speaks of the Divine, the Divine passes through her lips, just as when she works to build a forest this becomes for her the work of the Divine and the Divine is passing through her, in her becomings-spiritual, such that the Divine is becoming part of her world, part of matter.
The act of planting a tree, placing a rock, digging the ground or building a fence is as territorial a move as it is to ‘plant a flag’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004). What is peculiar and significant is that such actions can never be simply human actions. Every act here can create a territory. Rocks move and are open to be moved by more than human forces; they disintegrate. We understand, perhaps from an anthropocentric place, very little of the agency of the rock. This remains hidden to us, even though we might understand some of its nature and its scientific categorisation or why it was formed and how it disintegrates, naturally and unnaturally to become the sediment of the earth.

Sustainability – such as Pearl’s, Sira’s, Janine’s, Carla’s, or any of the other women named in this research in their ‘becoming sustainable’ and their becoming-garden – is viewed as a virtual, intensive multiplicity of difference. Sustainability implicates a political ecology of flows. It directs the plugging of rocks into an assemblage just as it directs the becoming bird of a human whistler. Sustainability is virtual – it is a complex event that actualises an assemblage out of the whole of potential. A garden is the actualization of the virtual or the potential of whatever a garden can be in continuous variation (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, pp. 22-23). A garden always exceeds its actuality but is unable to capture the whole or the virtual of what a garden can be, yet a garden can continue to draw on the virtual. For example, when land is made visible as a degraded commodity it becomes a problem and thus opens to becoming something else. Where lives are being lived in unsustainable political, social, libidinal and economic states, they are open to becoming something other. The work to design a sustainable community and produce a sustainable life or a sustainable ecology as becoming-garden opens up the intimate virtual potential of a designed sustainability.
Within the larger community individual designs emerge from situation in an ecologically driven, micropolitical process. The implementation of such a garden consciously includes so much more than the human. The permaculture garden already has an ecological politics of prolonged observation, of witnessing, listening to and speaking for that which is unable to speak for itself. Each garden is experienced as the actualisation or materialisation of the virtual into material forms – into gardens situated in their own problems where the potential of each garden exceeds its own actualisation, having its borders overrun and overrunning its borders – into women passing into gardens in a becoming-garden as a solution to a problem as an event.

What is presupposed by permaculture and organic gardens is sustainability as a transformative ecopolitics that is open to a multiplicity of composing forces. It is important to realise that the variation of the forms of sustainability in these molecular forms of experimentation are ongoing variations.

Massumi (1998, p.16) locates this capacity to vary in topology, which makes continuous transformation visible as events, which subsume the forms of things, such as gardens as they grow and change, or as he says ‘engulfs forms in their own variation’. It is the act of engulfing that works as a way of thinking about a permaculture food forest and shows that in the passage between a food forest’s nascent state and its autopoietic climax state that gardens are not just about what contains them. Food forests fold the forces of the (natural) world – rain, wind, frost, – into themselves. They are constituted through a series of alliances or by what they fold into themselves from the outside. The continuity of gardens as a domain of variation is inseparable from the different forms that emerge, such as organic market
gardens and a permaculture gardens. Yet, that very field of difference exceeds any single garden.

Each woman, and each garden is a spatio-temporal dynamism, or a field of singularities open to becoming, is constituted differentially through the various forms of sustainability generated and incarnated within the community and both the woman and the garden. Both the woman and the garden are forces for change. The forms of expression and the content of sustainability as becomings-garden leave open the way for change.

If permaculture and organic gardening are taken up negatively, as static forms of sustainability and are bounded by variation, then what happens in between as variations of sustainability and as events of sustainability are interleaved by these forms of sustainability. In Massumi’s view, these forms are bent and stretched through their own variation, their own topology of metamorphosis, such that while the static forms only ‘stand as its beginning and its end’, they may be ‘stopped at any point to yield another still-standing form’ (Massumi, 1998, p.18). What I have argued throughout my thesis is that sustainability as expressed in a garden is an unstoppable force because it folds in the forces of the cosmos. The form of a garden may vary; a garden can be a wasteland but if the proposition that everything gardens is to be taken seriously then humans can never be the final arbiters of what constitutes a garden. Its variation and continuous transformation in a becoming-garden is always exceeded by non-human gardeners. The stories of the women in this study strongly suggest such a series of propositions. What is implicated in their stories is the diagrams of permaculture and organic gardening and of the continuous repeated attempts to
‘become sustainable’ to becoming-garden. The event is actualized ‘in a body in a lived, but it has a shadowy and secret part that is continually subtracted from or added to its actualization…. The event is immaterial, incorporeal, unliveable: pure reserve’ (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, p. 156). Sustainability is an event, in a garden, a body, ‘a lived’, and is an excess of such a body, such ‘a lived’ and such a garden. The event is central to action and becoming and as Deleuze (1990, p.149-150) states, to ‘become worthy of what happens to us, and thus to will and release the event… to become the offspring of one’s events and not of one’s actions, for the action is itself produced by the offspring of the event.’ To become worthy of the event of sustainability is to become garden.

Intentional communities, permaculture and various forms of organic gardening remain engaged in developing a politics of livability. They actively seek to change the direction of mainstream cultures and present an alternative, more sustainable way of life. They are driven to act individually and collectively on contemporary political and environmental issues. The women’s lives and their worlds are expressions of sustainability.

Expression implies enunciation which in itself implies collective assemblages. In this sense the collective assemblages constituted through the three intentional communities and their varying and doubled forms of expression and content concerning sustainability processes, subtend the potential subjectivation and individuation processes in becoming-garden. When Deleuze and Guattari discuss expression in terms of discourse they state that ‘There is no individual enunciation’ and continue with the claim that ‘It is for this reason that indirect discourse, especially
“free” indirect discourse\textsuperscript{321}, is of exemplary value: there are no clear, distinctive contours; what comes first is not an insertion of variously individuated statements, or an interlocking of different subjects of enunciation, but a collective assemblage resulting in the determination of relative subjectification proceedings, or assignations of individuality and their shifting distributions within discourse’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 88). Yet as Deleuze and Guattari (2004, p. 93) state, ‘My direct discourse is still the free indirect discourse running though me coming from other worlds or other planets’. The collective assemblage that each woman draws on is wider than that of permaculture. The indirect discourse that is operative in each woman’s case and allows her to open up the assemblage she lives within (more complicated than this because every woman is part of the assemblage too) and to draw on alternative enunciations. The processes of subjectification and individuation, which constitute the many passions and voices that narrate each woman, are available only in translations of the interview, where ‘the translative movement of language proper is that of indirect discourse’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 85). This translation is a doubling of translation or the translative moment. The transcribing of interview tapes and the translations of what has been heard – often many times – is part of the process of constructing a narrative and a translation of the women’s lives, from their rendering of their pasts for me. It is part of an event, of becoming as a succession of events that moves beyond subjectivation and individuation to the collective assemblage. In this sense the narrative is not a sequence organised by a plot but an event of expression

\textsuperscript{321} Indirect discourse for Deleuze and Guattari is language content and vision that goes from one party to another regardless of whether or not any of the parties have seen that content or vision and in this sense ‘language is the transmission of the word as the order-word, not the communication of a sign as information’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 85). The order-word is central to the analyses in this chapter.
and sense that make change possible. Certainly passion is expressed by all of the women.

**Ethics and immanence**

The capacity to act, is concentrated, each and every time such that it occurs as ‘the whole of one chance into one time’ (Deleuze, 2004, p. 248) given that we do not know what a body can do. This is especially the case in connection or conjunction with others (human and beyond) and sets aside any sense of an impossible ethics – an ethics that produces slavery and impotence – and moves towards an aleatory becoming of being. Such a sense of ethics subtends not only the women’s stories of community, or their refrains that constitute a territory, but also their subjectivities-in-process and their becomings-other, as they emerge. I want to suggest that there is little that is fast about the rhythms of intentional community and there is a great deal of uncertainty about directions, at least in a pragmatic sense. There is always room for manoeuvre and change.

Their relatively slow movement and rhythm interleave duration with ethics. The ethical moment of immanence, of duration, is movement, or waiting, in time that circulates intensities. In rhythm, assemblage and event – where each woman, each

---

322 Narrative for Deleuze and Guattari is *hearsay* ‘We believe that narrative consists not in communicating what one has seen but in transmitting what one has heard, what someone else said to you’. They go on to say that ‘It does not even suffice to invoke a vision distorted by passion’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 85). There is a question here for ethnography. The voices within the voice and the voices within the voices suggest a plurivocality, or polyvocality that is attested to in the ‘voices’ of the women.

323 Turetsky (2004) makes this point succinctly and elegantly in his analysis of the haka, ‘Rhythm inserts time into ethics. The haka of the Maori exhibits the way rhythms perform temporal syntheses assembling bodies and distributing intensities.’ For my analysis it is duration that is the key.
community, is movement towards the future, yet situated in her own duration.

Duration is expressed in many forms. Pearl’s desire for community or Rosalind’s gentle movements in her raised garden along with the political of attunement and animal movement and the signs of her wild life sanctuary are signs of duration. Duration is also Joanne with her steady work in, and movement, through the organic community garden and the farm that she manages. Duration suggests her weekly and seasonal drive to the nearby city, with boxes of vegetables for those who belong to the Community Supported Agriculture Program or her love of putting the garden to bed, each winter, implicate the force of duration. In duration the subject ceases to be in the centre but to be a transformational process, a becomings-other in the event, in assemblages that are inseparable from an hour, a season, a wave, a wind: in other words, an haecceity.

Such rhythms and events are part of the ethics of becomings-community. The women move towards becoming-community, towards all of the other becomings that are part and parcel of living in an intentional community. The coming community, which is expressed in each of the communities, in their collective enunciations, takes the form of ethical expressions of responsibility, rather than imaginations of responsibility. Such an ethical responsibility is being worthy of the event – the event of a global environmental crisis. Intentional Communities are seen by their members as a dynamic, open response to the problems of the world.

Community is something that is desired and yearned for, which has become tangled up with notions of spirituality, the environment and, sustainability, something that drives the transformations of the women’s subjectivities and their becomings-other in
the in-between of the relations of these notions. However, desire is more than a desire for a ‘thing’. For Deleuze and Guattari, life is desire, productive desire (Colebrook, 2002b, p. 99). Desire is prepersonal but it is folded into the bodies and minds of women in their becomings. Desire is the univocal or the Whole: the outside that is folded into the inside and unfolded and refolded again, in all of the processes of becoming, of individuation and difference. The virtuality of desire is implicated in the potential of becoming, in what has come to be written and theorised as ‘coming’ communities (Agamben, 1993; Lingis, 1994). Deleuze and Guattari’s work opens up ways of thinking community beyond the ‘good’ sense or the ‘common’ sense of community and the body politic of community. Their work allows some sense of the paradox that community is in becoming, in desire and in life. Such thinking transforms the everyday life of women, who live in intentional communities and sweeps everything into the prepersonal, the affects of life and of desire that exceeds any given life.

Community, when it is intentional community, exemplifies difference. It does this through the repetitions of community that are both bare repetitions and covered or disguised repetitions implicated in the will to power, the will to actualise the virtual of community along differing bundles of lines that intersect, in duration, connecting into an assemblage that is an intentional community. The convergence of such lines is

---

324 Nancy’s (1991, 1999, 2000) claim is that we, as singular beings, freely share community, in a sharing that is never completed. It is this already being in community but moving against unity that moves singularities to create intentional communities as a passionate resistance to the perceived, unitary status quo. This opposition may be on many levels, however it is always relational. The resistance is to social relations as they are formed within capitalist society. The originary, fractured communities that spawn intentional communities are relationally linked. The communities that are created have both a spatial and a social reality however they are not static essences but are themselves fractured and in motion as a multiplicity of bodies existing in an ecology of relations.

325 It is in bare and covered repetition that Deleuze (2004, p. 27) offers an opening to community as that which is both ordinary, replicable, regular, mechanical repetition and that which produces hidden or disguised inequality, incommensurability, and dissymmetry, which is difference-in-itself. He writes
part of the conjugation of the flux of desire and of the constitution of contemporary intentional communities, such as Clear Creek Community, Bonville and the Motherhouse, where I jumped into the realms of fieldwork and ethnography and where I splashed down in the process of becoming a ‘researcher’.

The context of contemporary intentional communities is that of the cosmos, where the ‘relations between forces’ of the cosmos is mapped onto the event of community, ‘passing through every point’ (Deleuze, 1988a, p. 36) as an attempt not to be unworthy of the event of life in the present time. The presumption of a coming utopia that has accompanied the emergence of intentional communities has dwindled with their ubiquity, their longevity and the changes that they have absorbed.

Intentional communities emerge on the borders of social formations. They shoot off as small bundles of lines of flight that coalesce at the point of a community. They grow as more lines of flight join them in the assemblages they create out of their connections. The emergence of intentional communities, along with their different modes of existence, is a critique of the social formations and the capitalist body politic that they come from. However, there is nothing simple or homogeneous about the women’s originary societies and that heterogeneity spills into intentional communities complicating and enriching the ‘glue’ of spirituality and sustainability. The communities themselves are pluralistic. The work of the social permaculturists,

‘One is material, the other spiritual, even in nature and in the earth. One is inanimate, the other carries the secret of our deaths and out lives, of our enchainments and our liberations, the demonic and the divine.’ He continues ‘the two repetitions are not independent. One is the singular subject, the interiority and the heart of the other, the depths of the other. The other is only the external envelope, the abstract effect. The repetition of dissymmetry is hidden within symmetrical ensembles or effects; a repetition of distinctive points underneath that of ordinary points; and everywhere the Other in the repetition of the Same.’ It is such a sense of difference that subtends any social research. It is an interweaving of the material and the spiritual, especially given that it is matter, nature, which is God, that is univocal being.
the neo-pagans, the Buddhists and the Bhakti Yoga brings that pluralism into view in a positive way through a political will to experiment with the political expressions of community. Intentional communities also resist unity and commonality in the wider body politic and instead attempt to be exemplary laboratories for social change. These are not the changes that will reveal any utopia. These are little transformations that are often joyful but not always. Intentional communities are sites of experimentation.

In each community, there has been a past will to unity. Historically, at the Motherhouse, the women were a lay apostolate with a very clearly defined and identified commonality that was nonetheless hierarchical and authoritarian. The centre of this system was the nucleus – women who were the vanguard of the transformation that ‘place’ was supposed to bring about. At Bonville, there was the ‘law of the woman guru’ that was supposed to be followed and was used to block change; and at Clear Creek Community, there was the abstract machine of permaculture and the rules of the body corporate. The collective enunciations, the passwords and order-words of unity and consensus, are both taken into account yet resisted, in subtle ways, by the women in all of the communities. The enunciations of change and adaptation are centred on sameness, or some form of acknowledged diversity at best, and the social context for each of the communities is central to their existence. However, such a territorial social context is only a part of an ecological assemblage and each assemblage itself has fuzzy aggregates that open lines of flight and mutation in terms of the everyday ethics or pragmatics of each community.

Although I have claimed that this thesis ends in the middle there has to be an end somewhere. For each of the communities, there was a presupposed originary
consensus against elements of the world outside. The paradox here is that the women, even while they support consensus, or democratic processes, still hold strongly diverse views about the processes of change and experiment, entangled in a series of ecological relations, that extend beyond any governable assemblage.

What are the abstract machines of the three intentional communities? Deleuze and Guattari (2004, p. 278) write of the abstract machine as having ‘no form itself’ but as ‘the abstract Machine of which each concrete assemblage is a multiplicity, a becoming, a segment, a vibration. And the abstract machine is the intersection of them all – ‘The abstract machine of the waves.’ – where in Virginia Woolf’s work, every element is like a wave but on the plane of consistency (the plane of immanence) the elements are ‘a single abstract Wave whose vibration propagates following a line of flight or deterritorialization traversing the entire plane’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 278). The women in this research are elements, like waves, that are multiplicities, becomings-imperceptible, ‘on the plane of consistency, which is nevertheless precisely where the imperceptible is seen and heard’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 278). Becomings which incorporate becomings-imperceptible incorporate the ‘most obstinate animal dynamism’ and the abstract impelled ‘all the way to the plane of consistency’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 277).

Each community is an abstract machine that has a proper name, Bonville, Clear Creek, the Motherhouse. Such proper names that come to mind are those who participate in an environmental ethics and whose names are expressions of sustainability and/or permaculture: Rosemary Morrow, Bill Mollison, Jenny Allen and many more. They are also the names that express the radical wing of the Roman
Catholic Church and its engagement with ecofeminism and environmental change: Rosemary Radford Reuther, Wendell Berry. They are the names of the avatars and gurus or their modern day counterparts. The figure of the abstract machine or the diagram pertains to the community as a diagram in itself, where such diagrams incorporate the thinking of such proper names and their designs for the future. Yet, each community is different and local, and is not the same abstract machine. Each community is a series of actualisations and counteractualisations of a virtuality that is the whole of the past and the whole of space (Grosz, 2001, p. 119). Each community actualises and differentiates from the virtual, from the potential of all of space, all of time as events, as becomings-other. The proper names that go into the make-up of each community are different; the figures are different, the designs are different. Each abstract machine brings composing forces into view as affect: duration, matter and the ways that duration constitutes and tends to overflow space. Intentional communities are assemblages of fuzzy aggregates and of forces, which create consistency from the open series of abstract machines operating within them. Such series complicate the event of communities, the signs, the proper names, the gurus, social movements, territories, theories, designs, and sense, in all of their connections.

Each woman’s world resonates, not simply as a series of analytic predicates of individuals, but as ‘rather the incompossible worlds which are the synthetic predicates of persons defined in relation to disjunctive syntheses…. Indeed the garden may

326 ‘The diagram or abstract machine is the map of relations between forces, a map of destiny, or intensity, which proceeds by primary non-localizable relations and at every moment passes through every point, ‘or rather in every relation from one point to another.’ Also ‘The diagram acts as a non-unifying immanent cause that is coextensive with the whole social field; the abstract machine is like the cause of the concrete assemblages that execute its relations; and these relations between forces take place ‘not above’ but within the very tissue of the assemblages they produce’ (Deleuze 1988a, pp. 36-37).
contain red roses, but there are on other worlds or in other gardens roses which are not red and flowers which are not roses’. In this sense, each woman, as a person, and in this thesis, is a finite number of predicated synthetic variables, possibilities or properties, and the predicates, rather than producing the one constant, themselves, is a becoming in a series of synthesising incompossible worlds (Deleuze, 1990, p. 115). Such worlds are created and inhabited and exist in each woman’s ‘conditions of emergence’ (Massumi, 2002a, p. 10), that is, the virtual, out of which her subjectifications and becomings are counter-actualised.

This project began with thinking of women in intentional communities, as an entry point into women’s experiments with an immanent, transformative, ecological politics and the worlds they make love with and so, continue to compose. It was an attempt to pay attention to the many small modes of existence in intentional communities. I wanted to know what happens so that women want to live in communities and what happens when those same women live more sustainable and spiritual lives. Living sustainably, with a focus on the ways that spirituality transforms the possibilities of our social and material worlds, through the ways that it is spoken, and made visible, framed my interests and opened up the worlds of the women. In an odd way, my hunch that the work of the theorists, who became my intercessors – and the time it took me to work with the many worlds I entered in the name of political fabulation – forced not only a different, slower way of thinking but a different outcome.

Intentional communities are worlds always in process, always actualising and counter-actualising in the always changing circumstances and in duration. They are created out of a yearning for community, for spirituality and sustainability but not by
everyone in the same way each and every time. They are a flight from the forces of the capitalist system, from the capture of conjugality and exploitation but more than that, they are ecological and political experiments with a series of agendas, always beginning in the middle, characterised by intensities, working through and drawing on every body available to ‘increase the number of connections’ (Deleuze & Guattari, 2004, p. 559). Intentional communities build, in Latour’s (2009, p. 488) terms, a ‘livable and breathable “home”’. In my terms, such communities successfully make love with worlds.
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