CLA as Process: Mapping the Theory and Practice of the Multiple

Marcus Bussey
University of the Sunshine Coast
Australia

Abstract

This paper argues that Causal Layered Analysis aka CLA is a method of the multiple that offers a process–theory of knowledge that facilitates new becomings and alternative futures. It makes the case that agency and social learning are enhanced through understanding human contexts as layered and dynamic. To do so it draws on the work of French philosophers Deleuze and Guattari who offer the organic metaphor of the rhizome as a way to understand the hybrid and multiple nature of reality. CLA is an ideal vehicle for articulating this insight and enabling futures practitioners in their work to empower those in contexts to realise their preferred futures.

Keywords: Causal Layered Analysis, CLA, Rhizome, Critical Agency, Critical Futures

Introduction

The challenge in this paper is to present Causal Layered Analysis (CLA) not as simply a useful taxonomical device but as a method of the multiple that offers a process oriented theory with libratory possibilities. To delve into these possibilities two premises are offered as a starting point and the thinking of French theorists Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari (1987) is drawn on to map out a theoretical space in which the potential of CLA is better understood.

The two premises make broad claims for CLA. They are:
- CLA is central to understanding and activating critical agency
- CLA successfully encompasses both poststructural and structural concerns, whilst representing a transdisciplinary and intercivilizational temper

To understand CLA as a method of the multiple it is necessary to turn to thinkers with a taste for the multiple. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) offer us the rhizome as a metaphor for the creative and layered possibilities immanent to any context. This concept is important as it underpins the first premise which asserts CLA's centrality to understanding and activating critical agency. This premise requires an embodied understanding that works the space that lies between agency and structure as constructed in the heavily binary geophilosophy of the West

(Bussey, 2009). The process orientation of this work is multiple in nature and can be understood rhizomically. The rhizome is an organic metaphor offered by Deleuze and Guattari as a tool for understanding the process of both natural and cultural transmission. Rhizomic process in turn functions as a basis for the second premise. CLA's hybrid nature brings together poststructural and structural concerns whilst representing a transdisciplinary and intercivilizational temper.

The following sections explore these threads, profiling CLA in both its taxonomic and process functions and offering a process theory for framing its possibilities. The thinking of Deleuze and Guattari is called upon to flesh out the philosophical conditions for CLA as process theory. Both their interrelated concepts of the *Rhizome* and the *Map* enable an understanding of CLA that is flexible and robust enough to account for its critical and libratory potential. Significantly the discussion of CLA enables a better understanding of Deleuze and Guattari's concept of the rhizome just as the rhizome deepens our understanding of CLA. The paper unpacks Deleuze and Guattari's (1987, pp.12-13) concept of the map to further this investigation. In fact it is in the map that the rhizomic possibilities of CLA are revealed. In this way the utility of the rhizome, which Deleuze and Guattari declare to be an *antimethod* (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p.27), is brought into focus.

Overview of CLA

CLA is Inayatullah's applied theorizing of Sarkar's layered ontology (Inayatullah, 2002; Ramos, 2003). As method it allows for specific contexts to be opened up to layered analysis while as theory it offers an account of social space that links context to epistemological and ontological assumptions about the real in a systematic way.

CLA, as theory, brings depth to the theoretical account of social space provided by Deleuze and Guattari. These authors posit a plane of immanence which is pre-philosophical (1994, p. 40) and grounds all conceptual activity in an immanence that "is not a concept that is or can be thought but rather the image of thought, the image thought gives itself of what it means to think, to make use of thought, to find one's bearings in thought" (Deleuze and Guattari, 1994, p.37). Inayatullah (Ramos, 2003), drawing on Sarkar's layered neohumanism (Bussey, 2006), poststructural genealogical analysis (Foucault, 2005) and on macrohistory (Galtung, 1997), suggests a way of accessing this 'image of thought' via CLA. Thus he theorizes the ontological preconditions to action and thought (how we see ourselves, the stories we tell, the myths we inhabit, the truth claims we make) and links these to the mythic/metaphoric stories, traditions and the local contexts deployed as a precondition to any thought or action. Thus for Inayatullah:

> "The issue is less what is the truth but how truth functions in particular policy settings, how truth is evoked, who evokes it, how it circulates, and who gains and loses by particular nominations of what is true, real and significant" (Inayatullah, 2004, p.7).

Such theoretical work, particularly when conducted *in situ* with those who share a context, demonstrates CLA's transformative and dynamic nature as a process–theory of knowledge that facilitates new becomings and alternative futures (Bussey, 2010).

CLA performs two related but discrete functions within what can be characterised as shamanic futures thinking (Bussey, 2009). As taxonomy it is essentially an academic exercise and tends to be analytically useful but contextually passive. As process–theory it tends to be socially transformative, fostering critical agency within an open and dynamic context. These two processes often occur in conjunction and generate a simple feedback loop that allows for reflexive, contextual self awareness to emerge. As method CLA exposes key assumptions and metaphors that shape the way we think about the future and agency. As a tool of epistemic scrutiny it has the capacity to reveal the hidden assumptions that drive culture to shape systems of reproduction and the kind of rationality we deploy when problem solving. These systems are nested and reflexive zones of sense making 'layers', in Inayatullah's sense of the term, that can define the real and forge identity in context.

Unpacking CLA

When introducing CLA, Inayatullah represents it as an iceberg with Litany at the top, System below it, Worldview/Paradigm below that and Myth/Metaphor at the bottom. The problems discussed in the newspaper, on television and around the kitchen table are in fact usually a shallow representation of much deeper issues. This is the level of **litany**—it is public, official, frequently chaotic and disconnected, associated with the normal and always unique. Thus, for example, the problem of violence in schools is not in any way seen as related to the problem of housing in the area. Each is a separate and discrete effect and is read as random, sensational and beyond our control. The media and politicians can pick this up and amplify it into "shame and blame" one-liners. At this level agency is all about the individual.

However, when we want the problem resolved it is common for us to turn to the **systemic level** where there are structures and processes (police, politicians, bureaucrats) in place to "manage" the problem. So, when considering violence in schools, the systemic response asks questions about professionalism, truancy, policing and standards. It seeks to understand and represent the problem through metrics on socio-economics and in dollar terms (how much money to resource the problem away). "Shame and blame" becomes punitive and righteous. This is the system response and it is political, social, legal and economic. At this level agency needs to be managed and the individual acts as a customer and becomes a number.

It is rare for the public "eye" to turn to the level of **worldview**. This is the province of theorists, political scientists, and philosophers. Here events like school violence are treated as discourse and read in relation to cultural systems of power that create contexts where violence is inevitable and in fact expected and necessary. Such discourse reads issues such as violence as essential for the validation and maintenance of specific forms of power and institutions. At this level authoritarianism, paternalism and nationalism battle it out with egalitarianism, Gaian visions of unity and universalism. Hence this is the domain of the -ism. This level works at generating new forms of consciousness in response to the prevailing hegemonic worldview while agency is collective and contextualized. Though individuality is recognized it is seen as variations on a theme determined by history and culture.

The deepest layer of **myth–metaphor** is submerged and, to borrow Deleuze and Guattari's (1994) term, pre-philosophical. This is the zone of unconscious awareness where deep stories function to ground logic, representation, discourse and identity

in comforting and deeply meaningful myths and metaphors. Here school violence becomes a story of the father betrayed by his child. It could call forth one of two responses, either demanding an eye for an eye (Old Testament) or urging a Prodigal Son reading (New Testament) where the father welcomes back the reformed son: the first story requires retributional justice while the second calls for ameliorative justice. At this level agency is mythic in nature and responds to a variety of archetypes such as the Father (Dark Father/Darth Vader/Father of the Prodigal Son) or the Servant. Of course pragmatically both the father of the prodigal son may sense the need to invest in the future (two sons are better than one) as a way of avoiding death (overcoming mortality) and ensuring the ongoing story of the entire project.

CLA is often presented taxonomically as a chart (Bussey et al, 2011) such as that in **Figure 1** which maps the above discussion of school violence.

	Violence in Schools	
	Response	Agency
Litany	Punitive, hyperbole, random chaos, reaction, shame and blame	Individual/Discrete/Un-reflective
System	Laws, rules, authority, order vs dis-order	Managed persona, individual as number, customer
Worldview	Institutions create violence; Institutions are violent. World a violent place that needs rules, force and order. Authoritarianism vs. Anarchy/Panarchy	Agency collective, context bound by culture and history
Myth–metaphor	Abraham, Zeus kills his father (child must become adult through a test), Darth Vader, Prodigal son, Luke Sky-Walker	Agency lies with the story teller/Bard/Prophet

Figure 1. CLA of Violence in Schools

Snapshot of CLA

CLA captures a set of lived domains which we can apply taxonomically but we can also engage with it to empower those in context to develop preferred futures, articulate pathways to these and identify what needs to be done at what level to enable success. In this we see that it operates **theoretically and methodologically** as a process of analysis whilst offering increased agency for those engaged in **processes of transformation**. Furthermore we also see it functioning at the **human level** where it opens up participants to deeper self-reflection on power and identity. The following scaffolded statements are worth considering:

At the **methodological/theoretical level**:
- CLA is both a method and a process theory. As analytic method CLA functions taxonomically, as process–theory it functions rhizomically
- CLA as process theory, engages rhizome in order to articulate process within layers and relationally across layers
- CLA is structural in form but poststructural in temper: ie it offers a clear structure to approach social process yet understands process as multiple, discursive and ephemeral, thus
- CLA as a hybrid method, supports the heterotopic space opened by shamanic futures thinking that allows for the multiplicity and hybridity of specific contexts. Structure is recognised but 'read' through a poststructural lens as contingent, fragile and fluid
- CLA behaves both deconstructively and reconstructively as transformative praxis

At the **process level**:
- Each layer of CLA is thick with the rhizomic possibility of its 'plane of immanence'
- CLA offers 'embodied' context for individuals and collectives seeking to locate agency within structure
- CLA by moving up and down the layers, following causal chains, further reinforces the appreciation of the immanent creativity of all contexts at all levels
- CLA locates agency at all levels according to context

At the **human level**:
- CLA provides an analytic tool more concerned with the 'social struggles' of specific actors than with 'purifying' theoretical rigour. This occurs because CLA reads the social as structured/mediated through history, language, ideology and individuality.
- CLA, by mapping unique lines of flight, identifies where agency is located within each rhizomic layer

Figure 2. CLA in Levels

The rhizome as an organic, networked, unstable and dynamic metaphor for social process offers a conceptual model for understanding this complex and rich set of possibilities. Thus rhizomic thought is sensitive to the uniqueness of context, what Deleuze and Guattari refer to as its multiplicity (1987, p.8). They are also aware that rhizomic activity occurs in both the macro and micro contexts of human expression. Thus a rhizome may function civilizationally, like the concept of democracy with its long and ambiguous career across time and space, or it may function at the micro level of human psychological process such as a desire or self-image. They use the analogy of the puppet and the puppeteer (Geleuze and Guattari, 1987) to bring some coherence to the relationship between the various hierarchies of existence. Though each rhizome may have a history, such as democracy, they challenge this history by arguing that rhizomes deterritorialized between contexts and then reterritorialized in a new context (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p.9) are made unique by virtue of the presence of other rhizomes (historically specific conditions) that were not present in

its previous context. Thus they argue that the rhizome is an antigenealogy.

Each layer of CLA can be seen to function rhizomically as unique configurations dependent on context and open to deterritorialization as a prelude to transformation, i.e. reterritorialization. Thus the relationship of CLA is one of a mutually enriching engagement.

Developing CLA as a Process–Theory

We now orient this investigation of CLA to a consideration of CLA's critical potential. The two premises stated at the opening of this chapter flag CLA's potential which can now be seen as twofold: taxonomic and process oriented. As critique is a dynamically relational principle the rhizome has been introduced to further understanding of CLA as a process theory. It is now necessary to explore more deeply this relationship with the work of Deleuze and Guattari. CLA's capacity to deepen thinking and praxis that promotes social learning (Wals, 2012) and critical agency is linked to this engagement.

CLA as it intersects with social process offers **a horizon of critical enquiry**. It thus plays a central part in any rethinking of social learning and critical agency within society and culture. This rethinking acts like a utopic, to use Louis Marin's useful term (Marin, 1990), which is inherently futures oriented. Such a horizon motivates futures practitioners theoretically while structural conditions of inequality, disadvantage and violence underpin their practical concerns. The critical agency that CLA's possibilities generate calls forth the condition of "becoming–critical" as an antidote to the reversals that regularly occur in civilizational processes. This futures orientation has relevance for social learning as it generates a logic in which critical praxis challenges the present by questioning its own identity/becoming.

Critical action seeks to deterritorialize the present tense of any social context. Its goal is to open up the sense of the critical, as Giri suggests (2006, p.6), to the entire range of human potential. Furthermore, Deleuze and Guattari quip that to create is to resist (1994, p.110); when this assertion is linked to their comment that "philosophy begins with the creation of concepts" (Deleuze and Grattari, 1994, p.40), then we must conclude that an expanded philosophy also resists the present.

Such a critical positioning is modelled by CLA as a way of shaking up habit such that we become strange to ourselves. In this way the present is understood and represented as ephemeral and already more closely aligned with the past than the future. Critical action is what births transformation as a break with the past. CLA facilitates this 'becoming strange' by mapping the "present–that–is–already–passing"as a shared and unique moment. It brings together "an experimentation in contact with the real" (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p.12). Following this logic, while simultaneously abrogating it[1], it offers a method for provoking new possibilities "rhizomically". Precisely because social reality is past–present–future–becoming; locked in buildings of brick; bodies; visions; dreams; desires, language and nonthought; it is difficult to effectively engage in linear analysis that can approach its concrete–fluidity. CLA can be read as a rhizomic–machine that maps the intersections of concrete–fluidity that define the social field and plays hide and seek with the researcher.

Mapping creates a landscape. It is a creative act and may be thought of both as concrete geographical process of description and also as a cultural activity. Hutchinson alerts us to this issue, arguing that:

> Metaphorically and genealogically speaking, our guiding images may be seen as forms of cultural maps. Such guiding images "naturalize" our orientations to the physical and social world, the steps we take in everyday life and our anticipated future journeys (2005, p.1).

Hutchinson sees maps as sites of cultural politics and argues that developing critical awareness of how context determines what is possible, and how map and context are self-referential artifacts, is an important critical task. Thinking of futures as a spectrum of possibilities running along a critical continuum suggests that thinking shamanically about context allows critical agency to become contextually aware. For Hutchinson this would mean finding pathways of practical hope, "From a critical futurist and peace education perspective, it is important to attempt to negotiate pathways of practical hope rather than make a labyrinth of cynicism, fatalism or despair convincing" (Hutchinson, 2005, p.10).

CLA's potential is enlarged when it is understood as a map that performs a number of specific tasks:

1. It generates pathways of practical hope through its process orientation
2. It maps epistemological context
3. It problematizes a given moment and thus returns agency to those in context
4. It contains the energy of the rhizome, harnessing it to an understanding of context and transformation

The following section illustrates the cartographic possibilities for CLA when it rhizomically intersects with Deleuze and Guattari's thinking on the map.

The Map: a Rhizomic CLA?

Deleuze and Guattari describe the map as follows:

> The map does not reproduce an unconscious closed in upon itself; it constructs the unconscious. It fosters connections between fields, the removal of blockages on bodies without organs, the maximum opening of bodies without organs onto a plane of consistency. It is itself a part of the rhizome. The map is open and connectable in all of its dimensions; it is detachable, reversible, susceptible to constant modification. It can be torn, reversed, adapted to any kind of mounting, reworked by an individual, group, or social formation. It can be drawn on a wall, conceived of as a work of art, constructed as a political action or as a meditation. Perhaps one of the most important characteristics of the rhizome is that it always has multiple entryways; in this sense, the burrow is an animal rhizome, and sometimes maintains a clear distinction between the line of flight as a passageway and storage or living strata (cf. the muskrat). A map has multiple entryways, as opposed to the tracing, which always comes back "to the same". The map has to do with performance, whereas the tracing always involves an alleged "competence" (1987, pp. 12-13).

It is not too difficult to see how CLA fits with this description of a rhizomic map. Firstly, CLA allows for the heterodox and transgressive. Secondly, it generates a space of possibility rather than dictating what goes in the space. Thirdly, it

identifies loci around which meaning in the passing–partial–present aggregates, yet it avoids definition—allowing instead for those within the CLA "burrow–rhizome" to define themselves. Fourthly, it can be asserted that hybrids like CLA are rhizomic by nature/definition. The hybrid CLA fulfils its map potential while not exhausting it or being confined to it. This section will demonstrate these assertions by unpacking the above statement from Deleuze and Guattari.

- *The map does not reproduce an unconscious closed in upon itself; it constructs the unconscious* (all bullet point statements are from the above quotation)*.

CLA validates the mythic, metaphorical and unconscious/preconscious dimensions of culture by representing this level as foundational. This level provides the energy that motivates human cultural creativity; when enacted face-to-face the process of CLA invites participants to generate–identify–reconfigure their own myths. In this way the unconscious drives of a social-institutional context are made "visible" not as "things", but as processes and urges that emerge and dissolve as the CLA process unfolds. The present becomes contingent, agency returns as the unconscious along with the conscious self, which in turn becomes contested and open for reconstruction. When applied epistemologically CLA maps by analogy, suggestion, inference and association. Thus as Inayatullah points out:

> The project here is to show that the real has come about for various reasons and that the coming about of a specific "present" means the non-realisation of other "presents". Thus, in any given moment, *what-is* is an imposition, a silencing of various ways of thinking, of doing, and a realisation of other ways of thinking (2004, p. 71).

The autopoesis of the individual becomes that of the social; and the autopoesis of the social becomes that of each individual. The lines of flight available within any context are potentially infinite. The unconscious is like a deep cave and the conscious provides tracings on the wall.

CLA locates these conscious tracings, offering genealogy, deconstruction and meta-reflexive opportunities that are fractal in their engagements with the social/individual nexus. Hence the "tracings", are simple etchings on the cave wall, while CLA offers a rough approximation to the cave. Such a cavernous space is hinted at in Picasso's evocative painting of the Minotaur (Figure 3) in which a bodiless pair of hands beckons or perhaps seeks to repel. They have not yet made themselves. In one sense they represent Deleuze and Guattari's Body without Organs (BwO) (1987, p.149), the constant possibility of the reconfiguration of desire through the binding presences of organism, significance and subjectification (Deleuze and Grattari, 1987, p.159). From the perspective of CLA they can be read as the human intersection with the mythic meta-self. They bind and unbind; beckon and repel. They are the conscious and the unconscious as they are both figurative and suggestive. CLA maps the conditionality of our social world. It produces a critical agency by offering us a possible way to construct the "unconscious" conditions that bring coherence to the social–individual dialectic.

Figure 3. Minotaur and the Mare before the Cave (Picasso)

- *It fosters connections between fields, the removal of blockages on bodies without organs, the maximum opening of bodies without organs onto a plane of consistency.*

CLA acts in a similar way to Deleuze and Guattari's plane of consistency. The former acknowledges layers while the latter strata (1987, p.69). The terrain mapped by both is paradoxically indeterminate yet Inayatullah allows, in fact, *insists* on a normative dimension to CLA.

I argue for an eclectic, integrated approach to methodology. The approach is not based on the idiosyncratic notions of a particular researcher. Nor is it a turn to the postmodern, in that all methods or approaches are equally valid and valuable. Hierarchy is not lost and the vertical gaze remains. But it challenges power over others and divorces hierarchy from the feudal/traditional modes… How myth, worldview, and social context create particular litany problems remains foundational (2004, pp.2-3).

Both however, trace connections and use them freely to develop concepts, and associations, and expose ruptures and asymmetries. Deleuze and Guattari write so poetically that their metaphors collide and tease: they have strata but no hierarchy; their plane of consistency can easily be read as a plane of inconsistency. Yet they offer the map as a rhizomic system that is fluid, eclectic and transgressive. It has, as they suggest above, the potential to create the 'maximum opening' for BwO, or as Inayatullah would have it, identity categories. Within CLA such categories are constantly disrupted and problematized, new stories and connections emerge and then destabilize: this is a map of potentiality as much as a method for the reterritorialization of identity and agency. In this way it corresponds in process, content and intention to what Deleuze and Guattari say of the plane of consistency:

What it comes down to is that we cannot content ourselves with a dualism or

summary opposition between the strata and the destratified plane of consistency. The strata themselves are animated and defined by relative speeds of deterritorialization; moreover, absolute deterritorialization is there from the beginning, and the strata are spin-offs, thickenings on a plane of consistency that is everywhere, always primary and always immanent (Deleuze and Grattari, 1987, p. 70).

- *It is itself a part of the rhizome. The map is open and connectable in all of its dimensions; it is detachable, reversible, susceptible to constant modification. It can be torn, reversed, adapted to any kind of mounting, reworked by an individual, group, or social formation.*

CLA is open: it can be, and regularly is, applied to any working or theoretical context. It moves across the social, rhizomically connecting, linking, disconnecting with context and subjectivity. In this sense it is the ultimate map. But it has the uncanny ability, not unlike Jack Sparrow's compass[2] in the movies *Pirates of the Caribbean*, to take us to where we wish to be: hence its normative base. Yet, despite the avowals of relativity, the philosophy of Deleuze and Guattari is motivated by the same desire Inayatullah has to destabilise and problematize regimes of truth in order to release the creative potential that a good map contains. The implicit normativity of the rhizome is contained in their commitment to extract:

…from chaos the 'people to come' in the form that art, but also philosophy and science, summon forth: mass-people, world-people, brain-people, chaos-people—nonthinking thought that lodges in the three (art, philosophy and science), like Klee's nonconceptual concept and Kandinsky's internal silence (Deleuze and Guattari, 1994, p.218).

The rhizomic qualities of CLA, its ability to morph and shift context and identity are rooted in its chameleon-like ability to acquire meaning when in context. In the absence of an object CLA is nothing. Like a map it needs a territory to chart, coordinates and compass; and a purpose for going on the journey.

- *It can be drawn on a wall, conceived of as a work of art, constructed as a political action or as a meditation.*

CLA, like all maps, is an analogue for the Real but not in the mimetic sense, rather as an abstract representation or a symbol that condenses the properties (the marks, contours, forms) of reality into a system of signs. Inayatullah presents it, projecting it on the wall, via the analogue of the iceberg. This image alerts us to how little of the Real we see. It reminds all involved with the CLA process that much behind the litany of day–to–day issues is unclear, uncharted and inaccessible. Much of the litany is under writ by what Deleuze and Guattari characterise as "A silent dance" (1987, p.69), a dance on alien terrain; a dance over a symbolic map such as that performed by Pueblo Indians (Sando, 1998).

As a map CLA also reminds us that the dance is with a multitude, people from the past and from distant lands, people also from the future; and not just people! We are dancing in and with the Cosmos. CLA is a work of art and of heart: it is, as Leonard Cohen notes in his great poem "Dance Me to the End of Love", a dance with a burning violin; a dance beyond fear in which "We're both of us beneath

our love, we're both of us above…" And the politics behind it all is libratory and designed to expose power/knowledge coagulations through the hermeneutic of a cultural space constructed to open up possibility rather than close it down.

- *Perhaps one of the most important characteristics of the rhizome is that it always has multiple entryways; in this sense, the burrow is an animal rhizome, and sometimes maintains a clear distinction between the line of flight as a passageway and storage or living strata (cf. the muskrat). A map has multiple entryways, as opposed to the tracing, which always comes back 'to the same'.*

The emptiness of CLA means that it is the ultimate rhizome—all is connection, movement, with direction linked to intention. As with the compass of Johnny Depp's Jack Sparrow character in *Pirates of the Caribbean* CLA is a tool for reaching a more optimal place – a desired "end" – that is still open to new interventions. This allows for a creative, non-prescriptive flexibility that allows agency to move across the layered/discursive fields of the CLA–rhizome–map. Responsibility, in the practical context also shifts, as Inayatullah points out:

> [W]ho solves the problem/issue also changes with each level. At the litany level, it is usually others—the government or corporations. At the social level, it is often some partnership between different groups. At the worldview level, it is people or voluntary associations, and at the myth/metaphor it is leaders or artists (2007, p. 57).

- *The map has to do with performance, whereas the tracing always involves an alleged "competence".*

Finally, unlike "tracing" that tends methodologically to be descriptive, analytical and constitutive, CLA is a map-method that is committed to forms of anticipatory action learning that challenge power structures, offer alternative 'archaeologies' of the present (Foucault, 2005), and question the foundational assumptions that are often unconsciously accepted by both individuals, groups and epistemic communities (academics) as incontestable. CLA's performativity is linked to context, and demonstrated rather than mandated *in situ*. Certainly, the normative basis for CLA's application—the intention of generating inclusive social pedagogies of resistance and re-enchantment that increase levels of institutional, social and individual agency is a significant guarantor for such a positioning.

Constructing a Method of the Multiple

Shamanic futures thinking seeks to understand agency as a relational expression within context. CLA as a rhizomic and hybrid map of context is well placed to facilitate this process. Hybridity defines the process nature of the life-world as it is the product of rhizomic encounter.

Through an exploration of the work of Deleuze and Guattari CLA has been shown to be a useful vehicle for understanding the rhizomic process of becoming that these philosophers describe. In CLA the heterotopic, the immanent, the intercivilizational and the transdisciplinary all meet and are integral to its nature and process. In this way CLA clearly meets the criteria identified by Deleuze and

Guattari for a method for attaining the multiple:

> To attain the multiple, one must have a method that effectively constructs it; no typographical cleverness, no lexical agility, no blending or creation of words, no syntactical boldness, can substitute for it (1987, p.22).

CLA's hybrid and heterotopic nature constructs such a method. It thus facilitates critical analysis that is productive of conditions that expand life's possibilities and generates the kind of critical agency necessary for vibrant social learning. To further demonstrate the degree of alignment between CLA and Deleuze and Guattari's rhizomic thinking, time was spent in this paper exploring how CLA functions like the map that these philosophers describe as a tool for both constructing and theorizing the multiple. As a map CLA moves beyond taxonomic and schematic method to a process theory of being/becoming. In this it offers a way to think about critical agency pragmatically, in context, as part of a pedagogic process of possibility (Bussey et al, 2012) committed to expanding the emancipatory politics at the heart of the critical project.

Conclusion

This paper has explored CLA through comparison with Deleuze and Guattari's concept of the rhizome. Concepts have effects and therefore we can understand them best through application and reflection (Bussey, 2014). CLA's uses can be in the analytic sphere as taxonomy or in the applied sphere of process method in which it functions pedagogically as a critical facilitator of liberatory consciousness and the social learning this fosters. Thus it treats any singular projection of reality with suspicion, instead embracing the plural as the creative inversion of given context. In this way structure becomes flexible and open to transformation whilst agency finds itself located in structure so as to critique and influence it in ways that make it more reflective of optimal current and future possibilities.

CLA can be understood to function as a *map of process*. This process functions rhizomically, context is thus always unique and constructed with infinite variety, yet is made legible through CLA. In this way CLA acts as a method of the multiple and as a process theory for rethinking social learning. CLA as a method deepens futures thinking by (1) revealing the role that context has in shaping meaning and (2) the role people have in shaping context. Thus CLA works the interface between agency and structure where intelligibility shapes individual and social existence. It is this ability to engage process—how agency and structure generate meaning interactively—that makes CLA an appropriate social learning tool.

Acknowledgement

Correspondence

Marcus Bussey
University of the Sunshine Coast

Australia
Email: MBussey@usc.edu.au

Notes

1 This is a paradox! They argue that we need a method while declaring that the rhizome is an anti-method. CLA by offering sites for rhizomic process thus acts like a bottle for an unstable chemical.
2 Jack Sparrow is the anti-hero of the movie *The Pirates of the Caribbean*. In this movie his compass keeps pointing in the direction of that which he most desires, with comic results when he falls for his best friend's girlfriend.

References

Bussey, M. (2006). Mapping Neohumanist Futures in Education. In S. Inayatullah, Bussey, M., and Milojevic, I. (Eds.), *Neohumanist Educational Futures: Liberating the Pedagogical Intellect* (pp. 7-24). Tamsui, Taiwan: Tamkang University Press.

Bussey, M. (2009). Six Shamanic Concepts: Exploring the *Between* in Futures Work. *foresight, 11*(2), 29-42.

Bussey, M. (2010). Resistance is Not Futile: escaping the integral trap. *Futures, 42*(2), 110-114.

Bussey, M. (2014). Concepts and Effects: ordering and practice in foresight. *foresight, 16*(1), 1-16.

Bussey, M., Bjurstrom, Åse E., Sannum, Miriam. (2011). Explorations in intercultural work integrated learning: Educational Process for a Topsy-Turvy world. *Futures, 43*(1), 39-47.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (B. Massumi, Trans.). London & New York: Continuum.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1994). *What is Philosophy?* New York: Columbia University Press.

Foucault, M. (2005). *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. London & New York: Routledge.

Galtung, J., & Inayatullah, Sohail (Eds.). (1997). *Macrohistory and Macrohistorians: Perspective on Individual, Social, and Civilizational Change*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.

Giri, A. K. (2006). *New Horizons of Social Theory: Conversations, Transformations and Beyond*. Jaipur: Rawat Publications.

Hutchinson, F. P. (2005). Mapping and Imagined Futures: Beyond Colonising Cartography. *Journal of Futures Studies, 9*(4), 1-14.

Inayatullah, S. (2002). *Understanding Sarkar: The Indian Episteme, Macrohistory and Transformative Knowledge*. Leiden: Brill.

Inayatullah, S. (2007). *Questioning the Future: Methods and Tools for Organizational and Societal Transformation* (3rd ed.). Tamsui, Taiwan: Tamkang University.

Inayatullah, S. (Ed.). (2004). *The Causal Layered Analysis (CLA) Reader: Theory*

and Case Studies of an Integrative and Transformative Methodology. Tamsui, Taiwan: Tamkang University Press.

Marin, L. (1990). *Utopics: The Semiological Play of Textual Spaces*. Amherst, NY: Humanity Books.

Ramos, J. M. (2003). *From Critique To Cultural Recovery: Critical futures studies and Causal Layered Analysis*. Melbourne: Swinburne University of Technology.

Sando, J. S. (1998). *Pueblo Profiles: cultural identity through centuries of change*. Sante Fe, N.M: Clear Light Publishers.

Wals, A. E. J. (2012). Foreword. In H. B. Lotz-Sisitka (Ed.), (Re) Views on Social Learning Literature: A Monograph For Social Learning Researchers In Natural Resources Management And Environmental Education (pp. 8-9). Grahamstown/Howick: Environmental Learning Research Centre, Rhodes University / EEASA / SADC REEP.