

# 'Resisting Creativity, Creating the New'. A Deleuzian Perspective on Creativity

Emma L. Jeanes

Create/Innovate or die. This is the taken-for-granted 'truth' in the social, political and economic context in which we currently live. In fact, so accepted is this mantra that criticism seems foolish; mere evidence of the entrenched conservatism that needs to be challenged. This article posits an alternative view of creativity, drawing in particular on the thinking of the philosopher Gilles Deleuze. The writing of Deleuze is used to explore our understanding of creativity, in terms of what 'creativity' is (and what it is not), and the destructive (and sometimes pointless) nature of creativity. In doing so it is hoped that this article challenges clichéd representations of 'creativity', the typical 'creativity is wonderful and we need a lot more of it . . .' type arguments and assist scholars to become more creative (or at least more reflective) in their own practice.

## Introduction

The purpose of this article is, to borrow a phrase, 'to make the familiar seem strange'; in particular, to problematize the moral crusade that seems to be waged on account of the constructs of 'creativity and innovation', a crusade that has remained largely unchallenged. Its aim is to expose a range of clichés and ready-made representations we find in the literature on creativity and innovation management, and force scholars in the field to engage in a deeper exploration of the implications of the 'creative process'. In proceeding thus, a connection between the field of creativity and innovation and certain writings in philosophy and social theory are relied upon, in particular those of French philosopher Gilles Deleuze. Given the emphasis on 'process' and 'flow' in recent years (e.g. Csikszentmihalyi, 1996; Drazin, Glynn & Kazanjian, 1999; Mauzy & Harri-man, 2003) it seems somewhat surprising that creativity studies have largely ignored a body of work that has continued to expand in importance and impact in recent years, not least in the field of management and organization theory. This absence is all the more puzzling since the notion of creativity, and indeed that of 'creative organization' (Hardt,

1993, p. 20), plays such a central role in the Deleuzian oeuvre.

## The Creative Mantra

The discourse of creativity is rife within society (Thrift, 2002), with the necessity for creativity (and innovation) now seemingly elevated above many other aspects of traditional management discourse. This 'creative imperative' can be seen alongside developments in (primarily information) technology that enable ever-intensifying change. Contemporary business not only has to change, but change rapidly and perpetually – with today's success very much tomorrow's history. Pick up any text on management and you can hardly fail to notice the apparent importance of creativity and innovation to an organisation. In fact, so typical are these statements that we take them for granted, assume they are unquestionably 'right'. Critics of the 'innovate or die' argument remain a minority voice at the edge of management discourse and have a tendency to call for a new approach to innovation: a new mantra. Getz and Robinson (2003) for example, argue that the drive for innovation fails to take account of the importance of doing other things (that are already in

place) well; that it fails to take into account the reality of successful innovation, and high failure rates. They make sensible observations, but also implicitly acknowledge the importance of innovation (if companies are buying-in innovation, someone must be innovating) and tend towards a prescriptive approach (arguing that getting the 'right' combination of skills to innovate may be rare and difficult still implies there is a recipe for innovative behaviour). Indeed they conclude with the thoughts that real innovation results from progress and excellence: that customer-focused processes and basic continuous improvement play a far more important role (Getz & Robinson, 2003, p. 133) and front-line staff are key to this process, as the people with ideas that relate to real problems and opportunities facing the company.

Not only is the discourse of creativity familiar, it is instantly recognizable: we know the language of creativity; we know how to identify and classify creativity; we are told how to be creative; and sometimes we are even asked 'what do you want to create?'. In Foucauldian terms creativity has become 'normalized'; our understanding has become framed by the language of creativity, our 'being creative' prescribed both substantively and instrumentally. The literature (and language) of creativity is, of course, evolving. We are re-classifying, finding new methods, working on our understanding of the 'essence' of creativity. Creativity has become the modern mantra. We have creative industries, creative partnerships and creative approaches of which individuals, businesses and even governments are trying to harness the potential. Creativity is seen as essential for our survival, economically and socially. Yet fundamentally, and significantly, the argument presented here is that we have become uncreative through this very process. In making creativity the current orthodoxy, and by focusing on the provision of an ontological basis for creativity (what *is it?*), we are actually subverting the true process of creativity.

This article adopts the writing of Gilles Deleuze to re-examine what we mean by 'creativity', to question its role and impact, to question the current mode of thinking, and to add a new perspective and impetus to the important minority who challenge 'creativity' and 'innovation' as currently represented. By its very nature, Deleuze's work does not offer prescriptions as to 'how to be creative', however it does offer us a perspective, which should at least, in practical terms, present us with a mode of reflection on our desire for, and means to becoming, creative. In doing so it

rejects any heroic image of creativity (instead, balancing the positive force of creativity with its destructive side) and moves us away from trying to capture the 'how-to-be' creative processes and the 'eureka' moment of creating the new, but instead forces us to appreciate the more humble processes of thinking and working at problems and creating new ways of seeing and responding to these problems: the *creation of new concepts*.

### What Is Creativity? (A Deleuzian Perspective)

Deleuze explores creativity as an intellectual activity, with particular reference to philosophy (although also the arts and to a lesser degree the sciences) and the creation of concepts. Deleuze argues that philosophers should not reflect on things: ideas that already exist; and that mere representation (and exploration) of these ideas imposes rules on our thinking and is inherently limiting (Deleuze, 1994, p. 135). Instead Deleuze believes that what (good) philosophers actually do is *create*, by generating *new concepts*: 'To think is to create – there is no other creation – but to create is first of all to engender "thinking" in thought' (Deleuze, 1994, p. 147). His concern is to open us up to new powers of thinking, and what he termed its 'power of becoming'. Essentially this is a 'creative' thinking – one that is free from established ideas and ways of thinking, albeit constrained and transformed by the context in which we think. Deleuze looks to a form of thinking that strives for 'production, mutation and creation . . . we do philosophy to expand thought to its infinite potential' (Colebrook, 2002, p. 15). This process of 'becoming' – the what *might/could* be – the creation of what is not yet, is achieved through thinking in new, perhaps previously unimagined, modes of thinking – what he sees as the key to maximizing the potential of life. He describes this as thinking in the *virtual*. The concept enables us to move beyond that which we know and experience and think how this might be extended. It provokes us, dislodges us from our ways of thinking. It creates whole new lines of thinking; new possibilities. This is thinking that reforms itself over and over again, eternally; thinking that is not defined by an image it creates of itself, a mode of thinking that is *new* (Colebrook, 2002):

Thinking is always experiencing, experimenting, not interpreting but experimenting, and what we experience, experiment with, is always actuality, what's coming into being, what's new, what's taking shape (Deleuze, 1995, p. 106).

Such a 'thinking' is inherently destabilizing as it takes us away from what we know, what we recognise as 'good practice' in creative thinking, and ask us to think about *how we think*.

Deleuze argues that what is typically ignored is the power of the 'virtual' in favour of a focus on the actual world. The virtual power of becoming is one of potentiality – what has not yet unfolded. Life, for Deleuze, is a virtual power – a power to become in unforeseen ways and as fully real as the actual (Colebrook, 2002, p. 96). The actual world is limited in its future possibilities by what is already given: the actual world evolves through the unfolding of given possibilities towards a given end. We are working with known ideas, and thinking in the same way, so the outcome of our thinking is almost predictable. In the virtual world, however, there is the power to 'become' – to create – in unforeseen ways, unlimited by the actual world because we are no longer working within those terms of reference. In terms of the discourse of creativity this means thinking, being creative, in new ways and not in ways prescribed and recognized by our current understanding of creativity. The problem with our current way of thinking is it is a process of the *realization* of ideas. The process of realization is guided by resemblance, since we are working with known ideas and ways of thinking, and limitation, since not all possibilities can be realized. However, for the *virtual* to become *actual* it must *create* its own terms of actualization; with no pre-formed order this is a process of genuine creative evolution (Hardt, 1993). It is the process of something new – something previously unknown – becoming actualized.

Central to this process of thinking differently is the ability to think beyond transcendent ways of thinking and seeing; to think beyond our current conceptualizations of creativity: in particular the language of creativity and creative practices – what we already 'know'. It appears as something we can reveal or interpret (we can recognize the creative act and attempt to explain it). For Deleuze, transcendence is ultimately an illusion, the transcendent image (the way in which creativity is conceptualized) is merely an invention.<sup>1</sup> To remain enslaved by transcendent modes of thinking means we have stopped thinking:

If we allow thought to accept some transcendent foundation – such as reason, God, truth or human nature – then we have

stopped thinking. (Smith, 2003, p. 79; see also Nietzsche, 1976, p. 451)

Working *within* the creative narrative effectively limits us to merely replicate, or think (or create) within these linguistic boundaries. Our ability to create the 'new' is limited by what we already know.

Essentially the pre-given importance of creativity, and ways in which we think about creativity, actually prevents us from being truly creative. What we need to do is break-out of these transcendent modes of thinking: to try and 'deterritorialize' creative thinking from its current conceptions and free the possibility from its origins. Remaining territorialized within our current conceptions of creativity naturally limits future possibilities to what is already given, to the constraints of the ordering of language:

In Deleuze's view, language is charged with power relations. The object of language is not communication, but the inculcation of mots d'ordre-'slogans,' 'watchwords,' but also literally 'words of order,' the dominant, orthodox ways of classifying, organizing, and explaining the world. (Bogue, 2004, p. 71)

The question, therefore, is how to avoid this grounding of our thinking that would otherwise prevent us from thinking creatively. The very fact of 'thinking' *having a form* means that it is already conforming with a model taken from somewhere – such as the state, the market – but no longer identified with its origin: it is seen as a natural phenomenon (Buchanan, 2000, p. 75). Deleuze's concept of 'nomadism' appears a logical extension of this critique: a form of thought that owes nothing to established models, nor engages with them. The nomadic thinker is one who is free to create new connections, open up experience to new 'becomings', in short – to think *differently*. As a consequence, it may appear that Deleuze suggests a nomadic existence rather than a sedentary one: one that is fixed to certain 'ways of thinking', but his real point is that there are always new ways of thinking, and that 'our' conception of philosophy (or creativity) is not the only one (Buchanan, 2000, p. 74). Deleuze is not driven by a desire to propose *a* way of thinking – one true answer (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994). Deleuze and Guattari (1986) related the 'nomad' to 'minor science'. The alternative of reproductive science or 'Royal Science' – the dominant way of thinking and understanding – is, for Deleuze, inherently uncreative in that the supposedly 'creative' processes are captured. Under Royal Science, the modes of thinking are known, often

<sup>1</sup> Paradoxically, this exhibits the power of the inventive process – that thinking can be so powerful as to enslave itself to images of a transcendent 'outside' (Colebrook, 2002, p. 71).

explicitly specified and expected of those working within the scientific tradition. With Royal Science the process of thinking, of creativity, is institutionalized: scientists are socialized into these ways of thinking. This results in a proliferation of imitation, and a limitation to what can be created, for all the possibilities have to emerge from the limited givens and through the limited procedures possible; in essence the Royal Science knows how things are to be done, and what the possible answers can be. By articulating a minor science, Deleuze is proposing an 'untimely' approach to science – that is a science acting counter to its time, by thinking outside these limits, and hopefully in a manner for the benefit of a time to come.

Perhaps Deleuze's most utopian idea is that one can think *differently*. It is not the point of origin of thought, nor the content of thought that matters, but that the *way of thinking can be new* or distinct (Buchanan, 2000). Nor does Deleuze propose a particular form of new thinking, but rather a 'polyphonic' (see Bakhtin, 1984) form of philosophy: an 'assemblage' of forms of thinking (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). Deleuze enables us to see the possibility of creating a fresh way of thinking; and one that is entirely practical rather than theoretical; and one that is political (Deleuze & Guattari, 1977; see also Patton, 2000), as we shall now explore.

## Deleuze, Creativity and Capitalism

When we talk about creativity we do so essentially within the context of capitalism. The creative process, and its importance, is connected with the economy; we measure creative success in capitalist terms. Deleuze's work is inherently interested in the capitalist system. The 'untimely' (Deleuze, 1990, p. 265) nature of his philosophy was in part the destruction of the precept of capitalism, a dogma of Western thought. We can deterritorialize, to some extent, but ultimately this deterritorialization is limited by the retention of the unit of capital: our imagining of all possible beings – or deterritorializations – is measured through the unit of capital and thus only relative deterritorialization of capitalism is possible. Newly created concepts are seen as 'things' to be sold or exchanged; all our imaginings of becomings are measured through capital units. For Deleuze this has both positive and negative aspects (Colebrook, 2002, p. 65). A positive perspective can be seen by the deterritorialization possible by this system of exchange – any aspect of life can be opened up to exchange and interaction. However, this deterritorializa-

tion relies on an initial territorialization – that of capital – which creates the tendency for quantification of all exchange, even the value of concepts. Here, the becoming does not fully deterritorialize; it does not fully escape its original territory. Even creativity (in the form of 'creative' knowledge) is increasingly valued as a commodity in this economy. Deleuze is not so much anti-capitalist, as desiring an expansion of possibilities beyond the limits of capital. Indeed rebelling against capitalism creates its own problems: by projecting an opposing set of ideas one conforms to a new form of thinking, a new territory.

In much of current creativity discourse there seems to be this assumption of truth – the truth that is the value of 'creativity'; the compulsion for 'creativity'. The desire for creation, as typified by much of the creativity literature and management discourse, talks about 'frame breaking' and 'changing the domain' in which it works, but in reality this 'creativity' is no different from Deleuze's Royal Science – it is, in a manner of speaking, a creativity captured by capitalism and its language of creativity. Here the notion of creativity is limited to that of reproduction; working within and from a plane of thinking that grounds (and thus limits) our thinking with the territory of capital. Creativity is treated as a 'something,' as a value *in itself* (Thrift, 2000, p. 676). Furthermore, the processes of 'creativity' are thought to be understood; they are 'captured' and taught. In effect we are seeing an *engineering* of the creative process; one that is repeated for its own sake. And in this process of fixing creativity – of territorializing creativity – we are losing the very ability to be truly creative:

Any such moral or rationalistic avowal (of creativity) runs the risk of turning the value of creativity into something like 'fashion', the endless repetition of permanent change under conditions of permanent imitation – production for the sake of production, 'ideas' for the sake of ideas – and something which ultimately, perhaps precisely because of its character as a sort of compulsory heterodoxy, has conservative effects. (Osborne, 2003, p. 512)

In essence we have over-romanticized the notion of 'creativity' in capitalist society and have constructed creativity as a capitalist creation. Creative thinking has become a 'timely' thinking (thinking 'of its time' and recognized as such), and therefore almost 'un-thinking'. It is also limited, in a very uncreative manner, to our current perceptions of what creativity is, and how we can be creative. Furthermore, creativity is valued by and captured within the territory of capital. In an effort to 'un-

romanticize' creativity we now turn to explore the 'darker' side of the creative process.

## Creativity as Destruction

It is extraordinary that citizens of the contemporary West could imagine that overlooking the changeability of things is one of our greatest perils. On the contrary, there is far too much change around, not too little. Whole ways of life are wiped out almost overnight. Men and women must scramble frantically to acquire new skills or be thrown on the scrapheap (Eagleton, 2004, p. 164).

A particular feature of much of the creativity literature is the focus on creativity as something 'fun' and 'enjoyable' (e.g. Csikszentmihalyi, 1996, p. 108). Yet, it is useful to reflect on the 'darker' side of the creative process; to reconnect it with terms such as 'destruction' and 'loss'. This aspect of creativity is perhaps best documented at the societal or market level, such as for example in Joseph Schumpeter's 'gales of creative destruction'.<sup>2</sup> To put this in a Deleuzian vocabulary:

Everywhere capitalism develops, it undermines traditional social codes – kinship systems, religious beliefs, class hierarchies, taboos, ritual trade relations and so on and releases uncoded fluxes of heterogeneous matter, ideas, affects, and fantasies. But . . . it constantly recodes fluxes and flows within new forms of social organization . . . in an effort to maintain a controlled and universal exchange of commodities (Bogue, 2004, p. 35).

The creative forces involved here are clearly destructive. By limiting ourselves to thinking within the territory of capital, we judge creativity as a value, indeed a necessity, for society, but we are not sufficiently reflective on the negative, or pointless aspects of this process. As capitalism, in Western thought, is taken as a pre-given, then even if we judge the impacts of change, of creativity, to be harmful, we never question the need to change *per se*, as change is central to capitalism. It is important, therefore, to be reminded that change is in part

a product of human agency; that much of the explosion of 'creativity' is as a direct result of the conscious efforts of individuals (Osborne, 2003) rather than an inevitable process. In reality, the change we experience is almost certainly a rather prosaic mixture of progress, in the positive sense of the word, and deterioration (Eagleton, 2004).

## Creativity as Work

These destructive (and positive) forces are not just evident at the level of society. Deleuze, in discussing Foucault and his development of conceptions such as discourse, knowledge and power, with reference to his book *Madness and Civilisation* comments:

There's something great writers often go through: they're congratulated on a book, the book's admired, but they aren't themselves happy with it, because they know how far they still are from what they're trying to do, what they're seeking, of which they still have only an obscure idea. That's why they've so little time to waste on polemics, objections, discussions. I think Foucault's thought is a thought that didn't evolve but went from one crisis to another. I don't believe thinkers can avoid crises, they're too seismic (Deleuze, 1995, p. 104)

but goes on to add: 'For Foucault it was a great period of energy and exhilaration, of creative gaiety' (1995, p. 105). The key point here is the notion of creativity as a process of personal and perpetual crisis, of knowing that concepts are not 'finished', of knowing one has not succeeded, of being thrown back into the open sea. The artist, philosopher or scientist is working on the continually evolving, unfinished and 'unfinishable' project. This stands in contrast to our current image of creativity in which the creative process has outputs and outcomes; in which success is measured through the unit of capital.

Artists provide a further useful point of exposition in exploring the creative process in the Deleuzian oeuvre. By trying to be creative, in a very conscious way, rather than merely *working* at some idea or problem, they are by that very act being uncreative. Successive generations of young artists in Britain, usually subsumed under the heading of 'Brit Art', have been trying to shock the nation with new forms of art – often exemplified in the annual Turner Prize competition, which seeks to showcase 'innovative' art. However, in their conscious desire to be creative, they have become increasingly clichéd, even passé, and demonstrate a reliance on imitation rather

<sup>2</sup> It is interesting to be reminded that Schumpeter's (1942) prologue opened: 'Can capitalism survive? No. I do not think it can'. Schumpeter believed that capitalism would be destroyed by its successes; that it would spawn a large intellectual class that made its living by attacking the very bourgeois system of private property and freedom so necessary for the existence of this intellectual class.

than genuinely new thinking. Their aim is to shock (again) in order to win the coveted prize, but this very prize (and the institution of the Turner Prize, its criterion of judgement) confer upon the art works a sense of reproduction: we know it is 'innovative art' because it meets our criteria of innovation – it fits our units of measurement. The artworks, and in some cases the artists, have become marketable commodities; the value of these pieces have become connected with their identification with the Brit Art genre, the people who choose to buy them and in some cases the ostentatiously 'different' behaviour of the artists. The value associated with these artworks encourages more artists to work in the same tradition, to see the Brit Art style as the new way of working, the new way of expressing oneself through art, and as a result immediately stifles any truly creative potential. The endeavours of these artists can be compared to the artist working on a new idea; trying to improve it but never quite succeeding, knowing it is not quite 'there'. At the risk of another cliché, this is the 'authentic artist' – the artist who is focused on working to develop and improve the idea, trying to respond to the problem, but knowing that this response is not quite good enough. This is not the artist who is 'trying to be creative', but the artist who is *working at a problem*. Precisely because the task ahead is never really achievable, because the creative act cannot be 'finished', the artist will be dogged by a greater or lesser sense of their own failure:

A creator who isn't grabbed around the throat by a set of impossibilities is no creator. A creator's someone who creates their own impossibilities, and thereby creates possibilities . . . without a set of impossibilities, you won't have the line of flight, the exit that is creation . . . (Deleuze, 1995, p. 133).

Yet it is this 'failure' that retains the artist as a creative force.

At this point it may appear that we are slipping back into transcendent modes of thinking: 'creativity is good and we need more of it'. But the important distinction here is that we reflect on both the destructive aspects of creativity and the inherently uncreative process of trying to be creative as currently construed. The idea of working at problems is key to the creative process in the Deleuzian perspective, but this cannot be framed by alternative understandings as to what will achieve 'real' innovation. The current narrative is still framed within the transcendent discourse of how to be innovative, the need to be innovative; and furthermore it is framed within a

capitalist mode of thinking: we recognize innovation (creation and the new) in capitalist terms of market success, profitability and so on. What we argue here is that such a narrative is folly, that creativity results from a process of thinking, a process of working, but one not framed (constrained) by known ways of working and thinking.

### Creativity and the New . . . Made Strange (Concluding Thoughts)

Osborne, in a recent paper proposing a philistine attitude to 'creativity', made reference to Deleuze (amongst others) as an exemplar of his argument. Whilst I agreed with the overall message – that we need to liberate ourselves 'from the potentially moronic consequences of the doctrine of creativity' (Osborne, 2003, p. 507) – the issue may not be one of needing to be against 'creativity', 'being the philistine', as much as reconceptualizing what we mean by the notion of 'creativity'. Osborne argues that there is no need for the concept – as opposed to the word – for a process of inventiveness is sufficient (2003, p. 520). The logic for this is clear, but retaining the word will, inevitably, lead to definitions (territorializations) and attempts at explications of the process. Instead I argue that we need to reflect on the notion of creativity, and hopefully in doing so be more reflective in our thinking, or perhaps more creative in an unconscious way.

I have argued that 'creativity' is held up as a 'taken-for-granted' necessity in today's turbulent capitalist economy. I have tried to present, or perhaps 're-present', this notion of creativity as a concept based on popular opinion. For Deleuze, opinion is a failure to think: evidence of inertia rather than creativity (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994, p. 146). I am not merely suggesting an anti-capitalist stance, although that is certainly a logical response, but a more creative form of thinking; a form of thinking that thinks beyond/outside the discourse of capitalism. Destruction of these opinions must be achieved by disrupting the supposed harmony or unity of experience (Colebrook, 2002). It is inspired by the idea of pulling down the screen of clichés that every culture produces; clichés that have become unprecedentedly trivial and egotistical in our times of hyper-capitalism (Berger, 2001). We are certainly not 'against creativity', but suggest that a little more sobriety is needed when calling for creativity, and a little more resistance should be offered to efforts that try to capture what it means to be creative. Nor are we saying that creativity is necessarily 'bad' for its

destructive effects, just that we also should be reflective of this impact.

Inevitably, of course, the process of 'reflecting' on the 'meaning' of creativity leads to reconceptualizations – and fixes – of the meaning of creativity. Or, alternatively, in our efforts to avoid 'fixing' the meaning of creativity, we are left with the question: so what is creativity? Since, for Deleuze, concepts create possibilities for thinking beyond our current assumptions we should focus not on being creative, but on creating concepts that change the way we think. By focusing on existing problems and trying to make sense of them we are *creating* concepts: we are actually putting our creative potential to work. By establishing ways of 'being creative' we are actually limiting our creative potential. To paraphrase Eagleton: to define (creativity) is to destroy it (2004, p. 195).

In practical terms we are suggesting this means working at problems, creating concepts, and thinking rather than trying to capture a creative approach, identify the new. And when we think about creativity we need to understand it as a process of thinking and working at something, rather than trying to capture the moment of creation. In essence, by focusing less on the obsession within trying to be creative and the act of creation (as defined and identified) we have a greater chance of being truly creative through the more humble (yet no less significant) act of thinking through problems and of thinking differently. The real 'new' is the creation of *new concepts*: new ways of thinking, new ways of thinking about real problems.

So where to go from here? One place to start, perhaps surprisingly, may be that of 'silence', or at least a disengagement with the current management discourse (cf. Thrift, 2000, 2002):

Repressive forces don't stop people expressing themselves but rather force them to express themselves. What a relief to have nothing to say, the right to say nothing, because only then is there a chance of framing the rare, and even rarer, thing that might be worth saying. What we're plagued by these days isn't any blocking of communication, but pointless statements. (Deleuze, 1995, p. 129)

Following Deleuze it is worth exploring the suggestion that: 'creating isn't communicating but resisting' (Deleuze, 1995, p. 143). Capitalism and its 'creative imperative' does not inhibit the development of ideas, indeed it almost forces this process, demands these very things. The problem is that these things might not be worthwhile (Deleuze, 1995, p. 137). The communication we propose should be resisted is that of 'common sense' and 'consensus in

modes of thinking' – resisting creativity as currently construed. This does not mean a wholesale rejection of traditional approaches to creativity: Royal Science can operate alongside minor science. However, it does mean we need to be open to new ways of thinking, to creative processes we do not recognize and that do not fit with our current assessments and measurements of creative processes and outputs, to have the courage to resist the 'realization' of current creative practices in favour of the *actualization* of the new (previously unknown) ways of thinking. Perhaps through this resistance, through this 'active' thinking, through simply 'working' we can provoke new experiences and possibilities, and ultimately create something worthwhile.

## References

- Bahktin, M. (1984) *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, ed. and trans. C. Emerson. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Berger, J. (2001) *Selected Essays*. Vintage, New York.
- Bogue, R. (2004) *Deleuze's Wake: Tributes and Tributaries*. State University of New York Press, New York.
- Buchanan, I. (2000) *Deleuzism: A Metacommentary*. Duke University Press, Durham, NC.
- Colebrook, C. (2002) *Gilles Deleuze*. Routledge, London.
- Czikszentmihalyi, M. (1996) *Creativity: Flow and the Psychology of Discovery and Invention*. Harper Collins, New York.
- Deleuze, G. (1990) *The Logic of Sense*, trans. M. Lester with C. Stivale. Athlone Press, London.
- Deleuze, G. (1994) *Difference and Repetition*, trans. P. Patton. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Deleuze, G. (1995) *Negotiations*, trans M. Joughin. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1977) *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. R. Hurley, M. Seem, and H.R. Lane. Viking Press, New York.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1986) *Nomadology: The War Machine*, trans B. Massumi. Semiotext(e), New York.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1987) *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans B. Massumi. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1994) *What is Philosophy?* trans. H. Tomlinson and G. Burchill. Verso, London.
- Drazin, R., Glynn, M.A. and Kazanjian, R.K. (1999) 'Multilevel Theorizing about Creativity in Organizations: A Sensemaking Perspective'. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, pp. 286–307.
- Eagleton, T. (2004) *After Theory*. Penguin, London.
- Foucault, M. (1989) *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*, trans R. Howard, Routledge. London.
- Getz, I. and Robinson, A.G. (2003) 'Innovate or Die: Is that a fact?'. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 12, pp. 130–35.

- Hardt, M. (1993) *Gilles Deleuze: An Apprenticeship in Philosophy*. University of Minnesota Press, London.
- Mauzy, J. and Harriman, R. (2003) *Creativity, Inc.: Building an Inventive Organization*. Harvard Business School, Boston MA.
- Nietzsche, F.W. (1976) *Nietzsche*, ed. and trans. W. Kaufman. Penguin, London.
- Osborne, T. (2003) 'Against 'Creativity': A Philistine Rant'. *Economy and Society*, 32, pp. 507–25.
- Patton, P. (2000) *Deleuze and the Political*. Routledge, London.
- Schumpeter, J.A. (1942) *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*. Harper & Row, New York.
- Smith, D.W. (2003) 'Deleuze and Derrida, Immanence and Transcendence: Two Directions in Recent French Thought', in Patton, P. and Protevi, J. (eds.), *Between Deleuze & Derrida*. Continuum London.
- Thrift, N. (2000) 'Performing Cultures in the New Economy'. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 90, pp. 674–92.
- Thrift, N. (2002) 'Think and Act Like Revolutionaries: Episodes From the Global Triumph of Management Discourse'. *Critical Quarterly*, 44, pp. 19–26.

Emma Jeanes (E.Jeanes@ex.ac.uk) is a lecturer in organizational behaviour at the University of Exeter. Her research interests have included explorations of creativity and innovation in the public-service sector, but in recent years she has taken a more philosophical approach to organization studies, and creativity in particular.



Copyright of *Creativity & Innovation Management* is the property of Blackwell Publishing Limited and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.