
Žarko Paić

BODY-IMAGE AS AN EVENT: DELEUZE AND VIBRATIONS OF CONTEMPORARY ART

Upcoming - Art as a roll of chaos

69

Whether through language-scripture-picture are opens the perspectives of contemporary art event that will upcoming? Eliminate the tone of the Prophetic dimension of speech and the apocalyptic tone in a speech about what the imminent future, It seems that contemporary art is immersed in the dark shadows of the present which has lost any sense of its own sovereign rights to the destruction of everything that exists, including ourselves. Do not just seminal thinkers-artists of modern times demanded to overcome the world of transcendence in immanence from Nietzsche to Artaud, from Duchamp to Debord? What we are left with one (not) of realized programs without insight into the future beyond the measures fulfillment of the present with greater intensity of techno-scientific power source and power control mechanisms of social reproduction of life? If art was only a view, narrative, and social intervention in the current state of the “world”, then its imaginary power was reduced to a mere aesthetic character albeit with critical social services to rebellion against the world and its dominant symbolic forms (Groys, 2009). But there are moments of changing something that fits to fatal embrace the actuality and its immanent critique. Perhaps it is finally ripe to get rid of the temptation of the art that descends to the profane comment of philosophical and scientific interpretations of the world as well as the function of social change and awareness of a change in the world. These are all superficial and external terms of what contemporary art confronts us still retaining the primordial understand-

ing of creating something new-in-the-world. Upcoming is this possible and conceivable in thinking in language-scripture-picture perspective of the radical events.

Elemental power in the chaotic dance of human and inhumane living together or mesh networks. It is endlessly reflected in the finite, eternity in a true temporality, and the images of unrepresentable the conceptual clarity of the world as an event. Art flows through the pictorial worlds of different epochs, leaving a trace of one and one-off events in their epoch-making time limits. It will be able to blaze and burn through the language, script and visual codes of art, philosophy and science (Deleuze/Guattari, 1991/2005). Deleuze open the three major forms of thinking which is defined as common game of the elemental power in understanding the primary state of chaos. From its magma and ash stems each possible creation of worlds. The ratio of infinity and finitude, and deterritorialisation, nature and the cosmos, man and inhumane occurs in three forms of relationship with the general chaos. Conceptual Art opens through sensations (*sensatio*) and construction of monuments, works of material traces. But the architecture is original art which articulate finite and infinite relations, the Earth and the cosmos. Science operates with the functions and structures, conceptual thinking and philosophy of language operates with linguistic forms, but all three forms doing together to the direct creative operations for producing new events.

70

Art, however, appears to contrast science and philosophy as it is the elemental power of creating a new nearest state primary of chaos in the creation of artistic works. Complete the temporality of a work of art shows in the mode of possibility that the upcoming event (Heidegger, 1972). Time builds and breaks, such as imposing one of Heraclitus fragment of a child play with pebbles without any purpose other than in an act of creative play. Art and philosophy and science are mutually relation to “the ocean of chaos,” so that in their symbolic games does not exceed a certain threshold of feeling, function/structure and conceptual language. Contemporary art can therefore be determined only negative. She was frantically searching for a lost place of reconciliation (space) and deterritorialization (time) of singularization. This is its indeterminacy and irreducibility on the philosophy of science. But at the same time it is the Promethean dream of a rule that connects the conceptual image-scripture-language with functions and structures of the world. The rest of the irreducible left her on the other side of each image as a perspective event. The rest is not only felt flashes of chaos. It is a holistic experience that a work of art opens its entry into the world and his departure from the material struc-

ture of the work itself. The subject matter of artistic works in the open event of becoming/being a world Deleuze called the singularity (Deleuze/Guattari, 2008). It is finite and the infinite motion occurs through the subject of artists. But this is not happening so that the artist becomes the center, but the governor of events. The subject of contemporary art in the coming time, the gaps filled with the works, artifacts, performatives actions, interventions and provocations (provoking experiences and interactive communications event participants) is a singularity without modern subject as the actors work of art (Steinweg, 2009: 84–94, Zepke, 2009: 176–197).

The artist is nothing but a relationship of singularity and deterritorialisation. So, the art is the state of overcoming the elemental power of the modern era. Conceptual language constructs the world as a network function with the feeling and experience of this side of the world hereafter. Everything is “here and there.” Every thing has its place in the chaos of universal creative games only when the world is set in the horizon of techno-scientific games, with facilities in the area of social, political and cultural network events. To have your event perspective, it is obvious that it must produce a double effect. Must be placed in some relationship to the history of the mediality perspective as illusion that the participant (observer) participated in the act of artistic creation and must be in *excess of the imaginary* act of placing the works in deterritorialized space. It should be clearly noted that the concept of the perspective directions in the event is something else than the media conditions of contemporary art. First, the perspective is determined by the optical illusion effect views in the new century. With the Renaissance art of the body in space is becoming a subject as the figure due to the technical invention of geometry and linear perspective. It is a kind of Western symbolic form (Belting, 2009: 9–20).

The power comes from the formal requirements of action in space and time. Without the perspective can not be technically rendering the world. But the notion of perspective is not only about the possibilities of perception of things and objects in space. The prospect is not measures of human “weapon” in the articulation of visual power. In horizon of the future, that will come, we are always far away from a perspective of original time. It is a possibility of setting up the subject/actors look at the upcoming deterritorialized zone of uncertainty of life. Interwoven networks, inhuman social relations, ideological conflicts over the occupation of empty seats and be able to download the same symbolic form for other purposes. Therefore, contemporary art must be interpreted through the deconstruction of the symbolic form of the modern world. The perspective of events in itself has the dimen-

sion of the possibilities of turning prospects. When Paul Virilio quotes Paul Klee that it is now catching objects, and not on them, then this is not a revolution of objects, but objects of revolution in the concept of the event (Virilio, 2000). View of the subject is no longer entering the body of the world. Now a self-worldliness of the world in its immanence of corporal condition is rooted in the body of an eccentric subject. Contemporary art is a scene of the revolution as a world perspective of the upcoming event. One can rightly say that there is no event without turning the art in the very core of the contemporary world (Paić, 2006).

72 Language is the art of pictorial scripture in the elemental powers of chaos. >From the contingency of life that the world is and that is precisely the result that the desire for a thoughtful understanding of the chaos and the will of common coupling the lattice model, system, order. The entire history took place in the signs of dominance of one over the other. Art preceded was in the mythical world of philosophy, and of the new century and this we call the modern age of science has established his absolute rule over every other language of thought. Not surprisingly, therefore, that the paradox of our time lies in the fact that modern science research in the last secrets of the creation of the universe and the origin of life do not use mathematical symbols and formulas, but hybrid-scripture language arts and philosophy to explain their assumptions and theoretical solutions. Analogy and metaphors are used reasoning operation structural games with mythical language and pointing to what meanings last and first, and the mysterious yet open, to what no longer stands “behind” in *Mysterium tremendum* divine feast. That “after” is always “there”. In the event of openness of the world as a work of art with a time stamp of the new apocalyptic power forever there is no more sublime *thing* that regulate social relations. Capital is neither sublime nor immanent manifestation of a radical reversal. The concept of structural capital and will develop the network of its cargo of artifacts as a visual representation of the gaps between the sublime and the banal *reality of things* material reproduction of life. Gilles Deleuze could therefore leave the following statement on file with *Proust and signs of* further explanation, in the wake of the Romantic dream of the artist-philosopher, and merging art with a conceptual language of philosophy. Namely, that despite criticism of the philosophy of art means a weapon of criticism can not be more than philosophical.

“Philosophy and all its methods and its good will is not nothing compared to the mysterious forces of artistic works” (Deleuze, 1964: 76).

When the modern world opens up in his country and arithmical vibrations, Inhuman vibration pulsing techno-sphere in which everything still belongs to the classical definition of man and his essence, then, is primarily portends the arrival of something ineffable sublime and terrible darkness. That is what is hidden behind the veil of reality that is self-devouring (Agamben, 2009: 21–36). The possibility of breakthroughs and the limits on which contemporary art is, with all its restlessness, repeating gestures and strategies ancient predecessor of the historical avant-garde of the first half of the 20th century (from Dadaism, Constructivism and enchantment Surrealistic images of dreams and illusions of reality), Deleuze's thinking is to present the event as always becoming a new/different being the Identity of Being and Time. Art that transcends the artist (personality) open the creative chaos of becoming/being eternally other. Repetition does not cancels the difference. Moreover, it can be shown as a difference only constant variations there (Deleuze, 1969). The difference can not be thought without identity in time. Becoming/being eternal identity in other contemporary art achieves apparent change of form in the important events surrounding the temporality of life. Technological innovations have contributed to the formal and substantive changes in the status of new Media art as a practice activity. Video art is the techno-structure of the media obsolete. But it is the time integral of digital media continues in the new technological matrix. This applies to all forms of contemporary art from photography, film, performance and installation art. Thought-image corresponds to both conceptual art. Conceptualism in all its variations, including political and social intervention, is purely symbolic form of human-Inhuman constellations in real time. Language-scripture-text takes under its wing image of unrepresentable events (Alberro, 2003).

The question is why conceptual art placed in the center of philosophical discussion on the new comparison pictures and script-language-text in the visual culture of modernity? Although it is undoubtedly the performativity of the body apparently is closer to what the term means the event – especially in Heidegger, and then in Derrida, Deleuze, Badiou –, conceptual art is philosophically geared towards the concept of silence as a picture-word without its transcendent referent. In other words, conceptual art is a radical abolition of the modern art of the subject. It is a text without the letter and the letter without words, without a sign of the case and the case without a sign – the exclusive immanence of form and content of art without a body.

Between concept and image supersedes the difference in picture is not preceded by the term and the term is not preceded by the picture. Image and con-

cept in their productive unity corresponding singularity of events, this means that any narrative structure, a new “iconology” or “narratology” for new Media art is not only inappropriate tool of interpretation, but inadequate way of understanding what the image as a concept or concept as an image, regardless of whether it is the art of film or video-art, non-discursive points watchers, watchers, listeners. It is also the reason that more works of art can not be appropriately interpreted as ruling out some theoretical omega-point (neolacanian psychoanalysis, phenomenology, hermeneutics, relational aesthetics), but only the immanent, from his own horizon.

For Deleuze, the only real aesthetic problem during the end of aesthetics in which the resident contemporary art (not) implemented a program of historical avant-garde: the entry of art into everyday life. The construction of such a life is not so untouchable world of life from the impact of techno-science and the ideological-political articulation of social relations in the form of capitalist control over the body of nature and human body. Iconoclastic way of contemporary art that leads to inhumane towards the horizon, feeling/experience of the world without secrets is the last historical event in the language of moving pictures-scripture-text objectified reality. Virtuality precedes actuality, not only because life has not always pre-machined product (*ready made*). Moreover, the life that art event into a work of art is virtually the same time-the actual act of intervention in its crevices, grooves and chaotic structure of becoming/being different and other (Guattari, 1995).

74

Perversion and theology

In the text dealing with the analysis of body-language in the opinion of the contemporary French philosopher Pierre Klossowski, by one of the best studies on Nietzsche in French general, Gilles Deleuze has argued that

“in some way our epoch reveals perversion“ (Deleuze, 1993: 341).

At the time of the Marquis de Sade had a perversion subversive function demolition order of moral law. When it is “unnatural” symbolically legitimized as a “natural” then it is within the demolition of “naturalness” of sexual relations between people of perversion of something quite different than in our era. Deleuze suggests that the essential difference, perverse, according to him, can only be called what it is exactly the objective power of the show, what makes the distinction between the two orders of nature-morality. If there is no obscenity of-itself, but the concerned authorities to enter into the gap of

language that goes beyond the language of the act of his speaking situation reflection about the body, then the experience of transgression, language plays in language itself. But the language that allows the elevation of consciousness to the level of reflection on obscenity must be rooted in the body as a boundary between what is somatic body and the semiotic body. The paradoxical presence/absence of language in the body and body language comes to reality in an act of perverse pleasure. This is why Deleuze can perform a setting that is second invention of our epoch – the invention of theology (Deleuze, 1993: 342).

The more is not necessarily believe in God, says Deleuze, because this is a quest for structure or form of expression of religious beliefs, not about the true religious feel. Although the latter position only modernized the statement of the dispute between Christian theology as “Christian philosophy” with the metaphysical tradition from which she had just performed subprime doctrine of the faith, not philosophical questions about the meaning of the divine in the world, it is noticeable however is something much more challenging for an opinion. Deleuze in the context of reading settings Klossowski states Gombrowic’s *Pornography/Cosmos* novel to reach the key settings of overall opinion about the modern world “body without organs.” In fact, theology in this sense becomes a superseding science about God, or, better, non-science of existential substance. Theology is found in dysfunction of language itself. Hence Klossowski, according to Deleuze, reasonably come to the view that the perversion of authority superseding the power reflected by the world of theology in the world without God (Deleuze, 1993: 342). The unity of theology and, therefore, is not pornography scandal of destruction of an idol of Christianity with the help of the Antichrist figure. It is about unity of structural dysfunction. Perversion and the theology of the dysfunctional ways leads to experience the body-language in contemporary visual culture as a fascination with body image.

Both inventions of our epoch, the epoch-making fact sinkage of the subject to something beyond pornography as a visual language and bareness of the world in its dysfunction. Perversion is the language of the body-the body itself without any spiritual substance, and theology is superseding the speech of God as relation to *things* which is no longer crucial. Perversely-theological revolution of our epoch, if we radicalized Deleuze’s fundamental idea of his anti-philosophy, is that the experience led to extreme pornography disappearance of the borders of the body itself in a total physicality of the world in general (Deleuze/Guattari, 1972). How is it possible to indicate that much

is accepted, but at the same time and fully unreflective then the phrase itself Deleuze, the *body without organs*? The body disappears in all the physicality of the world as a porn world only because it is exhausted what the body allows the body to be what enables the body to have a body. The body without organs is the result of dysfunction ontological language itself being transformed into a thing so it becomes a perversion of the experience and theology of the language itself-in-flesh. When the body disappears in a pure visual fascination with body image, then it is exhausted the possibility that the language opens up new horizons of sense of the world. Language remains without no authority, no substance. The body is subject, nor the master in his own house, what Lacan says about the subject in a new position within the world. The relationship of language and the body is analogous to the relationship that the traditional philosophy as a metaphysics of being gave to the Being and belonging relative beings. Language is the physical condition of possibility of speech in the absence of articulate language. When the body is “silent” than it speaks in a “language”.

76

The question that the opinion of Gilles Deleuze opens the inevitable reflection of modernity marked by gaps, communication, visibility and the body is therefore not only set in the new framework of relations of old concepts. It is a question of structural and formal conditions under which all else can talk about a world without horizons of its meaning. Or, in other words, it is a question about the dysfunctionality of the world reduced to the logic of the rule of global capital as a universal “desiring machine.” The change in the way of talking about the life of this important defunct world testifies to the language that the world describes the ontological character of perversion: its reification corresponds to theological reification of speech of the body in a position of principle of transgression of moral and political restrictions. The Science of God deals with the body as an object because it has itself expelled from the center of the speech on the subject. God in the world of dysfunction that inhabit the bodies available as objects of desire. God can not be “subject” to forever guarantee the meaningfulness of the world. It is a “function” that in the general perversity of the world is what is, after all, derives from the transcendental lattice point: that, namely, acting as *it* or as a *thing* (on-itself).

In all films that deal with perverted sexual relationships and their projected social and ideological-political problems of our era, like the masterpieces of the problem of relations between executioners and victims of Nazi totalitarian rule and inventions be the rule of sexual perversion and after the end of totalitarianism as a political-ideological system, *Movie Night Porter* by Liliana

Cavani with brilliant actors Dirk Bogarde and Charlotte Rampling, still left behind that pornographic horror-body encounter in something sublime. What remains is a *thing* which produces the perversion and at the same time softens the language. Production and gasification of *things* sublime metaphysical loss of the activity level of the world itself. Poststructuralist theory of the subject, therefore, inevitably departs from this state of things.

Language that expresses the subject is a “thing”, and when that is no longer behind and there, but “there”, as Lacan designated change the function of images in modern painting, which refers to the body in its perverse-theological stories of sexuality. Pornography without God is equal to the visual fascination orgasmic orgasm in *white holes*. Vacuity fact leads to the disappearance of the *fact* that sexual act imparts meaning. Reified language in the era of the rule differences (*differences*) gains its identity by being reduced to a visual communication between the image-bodies as objects of desire. Machine to calculate the language of new media, as it is accurately called the German theorist of visuality and new media Friedrich A. Kittler, corresponds to the idea of changing the language of the modern world that has become the image of *the body without organs*. Briefly expressed, in a phrase that hides what is result of discharge of the modern world in its realization of Western philosophy as metaphysics. In the heart of the very *axiom of capitalism* going to turn, we are witnessing the realisation of that matter. No longer talking about the idea of machines that work behind the things, but it comes to the realization of materialistic desires alone, and not pleasure himself in space-time zone vacuity of the machine itself. This zone is not the territory. This zone has a new code which registers the “logic of sensation”. Mathematical structure of capitalism is identical to binary code that establishes a virtual reality.

Instead of transcendent sources of ideas that allows beings to appear, rather than its structural-formal ontological primacy of the original, the body without organs is obstinate immanentism-body-image stuff. That change, which is more than a turn toward the body, leads Deleuze to offset against the whole tradition of philosophical aesthetics, such as, for example, held today in phenomenological approach to art (Merleau-Ponty, Lacan and the psychoanalytic supplement), followed by something almost identical to the request of Malevich in the first *Manifesto of Suprematism*. Art is not reflected in the incidence of and relationships between subject and object, and painting pictures. Image resulting from body image alone in his immanentism no superior sources is addressed to the emotions and neurosystem, feel and sensibility, logic, metaphysics, sensation and not representation (Grosz, 2008: 3).

Immanence

Already in its first crucial text for the entire “new” poststructuralistic orientation *Nietzsche and the philosophy* Deleuze put the problem of overcoming the dialectical understanding of the rule of reason in history (Deleuze, 1961). An alternative to Hegel’s dialectic was found a difference in the game of life itself in its fragmentary. Immanence became a key moment to overcome the entire dialectic of history with its transcendental structure of thought “from above”. To that extent the shift towards the body in its sensibility, logic sensation is, the result of Deleuze’s anti-philosophy. The body is in its the-battle, and its openness to the world place is a radical shift of metaphysics.

78 The notion that Deleuze was introduced as an alternative to the rule of reason is immanence (Günzel, 1998). Coming down, metaphorically speaking, from heaven to earth, does not mean setting up of the lower rank on the upper. The distinctive concept of being as being, according to Nietzsche’s view, here is elaborated in the context of territorial processes within the clinical method of treatment of psychopathological symptoms. In the analogy, analysis of schizophrenia of capitalism, the concept of duplication of its proliferation in the formal sense of inability and fixed identity of the person, leading thus to turn one that fits the philosophy of immanence. It is thereby crucial to consider the theme of the body itself in this production of duplicate identities. Deleuze and Guattari are therefore in *Anti-Oedipus* introduced into circulation the term of Antonin Artaud *body without organs*. The function of this concept is quite concrete: determination of immanent forms of life which is to overall social functionalistic tendencies within language and communication that operate social sciences and humanities “objectified”. Form of life that is paradigmatic of the whole social and clinical transformation is the figure of a masochist.

Deleuze and Guattari in *A Thousand Plateaus* cite Artaud from his *Theatre of Cruelty*:

“The body is a body. It is unique. It is not require any organs. The body has never organism. Organisms are the enemies of the body“ /Deleuze/Guattari, 2008: 218).

For Deleuze and Guattari in this programmatic Artaud’s *Theatre of Cruelty* paragraph of his emphasis is not on the body against the body as such in terms of the integrity of the body itself, but the rejection of “organic organism organization“ (Deleuze/Guattari, 2008: 218). Medical speaking, the body can not access the properties as a whole spiritual organism, but as a functional part. Body in relation to their transcendence, which had traditionally imparts

the meaning eludes the inherent circuit. Organic in the organism as a system is nothing “natural” organic, rather than the result of modern articulation of science that analyzes what the basis of a lively scientific knowledge about life in general. Biologically term life is not the original concept of life. For it is in its analysis of the history of institutional oversight bodies through biopolitical production of knowledge about the body directed critical attention to Michel Foucault.

Step towards what Deleuze thought as immanence bodies in his anti-philosophy just parsing the original concept of reified life. The body can not be otherwise placed in the center of modern thought without deconstructing the very notion of life. The body regains its integrity as opposed to the body so that the “living body” is something quite different from “living bodies” of the modern scientific approach to life. But, as Artaud was not in his *theater of cruelty* mystic origin of life assumed the contemporary commodification of life itself, but from the time he thought of the future life of ecstasy in his inexhaustible vitality, nor Deleuze did not succeed, but always being existential body without organs, which guarantees existence. Body, therefore, becomes the complex configuration of relationships in magma being not beyond something, but in the very here and now, within the very life of the body.

79

The organism belongs to the organs of the body structure. When we say that it is constituted, should be recalled that for Heidegger, the fundamental structure of metaphysics in that it is onto-theological (Heidegger, 1959). Being, beings and God as the supreme being to think of these arrangements are always starting from the very position of beings. The organization says that the metaphysics of being and the ontological difference being derived from open cracks within the original battle. But this flaw is not the one flaw that Lacan assumes in his theory of decentred subject, which is located between the imaginary and the symbolic structure of the subject. The crack in question in the basic structure of metaphysics is not “visible” or the “noises”. Metaphysics open the question of unrepresenting and verbally inexpressible but nonetheless “see” and “hear” within the openness of the body during his historic events. To grasp the epoch-making body, but still means a move from its contingency. Mortality as the final boundaries of the body is being mortality.

Heidegger located a man in this area-Being “hear” and “there” because the body is mortal, that the body has the experience of ontological difference Being and beings. Experience is not a body of empirical givenness of existence of man in the human body, which opposed to all other living beings and their bodies, in existential experience of death being determined by their aware-

ness of their own finite existence. It is obvious that the French structuralists and poststructuralists and postmodernists (Lacan, Deleuze, Derrida, Foucault, Lyotard, Baudrillard, Lyotard) in its life balance with Hegel's dialectic came to this issue through the body and the existence of Kierkegaard and Nietzsche. What, however, is crucial here is that the constitution of metaphysics, its internal structure. This means that the opinions of transcendental horizon is given precisely in what has since Nietzsche, the fundamental problem of overcoming the Hegelian dialectic. Specifically, it is a question of whether a one-off being in the very existence of the body as a living experience of being an alternative to Hegel's view of being in the absolute totality of the spirit? The issue is the scope not only the overall intentions of the anti-philosophy of Deleuze to turn against the body without organs, but also the whole anti- postmetaphysical or philosophy that after Lacan repeatedly returns to a new foundation subject. Can it therefore be one general subject without a body "is not" contingent, but the body becomes a one-time existence of language as the horizon of the world in which to live and such a body "that" as the temporal and finally? Finally, is not the only origin of the word used by Heidegger for the way the historical traditions of metaphysics – *Verfassung*, the organization – related to what the basic idea of structuralism, namely, that this is the logical and historical development or structuring of the world as a machine?

The organism and the organs are by no means opposed to something mechanical and organical, nothing artificial, or "dead" as opposed to the living "structure" of the organism. Artaud's phrase about the body without organs in Deleuze's anti-philosophy therefore can be understood in an attempt to offset the absolute spirit of Hegel's dialectic. In the second part of the *Science of Logic*, Hegel says:

"The whole is not an abstract unity, but unity as a *multiplicity of distinctive*, but this unity as the one on which the *manifold* relations with the other is the *determination* of the same which is a part" (Hegel, 1986: 269).

Is not this place also the opinion of totality a sign of whole way of deconstruction of subject? Whole, therefore is not an abstract unity, but whole in a multiplicity of differences. What determines the unit in its entirety not come from any part of something beyond the parts, but is "above" parts. This is the transcendental unity of being or staying alone in a whole life of the whole idea.

Opinion of subject as unconscious articulation of language in the symbolic horizon of the world assumes that the crack, but it leaves untouched. Body language as a subject – Lacan's setting – so says the traumatic truth of their

own sacrifices as a whole to become a “person” or entity in terms of the master without the Lord. However, this is the language of the subject unconscious articulation of what Lacan in the tradition of metaphysics leaves without answers. This is the language of the unconscious, or *what* not to say, *the thing*. Anthropological horizon is the deprivation of the opinion of the whole, or better put, it is failing every subject with opinions paradigmatic case of theoretical psychoanalysis, Freud-Lacan, because in his return to Descartes and Hegel, it seems just from that same starting point that is at the very start of the deficient and denied: that is, in fact, “subject”, the structural network of relations and intersubjective relationship between appearance and fact, as is done in media theory Flusser (Flusser, 2005).

Every body of opinion and perspective can only be decreased below the level for which Hegel anthropology and problems of the “soul” – regardless of what psychoanalysis “soul” is treated in a more complex understanding of the subject of the unconscious – absolved within the subjective mind, the lowest stage in development of absolutes. The man may “have” authority only when he governed his life and has “his” being as particularly of his own existence. With Artaud’s words, either consciously or unconsciously, but only life self-affirmation of life decide on authentical existence that is truly open.

Which is the way life balance with Deleuze in Hegel’s dialectic, that is how he came to immanence of the body without organs as a modern alternative to psychoanalytical concept of the unconscious (Lacan)? Does Deleuze, that logic is true sensation pictures of art in general, has in its dealing with outside bodies is beyond the mechanical organization of the world as a body? We can anticipate a basic Deleuze’s conclusion before they show the direction of thought, the basic categories and a way of articulating a completely different understanding of the subject in the modern world of visibility. In the world body without organs it is no more reason to talk about culture in general. As Baudrillard pointed out that the analysis of the film *Crash*, and so he went even further than just thinking of Deleuze in consequence of its settings, when there is no desire (erogenous zones) in pure visual fascination with the machine itself as an object (the car and the highway as a metaphor of the contemporary world of objects), then there is no more a culture values. Vacuity of sense of the world finishes/ends up in the body without organs or in the clear visualization of desert world as picture. It is not the result of an act of the subject. But not even an object (*ready made*) from the surrounding world. Do even this last step in completing intercommunicative interface come faster as the world body that no longer applies to any company, nor the culture. Is it actually

Deleuze is indeed possible to save a few more aesthetic sensation, sensibility, ecstatic delight of the body in the new conception of art as they wish many contemporary theorists of the body as an image?

Meta-aesthetics of sensations

Deleuze and Guattari articulated two main concepts of the whole theory of new subjects: 1) desiring machines and 2) bodies without organs. Now it should be said that it is not only contrary to traditional notions of understanding. The first is not a mere opposition against the “machine soul”, for example, while the other is not at issue against the opposition mechanically produced the body as an organism. The body without organs is therefore exempt body “without soul”, ie, those souls that theological tradition was thrown out of the body as its over-world’s aura. The body can not restore the dignity, of its original freedom, without dissolution of the metaphysical tradition in which he was detained. The machine of desire and the body without organs were apparently “robotic” terms of total reification of man. But in a situation of advanced capitalism as a socio-communicative systems perverse realization of man in things, schizophrenia is a mode of existence, split identity.

82

Longing for what instinctive and mediated by cultural symbolic order of Western history is a machine, therefore, institutional (physically) an organized system of relationships between people and the territorial sequence of events in real time. The body without organs is the desiring machine for a life deprived of the “soul” to get right to the true life of the body in freedom from the bondage of the soul. Nietzsche’s influence on Deleuze, undoubtedly, was crucial. Indeed, Nietzsche was a turning point in relation to Hegel and Marx’s dialectics throughout Deleuze’s opinion. That’s the reason why his criticisms and Guattari psychoanalysis must understand the programmatic analysis of the modern body. Culture is the order of a perverse system of power, not the original desire to transcend opposites of mind and body, and immanently otherworldly, battle and values. It can be said that Deleuze’s “philosophy of immanence,” enters a radical step in deculturalization of modern world that has become exactly that which is sought by the new century: that, namely, the machine becomes reified desire for a new desire, objectified history as a storehouse of memories, clear visualization of reality numbers, pictures and words.

Deleuze and Guattari to trace Artaud trying to make the shift from psychoanalysis. That does not mean that psychoanalysis is wrong side of the human’s moon. After all, we can say that Artaud with Freud had common points in the

interpretation of dreams as the basis of imagery. The art lies in the “heart of darkness” imaginary. So it comes to turn from something (Freud and Lacan) to something we received. It is not, therefore, a radical reversal of opinion, but turning on Nietzsche/Artaud’s return to its original vitality of life as “unknown games, and pleasure of God”. Psychoanalysis is for the philosophers Deleuze and Guattari psychiatrist socratical modern form of the Enlightenment: Know yourself so that You unconsciously aware that the end of the analysis (session) with the Other (the psychoanalyst). Instead, Shizo-analysis of the “machinery of desire” to be appointed by world in order to register signs of the body itself. It serves as some kind of record of all social disorder in the order of selection.

State (*condition*) is a fundamental perversion of self-affirmation of life in the world telling linguistic horizon. Capitalism in this state is Shizo-body of social relations. They do not show a man a man, but is already ahead without substance and without subject. It is a state of pure self-determination of desire for desire. Deleuze and Guattari in their analysis have proved critical limits of psychoanalysis in the interpretation of the modern world. But it is not out beyond Marx’s anthropological critique of Hegel’s Absolute. In other words, they deconstructed the basic tenets of Marx’s destructive dialectic of capitalism that man constitute entire social relations. From the structuralist theory it is simply not possible. The reason is that social relations are considered within the network structure and function of symbolic exchange as a sign of social networks signifier and signified.

Why is it so crucial for the overall analysis carried out in *Anti-Oedipus* and *A Thousand Plateaus* and to understand the preferences of the body without organs just masochistic understanding of the body? Submission of pain, “his” body is not the goal of the subject who undergoes infliction of pain caused by someone else or himself. Masochist, according to Deleuze and Guattari do not follow any fantasy nor a mere contingency pain on the body. The basic lack of psychoanalytic interpretations of masochistic body is that the pain in terms of selffulfilling pain considered something transcendent. The experience of pain for pleasure as a necessary result, for psychoanalysis, from something which is transcendent to body, allowing his pleasure at all. In touch with the views of Nietzsche, but in his first work, Deleuze come up with a solution of the philosophical, structural-ontological problem. Instead of Platonic duplication of the world, it is instead about materialistic deduction of subject to the authority that “there” in this reality below. To that extent we can not talk more about the subject that unconsciously an awareness that the truth of his *subjectivity* is the principle behind the well-being. Deleuze and Guattari in this process within

the assembly of desubjectivisation of masochistic body is saying because of the events based on the concept of processed scholastic theology of Duns Scott *haecceitatats* (this reality below). It is a mutual game of reality and the possibility that the principle of individuation allows becoming the subject.

Masochism is, therefore, should not be construed as some kind of psychoanalytic psychopathological “propensity” towards such terrible pain in filing magnification (accumulation) of pleasure. It is something different. Instead of staying in the dialectics of economic goods (sadism-masochism), it is necessary to go beyond of discourse of power. Masochism is analyzed, and paradoxically, the only reasonable, in analogy with Hegel’s dialectic of history in which the absolute truth requires self-awareness of being-in-itself to the low position (Slave) would be able to establish a whole is to establish a new principle - the economy, or work as a substance-subject bourgeois world. Masochism is a literary figure, but something much more than psychopathological form of the apparent loss of dignity in exchange for accumulated pleasure here in this body, anywhere outside of it. When the victim speaks the language of his tormentors, then the phenomenon of masochistic body should look radically different from Freud and psychoanalysis. For Deleuze, the essential difference between sadism and masochism lies in the opinion of sadism after de Sade where we can see two holds of nature: primary and secondary. The latter is directly experienced nature. It takes experience of creation and annihilation. However, the emphasis is on the first nature as a pure negation. In destructive attitude toward the body of another one can never arrive at the final state of pleasure, but is mediated by the absolute destruction of the body of another. Sadism in this primordially state as possible is just as absolutely annihilation.

What is the problem of destructive-constructive dialectic of history that defines all the culture of capitalism as a structural mode of production “machinery of desire”? With Hegelian terms, and it is only in pervert shape and position of Marx’s historical materialism, sadism and masochism is true. The torturers also an awareness of pain as pleasure in inflicting pain (suffering and overcoming pain with pleasure) is transferred to his awareness of the absolute destruction of the first and second nature. The proletariat is a self-history as a machine or some kind of masochistic desire for the realization of sadism in his definitive “appeasement” the disappearance of differences between the torturer and the victim. Deleuze and Guattari are trying to establish some kind of “differentiating dialectic” of history. This means that it is not possible to establish a new unit because it is, paradoxically, is possible only in the binary dialectic or binary oppositions Lord – Slave. When it comes to the abolition of

both article by slave becomes a master, and slavery is no more substantial basis of his new master because it is not at all “master” but Slave is to reverse the history that was abolished in unity abolished two members, then the fundamental question of who is at all so subject of post-history? Strategy of Deleuze in his anti-philosophy of immanence is actually a highly philosophical strange. First it was because he interpreted the entire history of philosophy from the perspective of the establishment of immanence as orientation points of opinion. Thus, such an interpretation does not exhaust the hermeneutical interpretation of the text inside the circle because that would be the text of what became the basis for interpreting the new thinking. His method includes genealogical method according to Nietzsche’s method that is always a dialog-critical. This means that, for example, Spinoza opposes Descartes, Kant, Nietzsche, Hegel, Bergson, and Sacher-Masoch Freud to the concept of the body without organs of the body opposed the idea of mechanical and Shizo-analysis of psychoanalysis, and how to correctly recognize Günzel in he’s interpretation of Deleuze – to oppose of principles immanence of transcendence (Günzel, 1998: 93).

What are the consequences of such an interpretation? Deleuze is reasonably trying to undergo theoretical psychoanalysis on critical evaluation with respect to its starting position on the subject unconscious. It is already in that position present moment “suppression” of the radical of a different course of history and move the focus to another dominant order of ideas, as is the case with Lacan’s settings on the de-centering subject, it is Deleuze’s most significant achievement in the method of thinking. Conceive of a modern culture of global capitalism as a desiring machine which is equally pervasive war machine and the machine of sexual perversion of the order itself built on the ideological tenets of liberalism, it seems sufficient incentive for what has been the subject of this discussion. Do not enter here into the extensive exposure to the difficulties of such methods. We deal only with what is clearly in Deleuze’s philosophical preferences of the body without organs. Before we show the consequences of such a critique of the subject for any possibility of thinking in a different order of significance of the body as an image (the logic of sensation), it should be a little more to keep the differences between psychoanalysis, Freud is not so much of Lacan and Deleuze and Guattari Shizo-analysis machines desire of contemporary visual culture of capitalism as a total history of the machine (Agamben, 2003).

As mentioned in the writings of *Anti-Oedipus* and *A Thousand Plateaus* are Deleuze and Guattari make a radical step forward in this regard? Contrary to Lacan’s psychoanalysis they like Derrida directed at reversing the funda-

mental psychoanalytic concept. Hence the emphasis on programmatic mazo-historical body act to reverse the signifier. Instead of Freud's psychoanalysis the goal formula *wo es ist, soll Ich werden* that Deleuze is evidence that the unconscious as a subject of the ultimate scope of psychoanalysis, it is necessary to break a vicious circle of unconscious, which is located in a crevice of the language. This means that Deleuze deconstructs the very method by which the goal of psychoanalysis is observed within the assembly supervisory schizophrenia society of capitalism. Anti-Oedipus is a desire to reverse the machine that has lost "idealist" or a transcendent lever to reverse order of the imaginary nature of the symbolic order of sublime perversion of history. What needs to be reversed is only a basic ontological principle of psychoanalysis - the unconscious.

86 This, of course, turns, and the new theory of the subject as the basis for a new visual culture of the modern world. What, then, instead of the unconscious? Nothing but the body as a machine of desire, not the language of the unconscious as a symbolic order. Against the "lack of ideology" of psychoanalysis, Deleuze and Guattari are mainly in *Anti-Oedipus* affirmed denial of the institutional logic of justification of new contradictions in the understanding of the binary oppositions of madness and rationality. Return of the body without organs is not a return to something already in the history of what happened. Body without organs is a concept, not a state. Therefore, the method of philosophical interpretations of what is always subversive related Nietzscheanized invention of affect and logic "heart". Sensing the very concepts of the body corresponds to "plateau" and not the category or higher levels. So the key concepts of Deleuze's thinking, such as *nomadism, chaos, territoriality and reterritorialisation*, arising from the *rhizome* of the immanent unfolding tradition of binary opposition conscious-unconscious outside of what Merleau-Ponty put "object" of observation - the body in the surrounding world.

In the writings of *Logic of sense* and *What is philosophy?* Deleuze presents the way of understanding art as a complex of perceptions and affects. Sensing that a framework of aesthetics is not separated, as in Kant, the intellectual sphere. The glory that was the key to Kant's aesthetic concept of overcoming opposition wise and sensible in unrepresentability what is shown in the figure, no longer a transcendent figure. The logic of sense is, therefore, it is "logic" whose meaning can no longer look at language as a logical ordering scripture outside the body, but his very "heart". However, Deleuze does not rehabilitate the Pascal's "Order of the heart" against the mind in the inverted sense of metaphysics, which assumes the existence of an essence of being.

Image created by artists but by the modern art of Cézanne, as was shown, and Merleau-Ponty, Lacan, and Heidegger, is located in the heart of the world. His body image opens a new “perspective”. An artist his whole style of painting gently engaged into it without perspectivistic illusions truth of being. Not breach affects emotions. And it was *Malevich's Suprematism* in his *Manifesto* avant-garde art defined as “pure sensibility” in the dimensions of the image that no longer fascinated by the external “story”, but is immanent in the essence of the world without pictures. Art is for the work of Deleuze that new creation and what is now the only thing that matters, not applicable over the intentions and the perception of its creator – the artist. In fact disappear differentiation of human-inhuman, because the artwork in its perceptive affective self-affirmation of life itself above the current one and another. But it happens so that they can not reconcile, but it opens up the natural-human-inhuman opening of the body as an image.

Deleuze's interpretation of the painting, the English painter Francis Bacon in his book *The Logic of sensation* is probably one of the most important philosophical study of art after Merleau-Ponty books *Visible and invisible* on Cézanne and Heidegger's writings *on the Origin of Artwork* in which the author discusses the art of Van Gogh (Deleuze, 2005). It is not only a means on the interpretation of a painting of the last great modern painters of the 20th century. Rather, it is a study of the phenomenon of aesthetic and artistic subject of philosophical insight into the essence of art at the time of *corporeal turn*. What is a body without organs in his “aesthetic-artistic” openness can only be understood if, together with Bacon abrogate the distinction of the figurative and abstract painting. In the second conceptual part, to the abolition of the distinction between transcendence and immanence.

For Deleuze, Bacon is a painter of the body without organs. In his painting confirms the logic of sensation (disembodiment as the embodiment) in the process of deterritorialising of desiring machines. For this approach the painting, which the “center” raises the body, in its somatical and semiotical sense is very important the change from the previous fenomenological and historical (hermeneutic) approach to artistic work (Cézanne – Van Gogh). There are three basic characteristics that Deleuze shows in the entire Bacon's work:

- (1) destruction of a defined body
 - (2) download the object of artistic creation of characters human body without subject from which the products space affectivity (paradigmatic case is the image of *the Pope who screams*) and
 - (3) the dynamics of being in processuality.
-

Destruction, download and dynamics pushing match what Deleuze and Guattari have developed the *Anti-Oedipus* and *A Thousand Plateaus*. Destroys the body as an organism (mechanical assembly), so it opens the possibility of arriving at the center of the problem of artistic activities/ events affectivity artists living in the “logic of sensation”, and all occur in space-time unfolding existence of life itself. Bodies dismembered, placed in space, is reduced to that body only, but not at “bare flesh”, are located in the body-painting in which space covers only certain parts of the body.

88 That does not mean that Bacon was the prevailing tradition of *corpus mysticum* sublime metaphysical and religious definition of the image displayed when a explicitly “obey” the spiritual in art. Bacon, on the contrary, create the picture image in which the body without organs does not belong to any gender/sex, or a spiritual signifier of body image. It is inhumane and animal bonding. The body is a desiring machine, regardless of its “function” in human-inhuman world. What he wanted is Artaud’s *theater of cruelty* confirmed in Bacon’s portraits. Body image is not a divine body. It is no archetype of the human body. Deleuze sees in Bacon’s portraits of the final abolition of the idea of painting that shows what is unrepresentable. Lyotard, in the wake of Kant defines these words back in the postmodern sublime (Lyotard, 1991). Divine no longer shows in-picture. But it shows neither any of his remaining vestige. Instead, what images “showing” is, says Deleuze, or some kind of animal spirit of man. The “spirit” identical to that pig, cattle, dog man “living” their physical adventure of life. But neither the word spirit is no longer the one weight that is the whole metaphysical history of wearing a structured language to distinguish humanity of man and the external world in which live animals. If the body no longer resides in the human space, “home of the subject,” then it is thrown into another world deterritorialized. A time to actually abolish the space in the traditional understanding of the word. Territories are not spaces. Reduction body to “meat” answers on reduction man to the thing at all. To that extent the interpretation of Deleuze in Bacon’s painting directs necessarily an attempt to what shows the body without organs is inscript in Figure artistic activities/events.

“The body is the figure, or rather the material figure. The Material of the figure must not be confused with the spatializing material structure which is positioned in opposition to it. The body is the Figure, not the structures. Conversely, the Figure, being a body, is not the face, and does not even have a face. It does have a head, because the head is an integral part of the body. It can even be reduced to the head. As a portraitist, Bacon is a painter of heads, not faces, and there is a great difference between the two“ (Deleuze, 2008: 15).

Somata in the form of their existence is not just “meat”. It is a desiring machine, which resides in the universe being reified. Bacon as a portrait painter no longer portrays the “man” as such, no even idea of man. The head is not the center of spirituality, but what precisely Deleuze shows: the head of the physical center of the world deterritorialized body without organs. What inevitably follows from it is not only the disappearance of differences between humans and animals, but an attempt to open up the possibility of surpassing artistic abstract and representational painting. However, Bacon’s paintings belongs to essentially transforming images in the event of the body itself. This completes the transition from finite to infinite. This is a decisive point of distinction Deleuze and Heidegger. For Heidegger there is a body-in the Being-of-the-world as the outside world. For Deleuze, who does not think the position of the subject, the body reverses differentiation of human, animal and machine. But, of course, only the body is something that has no other characteristic except that is “without authority”. Bacon’s painting depicts a just suspended the process of decomposition transcendental signifier images. As none of Artaud, and here is no longer functioning model of representational images. But now the question of which model picture has in mind when Deleuze plunges into the “riddle” Bacon *corporeal’s turn*? It obviously can not be a communication model picture, because the body without organs is not intercommunicative body. Their only “substance” is in a picture fascination and that is what Deleuze calls “logic of sensation”.

“There are two ways of going beyond figuration (that is, beyond both the illustrative and figurative); either toward abstract form or toward the Figure. Cézanne gave a simple name to this way of the Figure: sensation. The Figure is the sensible form related to a sensation: it acts immediately upon the nervous system, which is of the flesh, whereas abstract form is addresses to the head, and acts through the intermediary of the brain, which is closer to the bone. /.../ sensation is the opposite of the facile and ready-made, the cliché, but also of the “sensational”, the spontaneous“ (Deleuze, 2008: 25).

At one place the file on Bacon’s painting Deleuze will explicitly say that the sensation is vibration. If we eliminate the so-called methodical speech, subject and object a sensation that sends their information to a work of art without a message of openness of the body without organs, then we are in doubt. Specifically, the communication model picture of the digital age media as a paradigm of visual culture is nothing more than displayed. The image is calculated and technology produced. The reality comes from its virtually interchangeable na-

ture which abolished the distinction originals and copies. Insofar the pictures in a model of communication is always the result of adjustment with body image in his state of visual information about something real. Communication is a model of image which shows manifestation of the socio-cultural change in ontological status of images in the digital age. This image information is modeled. Traditionally metaphysically speaking, its a bit of information that precedes any possible relationship between humans, animals and machines in a real-virtual community.

When Deleuze explains the basic idea of “aesthetics” for the era of new media, which has essentially abandoned the distinction field observations “sensation” and “concepts”, then the problem is that Bacon, in clothes of the figurative painting just completed a radical idea of the historical avant-garde with Malevich as a starting point. This idea does not refer to change society aesthetization world in which art becomes socially engaged comment, but to change the very essence of artistic activity. Key to these changes, which is indeed a big shift, but no more so in the direction, is entity (“artist” and his actions), but in the direction to object (a fact, place, event). That sensation comes from the whole fascination with the image of the body itself in its unique event. Sensation or feeling of logic as a “new aesthetic” is nothing but a performative and conceptual event of life itself in the pure physicality of events. It is the only remaining territory of contemporary art.

90

In this reality below the real time and virtual space is going fascination with the visual image of the body itself. Therefore, the interpretation of the painting by Francis Bacon for Deleuze not only illustrates his own philosophical preferences, but also attempt to thinking of art in general in the modern world of machines rule of desire as the kinetic events of the body itself in its chaotic “nature” (Grosz, 2008). It is no coincidence that Slavoj Žižek in his book on Deleuze said that the first definition of Deleuze’s philosophy that it is a “virtual philosopher,” but also “ideology of digital capitalism“ (Zizek, 2003). However, the critical judgments as much as was provocative, as long as rightly pointed out that Deleuze is not radically finished with Hegel’s dialectic, however, are driven by Lacan’s theory of decentred subject. Therefore, the shift towards the body without organs can not think without a radical critique of psychoanalytic theories of the subject. What is Deleuze’s great innovation at the same time some highly questionable for understanding the modern world is that it is like and, indeed, the entire poststructuralist theory opened the metaphysical problem of overcoming the opposition of body and mind and thus showed how the inherent space within the body, but always comes to reified world and life.

The problem is not that Deleuze was the only “virtual philosopher”, or, thanks to the interpretation of Hardt and Negri’s “ideology of digital capitalism”, but that was the whole orientation of the said renewal of the subject and its critics (Lacan, Derrida, Foucault, Deleuze) something else important. This is precisely the area of defining the world in its horizon of meaning. It belongs to transcendental position as capital of all *things* possible in the sublime perversion of capitalism in the real event in the world. The area that is critically analyzed the concept of Deleuze in the body without organs is the transformation of the concept of man as the structural fields of social relations. They may change or some kind of conscious decision politically articulated entity (Badiou’s “Politics of Truth”), and so revolutionary it will turn itself transcendental horizon at all, or may not be significantly altered by a decision “subject”, but structural changes in social relations in their mighty objectivity remains the same. Deleuze has indicated the problem of reification of social relations of life itself. The body without organs is not an overall solution to the puzzles of history marked by awareness about freedom of the original vitality of life. Bacon’s painting is thus for Deleuze paradigmatic for a description of what is already the fate of the world without the “organs”. On the contrary, body out of all inside-the-outside-world definitions of only the “heart” of the deterritorializing world means turning towards what is already at the beginning of the historical avant-garde in art the key assumption – visualization of the world.

This assumption is “sensational”. It is, therefore, the field of pure sensation opposed to Kant’s idea of intellectual apparatus of imagination. Because the only *thing* remaining area of the head-body-picture sensation, which in itself has the intellectual power of imagination (fantasy *Einbildung*), then the fundamental question of turning towards contemporary art pictures-body-head can be formulated with Deleuze in the following way: why at all events of the modern world in real time and require a virtual space has left a symbolic body if I’m already living in their vitality on the other side of the body without organs/organs without a body? Why, then, the body as the image disappears from the horizon of the world in general when it comes to the vacuity “desiring machines” in the pure pleasure of sharing things matter? We have seen that Baudrillard in the analysis of David Cronenberg film *Crash* has laid the basis for overcoming all the “small talk” post-modern *revival* of the subject and the theory of time it has come to the limits of physicality in aesthetized “the world” love “and” death “of the body itself. The remaining zones Unplayed games are still only in vacuity or defecation in the bare life as nothing biopolitical machine. But what a biopolitical machine? Instead of society and culture to which

they refer signs visualization of the world itself by making them lead to transparency, because both words are deprived of substantial importance, such as the Information Society and technoculture, is it not paradoxical that it is only politics and his character a true radical opposition to apocalyptic condition of possibility of radical changes of life itself? That politics is more than any real politics and counter-politics in real world. We have to develop much more reflexivity to the understanding that body-image in a digital desiring machine is construction of new horizon of communication. Performative turn in a very core of that event opens a possible turning point from material to fractal body as image in the age of techno-apocalyptic Event.

References

- 92 Agamben, G., (2003) *Das Offene: Der Mensch und das Tier*. Frankfurt/M. Suhrkamp.
- Agamben, G., (2009) *Nacktheiten*. Frankfurt/M. Fischer.
- Alberro, A., (2003) *Conceptual Art and Politics of Publicity*. London-New York. The MIT Press.
- Belting, H., (2009) „Zu einer Ikonologie der Kulturen: Die Perspektive als Bildfrage“, in: Boehm, G./Bredenkamp, H. (ed.) *Ikonologie der Gegenwart*. München. Fink. p. 9–20.
- Deleuze, G., (1961) *Nietzsche et la philosophie*. Paris. Minuit.
- Deleuze, G., (1964) *Proust et le signes*. Paris. Minuit.
- Deleuze, G., (1969) *Différance et répétition*. Paris. Minuit.
- Deleuze, G./Guattari, F., (1972) *Anti-Oedip*. Paris. Minuit.
- Deleuze, G., (1993) *Logik des Sinns*. Frankfurt/M. Suhrkamp.
- Deleuze, G./Guattari, (1998) *F, A Thousand Plateaus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. London. Continuum.
- Deleuze, G./Guattari, F. (1991/2005) *Qu'est-ce que la philosophie?* Paris. Minuit.
- Deleuze, G., (2008) *Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation*. London: Continuum.
- Flusser, V. (2005) *Kommunikologie*. Frankfurt/M. Fischer.
- Groys, B. (2009) *Einführung in der Anti-Philosophie*. München, Hanser.
- Grosz, E., (2008) *Chaos, Territory, Art. Deleuze and the Framing of the Earth*. New York. Columbia University Press.
- Guattari, F., (1995) *Chaosmosis. An Ethico-Aesthetic Paradigm*. Sydney. Power Publication.
- Günzel, S., (1998) *Immanenz. Zum Philosophiebegriff von Gilles Deleuze*. Essen. Reiche Philosophie. Vol. 35
- Hegel, G.W.F., (1986) *Wissenschaft der Logik*. Frankfurt/M. Suhrkamp.
- Heidegger, M., (1959) *Identität und Differenz*. Pfullingen. Neske.
- Heidegger, M., (1972) „Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes“, in: *Holzwege*. Frankfurt/M. Klostermann.

- Lyotard, J.F., (1001) *The Inhuman*. Oxford. Polity Press.
- Paić, Ž., (2006) *Image without World: The Iconoclasm of Contemporary Art*. Zagreb, Litteris.
- Steinweg, M., (2009) „Das Unendliche retten: Kunst und Philosophie im Denken von Deleuze“, in: Gente, P./Weibel, P., (ed.) *Deleuze und die Künste*. Frankfurt/M. Suhrkamp. p. 84–94.
- Virilio, P., (2000) *The Information Bomb*. London-New York, Verso.
- Zepke, S. (2009) „Deleuze, Guattari, and Contemporary Art“, in: Holland, E. W./Smith, D.W./Stivale, Ch.J. (ed.) *Gilles Deleuze: Image and Text*. London. Continuum. p. 176–197.
- Žižek, S. (2003) *Organs Without Body. Deleuze and Consequences*. London-New York. Routledge.