

Immediacy: A Remark on the Vitalism of Aesthetic Organising

MARTIN FUGLSANG* and ASMUND W. BORN

Mostly aesthetics are treated as a quality among others, characterising an object whether it is seen as an essential object-feature or a dimension in the observation and construction of “the object”. In this article, we elaborate on a more radical conceptualisation, where aesthetics are seen as desire and force, as an essential feature of expressivity, and as the actual it is born in the motion between language and visibility, between speaking and seeing, but as the substantive, it is always already dissolved by the absolute horizon, that which never actualises, always outside the general, abstract and inaccurate conceptualisation of difference, as difference between the actual and the possible, withhold in the inescapable remnants of virtuality, its own deferment, as always *becoming-other*. In this sense, it is an aesthetic which comes into being though the voices of Maurice Blanchot and Gilles Deleuze.

Keywords: Aesthetics; Virtuality; Territorialization; Vitalism; Expressivity

In the silent outside, in the silence of silence which by no means has any relation to language for it does not come from language but has always already departed from it - in this silent exteriority, that which has neither begun nor will finish, keeps watch: the night: the night where for the other an other is substituted. (Maurice Blanchot 1995, p. 57)

The gaze searching for man’s potentiality to become man, has to move away from the organising mode of the substantive, away from the landscape painting’s referentiality and towards the pure surface of the sculpture, visible as a vertical break in the infinite motion of the horizon, but always beyond the relative horizon, that which in the anthropocentric reductionism of history is projected and cemented in the silent foundations normativity, the eye of the Third, which is moulded in the plain and self-evident triviality of the substantive, very far from “new-possibilities-of-life”, the vitalism we find in the expressive force of the Foucauldian Enoncé and the organising mode of the verb, carrying the virtual as the real and the real, a repetition of difference present in the always minor.

Social science and especially the fetishism of organisation and marketing theory seems passively to surrender to the unity of the substantive, to the I, the Self, the Subject, the Institution, the Organisation and everything else furnishing the indefeasible boundaries of “One” and the grand idea of Identity, or to surrender to its counter image, that which we signify by the vague, erratic and trivial notion of “postmodernism” creating a specific otherness, which as an aggregated unity produces and constitutes a naive field of reflection driven by an always underlying negative Hegelian dialectics,¹ where the counter image

*Corresponding author. Department of Management, Politics and Philosophy, Copenhagen Business School, Copenhagen, Denmark.

always already is a part of the form's totalising history of performance, never providing an opening towards the vitalism giving any form its possibility of genesis, its coming-into-being. Therefore, if the organisational and marketing thought wants to create the realm of aesthetics, it has to move away from the common territories, away from the codified regions, away from the normative city's homogeneous centre and out into the fragmented, flowing and nomadic strata of the borderland, where the illusions of discursivity, transcendence, universals end eternity has not completed the seizure of territorialization and onwards, out into the desert where any act of judgement ultimately must encompass the intangible and fundamental alienation of the Social. To approach the aesthetic is therefore not first and foremost a judgement of taste and does not concern itself with beauty or its opposite, but constitutes to a higher degree a line of flight in and through fields of intensities towards the vitalism that borders an "Outside", which fold we could call the vitalism of organising, wherefore the ambition of an aesthetic gaze is to get closer to the immanent otherness of taste and judgement, and as such move the gaze towards the event of singularisation beyond any "One" creating a pure necessity.

In what can only be an approximation aesthetics in this sense can signify a force, a force of subjectification that gives rise to individuation, that which is found on the borderline to any discursive regime, and as such aesthetics creates a form of existence containing the uniqueness of language and the always specific enoncé as well as the uniqueness of light and specificity of visibility. It becomes a form of existence that emerge in the fluctuating motion between speaking and seeing, where every individuation is stretched out and rests in Borges' labyrinth, a horizon of *duréé*, but never being, a passage in which the lines of flight of becoming and disappearing are organised, the way in which the force of an "Outside" is folding the outer's inner. This is the world of enoncé and visibility where every enoncé and every visibility refers to its own exclusive horizon of reference, and in this world the enoncé always has primacy in the formation of individuation, as it expresses the power of the discourse to produce the flesh of Man, but never to exhaust the passage of *becoming-other*, as discourse always is before or after, in-between however, the visibility offers resistance (Deleuze 1998, pp. 100–108; Foucault 1982, pp. 89–93). Therefore discursivation of the aesthetic is an attempt to move towards the primacy of visibility, but as the visibility has no access to an ontological primacy restlessness or more precisely wandering becomes the existence of Man, an ongoing creation without continuity, a disappearing leaving only fragile and temporary traces, since the ultimate destiny is motion, a destiny set by a foucauldian aesthetic oriented towards the time-dimension of folding vitalising the force of organising instead of the intentionality and inertia of organisation, wherefore organisation and marketing theory, re-introducing and instrumentalising aesthetics in the assemblages and regimes of signs is a territorialisation of the enoncé and the aesthetic gaze, robbing them of their creative forces and substituting them with the narrow horizon of normativity and management. However, in the forever wandering motion emerges another and radical challenge, as the aesthetic mode of subjectification undermines the relation to a subject oriented individuation through the self-creating perpetuum mobile between enoncé and visibility, where the relation is between the relative and the universal and not between the subject and the context, which simultaneously inscribes the always possibility of becoming-man and the necessity through which it remains a persistent permanence like the intervening space between life and death, where "*old age produces not eternal youth but a sovereign freedom, a pure necessity in which one enjoys a moment of grace between life and death, and in which all the parts of the machine come together to send into the future a feature that cuts across all ages*", as Deleuze and Guattari folds the event of pure singularity, A Life, as it self (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, pp. 1–2). The motion between the relative and the universal is honoured by an aesthetic "judgement", which always is an appeal that the universal can not

be enounced nor formulated, wherefore the place of connection between the relative and universal, between the specific and the general is in it self an incident, an event [Ereignis], as Even him. This complementarity, or more precisely, this simultaneous interwovenness, where the concrete and the general simultaneously falls inside each other creating at pure surface in its folding from an "Outside" dissolves the traditional differentiation between the relative and the universal, as we are found to be in the Event-of-Meaning also called the infinity of moment [Augenblick]. The general and the universal, the invisible and the silence of organising, the vitalism of force, belongs to the other voice in our self, that voice, which wears the face of Never, that, which is not at any time and always exposes the condition that we do not have ourselves.

This is an opening into the world and the real which we can not tread, but it can visit us for a short moment and force us to confidence with the vitalism of organising inventing new possibilities of life, styles of life,² pure intensities which folds the death of Man and creates modes of subjectification beyond any "One", an expressivity, which produces events of individuation without any subject, a horizon, a breeze, an intensity which forces us towards a hesitant yet expectant listening to that something which compresses itself and slowly wants to come into the light. This stands as an opening of an expressive realism, a place beyond any interior or realism itself, a place, where breathing holds back, as those words that awaits their abundance or what we might call their body, a surface without any depth, but still a doubling, a line of flight, a folding of the line to an "Outside" which *"is not a doubling of the One, but a redoubling of the Other. It is not a reproduction of the Same, but repetition of the Different. It is not the emanation of an 'I' but something that places in immanence an always other or a Non-self"* (Deleuze 1998, p. 98), a place, where we do not find ourselves on the "Outside", but where we find the other in me, a self as the double of other.³ This opening is driven by a dwelling and a hesitant attentiveness towards that thought, that we do not have ourselves, as the self always is a void left behind by the Otherness of Other, wherefore any aesthetic contemplation first and foremost becomes a restraint of the anthropocentric lust to reduce everything to the same,⁴ a mode that does not see that it cannot see, as it is blinded by the mirror of reflection, the eternity of Same, as the doubling of One, very far from where we are met by the aesthetic of expressivity, that which stands out as a singularity from the internal fold of organising or more precisely, an ongoing repetition of difference, the always singular folded by the vitalism of organising, that which we can not capture, possess, nor master by new measures, methods, instruments or new ideas of what is good or bad.

The aesthetic of expressivity is therefore not judgement, not even a judgement of the tasteful, nor is it focused on the classical understanding of Physics, nor Being in its fundamental ontological Heideggerian sense, on the contrary, it is letting the world and the real actualise itself, which is a motion of pure differentiation of a virtuality that is actualising itself and becomes its own singular texture, the actual as different, qualified and limited being, where the birth of Man as One only stands opposed, as a gaze towards the relative horizon of potentia, but where this Man, Descartes' substantive, always already is dissolved by the absolute horizon, that which never actualises, always outside the general, abstract and inaccurate conceptualisation of difference, that of difference between the actual and the possible, it is the inescapable remnants of virtuality, its own deferment, as always *becoming-other*. An aesthetic of expressivity in this sense is not a project or a projection and by no means a representation, but always an actualisation and a reality of those words that unfolds it in time and inscribes it in space, a fullness of the infinity of language, but always from the silent exteriority, wherefore an aesthetic of expressivity is itself in its actualisation and appears as what we could call a sculptured monument, a condensation of materiality and space, a pure surface in and by the density of time, but not first and foremost as the appearance between clearing and concealing as Heidegger imagined in the Work of Art, as

“*setting-into-work*” [Ins-Werk-Setzen], that fundamental condition of the work-being of the work of art [Werksein des Werkes], but much more like an abated breath in the word itself, as the vitalism of organising folds that *do-ing* which never seeks its own objectification nor its own disappearance in the signified, the transcendent, that which needs a consciousness in the production of a subject and an object, but on the contrary, it is a non- “*Setting-into-Work*”,⁵ the event of Never, an absolute motion domiciled in the transcendental field’s residence in a pure immanence, that, which is not in any-thing and does not belong to any-thing, it is not dependent of an object and does not relate to a subject, in this sense we could say it is the *be-coming* of the noun, on the Deleuzian “Plane of Immanence” (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, pp. 35–61), a complete force and beatitude, as a tide, an absolute intensity, that runs through all the concrete and local waves, the actual, on the immense ocean of time, it’s A Life.

An aesthetic of expressivity is therefore in its purest sense a creation, but not a creation out of the hand of man, but out of that *do-ing* which is the ongoing folding by the vitalism of organising, it is a creation where the created is preserved by itself, as its cause is internal to its affect, a pure necessity that gives man the possibility of becoming man out of the difference created by the aesthetic of expressivity and as such it becomes its own actualisation as the actual, that different, qualified and limited being that gazes man and never the other way around, in exactly the same manner as the monument, where “*the monument is not something commemorating a past, it is a bloc of present sensations that owe their preservation only to themselves and that provide the event with the compound that celebrates it. The monument’s action is not memory, but fabulation*” (Deleuze and Guattari 1994, pp. 167–168),⁶ it is a singular event as its own difference, or more precisely, the return of the non-recurrent difference, that difference aimed by Walter Benjamin’s crystal. The force of aesthetics is therefore a singularisation, a life in pure immanence, neutral, beyond god and evil and creates lines of flight out of an intensive field of expressivity, freeing that Life which is imprisoned in any historical configuration, setting free in the de-territorialised languages attentiveness towards the hardly visible, the barely perceptible and the very small, the always minor, and moves as style in its actualisation towards that place, which as a void creates consistency by preserving the infinite.

It is the neutral He, the remnant!

NOTES

1. In the imprecise gleam of classification poststructuralism is not first and foremost, as it is often portrayed in the anglosaxian reading of this continental tradition, a negation of theoretical or even metaphysical foundations, and not only creating a deconstruction of the traditional political and philosophical discourse, but much more radical, it is a motion towards an affirmation of an antagonistic alternative within the philosophical tradition itself. It is a motion towards Blanchot’s “Outside”, which have no other side, only an internal Fold, an ongoing folding of force, wherefore the writing of Michael Foucault and especially the work of Gilles Deleuze should not be seen as an opposition to the philosophical tradition in general, but specifically to the Hegelian tradition, where we in Bergsonism are asked “*Of what use is a dialectic that believes itself to be reunited with the real when it compensates for the inadequacy of a concept that is too broad or too general by invoking the opposite concept, which is no less broad and general? The concrete will never be attained by combining the inadequacy of one concept with the inadequacy of its opposite. The singular will never be attained by correcting a generality with another generality*” (Deleuze 1997, p. 44). This antagonistic and affirmative motion towards an “Outside” is not just another anti-Hegelianism, because to end here is just to end inside the totality of Hegelian thought itself, it is fulfilment of exactly that form, so to say that the motion is antagonistic is to point towards the construction of a terrain or more precisely a plateau that is not only post-Hegelian, but is fundamentally separated and different from the negative dialectical negation in working with the problems of the determination of Being, the unity of the One and the Multiple and so forth. See especially the early work of Gilles Deleuze and his “first” work of doing philosophy, the second part of his dissertation *Difference and Repetition* 1994.
2. This maybe the vitalism we find in Foucault’s aesthetic writings, a line of thought in the motion between life and death, a mortalism inside life itself, an always minor death, as a play of force between the “Now”, that which we

are and therefore cease to be and “Actualisation” that which we become, a vitalism of force, truly a Nietzschean will.

3. It is no longer a question of letting thought work inside the lines of dualism or to reduce thinking to the thought that wants to find itself in thought, which of cause is a direct consequence of the attempt to create a plateau beyond any dialectical thinking, on the contrary, it is attempt to create a thinking thought, which tries to show how the Other and the Distant also is the Same and Near by exploding our traditional understanding of “Difference” and “Repetition” in a motion towards pure multiplicity.
4. It is a lust living by the simple proposition that A equals A in it's naive but equivalently dangerous attempt to produce the idea of the different, that which we today praise as the work mode of knowledge.
5. Non-“*Setting-into-work*” [désœuvrement] that also refers to inactivity and idleness can be read as Maurice Blanchot's crypto-grammatical comment to Heidegger's slow drilling towards Truth, as “*setting-into-work*” [Ins-Werk-Setzen] through the Work of Arts phenomenality, in its occurrence out of nothingness. Non-“*setting-into-work*” is a reticent motion in the writing that is unfolding the text, a deferment inside writing itself where the Non-“*Setting-into-work*” appears as the transcendental fields realisation beyond the transcendent. See “L'expérience de Mallarmé” and “L'inspiration” (Blanchot 1955a,b).
6. Deleuze and Guattari: What is Philosophy? P. 167–168, where the bloc of present sensations no longer belongs to the perception and thereby experience or to the affection and thereby feeling, but to the percept and the affect as autonomously and sufficient beings that no longer owe anything to any “One”, they are their own “*in the eternity that coexists with this short duration*” that overfly man in the absence of Man, the always present Be-coming.

REFERENCES

- Blanchot, Maurice “L'expérience de Mallarmé” L'espace littéraire, 1955a.
 Blanchot, Maurice “L'inspiration”. L'espace littéraire, 1955b.
 Blanchot, Maurice
 1995 The Writing of the Disaster (University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln and London), Translated from the French by Ann Smock.
 Deleuze, Gilles
 1991 Bergsonism (Zone Books, New York), Translated from French by Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam.
 Deleuze, Gilles
 1994 Difference and Repetition (The Athlone Press, London), Translated from the French by Poul Patton.
 Deleuze, Gilles
 1998 Foucault (University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis and London), Translated from the French by Sean Hand.
 Deleuze, Gilles and Guattari, Felix
 1994 What is Philosophy? (Verso, London and New York), Translated from the French by Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchill.
 Foucault, Michel
 1981–1986 The use of Pleasure in The history of Sexuality vol. 2 (Vintage Books, New York), Translated from the French by Robert Hurley.
 Heidegger, Martin
 1960 Das Ursprung der Kunstwerks (Philipp Reclam Jun., Stuttgart).