



PAULINA KŁOS-CZERWIŃSKA
UNIwersytet Zielonogórski

THE CREATIVE POWER OF AFFECTIVE DISCOURSE. RECAPITULATING DELEUZE

In the contemporary society, as a result of the workings of different kinds of media, a systematic degradation of everyday experience and a reduced sensibility in everyday communication has been observed. The conditioning of individual experience by standardized images has led to „the destruction of that which enables individuals to project the unity of an I in a fashion clearly as fictional as it is indispensable” (Stiegler, 2014, p. 83). While Bernard Stiegler writes about the unity of an I, Gilles Deleuze refers to three kinds of powers that take part in the creation of the subject: drives, affects (or feelings) and emotions. The workings of these powers and the outcomes of their work result in what I will refer to as „affective discourse”, which is launched in order to shape the „undetermined centre” named in short „the Self”. Such affective discourse possesses creative power which, if emancipated, may lead directly to the development of new ways of reacting to individual and social environments that are constantly changing due to phenomena like technological progress, mass consumption or the complicated relations between democracy and capitalism. In this way, creation becomes the key to counteracting poverty of experience and overcoming the misleading effects of standardized measures for feeling and experiencing. This unique, affective idiom, that governs behaviour possibilities and even individual profiles, should not be regarded as a heavy burden to be disposed of; on the contrary, it provides an open possibility to create life as one pleases, a possibility that will constantly be supplied with new potentialities and strengths.

In the culture of developed countries it is the cinema, among other forms of mass media, that has taken over the role of the creation of standards for feeling, behaviour and expression. Bernard Stiegler, a famous critic of the stupefying role of mass media, states that media and the cultural industries are „the most effective instruments in the creation of disgust for the old and unfashionable, and (...) [for the creation] of desire” (Stiegler, 2014, p. 31). They delimit possible ways of expression available for the future. If we do not leave the area of expression open, if we do not invite free creation, our choice of modes of living will be systematically delimited.

Referring to this media-induced degradation of experience and sensibility as „symbolic and affective misery”, Stiegler goes on to explain that mass media are „industrial temporal objects [which] are privileged instruments, as they intertwine ideally and massively with the time of consciousness” (Stiegler, 2014, p. 31), with the resultant danger that the Self’s „time of consciousness” may be „increasingly subjected to systematic exploitation” (Stiegler, 2014, p. 31) and „a fully controlled conditioning” (Stiegler, 2014, p. 83). In this sense consciousness, which is usually associated with freedom of mind, becomes a resource given to be used and manipulated by those who possess power and want to tell others what they should do or think and who they should be.

Symbolic misery is defined by Stiegler as „the loss of individuation which results from the loss of participation in the production of symbols” (Stiegler, 2014, p. 10) and also „the synchronization of all consciousnesses [which] is the annulment of the narcissism that [he calls] primordial. When consciousness becomes the object of a systematic industrial exploitation, which is nothing but a process of synchronization, self-love is destroyed. Ill-disposed to itself, consciousness can no longer stand itself: it lives in the untenable. And, not being able to stand itself, not being able to ex-ist, not being able to project itself into a world which has become for it an unworld, it can no longer stand others” (Stiegler, 2014, p. 62). The subject is here seen mainly as the result of different processes of narcissistic origin; it must love itself before it starts to love others and must have its own desires that differ from others. However, it is this very ability – to desire, to love oneself – that has been destroyed by „the submission of consciousness to the time of temporal objects” (Stiegler, 2014, p. 61), which block the

powers that make subjects singular and unique. As Stiegler writes, „once I am deprived of my singularity I can no longer love myself: it is only possible to love oneself starting from the intimate knowledge of one’s own singularity (...) Art is the experience and the support of this sensible singularity” (Stiegler, 2014, p. 6).

And it is here, in relation to art that Deleuze’s concept of creation as a potential means of solving Stiegler’s „symbolic and affective misery” comes into play. For Deleuze, creation and the locus of its realization, namely art, have the power to undermine the working of the media. It is therefore the problem of creation and the individual that I would like to turn my attention to in the rest of this article. However, before I start to present these ideas of creative power of art and affective discourse, I would like to mention that choosing Stiegler as the main figure responsible for the display of the problematic of affective misery is not an abuse or a mistake. Stiegler, throughout his philosophical career, has never stopped to underline the importance of the area of emotions in common undertaking in individual and social life. His work presents solutions, that applied, may contribute to better realisation of everyday routine in contemporary, capitalist society. However, it would be a mistake to take Stiegler’s writings only as the source of solutions to this problem, because what is the most visible in them is rather a constructive diagnosis based on noticing of the problem, than overall and systematic research. This systematic research is, on the other hand, the domain in which Deleuze stands out. Thus, from this point of view, we could look for the solutions of the problem only in writings by Deleuze and omit theories by Stiegler. The same situation concerns writings by Blanchot and Foucault: we can also ask here about the legitimacy of their contribution in the situation, where writings by Deleuze would be enough. However, I intended to support Deleuzian theory with the solutions presented by Blanchot, Foucault and Stiegler, because even if they are less adequate in this regard, they reveal the background to the problem of control, which is not only about its historical provenience, but presents additionally the problematic of emotions that accompany the interiorisation of control and affective misery. The problematic of affective misery would not be so clearly visible and would not make a problem, if the idea of internal control hadn’t been raised. Similarly, in the case of the problematic revealed

systematically by Deleuze, the diagnosis by Stiegler makes it sound more profound and constitutes this misery as the contemporary, serious indisposition, which must be faced and get over. Also, Maurice Blanchot or Michel Foucault's analyses make simple theories on affection more of a practical enterprise. In this case, presented restrictions on the work of these three authors must be taken into account if we want to do justice to the meaning of accepted assumptions.

One of such assumptions is the idea of „affective and symbolic misery” as it is stated by Stiegler in order to present the conditions in which contemporary individual lives. Deleuze assumes that the only solution to the problem of this misery is creation. He distinguishes between two types of creation in his work *Two Regimes of Madness*: creation treated as the invention of an idea and creation as a form of communication. In comparison with the invention of an idea, communication always amounts to being informed, and „when you are informed, you are told what you are supposed to believe” (Deleuze, 2007b, p. 325). You are placed within the society of control, and this society means „submission of almost every human experience to aesthetic and affective – as well as cognitive and informational – control” (Stiegler, 2014, p. 82-83). Hence the problem of affective poverty is related to the concept of creation, but whether this problem can be eliminated depends on how we understand the notion of „creation”. If we understand it as the act of communication or informing, we can always be told or informed what to do and what to think. For Deleuze, however, creation of ideas enlarges the sphere of freedom, which makes it possible to look at information from the outside, thus enabling us to gain distance to it, become critical of it and assess its value. Thus creation, and the locus of its realization, namely art, can undermine the working of the media. Creating beyond the overwhelming power of the media means that individual experience is not restricted and submitted to standardized concepts, but develops in different directions, presents imaginative skills and powers, can subvert the existing order, is inventive and unpredictable and as a result, may even be dangerous. Yet its value consists in these very functions which are released by creativity. Creativity is possible only where individual experience is not limited, but rather where all the powers of human

mind are employed in the enterprise of supporting the area for the unlimited and free development of this experience.

Creation in the writings by Deleuze is inseparably connected with the process of individuation, hence the notion of the subject is introduced. However, the subject in Deleuzian writings is not understood in the traditional romantic sense, where the creative power consists in the realization of an emancipating individual. Whereas the Romantic individual constantly and consciously realizes its own, individual self, the Nomadic subject – as presented by Deleuze – does not try to emancipate its own being or make itself constantly stronger and more fixed in its positions. On the contrary, it is rather a wandering subject that changes its territory and, as a result, is involved in the constant deterritorialization of anything that could somehow be territorialized. This subject is not distinguished and separated from others, but represents rather the strengthening of movement and change. Whenever the results of a change are grasped, this merely marks the way and forms the front from which another deterritorialization can begin. The results of this movement are the areas of singularity, which may be of subjective order, but also of an order of intensification of desire, which has not subjective character. We do not have a “particular subject” here, because what appears in the process of individuation is the nomadic subject, that is not centred around a given core but is the result of encounter. Deleuze writes: „something in the world forces us to think. This something is an object not of recognition but of a fundamental encounter. What is encountered may be Socrates, a temple or a demon” (Deleuze, 2010, p. 176). The encounter is the origin of the process of individuation, it is „the creation of a certain way of existence; however, you should not confuse it with the subject (...) The subjectivation has nothing to do with ‘person’ – it is the mode of individuation, individual or collective, that is ascribed to the event (the time of day, a river, wind, some life), the mode of intensity, not the particular subject” (Deleuze, 2007a, p. 107).

This nomadic subject, then, should not be called a subject at all, for it is not the consequence of the linear accumulation of experience. The Nomadic subject is the result of shivering in the area of intensities. It is these shiverings that transverse the spaces of intensity. The Nomadic subject is not supposed to have a centre, but is rather the

result of an encounter which may appear wherever certain affective powers are released. This encounter „may be grasped in a range of affective tones: wonder, love, hatred, suffering” (Deleuze, 2010, p. 176). These modes of intensity appear in areas susceptible to harm. In such areas, under the condition of the existence of certain emotions, individuation takes place. Simon Sullivan states in the article *The Aesthetics of Affect. Thinking Art Beyond Representation* that: „We ‘are’ – as well as subjects (bound by strata) – bundles of events, bundles of affects (in a constant process of destratification)” (O’Sullivan, 2001, p. 128) and that „[t]his world of affects, this universe of forces, is our own world seen without the spectacles of subjectivity” (Ibid.).

These spectacles of subjectivity seem necessary as the power of unifying synthesis that creates the subject, but Deleuze does not look for a centre from which all directives would come, a centre that would reign in the subjected realm of realities. Deleuze describes this areas of subjectivity as that which „is neither individual nor personal, but rather [creates] the emissions of singularities that are formed on the surface of the unconscious and use the mobile, immanent rule of autounification through nomadic distribution” (Deleuze, 2011, p. 148). This „nomadic distribution” does not rule in a certain, determined space; it is rather the intensity that assumes the world of „impersonal and preindividual singularities” and the world of „free and unbound energy” (Deleuze, 2011, p. 154). These explosions of intensities that result from encountering something that forces us to think and to experience „in affective tones” are called „nomadic singularities” and are not „imprisoned in consolidated individuality of infinite Being (...) or within the borders of the settled, finite subject” (Ibid.). Thus, we find the nomadic subject as opposed to determined, centred settlement of traditional, accumulative narration presented usually in the form of the individual.

To make it possible for the nomadic subject to appear, we also need to understand the forces that take part in its creation and are the consequence of an encounter with an event. These forces are placed in the realm of sensibility. Deleuze writes: „the object of encounter (...) really gives rise to sensibility” (Deleuze, 2010, p. 176) which can be thought of as the sphere where intensities and the result of feeling these intensities appear. Intensity is “understood as a pure difference in

itself" (Deleuze, 2010, p. 181). This means that some qualities are hidden in the affective potential and the released power of intensity gives them a form, an appearance of circulating energy. In this way, in the intensity, the separate, distinct units of meaning are created, for as Sullivan points out „signification itself might be understood as just a complex affective function (meaning would be the effect of affects)" (O'Sullivan, 2001, p. 126). Thus, we can draw the conclusion that the process of creation is possible and realized in the same way as the individuation of subject is realized, as result of the power of emotions being launched. They are the core where the first weakness appears, where the first harm is done, and the „bundles of events and affects" begin to form answers to these harms. The answers that follow the first emotions are called creation.

Creation seems to occur in conjunction with the realization or creation of the subject. In fact, creation of the subject may even be the most important part of creation in general. Its importance may lie in its ability to withstand the overwhelming powers of media described by Stiegler. In the writings of Deleuze, the workings of the powers of creation of the subject amount to any unusual activity that is not focused on the creation of the „ruling center", but rather on „the center of undetermination" where the creative power may be aroused and strengthened. This process of arousing the powers of creation is directed against the determining power of media that bind and immobilize the senses, making them incapable of producing new qualities. The notion of affect or feeling has a special role here. It is simply the power which, by relating towards a certain object, not only strengthens this relation, but also expresses the quality that is created in this process of indicating. Hence it is „the tendency that moves the immobile element" (Deleuze, 2008, p. 76-77). Feeling (or affect) is thus the missing element that can be satisfactorily inserted between perception and action. Thus affect „is here the being, it means the Power or the Quality. It is something expressed that does not exist independently from what expresses it, though it is something completely different from it" (Deleuze, 2008, p. 109). Thus, we have here „the coincidence of the subject and object, the way in which the subject perceives itself or rather experiences or feels itself 'from inside'" (Deleuze, 2008, p. 76). As for subjectivity, it is composed of the

perception of objects. The subject is the „centre of indeterminacy” which is realized in the distance, in the interval „between the received and the executed movement” (Deleuze, 2008, p. 73). This „centre of indeterminacy” wanders through the worlds of images and movements, whose frames it possesses. These frames may be objective or subjective, partial or fragmentary (respectively for objects and perceptions). Subjectivity is understood here as a certain frame realized in time. It retains from it and creates on the basis of it that which interests the subject with regard to its needs. Within this frame the belatedness, the interval between action and reaction is included, that makes the perception and the action possible: „indeed, the perception is only the first aspect of this distance, the second one is action” (Ibid.). Only these two elements create the centre which takes place in the world of images and movements, and around which all other frames of worlds are distributed. The area of relations, i.e. the interval between this, what the subject perceives and towards which it acts, and the objects that are submitted to perception and action, is not empty. This area is filled with feelings, strictly speaking they appear in the gap between perception and action. This affect, this feeling that appears in the belatedness is just „this inhuman becoming of human” (Deleuze, Guattari, 2000, p. 187), where „percepts are no longer perceptions, but are independent from the state of those who experience them; affects are no longer feelings or emotions, but exceed the power of those who submitted to them. The impressions, percepts and affects are the meaningful beings all by themselves and they surpass any experience” (Deleuze, Guattari, 2000, p. 180-181). These affects become independent beings and the states of becoming which amount to the processes of subjectivation or individuation as they are understood by Deleuze.

To organize the processes of creation first we must find the source of creativity. This can be found in the place indicated by Bergson in his *Matter and Memory*. This place boils down to different time. Bergson calls it „the pure-past, a virtual realm of pure potentiality. Such potential (...) can only be actualized when a gap is opened between stimulus and response, that is to say, a break in habit” (O’Sullivan, 2011, p. 92). This gap assumes „the complexity of the nervous system, which allows for a multiplicity of different pathways for stimulus – response, determines a hesitation in that response” (Ibid.). This movement may

be launched and opened by „a general slowing down of the brain-body configuration, or simply a halt (the opening of ‘vacuoles of non-communication’ as Deleuze calls them.)” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 175, cited in: O’Sullivan, 2011, p. 92).

So, to undertake the process of creation, first we need a certain background, some motivating resource. One such resource is a cultural setting where a certain „uneasiness” of the soul (Smith, 2011, p. 134), disquiet or disequilibrium is aroused. At this point the act of creation will follow step by step as „an act that integrates the small perceptions and small inclinations into a remarkable inclination, which then becomes an inclination of the soul” (Ibid.). This inclination, this uneasiness, however, does not appear alone – we have to help it to appear. In order to be able to cross the boundaries of the known into the unknown, first we have to stop the world.

In order to see you have to „stop the world” (Deleuze, Guattari, 2014, p. 161), and it is worth it, for the stakes are high. It is about „the ‘arrival’ in a place where everything agrees with oneself, which is to say, produces joy. The entire world affirms one’s being or capacity to act (one becomes, as it were, the world, or, to put it differently, one becomes the cause of oneself.)” (O’Sullivan, 2011, p. 93-94). This place „is a place in which one experiences the eternal” (O’Sullivan, 2011, p. 94). This is also the very locus where creation may unfold its wings and innovation may appear. This is also the place where desire may rule, bringing into existence new modes of living. To enter into the beyond we have to stop the world to the point of „absolute immobility” which „is itself part of the speed vector” (Ibid.). We must focus attention and begin to experience „a suspension of normal motor activity which in itself allows other ‘planes’ of reality to be perceivable (an opening up to the world beyond utilitarian interests)” (O’Sullivan, 2001, p. 101-102). Another way of describing this non-action is a „new’ way of being in the world, [which] must at some level involve a first moment of this awareness and indeed a moment of non-reaction, ultimately to pleasure or pain (that is to say, a certain disinterestedness)” (O’Sullivan, 2011, p. 99-100). In order to start thinking innovatively, a state of „freedom from the present plane of existence,” (O’Sullivan, 2011, p. 92) and „time underdetermined by that present”, (O’Sullivan, 2011, p. 93) must be achieved. Undirected by the space-times delivered by the media, we can then start to think

independently, by remaining for some time in a moment of pure continuity. Nietzsche “called for a practise of idleness in order to foster genuine thought. In both cases this is a kind of super-productivity arising from a specifically non-productive (in capitalist terms) state. Stillness producing a certain ‘speed’, or intensity, of thought” (Nietzsche, 2001, p. 183-184, cited in: O’Sullivan, 2011, p. 99). Deleuze calls such moments of intensity „spiritual voyages.” These different dimensions and temporalities can often be achieved through encounters with art. Art for Georges Bataille, „is precisely a mechanism for accessing a kind of immanent beyond everyday experience” (O’Sullivan, 2001, p. 127). Participating in art means we open different temporalities, „we access different durations”, (O’Sullivan, 2011, p. 99) durations of passion where lines of flights take the subject into the region of intensities.

However, passion cannot simply last forever; it must be recapitulated. This means that the cogito must always start anew, must always recommence, hence „[e]very consciousness pursues its own death” (Deleuze, Guattari, 2014, p. 155) and has this death inscribed in the very rule of its progress. A single „line of flight” is hence impossible, but it recapitulates itself in this impossibility producing moments of intensity that are the anticipation of the possibilities of consciousness. In the book titled *A Thousand Plateaus*, together with Felix Guattari, Deleuze describes a procedure for grasping and creating within oneself many productive lines of flight. This procedure helps to filtrate what is productive, creative against what can be called the external influence, the impact of the external, accidental objects and reality. Deleuze uses the term „plateau” „whose development avoids any orientation toward a culmination point or external end” (Deleuze, Guattari, 2014, p. 23) in order „to designate something very special: a continuous, self-vibrating region of intensities” (Ibid.). It is thus this state of „plateau” that we are trying to achieve in the process of creation.

Some explanation of this state of plateau may be gained by an analysis of the character of the writings by Deleuze or Maurice Blanchot, whose work was an inspiration for young structuralists, including Jacques Derrida, and also for Emmanuel Levinas, Blanchot’s friend. Blanchot’s writing reveals the situation when we have nothing to do with the object of discussion or controversy. Thought is not focused here on the central point or the matter in question. In the works by Maurice

Blanchot (Blanchot 2008, p. 25-27) writing is a detour, it surrounds or errs – it is a form of enterprise not directed at the achievement of some goal. From the economic point of view it is useless, it is a waste of time and a mistake, but from the point of view of creation it is the best way to behave, for it is this behaviour that leads to meaning, not information. In agreement with Blanchot, Deleuze explicates: „Making a clean slate, starting or beginning again from ground zero, seeking a beginning or a foundation – all imply a false conception of voyage and movement (a conception that is methodical, pedagogical, initiatory, symbolic...)” (Deleuze, Guattari, 2014, p. 26-27). Deleuze goes on to clarify that „[i]t is a regrettable characteristic of the Western mind to relate expressions and actions to exterior or transcendent ends, instead of evaluating them on a plane of consistency on the basis of their intrinsic value” (Deleuze, Guattari, 2014, p. 23). Writing in the works by Blanchot, who influenced Deleuze, is a voyage, a voyage where it is desirable to err, to take additional unnecessary routes, to detour or digress. Creation in the writings by Deleuze is strongly under the impact of this idea of detouring, Blanchot, rejecting here all external ends, says that to create is to form a passage from one singular point to another, and focusing on this passage, following this direction, thought expands. According to Blanchot the best form of the realization of such a creative movement is poetry, where “the poet is the mediator; he connects the near to the far” (Blanchot 1995, p. 114). Thus, though it may seem paradoxical, the simplest method to envision creation according to Blanchot is poetry: it is in the power of this surrounding, circular movement so characteristic to it, where Blanchot, and after him Deleuze, see the difference between this what only is and this what realizes itself in the process of becoming.

Affective discourse and the resulting processes of creation are vitally important precisely because of their potential to overcome the power of control in contemporary societies. For Deleuze „[t]he problem of control (...) becomes (...) that against which creativity must struggle” (Rajchman, 2011, p. 88). The idea of the overcoming of the problem of control is also present in writings by Michel Foucault, that is why it would be interesting and informative to look at it from this additional point of view, all the more that Foucault and Deleuze inspired each other in their scientific enterprises. However, this short overview should not be treated as a direct solution to the problem of affective

misery, because the social and cultural contexts in which the problem appears differ and what could be the solution in ancient times may not appear as curative in the contemporary capitalist society. Moreover, in Michel Foucault's interpretation of the problem of control, the situation is even worse than the one presented by Deleuze, because the external control exerted on humans has become internalized and now the subject succumbs to certain demanded behaviours on its own. It is clearly visible in the example with panopticon, where, as Foucault presents it, the control is only intended and assumed, but the real danger lies in its internalization by the prisoners. They alone feel as if they were observed, the figure of the guard in the tower is only hypothetical, what is real is the control present in the heads of the prisoners. Stiegler sees this problem in a different way and it seems that his approach is more in keeping with the current situation: it is not only that the subject accidentally becomes the guard for itself, but the process of diminishing the internal powers of subjects is undertaken on a broad scale in the mass consumption directed by technology. The creation of this misery becomes a global and constant tendency, and members of society normally have no possibility of escaping it. However, the Deleuzian idea of creation seems to be a possible solution to this problem.

To sketch the idea of the Foucaultian solution to the problem of control, first it would be helpful to look at the following question posed by Deleuze and Foucault, they ask: „in what forms, to what degree (...) can we invent today spaces and groups for the kind of open search and research, interference and resonance, learning and unlearning, which formed part of the whole idea of 'creativity'?” (Rajchman, 2011, p. 89). In what forms can we invent „spaces and times in which thinking lives?” (Ibid.). Deleuze bases his idea here on the propositions included particularly in the writings by Foucault, namely certain methods and techniques that do not need to explicate anything that lies under the surface of expression, their advantage is that they lie on this surface ready to be used, they lie at hand and in sight. The problem is only that you need to be taught how to use these methods and how to apply them to everyday routine. Deleuze and Foucault say thus that we do not need to be able to find certain depth or go down beyond the sphere of signs to find „space and time in which thinking lives”, we do not need to

decode the internal meaning out of the external sign. They propose something completely contrary: Foucault offers certain techniques, that will be easily accessed and always at hand to help in the organization of the matter coming from the outside or experienced inside the subject. Deleuze, on the other hand, also proposes concrete technique that becomes only on the surface: cinema.

As far as Foucault is concerned, in his writings on ethics, he provides many techniques of attending to oneself. As I explained earlier, these technics may not apply to the current situation of a subject, due to changed conditions of contemporary living, but they may, nevertheless, indicate the direction of the inquiry which, in the future, may lead to the area where the problems of control may be solved. Such an overview may be helpful, though it is not a direct answer to the problem mentioned by Deleuze and Stiegler. Among many such solutions presented by Foucault are practical methods of caring of the self and making an art of a subject's life, what means that they function as a certain form of creation that may counteract the stupefying powers of mass media. As was stated above, Foucault does not propose the inquiry into the depths of individual soul. Instead, he proposes „a constant practice (...), a set of carefully worked-out procedures (...) [that possess] curative and therapeutic function” (Foucault, 2000, p. 94, 95, 97). One of such therapeutic method is „habitual self-reflection” (Foucault, 2000, p. 101) which advises „to come back inside oneself and examine the ‘riches’ that one has deposited there” (Foucault, 2000, p. 101), or the next one which says that we should visualize the future „very systematically imagining the worst that may happen” (Foucault, 2000, p. 102), it may impregnate us against evil that may happen to us in reality. All these methods are directed to a certain common goal: to achieve a certain harmony in relation with yourself in order to be able to counteract calamities that may result in our worsening affective condition. What is important here, and goes in line with the following Deleuzian method, is that this self-control „is not aimed at uncovering, beneath appearances, a hidden truth that would be that of the subject itself; rather, it finds in these representations (...) the occasion for recalling to mind a certain number of true principles” (Foucault, 2000, p. 104), principles that may be always at hand waiting to be used. Thus, similarly to Deleuze, Foucault does not aim at depth of interpretation,

but proposes simple tricks of imagination and creation that may help in mastering the Self in the world of constant deception and manipulation.

Deleuze also relates his method of creation directed against the symbolic misery to surface. In his extrapolation on cinema he admits Foucaultian influence, and underlines this quality of surface: „It's in Foucault himself that surfaces become essentially surfaces on which things are inscribed: this is the whole problem of utterances which are 'neither visible nor hidden'. Archaeology amounts to constituting a surface on which things can be inscribed. If you don't constitute a surface on which things can be inscribed what's not hidden, will remain invisible. Surface isn't opposed to depth (...) but to interpretation. Foucault's method was always opposed to any interpretative method. Never interpret; experience, experiment...” (Deleuze 1995, p. 87). Experiencing and experimenting is clearly visible in Deleuzian approach to creation, where he tries to instill them against the overwhelming power of interpretation.

In Deleuzian writings it is film that is the example of a previously accepted technique. It does not need to come down into the depth of interpretation, but it releases the motion that happens on the surface and delimits this surface exactly as something that is the deepest according to the words by Valery: „there's nothing deeper than skin” (Deleuze 1995, p. 87). This motion as the art of surface takes place in the art of film production, whose main role amounts „to setting out new, actual routs in subject's minds” (Deleuze 2007a, p. 72). Deleuzian theory considers two great phenomena that are encountered in film: the movement-image and the time-image. They both resemble the movement of thought and may be understood as an attempt to construct new ways of experiencing. Deleuze always commented that „a cinema has always tended to construe a certain image of thought, certain mechanisms that govern our way of thinking” (Deleuze 2007a, p. 76). Following his line of argumentation, it appears that thanks to the cinema it becomes possible not only to follow the construction of our thought, but also inaugurate its change and deconstruction of its grounded matrices. Thus, creating cinematic experience becomes the very helpful and at hand method of the transformation of human ways of life, it may become a tool for subversion that changes the foundation of experiencing and thinking, subversion that comes contradictory to

everyday media impact. Together with the ideas on the process of subjectivity construction by Foucault, Deleuzian concepts of thought-image as possible to be constructed in film, provide easily accessible methods to counteract the production of affective misery.

Taking into account the definitions of affective misery and the Deleuzian idea of creation and his understanding of the nomadic subject as the result of this creation, we may infer that „spaces and times”, movement-image and time-image may be opened by entering into regions of intensity. Feeling and thinking within such regions may be the best way to counteract the controlling powers of contemporary media technology. Thus the creation of a singularity could be an answer to the problem formulated by Stiegler. The subject that stands behind Stiegler’s theory lacks the ability to produce affects and symbols. This is the result of the workings of different technological inventions, mainly the media. Through the process of synchronization of their time with the time of subject’s consciousness, they weaken this consciousness, strip it of its narcissism, of its love toward itself. The process of creation presented by Deleuze could start precisely in the place of this absence, this affective misery: when we can no longer love ourselves, we stop believing in ourselves and start to believe what media dictate. We can no longer love ourselves so we become weak, and as a consequence, we cannot produce affects that are the independent beings that express our inner reality. There are two reasons for this. First, because we no longer have this reality, second, because we are no longer independent, our consciousness is not creative and productive, because it can only repeat what is proposed by the media. We become enslaved by their images, by their forms of time. Not loving ourselves anymore, we do not have the ability to save our thinking and transform it into affects, we cannot win with our attachments acquired in the contact with media. The subject proposed by Stiegler is an enslaved subject, one that does not have enough inner power arising from its love of itself to create affects. It is not bound strongly enough to its own ideas, thoughts and inner pictures. When connection with one’s own experiences is destroyed, they cannot be formed into affects, and they cannot start to live their own lives as separate, unique beings independent of their authors. It is this state that Stiegler refers to as „symbolic misery”, which is part of our contemporary identity. The creation as it is proposed by Foucault,

Blanchot and Deleuze, provides an answer to this problem. First, it cures the lack and weakness caused by the media, second, it tries to induce the processes of creation that originate from this weaknesses. Moments of atopia, stillness, immobility which are sometimes the result of this weakness may be strengthened on the basis of the inaugurating hesitation, then some tension arises „until the free action drops from it like an over-ripe fruit” (Bergson, 1913, p. 171, 176, cited in: Smith, 2011, p. 135). Deleuze proposes the process of creation in the form described by him, because it allows the area between stimulus and response to become open to the unexpected, so the idea of nomadic subject may then function and singularity as „the self-vibrating region of intensities” may be realized. The whole process of the preparation and the realization of these intensities, called in this article „affective discourse” reaches its culmination in affects as the carriers of the power of the independent, inner life. Thus the creation treated as freedom in the realization of intensities seems to address the problem of affective misery and may constitute an important area for further research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bergson, H. (1913). *Time and Free Will: An Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness*. Mineola: Dover Publications.
- Blanchot, M. (1995). *The Work of Fire*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Blanchot, M. (2008). *The Infinite Conversation*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze G. (1995). *Negotiations, 1972–1990*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze G. (2007a). *Negocjacje 1972 – 1990*. Wrocław: Wyd. Naukowe Dolnośląskiej Szkoły Wyższej we Wrocławiu.
- Deleuze G. (2007b). *Two Regimes of Madness. Texts and Interviews 1975 – 1995*. South Pasadena: Semiotext(e).
- Deleuze G. (2008). *Kino. 1: Obraz-ruch. 2: Obraz-czas*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo słowo/obraz/terytoria.
- Deleuze G. (2010). *Difference and Repetition*. London, New York: Continuum.
- Deleuze G. (2011). *Logika sensu*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Deleuze, G., Guattari, F. (2000). *Co to jest filozofia?* Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo słowo/obraz/terytoria.
- Deleuze, G., Guattari, F. (2014). *Anti-Oedipus*. London, New Delhi, New York, Sydney: Bloomsbury.
- Deleuze, G., Guattari, F. (2014). *A Thousand Plateaus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. London, New Delhi, New York, Sydney: Bloomsbury.
- Foucault, M. (2000). *Essential works of Foucault 1954 – 1984. Ethics*. Vol. 1. London: Penguin Books.
- Jun N., Smith D. W. (eds.) (2011). *Deleuze and Ethics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Nietzsche, F. (2001). *The Gay Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- O'Sullivan S. (2001). The Aesthetics of Affect. Thinking Art Beyond Representation, "*Angelaki. Journal of the theoretical humanities*," Vol.6, No. 3, December.
- O'Sullivan S. (2011). The Production of the New and the Care of the Self. In: S. O'Sullivan and S. Zepke (eds.), *Deleuze, Guattari and the Production of the New* (91–103). University of Tennessee, London, New York: Continuum,
- O'Sullivan S., Zepke S. (eds.) (2011). *Deleuze, Guattari and the Production of the New*. University of Tennessee, London, New York: Continuum.
- Rajchman J. (2011). A Portrait of Deleuze-Foucault for Contemporary Art. In: S. O'Sullivan, S. Zepke (eds.), *Deleuze, Guattari and the Production of the New* (80–90). University of Tennessee, London, New York: Continuum.
- Smith, D. W. (2011). Deleuze and the Question of Desire: Towards an Immanent Theory of Ethics. In: N. Jun and D. W. Smith (eds.), *Deleuze and Ethics* (123–141). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Stiegler, B. (2014). *Symbolic Misery*. Cambridge, Malden: Polity Press.

ABSTRAKT

Kreatywna siła dyskursu afektywnego. Rekapitulacja myśli Deleuze'a

W prezentowanym artykule starałam się skupić uwagę odbiorcy na problemie ubóstwa afektywnego i emocjonalnego, które jest współcześnie wynikiem systematycznej degradacji codziennego doświadczenia. Proponuję analizę tego problemu opartą na pismach filozofów tradycji kontynentalnej, zwłaszcza Gillesa Deleuze'a, ale również Michela Foucault i Maurice'a Blanchota. W artykule sugeruję, że to właśnie tworzenie jest tym, co może stanowić odpowiedź na problem wymienionego ubóstwa. W związku z tym rozwiązaniem przedstawiam techniki i metody, które podjęte mogą zaowocować kreacją. Jednakże, najpełniejszy ich zestaw zapewniają oryginalne pisma wymienionych badaczy, do których starałam się odwoływać.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: Kreacja, etyka immanentna, eksperyment, podmiot

ABSTRACT

The Creative Power of Affective Discourse. Recapitulating Deleuze

In the following article an attempt is made to draw the reader's attention to the problem of affective and emotional poverty which has resulted from the systematic degradation of everyday experience in contemporary times. The analysis of this problem is based on the writings of different continental philosophers, especially Gilles Deleuze, but also others, like Michel Foucault or Maurice Blanchot. It is suggested that the solution to this problem may lie in the power of creation, and I have tried to offer the reader some techniques or methods which, if undertaken, may develop creativity and release its power. However, the best repertoire of such techniques is to be found in the writings of the above mentioned researchers, so the reader is directed to the original sources.

KEYWORDS: creation, immanent ethics, experiment, subject