

A Parallel Universe: The Keynote I Did Not Give¹

jan jagodzinski
University of Alberta

I WANT TO THANK VERY MUCH the board of the *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* for this kind invitation and especially Patrick Slattery who welcomed my coming knowing that I had forewarned Rob (Helfenbein) and Gabe (Huddleston) that I would present perhaps an entirely counter-position to his own, a position reaffirmed yesterday with his presentation that evoked his eschatological inflected term ‘proleptic,’ a term I will come back to with an entirely different understanding; as well as to query art (or arts) by those who support arts based research as it is hegemonically and anthropocentrically defined as a cure to what is set up as a failing educational system of assessment and accountability. From my perspective, the highest complement you can pay colleagues is to disagree with them. They can become, in Deleuze’s sense, mediators that help further one’s own problematic. Unfortunately, in the academy not all see it this way. Everyone has to get along on the surface and allow the obscene supplement to do its job through academic rejections of articles, books, ignoring citations, and the promotion of those who eventually become the brokers of knowledge as to what should or should not be funded and so on. What follows addresses many points Patrick makes in his well-known book, *Curriculum Development in the Postmodern Era*, as well as his performative keynote given on Saturday, October 15 at the Bergamo Center entitled, *Toward Proleptic Experience in Arts-Based Educational Research and Practice*.

I want to start with the question of *time*, as it addresses Patrick’s concerns. He uses the term ‘proleptic,’ as in ‘proleptic time’ drawing on eschatological traditions to make his case suitably given in the confines of Bergamo’s chapel where he had studied as a young person to become a priest some 25 years ago. Proleptic, coming from the Greek *prolepsis*, is usually used in the forward-looking sense, to treat as done that which has not yet been done. It anticipates an act to come. Patrick uses the term in the sense of visionary insight, heightened consciousness, or

profound insight and aesthetic awareness for artists. The proleptic moment, as he says, transcends linear segmentation of time; that is, chronological time and nurtures holistic understanding. He specifically uses the ‘experience’ associated with proleptic eschatology in a nebulous enough way to conjure up shades of mysticism, idealism and enchantment that leaves the future open. To read his vision of the curriculum in a postmodern era in the very *last paragraph* of his book is to encounter a string of promissory signifiers that seems virtually unending: As he writes, such a curriculum is

radically eclectic, determined in the context of relatedness, recursive in its complexity, autobiographically intuitive, aesthetically dialogic, embodies, phenomenological, experiential, simultaneous quantum and cosmic, hopeful in its constructive dimension, radical in its deconstructive movement, liberating in its poststructural intents, empowering in its spirituality, ironic in its kaleidoscopic sensibilities, and, ultimately, a hermeneutic search for greater understanding that motivates and satisfies us on the journey.” (Slattery, 2006: 296-297)

All one can say is: “Wow!” This certainly sounds like one of those moments were past, present and future collapsed into an epiphany of the highest order.

Theological Eschatology

Theological eschatology, which usually refers to ‘end of days,’ a theme I also addressed in my ‘other’ parallel speech, is given a new spin by Patrick that desires to instil hope and avoid the extremes of secularization, which allegedly, he says, wishes to do away spirituality by defining the space of learning as being free from any one religious domination, and the other extreme of religious dogmatism, where each religion is allowed to shape the curriculum and the school climate according to its own values. In my own city of Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, for example, we have the Catholic School board coexisting almost in size and scale with the public school board. While significantly smaller, there are also Islamic and Jewish charter schools that must have public school jurisdiction affiliation. This secular-religious dichotomy, more prosaically put as a mind-spirit dichotomy in its ‘pure’ state; that is, in its strict *de jure* state rather than in its *de facto* state (where, for example, catholic students attend public school, and visa versa without any strict regulations), to which proleptic eschatology seemingly offers us a way out through its well-meaning idealism, may well be presenting adversely a disturbing universalism in its utopian reaches that play into the very forms of globalization that are to be its means of escape; the line of flight Patrick has laid out in his curriculum book. Let me try to explain what I mean by my concern by looking at each side of the dichotomy (secular-religious) that forms the tension for a search for a more equitable and just curriculum that the string of signifiers describe in that last paragraph.

First, in relation to what is happening to religion in this post-postmodernist phase of globalization, the worst case being what the French Deleuzian scholar, Olivier Roy (2014) calls ‘holy ignorance.’ Political Islam, as he brilliantly shows, has little to do with Islamic theological scholars, the ummah; rather it is the recruitment of large numbers of alienated young men without much hope in the future, transforming political Islam into what he calls a ‘neo-fundamentalism.’ Here spiritualism is made to do its work as a return of Salafism (fundamentalist

religious radicalism). The return to Sufi communities of Sunni Islam fills the gap of the symbolic loss of cultural identity in traditional Islam as the Westernization of Islam as Roy puts it, ‘decenters identity.’ The time is ripe to fill that gap with such teaching to center the identities of young men and women; to give them a cause, and a drive for a meaningful life, even if that drive is a death drive. The decoupling of religion and culture regardless of the religion marks today’s religious revivals. Philosophy, culture, and even theology are rejected in favour of scriptural readings of sacred texts, and an immediate understanding of truth through individual faith. ‘Pure’ or *de jure* religion needs no specificity of culture as ISIS recruits come from any number of countries. Islam becomes detached from any given culture as there is no ‘fundamentalism’ of an original culture. Such an original culture disappears. Hence, there is no clash of culture or civilizations as there is no ‘culture’ anymore or civilization that anchors such an identity. What we have is an Islam not embodied by a society or a territory. As Roy so ably points out, this makes recruitment for ISIS that much easier as they adhere to a particular interpretation of the Qur’an with particular forms of behaviour that counter the deterritorialization and decentralization that forms the basis of post-Islamism or globalized Islam, and provides for a renewed centralization and belief system.

In this regard the teachings of the imams to youth in underprivileged neighbourhoods, or pastors in American churches to young Blacks to fight drugs and delinquency become ineffectual in their attempts at reform. Islamic Salafism and American Protestant fundamentalism trumps every time. With the continued migrations of asylum seekers, young people coming from Africa, Syria and other war torn countries into Europe, this situation of neo-fundamentalism will only increase as they are not allowed to work and are continually decentered from the symbolic order they knew. Religion and culture begin to be decoupled on a massive scale as each ‘believer’ has to reinvent what was once a culturally religious given, i.e., What does it mean to be a Muslim? This becomes a question every Muslim migrant must ask and face. Roy’s analysis points to the complicated result of this general trend that manifests itself as forms of Islamic militancy to peaceful coexistence where assimilation or integration brings with it a strange assemblage of identities. As Roy puts it: the religiosity of a Tunisian Muslim plays itself out in complex ways; he sells wine in a Parisian corner-shop, he faithfully prays throughout the day, he attends a mosque, and donates money to the Front National because he worries about the increase of crime in his neighbourhood; other French Muslims allow their children to attend school Christmas parties, and their sons join communist-led unions in car plants in exchange for unions lobbying to have prayer-rooms in the workplace.

This is but one part of ‘globalization’ as what I called the ‘the end of the world’ in my talk that Sunday. The worry here is that this ‘born again’ phenomenon has become globalized. Its viral spread through social media can also easily be interpreted as proleptic eschatology: here the future is seemingly open (in utopian terms), there is hope, there is a centering of identity (I belong), and a *jouissance* of being alive despite living in a ‘corrupt’ and unjust world, as when Catholic youth meet in religious jamborees to ‘see’ the Pope. They seek immediate experience and the enjoyment of religious fervour. Time stands still; it is an event. American imperialism and consumerism offers similar centering ideology for Islamic neo-fundamentalism. Roy calls this ‘religiosity,’ as opposed to religion, which is far more important than religion as a series of moral rules; religiosity is all about the way a believer lives his or her relationship to a religion as an Ideal. The young people who flock to the Pope are not looking for theological explanations, or

an authority per se, but participation and belief that only are affirmed in crowd-like formations like the Vatican plaza. The formation of a swarm mentality presents an entirely different level of thought, not one of control but of changing modulation that is characteristic of technology within ‘control societies’ (Deleuze, 1990). The rogue swarms in Tiananmen and Tahir squares take their place in a long line of revolutionary fervour: Place de la Bastille, Red Square, Alexanderplatz and, of course Washington Square to name the most obvious. You can say what I have said is a perversion of proleptic eschatology as Patrick Slattery would want it; as educators we are more concerned with the individual student, and the ‘management’ (better to shift terms already) rather the affective modulation of a class, but in a fractal understanding of space-time the swarm mentality articulates the politicization of affect in terms of the way bodies affect and are affected by one another, a Deleuze-Spinozan maxim. This line of thinking, which includes questions of social contagion and media viralism within issues of populism and micro-fascism as generated through techno-social digital means comes initially from Deleuze and Guattari (1987) drawing on the work of the sociologist Gabriel Tarde where issues of social imitation and repetition were first raised. This has led to questioning the way affective capitalism works through various technologies, generated through the manipulation of opinion polls or created via networks spread throughout the Internet for progressive as well as regressive social influences. Brian Massumi (2015) has attempted to make these connections more accessible in his *The Politics of Affect*, and the work of Tony Sampson (2012) is significant. It provides some understanding, for example, as to how the populism of a Donald Trump for the presidency of the United States is even possible.

Chaos, Complexity and Vitalism

This Spinozist inflection, where the mind and body are treated as one substance, has been updated today to accommodate issues of complexity theory wherein a heterogeneous assemblage (the swarm) is formed by the forces of desire in circulation. Social collective behaviour is then ethically judged. Manuel DeLanda (2000), from a Deleuzian perspective, describes the power of nonhuman inorganic materiality to ‘self-organize.’ Within evolutionary thought, the encephalization of such ‘thing-power’ intelligence increases in degrees and not in kind. Both Deleuze and Guattari embrace such a panpsychism as agency emerges as a property of an assemblage of forces. Popularized recently by Jane Bennett’s (2010) as ‘vibrant matter,’ it raises fundamental issues and questions on the way education has taken up this ‘new materialism’ in its ecological imagination where complexity theory more than chaos theory rules the day. Most of the complexity theory as applied to education works along managerial lines (Davis and Sumara, 2006; Mason, 2008) with little understanding of machinic desire as a plane of consistency developed by Deleuze and Guattari (1987). The emphasis instead is placed on embodied cognition. Autopoiesis, diversity, redundancy, and what is emergent within a system are understood within the paradigm of ecological and biological living systems following the ground breaking work of two prominent Chilean biologists, Humberto Maturana and Francisco Valera, as well as thermodynamic open systems theory as developed by the physical chemist Illya Prigogine. Although the difference between chaos and complexity is subtle, the difference is in relation to the question of *speculation*. Chaos, as Deleuze and Guattari ‘specularize’ the term, is a plane of immanence, a pure plane or infinite field that is metaphysically consistent with Spinoza’s single ‘substance,’ substance here refers to Nature (in Spinoza’s case God) of which our species is a part of. As a virtual plane it consists of only forces, particles, affects, percepts, connections. It is grasped as relations of rhythm and movement, as rest, speed, slowness, between

unformed elements (haecceities). It is a plane of consistency or composition as opposed to a plan(e) of organization or development. Conversely, with complexity theory the extrapolation of organization of complex systems already takes place, which is then put to ‘work’ in educational contexts. Deleuze and Guattari, on the other hand, are more concerned with virtuality, the potential realm of the preindividual (*potestas*), which is then *actualized* through transindividuation, a concept they garner from Gilbert Simondon. For Simondon, the individual is but a phase that is situated with respect to a preindividual milieu, which itself is a series of relations that are in a metastable state. They form the possible conditions for the actualization of multiple individuations. Individuation is always a realization and transformation of these relations, whereas human life refers to collective individuation, namely transindividuation.

Deleuze’s (1988) reworking of Spinoza’s theory of affect, along with Guattari’s fractal poetics, explored interstitial space and time. Deleuze and Guattari called this ‘holey’ [turbulent] space. Such infinitesimal space is positioned between striated (ordered) and smooth (fluid) space from which the new emerges. Theirs is a theory of genetic involution. This is, above all, a theory regarding creative life, what they called anorganic or nonorganic or impersonal life that has (mistakenly) been taken up by various forms of materialist vitalisms today via many variations of post-phenomenology, such as the work of Sara Ahmed (2014) where sociologized emotion rather than perindividual affect is theorized. Vitality; that is, the spiritual virtual realm is predominately understood as those forms of vitalism that appeal to an expressive and creative life force that are productive, creative and intensive—what Deleuze and Guattari (1994 p.194) call a ‘cerebral vitalism’ (qtd. Colebrooke, 2008, p.56). Creativity in this sense is promoted in schools in relation to achieving ‘excellence,’ an issue I will pick up below. This aspect is especially important when it comes to the questions that surround arts based research as embraced by Patrick.

A differentiation therefore needs to be made in relation to ‘creativity’ (spirituality or vitalism) in these respective theories. It is not simply that matter is coextensive with spirit, or time and Being. This gives us the common sense understanding of ‘becoming,’ which many arts based research models follow in the name of creative unfolding using conceptualizations that have now taken on humanistic overtones, such as ‘becoming event,’ where event in the Deleuzian sense is now understood as a conscious happening. A recent example would be Rita Irwin’s (2013) use of ‘becoming’ under the auspices of Deleuze and Guattari’s for her 2012 Studies in Art Education Invited Lecture to repackage her own position under her a/r/tography label. This is patently wrong. Such a stance is closer to how complexity theory embraces ‘becoming,’ although much of the theorizing is *anthropocentrically* humanist (jagodzinski & Wallin, 2013). Deleuze and Guattari’s ecology as a ‘passive vitalism’ (anorganic life) (see Colebrook, 2010) is far removed from any humanist organicism, and quite different from the complexity theory, like that of Valera and Maturana’s (1980) notion of autopoiesis, previously referred to, where the evolutionary forces of change come from the environment *outside* of the human organism; a coevolution of the organism and environment is posited whereby the organism selects the environment in ways that allows it to self-make itself as a self-reproducing organism – this is simply an ecological becoming cast further by Valera and Maturana as a search by the organism for homeostasis and equilibrium. Deleuzian biophilosophy, in distinction accepts destructive creativity. The organism must be rethought as open to all forms of information, where information is understood in terms of an event arising out of the complexity of open systems under far-from-equilibrium conditions of metastability, introducing notions of

past-present-future quite different from the proleptic eschatological moment advocated by Slattery. To turn back to Irwin's (LeBlanc et al., 2015) misapprehended appropriation of becoming in another context for a moment, the autobiographies of the students in praise of a/r/tography that are presented fit very nicely into an autopoietic model of an event. The failure is to recognize the pure event is *itself a movement*, (although 'becoming movement' is used which is directed at the person undergoing change). The *pure event* pulls the body in different directions at the *same time*, into the past and also into the future, stuttering us. The pure event does not take place in a particular moment in time or in a relation to a present body. Rather, it belongs to the time of aion, to the paradoxes and movements that surround us in everyday encounters and experiences. Irwin has taken what is extraordinary about Deleuze's paradoxical notion of an event and made it quite 'ordinary' and graspable as a sophisticated understanding of change not unlike many post-phenomenological research positions that claim processual status. Who can't relate to 'becoming'? For Deleuze and Guattari, experimentation is very much about breakthrough and breakdown. Involution and modification supplant adaptation and evolution. Theorists such as Izabella Stengers should not be lumped in the general mix of chaos and complexity theory as there are clear demarcations between the various biopolitical positions. Unfortunately, Slattery's chapter eleven on complexity and time falls into the usual Romantic vitalisms of nature calling on the "reenchantment" of a mechanized world (he calls on the constructivism of David Ray Griffin), supporting a theology of nature (he calls on Stephen Toulmin), the Complexity and Chaos group of the AERA, who forward the autopoiesis of cognition (Sheri Reynolds) and James Lovelock's (1979) Gaia hypothesis, which Lovelock has since refuted, and so on.

Affective Turn, Derrida, Gadamer, *Ritournelle*

For those educators who have tried to update this vitalist impulse, this way of taking up Deleuze and Guattari, has become known as "the affective turn" where the potential disruption of affect and percept at the non-conscious level of 'subjectless subjectivity' is replaced by emotions, which usually are then harnessed to discourse theory as way of identifying the 'structure of feeling' that is in circulation (i.e., Ahmend, 2014). Mostly, as with many arts based research models that call on affect, it is not Deleuzian but understood as affection despite references to Spinoza in some cases (e.g. Irwin, 2013). This move is very consistent with the way the corporate world has taken up affect (Andrejevic, 2013). This development parallels a similar misreading within American scholarship when it came to Foucault. Rather than the affective turn, we had the 'linguistic' turn where Foucault's work was reduced to discursive theorizing, complete with an expansive discourse theory where the slippages of signifiers did their work 'writing the body.' This eventually generated the morass of identity politics where cultural studies became complicit in forwarding differences within the same frame of representational theory. Only then could this new found poststructuralism, which appeared open to a social justice agenda, could be justified given, to utilize Jacques Rancière (2004) here, as 'the part that has no part,' that has no voice, and should be given one. This theory based on the structure of presence-absence is conditioned by the Other, as with Derrida, for instance with his concept of *différance*. The very identity of a system presupposes, Derrida maintains, a fundamental difference that prevents the system from ever attaining a sense of completion or closure – non-all. Every identity

or presence, every attempt to establish self-identity, or a self-present grounding is doomed to fail, for all groundings of meaning presuppose its Other, a difference and/or absence that is perpetually deferred so that a true self-presence is never achieved.

From this conceptualization of difference arises, as many critics have pointed out, the continual production that defers and subverts; that is, deconstructs any seeming closed system what-so-ever. The work of justice is never done, the political rearrangement will result in the creation of a new absence, a new Other. Derrida's offers an absence that is unreachable, subject to endless deconstruction, a *transcendental signified* whose final meaning is never arrived at (unlike Lacan, for example, where the *transcendental signifier* anchors the illusion of Authority – 'someone is supposed to know' and possesses the Phallus). This results in a future that never arrives, an oddly secular theology, as championed by John Caputo (1997), a messianism without a messiah, or a messianism without religion. Justice becomes a never-ending struggle for equality, which is itself never satisfied but caught in the vicissitudes of the values as forces in play. The claim is that the Law is not, in the last instance, arbitrary, but provides a necessary structure for democratic achievement of human rights and so on. Derridean 'grammatology' is unlikely to go away despite the argument that there is a material plasticity of the brain|body beyond language, therefore beyond *différance*, as shaped by the forces of technology and evolutionary genetics, nor will Foucault's governmentality, cast in micro-power terms be questioned, despite Deleuze's (2006) disagreement with his friend regarding the role of pleasure and affect, a position he tried to further in his book on *Foucault*, where, in a nutshell Foucault had failed to recognize that resistance is furthered not by power, but by deterritorialization, not by forming, but deforming and unforming.

Finally, we should recognize that the 'hermeneutic circle,' which preoccupied so many Gadamerians in the educational midst (still championed by Slattery in chapter five), needs to be *retired* as a cultural holdover of the linguistic textual turn (see Galloway et al., 2014). 'Preunderstandings' are affectively shaped by non-conscious intensifications, what Deleuze and Guattari called the Body-without-Organs (BwO)¹, as well as unconscious associations before conscious cognition of meaningful interpretation results. All understandings are already subjected to misunderstanding whose actualizations shape reality that does not escape violence, lying, nor viciousness. In the Lacanian context communication as speech is also a miscommunication. Knowledge is an intersubjective duel, an encoded puzzle wherein the subject receives his or her message from the other in an inverted form. The hermeneutic becomes a spiral only if some form of dialogic rationality is granted, making the process seem progressive rather than a game of compromise, which all diplomats will tell you. We should move from the hermeneutic to the Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) concept of refrain (*ritournelle*) as developed in their eleventh plateau.

The power of the refrain (*ritournelle*) as a concept is that it directly addresses the affective loadings of Gadamerian 'preunderstandings,' which have to be both accepted and overcome. Basically a refrain is the mapping or marking out a territory: it is a point of stability, a circle of property, and an opening to the outside; *one must exit one's territory* to become. Territories are formed by milieus and rhythms, which are created out of chaos (as defined above). A milieu is a coded block of space-time, and a code is defined by a 'periodic repetition' (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987 p.383). Every milieu is in contact with another milieu, and each code is in a state of

perpetual transcoding. Rhythm takes place between two milieus, or between a milieu and chaos. Rhythm, as if often thought, is not a regular measure; it is rather difference or relation, the interstice in-between where milieus (codes) communicate with each other. Hence, all codes are only provisionally stable. One can imagine how a human body, composed of many organs (as milieus), each having its own rate of periodic repetition, generates its rhythm that is a cacophony of all of them—as the inter-milieu rhythms of difference. If rhythm is difference (and not repetition) change takes place when ‘leaving’ the comfort of territory,’ a deterritorialization needs to take place. If we grasp that ‘presunderstandings’ are territorial, locked, as it were to a homogeneous rhythm, then only by new creative intensive refrains can a becoming emerge. For Deleuze and Guattari, the refrain as a pattern of difference via repetition, or repetition via difference. This calls on Nietzsche’s eternal return “as a little ditty, a refrain, but which captures the mute and unthinkable forces of the Cosmos” (p.343). What is expected is to produce a ‘deterritorialized refrain’ and hence leave the ‘hermeneutic circle’ that is still caught by language.

Packaging Creativity in Schools: Arts Based Research

The idea that the world is constructed through language merely repeats a centuries-old privilege of the formal and the logical over the material. It is another form of hylomorphism. But with the ‘affective turn’ we have just the opposite development: the asignifying nonconscious (along with the unconscious) of material affects have been ‘discovered,’ furthered often by what can only be stated as frightening neo-eugenic conclusions taken from fMRI brain scans. Both the scientific medical world and advertising industries claim to identify what a person is feeling, imagining, and even thinking, the projection is dreaming. From language we have moved to the body and now to the brain, where everything is now embodied and encephalized through various forms of newfound vital materialisms. This sequence of development segues a move from religion to secularization taken in its *de jure* or ‘pure’ form; that is, a position devoid of any *one* religious influence, but at the same time one that is never free of religion. Global religiosity in the form of a transcendentalism of the spirit (Allah, God, Intelligent Design), is matched equally by the secularization of vitalism (spirituality), or virtuality, or immanence understood as the mere construction of life in a laboratory.

It would be a shock if certain forms of complexity theory (dynamical system theory) for change were *not* being worked into school curriculum as the old subjectivization of students no longer makes sense in technologized societies of control. Complexity theory offers a full-court press at all levels to ‘force’ change, concentrated intervention on all levels. It becomes yet another hylomorphic form. The new subjectivization of students is being engineered mostly through charter and magnet schools where the technological mandate by a well-to-do-class pushes for the best life chances for their children. In such schools, students are learning how to program, being introduced to cutting edge science, ‘reenchanted’ the world through the wonders of physics and the design possibilities for the future, exemplified and popularized best perhaps by the ever more popular TED talks. These charter and magnate schools are the bridging step to more and more privatization of schooling. Corporations are eager to sink their teeth into public schools as they have already done within universities.

Complexity theory offers how to forge the flexible subject modulated through the surveillances of hand held devices that track and measure. Unfortunately, complexity theory is

yet another fantasy. “The knowledge we have of complex systems is based on the models we make of these system, but in order to function as models—and not merely a repetition of the system—they have to reduce the complexity of the system. This means that some aspects of the system are always left out of consideration ” (Cilliers, 2005, p.258). What is left out interacts with the rest of the system in non-linear ways. The effects of this reduction cannot be predicted, especially since the system and its environment change over time.

In the so-called secular public schools the harnessing of spiritualism, vitalism, immanence, virtuality, as synonyms, have taken but one direction to meet the demands of the flexible subject of capitalism— and that is via the signifier *creativity*; creativity becomes the magical flow word of modulation that does its magic in any number of ways: 1) it gives the Romantic illusion that material is being animated – reenchanting; 2) it brings out the potential of each and every student to achieve and strive to fulfill their dreams — after all the design schools present the products of such dreams; 3) it introduces flex time where work and play are collapsed, or as the Italian Autonomia movement (Virino, Bifo, Lazzarato, Marazzi) put it collectively: this is not the end of work but work without end; 4) it collapses art, science, mathematics, and engineering as the proponents of STEAM maintain, necessary for the ‘reality’ of the global capitalist world we live in; 5) it give schools a *raison d’existence*, a way to generate desire so that students can find employment in the creative industries; and 6) perhaps above all it shapes the subjectivity of the self-sufficient citizen who must make his or her way into the world based on the new signifiers of resilience and sustainability that are, in turn, shaped by two other key signifiers: performance and gaming. YouTube, Internet, Facebook, LinkedIn, all operate on performative identities where memes prevail and rule (Shifman, 2014) – “How many hits did I have?” It’s not about bodies anymore —it’s about the relationships you maintain with others, and the psychic area you are able to occupy through your creative labour. The more visits to your blog site the more likelihood you will be rewarded with advertisement dollars.

The uncertainties of artistic labour during the highly rationalized Fordist mode of production were unmanageable, but now we have the oxymoronic development of ‘mass customization’ as the proliferation of differences in the name of greater individualization and freedom of choice. Creativity and experimentation have been accepted at the expense of extremely flexible labour conditions. Contemporary artists, along with the rest of the workforce, now commonly hold more than one job. They accept hourly wages rather than annual salaries, and develop new forms of survival in what are precarious conditions. It is not that artistic creativity and its production— either as a product or as a performative effect—is *not* exceptional in the social relations art produces. The differentiation between artistic labour and the logic of industrial production as being morally superior were forwarded during the industrial period by figures such as John Ruskin and William Morris. The new hegemonic social relations determined by capitalism produced this artistic exception, worked out by Schiller’s treaties on *The Aesthetic Education of Man*. The 20th century avant-garde tried to shift the non-profitability of artistic production as a political force in everyday life only to have it swallowed up by the commodity market. Advertising, coming to prominence at the same time, easily won out. Yet, as Adorno (1984) in his *Aesthetic Theory* argued, artists can labour in the hegemonic social relations of capitalist production and can generate social relations that are worthless or non-productive *for* capitalism.

My point however, is that this exclusive exceptional smooth space of artistic rebellion, which is disruptive in its resistance, simply supports capitalism's 'creative destruction,' a position taken by any number economic observers, from the one-sided left journalistic popularizations of Naomi Klein (2008) to the more elegant and sophisticated analysis by David Harvey (2014) and Thomas Piketty (2014). Capitalism has no program, no social or political project beyond producing, circulating and accumulating capital. It is schizophrenic as Deleuze and Guattari put it. It has to absorb and integrate all new forms of dissent for continuous growth. The latest addition to its ranks has been the social and creative technological expansions, now often marked as affective and immaterial labour by Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri, Franco Berardi, Judith Revel, Paolo Virno and others. Enter Arts Based Research. To echo the Wet Diaper Deleuzians, the 68' Student Revolution did not bring the death of art, but the birth of art without end. Everything could become art (to echo Duchamp); anyone could become an artist (to echo Beuys). While Abstract Expressionists were still toiling with the 19th century romantic idea of 'the artist in his studio' (although that image doesn't easily quite go away), as etched famously by Jackson Pollock bent over dripping his paint, the space of the artist was made obsolete as technology set in through the practices of Andy Warhol (the Factory), Frank Stella (his serial productions) and Robert Smithson's Earthworks in the Great Outdoors. Today's technologies further this decentralization of what was once a coveted studio space of the lone artist was supplemented with architects, designers and engineers to join them in their strategies. We now have bioart labs that I had the opportunity of viewing last year at the Aalto University School of Arts, Design and Architecture in Helsinki. Bioart brings science and art together to raise questions concerning an expanded understanding of 'life.' This new adventure of artistic speculation points specifically towards the deanthropomorphization of 'Man' via ethico-political means (jagodzinski, 2014).

Patrick has a substantive 20-page chapter ten on aesthetic inquiry and arts based research framed by the 'Proleptic Moment.' All of which I disagree with and wish to show how this approach, and essentially the bulk of arts based research that replay on the creative vitalism of a 'for-us' anthropocentric world needs to be strongly questioned from a *political* Deleuze and Guattarian position. Patrick presents what would be the standard and commonsensical understanding of art as supported by the arts based research community. Multiplicity, understood as multiple identities are mentioned as the proliferation of differences that capitalism relies upon. The central piece, however, is the humanist notion of aesthetic experience buttressed by a phenomenological account based on lived experience. The job of aesthetic experience seems to be primarily one of transformation. Even when this is through disturbance or shock, it is directed in terms of growth and personal subjective insight. Thus justice and compassion are forwarded, as the arts nestled within a humanities agenda provide the discoveries of how life should be led. Community, wonder, deep ecology, and a vision that offers hope further the catharsis of art. This was illustrated by his own performance at Bergamo, inviting the audience into his art studio via a video he had prepared.

In his chapter on aesthetic inquiry, Maxine Greene is noted for the call to 'wideawakeness' envisioned in an aesthetics of wholeness and organism where form and content are in harmony through congruency. Nature and harmony are evoked via Thoreau and the claim that this is not a Utopian or Romantic position is dismissed by maintaining what is a future anterior position; that is to say, the future is pregnant with possibilities for change and direction through the seeds of

self-reflection that provides “the understanding of what lies behind them [phenomena], their being or ontology” (p.262). Through such self-reflection of conscious experience there is the potential “for arriving at the truth in a more subtle fashion” (Slattery, p.255, as quoted by Ozmon & Carver, 1990 pp. 246-247). To quote “The content of the curriculum is the individual in the process of becoming that which he or she has not yet been but which he or she is capable of becoming” (p.264). Or, in another choice passage, “The postmodern curriculum understands the future as that which brings to completion what has already been set in motion, the alternative possibilities offer a vision of hope for schools and society” (p.265) and, “learning elicits new experiences that encourage a futuring— a going beyond the present state of malaise” (p.264). Awareness and hope are what is needed.

With this curricular program, the mandate of creativity, mentioned above, is fulfilled. Becoming is taken care of in humanist fashion, echoing Rita Irwin’s (2013) *a/r/tography* mentioned above. As he writes following Ronald Padgham, “there is only one’s natural way,” (Slattery?, p.256) which requires self-discovery or consciousness of self; there is the magical communication of the artist through the art: Kiefer, Picasso, Georgia O-Keeffe, Edward and Nancy Kienholz, and above all Pollock, are the artist that have touched Patrick. During his keynote, Patrick brought out Anselm Kiefer yet again.

Patrick ends the chapter with a quote from Nietzsche, which claims to affirm the centrality of aesthetic experience. What he fails to mention is that this aesthetic is entirely in a different direction from the one he has forwarded. Nietzsche is Dionysian, which is hard to swallow within the context of Patrick’s humanism. What is even more ironic today is that global designer capitalism wallows in the aesthetic where the superstructure has collapsed in society’s base structure— what Hardt and Negri (2001) called the complete subsumption of the aesthetic sphere within the biopolitical sphere. Aesthetic work is not just labour, but biopoliticized labour – the bio standing for the vitalism of life for enjoyment. In complete subsumption any disruptive art is welcomed as it feeds into the capitalist machine.

I have of course said enough about why the creative vitalism or proleptic eschatology that pervades Patrick’s work and arts based approach to curriculum in general is flawed as it is overwhelmingly a humanism that continues to appeal, sometimes in Deleuzian disguises apolitically. The perversions of vitalism through religiosity and creativity today are manifest by forwarding a Christian globalization of hope in a precarious world, while its opposite appeals to a destructive global Jihad equally as utopian in its aspirations. Creativity as captured by designer capital thrives on the newly found immaterial creative labour to expand consumer markets via new technologies in control societies. This presents a segue to the last part of my presentation which attempts another line out via Deleuze and Guattari’s political agenda that is silent by those arts based researchers who embrace their ‘words’ if not their concepts.

There is a remarkable silence or complete erasure in Patrick’s book concerning screen technologies and the new media, especially within the context of societies of control where complexity theory has been harnessed to modulate affect via big data as argued above through digitalized technologies, and through the constant improvement of data processing of information. My guess is that Patrick’s silence exists because these developments are part and parcel of the caricatures of instrumentalization and manipulation throughout his work that the more authentic

claims of humanism are supposed to overcome through the romanticized vitalism that is put in their place via the arts. The images in his arts based website (<http://www.psartworks.com/gallery-sold.html>), along with his support of mainstream arts based research, seem to conform to this in relation to the aesthetic that he embraces. What challenges this neo-humanist aesthetic is now *ironically* designer education, which pervades the National Art Education Association (NAEA), an American organization once the purveyance of Elliot Eisner and his entourage who promoted this type of humanism that Patrick supports. Designer education as envisioned by NAEA now feeds the creative industries of control societies with its attention to science and technologies.²

But, there is a further irony here regarding another sense of proleptic moment, or proleptic time, another perversion if you like, of the zero point or clearing space of vision as to what *should* occur that equally supports societies of control. Stephen Crocker (1998) argues that this rhetorical device of proleptic time represents a future event or action as if it already existed, or were already an accomplished fact that pervades all capitalist control societies. The speed of production and exchange eliminates the period between the transmission and reception of a message in ‘real-time’ via tele-technologies. In each case actions take place in the present that proceed on the understanding that a second, future action has already been secured. No intervening event will emerge in the interval between now and then. Like video on demand, the future is limitless, filled with possibilities. We need only choose through our own wills as to what we desire. The interval that fills the time between present and the seemingly limitless possibilities available in the future, as in a video or computer game, has been eliminated. It is not a space of intervention to disrupt the pure flow of desire. The timelessness of the aesthetic experience is maintained throughout as gratifications proliferate, and the dream or fantasy is sustained. This sense of modulated control is further elaborated by Richard Grusin (2004) through his notion of ‘media remediation’ and especially ‘premediation.’ Phillip Dick’s *Minority Report* has finally been realized, the event is prevented before it even happens, ensuring a more fulfilling smooth free future, more organic and happy where form and content are always assured. The new regime of speed brought on by information technology at the speed of light, what Paul Villiro (2006) called a social dromocratic condition, accelerates life that erases the interval between present and future. This presents the possibility of living the dream of aesthetic experience as one long ‘enjoyment,’ as that provocateur, Slavoj Žižek has reiterated time and time again. Perverted gratification of intensive time, or intensive eternity of ‘play time’ where the future is open to even more use of apps and media by demand pervades contemporary control society. Aesthetic experience and the proleptic moment have already been instrumentalized; capitalism has already captured what were once considered ‘authentic’ moments. If you think I am wrong in this watch one episode of the hit television series *UnReal*.

The onus is now on me to present a rather startling different position that acknowledges the three signifiers of my title: ‘the end of the world, nonhuman and the inhuman, the last two shape the material plasticity of what we are constantly becoming as a species.’³ But, I have already done this in the other Universe. I hope you were there?

Notes

¹ Although a difficult concept, in a nutshell this is their way of conceptualizing dimensions of embodiment that are beyond being already organized; so it's the process of bodily organization as morphological genesis starting and ending (life and death) at zero degree of intensity. This is their way of saying that the point of origin and death itself is impossible to pinpoint. In terms of what has been said previously, this is an immanent involution, a larval stage of developmental unfolding, given over to the agency of matter itself. Their question is always: "How to 'make' yourself a body-without-organs?" "How to tap the flows that sustain you?" "How to pursue the intense embodied experiences?"

² Its national conference, held in New Orleans in 2015 was billed with the theme: Design: Form, Function, and the Future of Visual Arts Education. Featured keynote speakers were Tim Gunn (fashion consultant to television shows such as Project Runway: Under the Gunn) and D'Wayne Edwards (former Footwear Design Director of Jordon Brand and founder of Pensole Footwear Design Academy).

³ The title of the 2015 keynote was: The Arts at the End of the World: The Challenge of Non-representational Thought for Education - Between the Nonhuman and Inhuman.

References

- Adorno, T.(1984). *Aesthetic Theory*. Adorno, G. & Tiedemann, R. (Eds.). (Lenhardt, C., Trans.)London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Ahmed, Sara (2014). *Willful Subjects*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Andrejevic, M. (2013). *Infoglut: How too Much Information is Changing the Way We Think and Know*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Bennett, J. 2010. *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Caputo, J. (1997). *The Prayers and Tears of Jacques Derrida: Religion without Religion*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Cilliers, P. (2005). "Complexity, Deconstruction, Relativism," *Theory, Culture & Society*, 22(5): 255-267.
- Colebrook, C. (2008). On Not Becoming Man: The Materialist Politics of Unactualized Potential. In Alaimo, S. & Heckman, S. (Eds.), *Material Feminisms*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Colebrooke, C. (2010). *Deleuze and the Meaning of Life*. London and New York: Continuum Books.
- Crockerm, S. (1998). Prolepsis: On Speed and Time's Interval," *Cultural Values*, 2(4): 485-498.
- Davis, B. & Sumara, D. (2006). *Complexity and Education: Inquires into Learning, Teaching, and Research*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- De Landa, M. (2000). *A Thousand Years of Nonlinear History*. New York: Swerve Editions.
- Deleuze, G. (1988). *Spinoza: Practical Philosophy* (Trans. Robert Hurley). San Francisco: City Lights Book.
- Deleuze, G. (1990). Postscript on Control Societies. In Deleuze, Gilles. *Negotiations: 1972-1990* (Joughin, M. Trans.).. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G. (2006). *Foucault*. London and New York: Continuum Books.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1987). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*.

- (Massumi B. Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1994). *What is Philosophy?* (Hugh Tomlinson, H. & Burchill, G. Trans.). London and New York: Verso.
- Galloway, A, Thacker, E. and Wark, M. (2014). *Excommunication: Three Inquiries in Media and Mediation*. Chicago and London: Chicago University Press.
- Grusin, R. (2004). "Premediation." *Criticism*, 46(1): 17-39.
- Hardt, M. & Negri, A. (2001). *Empire*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2014). *Seventeen Contradictions and the End of Capitalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Irwin, R. (2013). "Becoming A/r/tography," *Studies in Art Education: A Journal of Issues and Research*, 54(3): 198-215.
- jagodzinski, j. and Wallin, J. (2013). *Arts-Based Research: A Critique and a Proposal*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- jagodzinski, j. (2014). "Life in Art|Art in Life: Bioart ethics within the Anthropocene," *Synnyt/Origins: Finnish Studies in Art Education Special Issue (Bio/Art/Education, Helena Sederholm, editor)* 3: 13-25. <https://wiki.aalto.fi/display/Synnyt>
- Klein, N. (2008). *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. New York: Picator.
- LeBlanc, N., Davidson, S. F., Ryu, J. & Irwin, R. L. (2015). "Becoming Through A/r/tography, Autobiography and Stories in Motion," *International Journal of Education Through Art*, 11(3): 355-374.
- Lovelock, J. (1979). *Gaia: A New Look at Life on Earth*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mason, M. Ed. (2008). "Complexity Theory and the Philosophy of Education." Special issue of *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 40 (1).
- Massumi, B. (2015). *Politics of Affect*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Maturana, H. R. & Valera, F. J (1980). *Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of Living*. Dordrecht, Boston and London: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Ozman, H. & Carver S. (1990). *Philosophical Foundations of Education*. 4th ed. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*. (Goldhammer, A. Trans.). Cambridge, Mass. and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Rancière, J. (2004). *The Politics of Aesthetics: The Distribution of the Sensible*. (Rockhill, G. Trans.). London and New York: Continuum.
- Roy, O. (2014). *Holy Ignorance: When Religion and Culture Part Ways*. (Schwartz, R. Trans.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sampson, T. (2012). *Virality: Contagion Theory in the Age of Networks*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Shifman, L. (2014). *Memes. Digital Culture*. London and Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Slattery, P. (2006). *Curriculum Development in the Postmodern Era, Second Edition*. New York and Oxon: Routledge.
- Virilio (2006)[1977]. *Speed and Politics*. (Polizzioti, M. Trans.). Los Angeles, CA: Semiotext (e).

