

I

From Elizabeth Grosz's *Chaos, Territory, Art: Deleuze and the Framing of the Earth* (New York: Columbia, 2008).

CHAOS. COSMOS, TERRITORY, ARCHITECTURE

Art and nothing but art! It is the great means of making life possible, the great seduction of life, the great stimulant to life. Art [i]s the only superior counterpart to a will to denial of life.

—FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE,
THE WILL TO POWER

This small book is directed to questions about the ontology, that is, the material and conceptual structures, of art. While I am not trained in the visual or spatial arts, there are, nonetheless, many points of overlap, regions of co-occupation, that concern art and philosophy, and it is these shared concerns that I want to explore here. I want to discuss the “origins” of architecture, music, painting—indeed, the arts in general—but not the historical, evolutionary, or material origins of art, confirmable by some kind of material evidence or empirical research such as would interest an archaeologist, anthropologist, or historian. Rather, I aim to explore the conditions of art’s emergence, what makes art possible, what *concepts* art entails, assumes, and elaborates. These, of course, are linked to evolutionary and material forces, that is to say, to the historical elaboration of life, but are nevertheless metaphysically or ontologically separable from them.

Art, according to Gilles Deleuze, does not produce concepts, though it does address problems and provocations. It produces sensations, affects, intensities as its mode of addressing problems, which sometimes align with and link to concepts, the object of philosophi-

cal production, which are how philosophy deals with or addresses problems. Thus philosophy may have a place not so much in assessing art (as aesthetics has attempted to do) but in addressing the same provocations or incitements to creation as art faces—through different means and with different effects and consequences. Philosophy may find itself the twin or sibling of art and its various practices, neither judge of nor spokesperson for art, but its equally wayward sibling, working alongside art without illuminating it or speaking for it, being provoked by art and sharing the same enticements for the emergence of innovation and invention. My goal is to develop a nonaesthetic philosophy for art, a philosophy appropriate to the arts that neither replaces art history and criticism nor claims to provide an assessment of the value, quality, or meaning of art, but instead addresses the common forces and powers of art, the regions of overlap between the various arts and philosophy.

My guides in the following explorations will be the writings of Deleuze and Guattari together and their critiques of signification and subjectification, the two dominant paradigms that have directed both feminist and postmodern politics; and the writings of Irigaray, with her insistence on the sexual specificity and irreducible bodily difference as the very motor of cultural and philosophical production. Through Deleuze, Guattari, and Irigaray, and their opening up of both nature and culture to unrecognized and open-ended forces, my goals will be to develop new ways of addressing and thinking about the arts and the forces they enact and transform and thus, indirectly, new ways of conceptualizing politics and the ways in which art and politics can be linked together and rethought.

In my previous work I focused on the ways in which bodies, and the forces of space, time, and materiality, that is, nature, have enabled rather than inhibited cultural and political production.¹ In this chapter, through Deleuze, Guattari, and Irigaray, I would like to address how these forces cohere to enable the productive explosion of the arts from the provocations posed by the forces of

1. See, in particular, Grosz 2004 and 2005.

the earth (cosmological forces that we can understand as chaos, material and organic indeterminacy) with the forces of living bodies, by no means exclusively human, which exert their energy or force through the production of the new and create, through their efforts, networks, fields, territories that temporarily and provisionally slow down chaos enough to extract from it something not so much useful as intensifying, a performance, a refrain, an organization of color or movement that eventually, transformed, enables and induces art.

Deleuze suggests, in opposition to those philosophical or phenomenological approaches to the arts that analyze their intentionality or the mutual engagements of subjects and objects in artworks, that the arts produce and generate intensity, that which directly impacts the nervous system and intensifies sensation. Art is the art of affect more than representation, a system of dynamized and impacting forces rather than a system of unique images that function under the regime of signs.² By arts, I am concerned here with all forms of creativity or production that generate intensity, sensation, or affect: music, painting, sculpture, literature, architecture, design, landscape, dance, performance, and so on. I am not interested in providing qualitative evaluations of works of art, in distinguishing “good” from “bad” or high from low art, in setting up some sort of hierarchy of the various arts, but in exploring the peculiar relations that art establishes between the living body, the forces of the universe and the creation of the future, the most abstract of questions, which, if they are abstract enough, may provide us with a new way of understanding the concrete and the lived.

2. Sensations, affects, and intensities, while not readily identifiable, are clearly closely connected with forces, and particularly bodily forces, and their qualitative transformations. What differentiates them from experience, or from any phenomenological framework, is the fact that they link the lived or phenomenological body with cosmological forces, forces of the outside, that the body itself can never experience directly. Affects and intensities attest to the body’s immersion and participation in nature, chaos, materiality: “Affects are precisely these nonhuman becomings of man, just as percepts—including the town—are nonhuman landscapes of nature” (Deleuze and Guattari 1994:169).

What distinguishes the arts from other forms of cultural production are the ways in which artistic production merges with, intensifies and eternalizes or monumentalizes, sensation. Material production—the production of commodities—while it may generate sensation, is nevertheless directed to the accomplishment of activities, tasks, goals, or ends. The production of commodities, even “artistic commodities,” directs itself to the generation of pre-experienced sensations, sensations known in advance, guaranteed to affect in particular sad or joyful ways. This is why it is not clear whether Deleuze understands pop music or mass-produced art, kitsch, as artistic, though he certainly understands its intensifying effects.³ Art enables matter to become expressive, to not just satisfy but also to intensify—to resonate and become more than itself. This is not to say that art is without concepts; simply that concepts are by-products or effects rather than the very material of art. Art is the regulation and organization of its materials—paint, canvas, concrete, steel, marble, words, sounds, bodily movements, indeed *any* materials—according to self-imposed constraints, the creation of forms through which these materials come to generate and intensify sensation and thus directly impact living bodies, organs, nervous systems.

What can philosophy contribute to an understanding of art other than an aesthetics, that is, a theory *of* art, a reflection *on* art? Instead of supervening from above, taking art as its object, how can philosophy work *with* art or perhaps as and alongside art, a point of relay or connection with art? Only by seeking what it shares with art, what common origin they share in the forces of the earth and of the living body, what ways they divide and organize chaos to create a plane of coherence, a field of consistency, a

3. See Buchanan and Swiboda (2004), and especially Ian Buchanan’s “Deleuze and Pop Music”; Deleuze himself clearly has a preference for works that might be considered high modernist, but it is not at all clear that his understanding of art as the monumentalization of sensation is not a more general characterization of all of the arts, including both the most everyday and popular, the most ready-made or found objects, the most quotidian of performances.

plane of composition on which to think and to create.⁴ In other words, what common debt do art and philosophy share to those forces, chaos, that each in their own ways must slow down, decompose, harness, and develop (through the construction of the plane of immanence in philosophy and the constitution of the plane of composition in the arts)? How, in other words, do the arts and philosophy (“theory”) create? With what resources? Techniques? Counterforces? And what is it that they create when they create “works,” philosophical works and artistic works?⁵

I want to start with some mythical sense of “the beginning.” “In the beginning” is chaos, the whirling, unpredictable movement of forces, vibratory oscillations that constitute the universe. Chaos here may be understood not as absolute disorder but rather as a plethora of orders, forms, wills—forces that cannot be distinguished or differentiated from each other, both matter and its conditions for being otherwise, both the actual and the virtual indistinguishably. Somewhere in this chaotic universe, in a relatively rare occurrence, through chance, molecular randomness generates

4. If philosophy cannot be understood as the master discipline by which the arts can be comprehended, it is equally true that art cannot be understood as the culmination or fruition of philosophy, as one recent text has claimed: “In his own late works Deleuze addresses these questions of subjectivity, freedom and creation and he does so largely within the domain of *aesthetics*. Deleuze thus makes aesthetics into a sort of master discipline of philosophy, replacing the ontology of sense and repetition from the early work” (Due 2007:164). This is both to mistake Deleuze’s understanding of art for an aesthetics and to misunderstand the relations between philosophy and art as a relation of hierarchy or “mastery.”

5. Peter Hallward argues a position that is the converse of Due’s: that Deleuze positions philosophy as the more spiritualized, less materialized counterpart of art, a step beyond and above art in what he perceives as Deleuze’s movement beyond materiality: “If, then, philosophy has any privilege over art it is simply that it is able to go still further in the spiritualisation of its medium. Or rather, philosophy is precisely that form of thinking which requires no medium at all. Whereas art works through sound, or light, or paint, or words, philosophy as Deleuze conceives it works through nothing other than itself” (Hallward 2006:129). Hallward’s reading entails an hierarchical organization in Deleuze’s understanding of the relations between science, art, and philosophy that has no textual basis in Deleuze’s writings.

organic proteins, cells, proto-life. Such life can only exist and perpetuate itself to the extent that it can extract from the whirling and experientially overwhelming chaos that is nature, materiality, and their immanent forces those elements, substances, or processes it requires, can somehow bracket out or cast into shadow the profusion of forces that engulf and surround it so that it may incorporate what it needs. Henri Bergson, one of Deleuze's major philosophical influences, understands this as a skeletalization of objects: we perceive only that which interests us, is of use to us, that to which our senses have, through evolution, been attuned (Bergson 1988). That is, life, even the simplest organic cell, carries its past with its present as no material object does. This incipient memory endows life with creativity, the capacity to elaborate an innovative and unpredictable response to stimuli, to react or, rather, simply to act, to enfold matter into itself, to transform matter and life in unpredictable ways.

Such elementary life can only evolve, become more, develop and elaborate itself to the extent that there is something fundamentally unstable about both its milieu and its organic constitution. The evolution of life can be seen not only in the increasing specialization and bifurcation or differentiation of life forms from each other, the elaboration and development of profoundly variable morphologies and bodily forms, but, above all, in their becoming-artistic, in their self-transformations, which exceed the bare requirements of existence. Sexual selection, the consequence of sexual difference or morphological bifurcation—one of the earliest upheavals in the evolution of life on earth and undoubtedly the most momentous invention that life has brought forth, the very machinery for guaranteeing the endless generation of morphological and genetic variation, the very mechanism of biological difference itself—is also, by this fact, the opening up of life to the indeterminacy of taste, pleasure, and sensation.⁶ Life comes to elaborate itself through making

its bodily forms and its archaic territories, pleasing (or annoying), performative, which is to say, intensified through their integration into form and their impact on bodies.

There is much “art” in the natural world, from the moment there is sexual selection, from the moment there are two sexes that attract each other's interest and taste through visual, auditory, olfactory, tactile, and gustatory sensations. The haunting beauty of birdsong, the provocative performance of erotic display in primates, the attraction of insects to the perfume of plants are all in excess of mere survival, which Darwin understands in terms of natural selection: these forms of sexual selection, sexual attraction, affirm the excessiveness of the body and the natural order, their capacity to bring out in each other what surprises, what is of no use but nevertheless attracts and appeals. Each affirms an overabundance of resources beyond the need for mere survival, which is to say, to the capacity of both matter and life to exchange with each other, to enter into becomings that transform each. They attest to the artistic impact of sexual attraction, the becoming-other that seduction entails. This is not a homeostatic relation of stabilization, the build-up and expenditure of libidinal energies that Freud sees as the foundation of orgasmic sexuality, but a fundamentally dynamic, awkward, mal-adaptation that enables the production of the frivolous, the unnecessary, the pleasing, the sensory for their own sake.

Art proper, in other words, emerges when sensation can detach itself and gain an autonomy from its creator and its perceiver, when something of the chaos from which it is drawn can breathe and have a life of its own. Deleuze elaborates the concept of sensation as it was developed in Erwin Straus's *The Primary World of the Senses* (1963), where it designates a relation between a subject and the

capacity to attract sexual partners is fundamentally linked to sexual bifurcation, the bodily differences—whatever they might be—between males and females and the various categories of bodily form all living bodies approximate. It is this difference that attracts, allures, appeals, though it does not do so in predictable or clear-cut ways. It is the indeterminacy of sexual appeal that ensure the processes of evolution are never predictable in advance. It is this indeterminacy that sociobiology and other deterministic branches of evolutionary theory seem unable to embrace.

6. See chapter 3 of Grosz 2004 for a discussion of the indeterminate, sometimes even deranging, effects that sexual selection has on the relentless operations of natural selection and its place in the generation of music, language, and the arts. I have used Irigaray's understanding of an irreducible sexual difference to elaborate and explain Darwin's account of sexual selection: his conception of the

world preceding rationality and knowledge, perception and intellection, in which there is always a mutual transformation between them:

The sensing subject does not have sensations, but, rather, in his sensing he has first himself. In sensory experience, there unfolds both the becoming of the subject and the happening of the world. I become insofar as something happens, and something happens (for me) only insofar as I become. The Now of sensing belongs neither to objectivity nor to subjectivity alone, but necessarily to both together. In sensing, both self and world unfold simultaneously for the sensing subject; the sensing being experiences himself and the world, himself in the world, himself with the world.

(STRAUS 351)

Following Straus in seeing sensation as that which becomes, forming one of the links between the subject and the world, Deleuze takes sensation as that which subject and object share, yet is not reducible to either subject or object or their relation. Sensation is what art forms from chaos through the extraction of qualities.

Philosophy, like art and like science, draws on and over chaos. The chaotic indeterminacy of the real, its impulses to ceaseless variation, gives rise to the creation of networks, planes, zones of cohesion, which do not map this chaos so much as draw strength, force, material from it for a provisional and open-ended cohesion, temporary modes of ordering, slowing, filtering. If philosophy, through the plane of immanence or consistency, gives life to concepts that live independent of the philosopher who created them, yet participate in, cut across, and attest to the chaos from which they are drawn, so too art, through the plane of composition it throws over chaos, gives life to sensation that, disconnected from its origins or any destination or reception, maintains its connections with the infinite it expresses and from which it is drawn. Twin rafts over chaos, philosophy and art, along with their more serious sibling, the sciences, enframe chaos, each in its own way, in order to extract

something consistent, composed, immanent, which it uses for its own ordering (and also deranging) resources.⁷

The different arts are a consequence of the various experiments in intensification that have marked sexualized life on earth, conditioned by the (historical) construction of a plane of composition, a plane of shared and differentiating techniques, methods, and resources, a plane transformed and reoriented through the upheavals in art production, the revolutions in sensation that art history, a history encompassing what we usually consider the prehistory of art as well, has wrought. Art is only possible insofar as such a plane precedes any particular work; and each particular work of art finds its place, even the place of disruption, within this plane, without which it could not function as a being of sensation, a sensory variety. The plane of composition, which cuts across and thus plunges into, filters and coheres chaos through the coming into being of sensation, is thus both an immersion in chaos but also a mode of disruption and ordering of chaos through the extraction of that which life can glean for itself and its own intensifications from this whirling complexity—sensations, affects, percepts, intensities—blocs of bodily becoming that always co-evolve with blocs of the becoming of matter or events.

Art and nature, art in nature, share a common structure: that of excessive and useless production—production for its own sake, production for the sake of profusion and differentiation. Art takes what it needs—the excess of colors, forms, materials—from the earth to produce its own excesses, sensations with a life of their own, sensation as “nonorganic life.” Art, like nature itself, is always a strange coupling, the coming together of two orders, one chaotic, the other ordered, one folding and the other unfolding, one contraction and the other dilation, and it is because art is the inver-

7. “Art indeed struggles with chaos, but it does so in order to bring forth a vision that illuminates it for an instant, a Sensation. . . . Art is not chaos but a composition of chaos that yields the vision or sensation, so that it constitutes, as Joyce says, a chaosmos, a composed chaos—neither foreseen nor preconceived. . . . Art struggles with chaos but it does so in order to render it sensory” (Deleuze and Guattari 1994:204–205).

sion and transformation of nature's profusion that it too must participate in, and precipitate, further couplings: "if nature is like art, this is always because it combines these two living elements in every way: House and Universe, *Heimlich* and *Unheimlich*, territory and deterritorialization, finite melodic compounds and the great infinite plane of composition, the small and the large refrain" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994:186). Thus the first gesture of art is not, as Nietzsche believed, the exteriorization of one's own bodily forces and energies, the transformation of flesh and blood into canvas and oil but a more primary gesture that requires a body's prior separation from the earth, from nature, from its world. Deleuze understands, and on this point is in remarkable and rare agreement with Derrida, that the first gesture of art, its metaphysical condition and universal expression, is the construction or fabrication of the frame.⁸ "Art takes a bit of chaos in a frame in order to form a composed chaos that becomes sensory, or from which it extracts a chaoid sensation as variety" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994:206).

ARCHITECTURE AND THE FRAME

The first artistic impulse in this metaphysical reconstruction is thus not body-art but architecture-art. Art is, for Deleuze, the extension of the architectural imperative to organize the space of the earth. Art, developed alongside of the territory-house and house-territory systems, is what enables the emergence of pure sensory qualities, the data or material of art. This roots art not in the creativity of mankind but rather in a superfluosity of nature, in the capacity of the earth to render the sensory superabundant, in the bird's courtship song and dance, or in the field of lilies swaying in the breeze under a blue sky. It roots art in the natural and in the animal, in the most primitive and sexualized of evolutionary residues in man's animal heritage. Art is evolutionary, in the sense that it

8. See Derrida 1987 and particularly the notion of parergonality he develops there.

coincides with and harnesses evolutionary accomplishments into avenues of expression that no longer have anything to do with survival. Art hijacks survival impulses and transforms them through the vagaries and intensifications posed by sexuality, deranging them into a new order, a new practice. Art is the sexualization of survival or, equally, sexuality is the rendering artistic, the exploration of the excessiveness, of nature.⁹

Art is not linked to some intrinsic relation to one's own body but exactly the opposite: it is linked to those processes of distancing and the production of a plane of composition that abstracts sensation from the body. The emergence of the "frame" is the condition of all the arts and is the particular contribution of architecture to the taming of the virtual, the territorialization of the uncontrollable forces of the earth. It is the frame that constitutes painting and cinema just as readily as architecture; it is the architectural force of framing that liberates the qualities of objects or events that come to constitute the substance, the matter, of the art-work.¹⁰ The frame is what establishes territory out of the chaos that is the earth. The frame is thus the first construction, the corners, of the plane of composition. With no frame or boundary there can be no territory, and without territory there may be objects or things but not qualities that can become expressive, that can intensify and transform living bodies. Territory here may be understood as surfaces of

9. "Perhaps art begins within the animal, at least with the animal that carves out a territory and constructs a house (both are correlative, or even one and the same, in what is called a habitat). The territory-house system transforms a number of organic functions—sexuality, procreation, aggression, feeding. But this transformation does not explain the appearance of the territory and the house; rather, it is the other way around: the territory implies the emergence of pure sensory qualities, of sensibilia that cease to be merely functional and become expressive features, making possible a transformation of function" (Deleuze and Guattari 1994:183).

10. Deleuze and Guattari follow Bernard Cache in seeing architecture as the primordial impulse or form of all of the arts, their modes of forming a plane: "It is possible to define architecture as the manipulation of . . . the frame. Architecture, the art of the frame, would then not only concern those specific objects that are buildings, but would refer to any image involving any element of framing, which is to say painting as well as cinema[], and certainly many other things (Cache 1995:2).

variable curvature or inflection that bear upon them singularities, eruptions, or events. Territory is that which is produced by the elaborate, if apparently useless, activity of construction, attention grabbing, and display that mark most of sexual selection.

Deleuze and Guattari provide a strikingly architectural example for their discussion of the performance of sexual allure or attraction:

Every morning the *Scenopoetes dentiostriis*, a bird of the Australian rain forests, cuts leaves, makes them fall to the ground, and turns them over so that the paler internal side contrasts with the earth. In this way it constructs a stage for itself like a ready-made; and directly above, on a creeper or branch, while fluffing its feathers beneath its beak to reveal their yellow roots, it sings a complex song made up from its own notes and, at intervals, those of other birds that it imitates; it is a complete artist. This is not a synaesthesia of the flesh but blocs of sensations in the territory—colors, postures, and sounds that sketch out a total work of art. These sonorous blocs are refrains; but there are also refrains of posture and color, and postures and colors are always being introduced into refrains: bowing low, straightening up, dancing in a circle and a line of colors. The whole of the refrain is the being of sensation. Monuments are refrains. In this respect art is continually haunted by the animal.

(DELEUZE AND GUATTARI 1994:184)

It is to this extent that architecture, and all the arts that follow from it, are linked to the birdsong, the olfactory dance of insects, the performative displays of vertebrates, including humans: they are each the constitution of a territory, a sexualized territory, the space that is one's own in which one can enact sexual seduction, extract sexual satisfaction, and intensify sexual forces. But, perhaps more significantly, the constitution of territory is the fabrication of the space in which sensations may emerge, from which a rhythm, a tone, coloring, weight, texture may be extracted and moved elsewhere, may function for its own sake, may resonate for the sake of intensity alone. And, equally, insofar as its primordial impulse is the

creation of territory in both the natural and human worlds, art is also capable of that destruction and deformation that destroys territories and enables them to revert to the chaos from which they were temporarily wrenched. Framing and deframing become art's modes of territorialization and deterritorialization through sensation; framing becomes the means by which the plane of composition composes, deframing its modes of upheaval and transformation.

At its most elementary, architecture, the most primordial and animal of all of the arts, does little other than design and construct frames; these are its basic forms of expression. Even in its most sophisticated contemporary forms, architecture is the constitution of interlocking frames, frames that can connect with, contain and be contained by other frames: architecture is the creation of frames as cubes, interconnecting cubes, cubes respected or distorted, cubes opened up, inflected or cut open.¹¹ The frame separates. It cuts into a milieu or space. This cutting links it to the constitution of the plane of composition, to the provisional ordering of chaos through the laying down of a grid or order that entraps chaotic shards, chaoid states, to arrest or slow them into a space and a time, a structure and a form where they can affect and be affected by bodies. This cutting of the space of the earth through the fabrication of the frame is the very gesture that composes both house and territory, inside and outside, interior and landscape at once and as the points of maximal variation, the two sides, of the space of the earth. Qualities are now loosened onto the world, no longer anchored in their "natural" place but put into the play of sensations that departs from mere survival to celebrate its means and excesses.

11. "Strictly speaking, architects design frames. This can be easily verified by consulting architectural plans, which are nothing but the interlocking of frames in every dimension: plans, sections and elevations. Cubes, nothing but cubes. . . . In a text called 'Déblaiements d'art,' Henry Van de Velde pointed to a parallelism between the historical evolution of the shapes of the frames and that of architectural forms. Paintings would finalize, as it were, the series of frames that make up a building. Through successive unframings, we would pass from the canvas of the painting to the fresco on the wall, to the mosaic on the ground, and finally to the stained glass window in the window frame. Thus the frame of a painting would be residual, or better yet, a rudiment of architectural framing" (Cache 22).

This is why the frame's most elementary form is the partition, whether wall or screen, that, projected downward, generates the smoothness of a floor, that "rarefies" and smooths over the surface of the earth, creating a first (human) territorialization. The floor, ever acquiring smoothness, suppleness, and consistency, makes of the earth and of horizontality a resource for the unleashing of new and more sensations, for the exploration of the excesses of gravity and movement, the conditions for the emergence of both dance and athletics.¹² The partition projected forward induces the wall, which constitutes the possibility of an inside and an outside, dividing the inhabitable from the natural (the chaotic), transforming the earth itself into a delimitable space, a shelter or home. The wall divides us from the world, on one side, and creates another world, a constructed and framed world, on its other side. Though it primarily divides, the wall also provides new connections, new relations, social and interpersonal relations, with those on its other side ("The wall is the basis of our co-existence" [Cache 1995:24]). The wall destabilizes and reinfects the territory created by the floor; yet within and through the wall another reterritorialization of the earth is always immanent.

While its most direct and perceptible function is to separate or divide, the wall equally functions to select and bring in. In this case the frame can be converted into the window, which selectively envisions its natural exterior, now a "landscape," no longer beyond its partition but within the enframed space of the room. It selectively brings in a now framed outside, a view or vista. The wall darkens, keeps out light and natural forces; the window selectively enframes them again to return them to the interior, bringing illumination inside. The wall, floor, and windows each enframe, that is, divide and select both each other and their collective outside; and together—ever approaching the form of the cube even as they eventually come to deform it—they entail a final partition, a roof. The roof, like

12. "It is the flatness of the stage that makes choreography probable, just as it is the flatness of the stadium that increases the probability of athletics. The ground plane rarefies the surface of the earth in order to allow human activities to take shape" (Cache 25).

the floor, though, is more than a horizontal wall, more than a box presented in any orientation whatever. As Cache argues, the roof follows a logic of form more than function: which explains why it tends to belong to a formal, even geometric register—prism, dome, cone, or pyramid (1995:26)—each with their own lines, figures and singularity, with their modes of inflection and curvature.¹³

Within the architectural frame, in miniaturized form, the frame reenacts itself and its territorializing function through furniture, an architecture on the inside of architecture, an architecture of architecture: "Though classified as objects in our everyday language, furniture can be seen as an interior replication of architecture. The closet is a box in the box, the mirror a window onto the outside, the table another floor on the ground." It is hardly surprising that, as Cache—himself a furniture maker—emphasizes, because furniture is that which most intimately touches the body, it is linked to the architectural frame through a direct contiguity with the body and its activities. Furniture enables the body to be most directly affected by, but also protected from, the chaos of every outside: "For our most intimate or most abstract endeavours, whether they occur in bed or on a chair, furniture supplies the immediate physical environment in which our bodies act and react; for us, urban animals, furniture is thus our primary territory. Architecture, object, geography—furniture is that image where forms are fused together" (30).

The real, the outside, nature, matter, force, the cosmos, geography—all terms we can understand as more or less stable expressions of chaos—are that which incites, from the outside, the productive proliferation of resources that reveal or envision an element, fragment, or section of the chaotic in the form of sensation. This real, the outside, chaos, demarcated through the constitution of a (finite and provisional) territory, makes possible the more calculable, measurable, and mappable features that characterize a site, the site's openness to scientific and technical manipulation

13. "The wall delimits and the window selects: such is the frame of probability within which we find the rarefied interval of the floor. It belongs to the regime of causes and of the interval. The roof is of another order: it envelops an event; it is the effect of singularization" (Cache 28).

and control; and the built frame, produced through a regulation and partitioning of orientations in the site, divides and selects that which the territory, now configured as landscape, a view, can directly mark, and illuminate, the inside, the divisions and selections made by groups and communities. And within the built frame, as a frame within a frame within a frame, our bodies and their bodily supports, furnishings, coexist to make of our bodies an abundance of sensations and actions. Furniture brings the outside in, but only to the extent that it itself is extracted and transformed from this outside, stripped down, reworked, refined, in short, an outside now constructed, regulated, inside. In this process of territorialization, deterritorialization, and reterritorialization, the body becomes intimately connected to and informed by the peristaltic movements, systole and diastole, contraction and expansion, of the universe itself. Body and universe, entwined in mutual concavity/convexity, floating/falling, folding/unfolding are directly touched by that outside now enframed, creating sensation from their coming together.

Art is first architectural because its cosmic materials require demarcation, enframement, containment in order for qualities as such to emerge, to live, and to induce sensation. Architecture is the most elementary binding or containment of forces, the conditions under which qualities can live their own life through the constitution of territory. Territory frames chaos provisionally, and in the process produces extractable qualities, which become the materials and formal structures of art. There is no one architecture, no single enframement, no universal technique for territorialization: each form of life, and each cultural form, undertakes its own modes of organization, its own connections of body and earth, its own modes of management of intractable problems that impose themselves on the living.

Cache makes it clear that although what is described above may be regarded as a kind of genealogy of the plane of composition and the art-events that erupt on its surface, it is not the only genealogy, nor the only (historical, cultural) reconstruction of the origins of art. If Western architecture and art, following the claims made by Wöfflin and Worringer, observe this genealogy of planar con-

struction, the construction of order from substance, then it may be that the genealogy of non-Western art follows an entirely different logic:

The first architectural gesture is acted upon the earth: it is our grave or our foundation. A plane against a surface of variable curvature, the first frame is an excavation. But perhaps this is just the bedrock of western thought. Unlike our western architecture whose first frame confronts the earth, Japanese architecture raises its screens to the wind, the light, and the rain. Partitions and parasols rather than excavations: screens emphasize the void.

(DELEUZE AND GUATTARI 64)

The earth can be *infinitely* divided, territorialized, framed. But unless it is in some way demarcated, nature itself is incapable of sexualizing life, making life alluring, lifting life above mere survival. Framing is how chaos becomes territory. Framing is the means by which objects are delimited, qualities unleashed and art made possible.

ART AND THE EARTH

Architectural framing produces the very possibility of the screen, the screen functioning as a plane for virtual projection, a hybrid of wall, window, and mirror. Painting can be understood, as we shall see in chapter 3, as the transitional passage from the frame to the screen, a movement of growing dematerialization, a movement where the image becomes less and less dependent on a milieu and location, and is itself the complex and enfolded second-order constitution of the frame, this time no longer for the mixed purpose of usefulness and pleasure, but for the generation (and never the reproduction or representation) of sensations. The history of the frame is the evolution of an increasing dematerialization, a territory-wall-painting-window-mirror-screen-becoming.

Like architecture, art is not only the movement of territorialization, the movement of joining the body to the chaos of the universe itself according to the body's needs and interests; it is also the converse movement, that of deterritorialization, of cutting through territories, breaking up systems of enclosure and performance, traversing territory in order to retouch chaos, enabling something mad, asystematic, something of the chaotic outside to reassert and restore itself in and through the body, through works and events that impact the body. If framing creates the very condition for the plane of composition and thus of any particular works of art, art itself is equally a project that disjars, distends, and transforms frames, that focuses on the intervals and conjunctions between frames. In this sense the history of painting, and of art after painting, can be seen as the action of leaving the frame, of moving beyond, and pressing against the frame, the frame exploding through the movement it can no longer contain.¹⁴ Art thus captures an element, a fragment, of chaos in the frame and creates or extracts from it not an image or representation, but a sensation or rather a compound or a multiplicity of sensations, not the repetition of sensations already experienced or available beyond or outside the work of art, but those very sensations generated and proliferated only by art. Framing is the raw condition under which sensations are created, metabolized, released into the world, made to live a life of their own, to infect and transform other sensations.

This is, precisely, the task of all art and, from colors and sounds, both music and painting similarly extract new harmonies, new plastic or melodic landscapes, and new rhythmic characters that raise them to the height of the earth's sound and the cry of humanity: that which constitutes tone, health, becoming, a visual

14. Deleuze himself seems rather contemptuous of postmodernist art, and especially conceptual art, and shows a clear preference for works of high modernism, in painting as in film and music. One of the challenges facing Deleuzianism is how to direct a Deleuzian-inspired analysis to texts and movements for which he himself had little time.

and sonorous bloc. A monument does not commemorate or celebrate something that happened but confides to the ear of the future the persistent sensations that embody the event.

(DELEUZE AND GUATTARI 1994:176)

The artistic release and propagation of sensation, which as we will further consider in the following chapter, is always a mode of resonance or harmonious vibration, an oscillation extracted from the fluctuating, self-differentiating structure of the universe itself used to pace, measure, and provide discernment in a universe in which nothing is self-identical, all substance is movement, modes of contraction/dilation or difference/repetition, and generates not only perceptions, that is, auditory and visual images, but, above all, rhythm. Rhythm explodes auditorily in and as music and visually in and as painting and the visual arts. Rhythm is what connects the most elementary and primitive bodily structures of even the most simple organisms to the implacable movements of the universe itself: art, as music, sculpture, painting, architecture, dance, resonates or transmits force through every structure. This force must be considered not as the product of mankind, an invention that distinguishes the human from the animal, but rather a nonhuman "unlivable Power" (Deleuze 2003:39) that runs through all of life and connects the living in its various forms to the nonorganic forces and qualities of materiality itself.

The visual and sonorous arts capture something of the vibratory structure of matter itself; they extract color, rhythm, movement from chaos in order to slow down and delimit within it a territory that is capable of undergoing a reshaping and a new harmonics that will give it independence, a plane of stabilization, on which to sustain itself. The refrain is how rhythm stakes out a territory from chaos that resonates with and intensifies the body. Territory is always the coming together both of spatiotemporal coordinates (and thus the possibilities of measurement, precise location, concreteness, actuality) and qualities (which are immeasurable, indeterminate, virtual, and open-ended), that is, it is the coupling of a milieu and a rhythm. A refrain is the movement by which the qualities

of a specific territory or habitat resonate and return to form it as a delimited space, a space contained or bounded but nonetheless always open to the chaos from which it draws its force.

Deleuze and Guattari argue that music and literature, much less clearly spatially oriented arts and more clearly oriented to temporal movement, nevertheless can be represented as readily on the model of territorialization and framing as the visual and architectural arts. Music too is framed and involves the extraction of a vibratory rhythm from chaos, which is then placed into the frame constructed of the interchange between the harmonic and the melodic. Vibration becomes harmonic; melody comes to regulate the bringing together, the construction, of a “sonorous” house, of an interchange of vibratory movements:

The situation of music seems no different and perhaps embodies the frame even more powerfully [than in the visual arts]. Yet it is said that sound has no frame. But compounds of sensation, sonorous blocs, equally possess sections or framing forms each of which must join together to secure a certain closing-off. The simplest cases are the melodic *air*, which is a monophonic refrain; the *motif*, which is already polyphonic, an element of melody entering into the development of another and creating counterpoint; and the *theme*, as the object of harmonic modifications through melodic lines. These three elementary forms construct the sonorous house and its territory.

(DELEUZE AND GUATTARI 1994:189)

A territory is established only once qualities/properties come to have their own resonances, their own forms of repetition and reconstruction; territory is the spatiotemporal configuration and containment of these rhythms and forces. Territorialization is “the act of rhythm that has become expressive, or of milieu components that have become qualitative” (Deleuze and Guattari 1987:315): vibratory rhythms become colored, sonorous, tactile expressions; they contact and cross-fertilize the earth, a specific location or geography, which frames and conditions their extractions as qualities.

At one and the same time, a quality comes to be abstracted from its milieu and a geography comes to be defined as property or habitat: in the constitution of the frame the cosmos is directed, through constructed planes of cohesion, to material transformations and becomings, to remaking the body, intensifying its forces, while investing its milieu in a new configuration of closures and openings.¹⁵ Chaos is both forestalled, framed, and welcomed through a regulated, tolerable if perhaps bracing and transformative, dose.

If painting aims to make every organ function as an eye, if it aims to make the very entrails see, and if music makes every organ and pore of the body function as an ear attuned to rhythm and melody, if, as Deleuze suggests, painting ever more deeply materializes the body while music spiritualizes it, this is because, through the various arts, the body is, for a moment at least, directly touched by the forces of chaos from which it so carefully shields itself in habit, cliché, and doxa, those movements of containment that render only predictable and preproduced sensations, not sensations that announce the future.¹⁶ What painting, music, and literature elicit are not so much representations, perceptions, images that are readily at hand, recognizable, directly interpretable, identifiable, as does the cliché or popular opinion, good sense, or calculation: rather, they

15. As Bogue suggests in his illuminating analysis of Deleuze’s writings on the arts, “Art, as the disposition of expressive qualities, is the active agent in the formation of territory and the establishment of the occupant’s proprietary identity” (2003a:20).

16. “[Music] strips bodies of their inertia, of the materiality of their presence: it *disembodies* bodies. . . . In a sense, music begins where painting ends, and this is what is meant when one speaks of the superiority of music. It is lodged on the lines of flight that pass through bodies, but which find their consistency elsewhere, whereas painting is lodged farther up, where the body escapes from itself. But in escaping, the body discovers the materiality of which it is composed, the pure presence of which it is made, and which it would not discover otherwise. Painting, in short, discovers the material reality of bodies with its line-color systems and its polyvalent organ, the eye. . . . When music sets up its sonorous systems and its polyvalent organ, the ear, it addresses itself to something very different from the material reality of bodies. It gives a disembodied and dematerialized body to the most spiritual of entities” (Deleuze 2003:47).

produce and generate sensations never before experienced, perceptions of what has never been perceived before or perhaps cannot be perceived otherwise. The visual arts render visible forces that are themselves invisible; the musical arts “render non-sonorous forces sonorous” (Deleuze 2003:48), in short, they extract something imperceptible from the cosmos and dress it in the sensible materials that the cosmos provides in order to create sensation, not a sensation of something, but pure intensity, a direct impact on the body’s nerves and organs.

Painting is about rendering the invisible in visible form, and music about sounding the inaudible, each the expression and exploration of the unrepresentable.¹⁷ Art is not the activation of the perceptions and sensations of the lived body—the merging and undecidability of subject and object, seer and seen in a common flesh as suggested by Straus (1963) and later elaborated by Merleau-Ponty (1968), but about transforming the lived body into an unlivable power, an unleashed force that transforms the body along with the world. Deleuze’s response to phenomenological readings of the lived body as the site for art production is highly critical, although it is clear that he owes a debt not so much to Merleau-Ponty as to Uexküll (as we shall see in further detail in the next chapter, a phenomenologist or semiotician not of the conscious human subject but rather of the animal), and his understanding of nature as the patterned counterpointing of phenomenologically selected environments: the spider carries within its web a complex picture of the prey it is to capture—its web is a map of and a counterpoint to the fly. Nevertheless Deleuze’s criticism of phenomenology is clear: flesh is the field for the elaboration of sensations but cannot be understood as sensation itself. Sensation heralds the nonhuman becomings of mankind, the evolutionary overcoming of man:

17. “Artists are like philosophers. What little health they possess is often too fragile, not because of their illnesses or neuroses but because they have seen something in life that is too much for anyone, too much for themselves, and that has put on them the quiet mark of death. But this something is also the source or breath that supports them through the illnesses of the lived (what Nietzsche called health)” (Deleuze and Guattari 1994:172–173).

in short, the being of sensation is not the flesh but the compound of nonhuman forces of the cosmos, of man’s nonhuman becomings, and of the ambiguous house that exchanges and adjusts them, makes them whirl around like winds. Flesh is only the developer which disappears in what it develops: the compound of sensation. (1994:183)

Cosmological imponderables—among the most obvious, the forces of temporality, gravity, magnetism—equally the objects of scientific, philosophical, and artistic exploration, are among the invisible, unheard, imperceptible forces of the earth, forces beyond the control of life that animate and extend life beyond itself. Art engenders becomings, not imaginative becomings—the elaboration of images and narratives in which a subject might recognize itself, not self-representations, narratives, confessions, testimonies of what is and has been—but material becomings, in which these imponderable universal forces touch and become enveloped in life, in which life folds over itself to embrace its contact with materiality, in which each exchanges some elements or particles with the other to become more and other.

It is for this reason that art is not frivolous, an indulgence or luxury, an embellishment of what is most central: it is the most vital and direct form of impact on and through the body, the generation of vibratory waves, rhythms, that traverse the body and make of the body a link with forces it cannot otherwise perceive and act upon. This explains art’s cultural or human universality and ubiquity: it is culture’s most direct mode of enhancement or intensification of bodies, culture’s mode for the elaboration of sensations, and thus culture’s most intense debt to the chaotic forces it characterizes as nature. While there is no universal art, no art form, no music or painting, that appeals everywhere in the same way, it is also true that there is no culture without its own arts, without its own forms of bodily enhancement and intensification.

Art is the opening up of the universe to becoming-other, just as science is the opening up of the universe to practical action, to becoming-useful and philosophy is the opening up of the universe to thought-becoming. Art is the most direct intensification of the

resonance, and dissonance, between bodies and the cosmos, between one milieu or rhythm and another. It is that which impacts the body most directly, that which intensifies and affects most viscerally. Through the plane of composition it casts, art is the way that the universe most directly intensifies life, enervates organs, mobilizes forces. It is the passage from the house to the universe, from territory to deterritorialization, “from the finite to the infinite” (Deleuze and Guattari 1994:180), from the body of the living being to the universe itself. What philosophy can offer art is not a theory of art, an elaboration of its silent or undeveloped concepts, but what philosophy and art share in common—their rootedness in chaos, their capacity to ride the waves of a vibratory universe without direction or purpose, in short, their capacity to enlarge the universe by enabling its potential to be otherwise, to be framed through concepts and affects. They are among the most forceful ways in which culture generates a small space of chaos within chaos where chaos can be elaborated, felt, thought.