

Deleuzian Creativity and Fluxus Nomadology: Inspiring New Futures, New Thought

Janae Sholtz

Deleuzian Creativity and Fluxus Nomadology

Abstract

This paper mobilizes a conception of creativity derived from the aesthetic philosophy of Gilles Deleuze that invokes principles from performance art, aesthetics of indeterminacy, and a theory of exhaustion in order to understand the political potential of artworks. After outlining some considerations of the modern conception of creativity and its cultural significance from the mid-twentieth century onwards, I will focus on the confluence between Deleuze's philosophy of art and the practices of the neo-avant-garde art collective Fluxus during the 1960s and '70s in order to theorize creativity as a form of anti-capitalist resistance. I interpret Fluxus performances as nomadological events that open spatiotemporal intervals for the manifestation of futural forces and re-examine Fluxus as a mode of "resistance to the present"—which is so important for revivifying creative and political impulses.

Keywords

Deleuze
Guattari
Fluxus
Nomadology
Creativity



In *What is Philosophy?* Deleuze and Guattari provide a succinct assessment of contemporary culture and its creative possibilities. They say, “We do not lack communication. On the contrary, we have too much of it. We lack creation. *We lack resistance to the present.*”¹ In order to understand how this statement enjoins us to a particular political imperative, we should think of it in relation to another phrase to which Deleuze often refers: Klee’s renowned statement that “what we need is a people, but the people is missing.”² By pairing these two key phrases we can begin to interpret Deleuze’s intense commitment to contemporary critique and political transformation. Taken together they can be interpreted as criticism and challenge, indicating both the waning of creativity and the possibility of imagining a new future—which is in effect to resist the overbearing and prefigured present. After developing an account of Deleuze’s critique of this waning of the creative impetus, I will focus on the confluence between Deleuze’s philosophy of art and Fluxus collective’s neo-avant-garde art practices during the 1960s and ‘70s—in attempt to envision a new Deleuzian conception of creativity as a form of resistance to the overbearing powers of capitalism.

Deleuze’s cultural critique is aimed at the manner in which post-industrial capitalism has changed our understanding of communication, creativity, and political possibilities and at how capitalism “takes over” all desire and creative or revolutionary outlets in such a way that, ironically, render truly creative acts impossible. Thus while Deleuze’s analysis refers to the mid-twentieth century, the twenty-first century’s cultural and political scenes seem to verify his views—especially when we consider such phenomena as privatized prisons, the manipulation of war and terror, or the military industrial complex. Moreover, his intuition is echoed by the uneasiness that resonated through the art world in the latter years of the twentieth century: the concern that a certain counter-cultural energy had left the social and political scene accompanied by the dread of a corporate takeover of life itself.³ This dread was expressed by Marcuse and Adorno—early critics of consumer society and the massification of culture—but became all the more profound as the counter-culture revolution of the ‘60s and ‘70s gave way to neoliberal economic policies of the 1980s (Reaganomics, Thatcherism).

Yet while Deleuze warns of the inescapable spread of capitalist territorializations and the ubiquity of control societies, his goal has always been to provide us with concepts that resist these totalizing, immobilizing frameworks and open us to, as he says, lines of flight—which is to say a reinvigorated creative impulse. The picture is complicated because

Deleuzian Creativity and Fluxus Nomadology

capitalism's model is that of constant deterritorialization as its mode of production; in effect, it has mobilized creativity for itself, so any simple recourse to deterritorialization as a creative, affirmative force has the paradoxical effect of reinforcing this system. It would seem that we have to think the possibility of creativity anew; to find lines of flight for creativity itself. My intent here is, by tracing the paths Deleuze has opened, to suggest a new conception of creativity that acts as a countermeasure to the swift appropriation of the concept by and through capitalism's modalities. Whilst I accept Deleuze's critique of capitalism and its deleterious effects on our creative capabilities, I attempt to make better sense of his more enigmatic imperatives to resist these phenomena in order to offer a conception of creative resistance that, while faithful to Deleuze's prerogatives and conceptual framework, moves beyond them.

It is well known that Deleuze constantly turns to the realm of the aesthetic in discussions of creativity, resistance, and futural politics. Yet scholars have pointed out that he rarely focuses on contemporary artists, opting for more canonical figures from modern art.⁴ This has caused some to question just how useful Deleuze's aesthetics are for addressing contemporary problems. Yet at the beginning of *A Thousand Plateaus*—a book devoted to the forces of the future and the possibility of resisting sociopolitical control mechanisms—he and Guattari use a graphic score by the Fluxus composer Sylvano Busotti to represent the concept of rhizomatic philosophy.⁵ Though this seems to be the extent of Deleuze and Guattari's referral to Fluxus, I have attempted elsewhere to imaginatively extend this engagement with other elements of the Fluxus paradigm and argue that Fluxus practices provide an artistic parallel to the critiques and conceptual framework that Deleuze and Guattari perform through their philosophy.⁶

After outlining the modern history of creativity and addressing Deleuze's own enigmatic gestures towards a new form of creativity, I will focus on three particular areas of confluence with Fluxus practice—ideas about the unity between art and life, indeterminacy, and infinite movement—in order to give image to this new form of creativity as resistance. I suggest that Fluxus performances are nomadological events which open spatiotemporal intervals for the manifestation of creative, futural forces. I also examine affects created by Fluxus performances as modes of the “resistance to the present” which is so important for revivifying the creative, political imagination.

I. Critiquing Creativity, Critiquing Capitalism

Deleuze's preoccupation with creativity and the creative act has to be situated within the context of a certain historical manifestation of the concept that has been delineated as something thoroughly modern. In other words, it is because the concept of creativity becomes a part of the cultural landscape that it must be assessed from within it and its relation to the socio-economic framework becomes particularly relevant. As Pope explains in *Creativity: Theory, History, Practice*, it isn't until the early mid-twentieth century that this emphasis on creativity took root as a response to rapid social and technological change.⁷ "The 1930s in particular witnessed some of the earliest recorded uses of such phrases as 'creative salesman' (1930), 'creative education' (1936) and even 'courses in creative writing' (1930)."⁸ Now, of course it isn't the case that there were no references to creativity prior to the twentieth century; it is just that these references were reserved for art and the artist, whereas mid-century creativity found its way into the cultural landscape as a populist possibility that utilized or coopted the realm of artistic creativity for itself.⁹ In the process, the concepts of creativity and the creative act are transformed.

The elevation of creativity as a modern phenomenon follows the shift to a post-industrialized society, which has generated the "creative culture" or "creativity industry"—a technological society revolving around ideas, communication of information and knowledge, self-expression and economic fluidity. The problem is that creativity has been appropriated by the new capitalist paradigm; that creativity, at least as a cultural product and attainment, is thoroughly integrated with consumerism and the ideals of choice and self-expression that serve the order of capitalism, and "it is precisely the compounding—or confounding—of consumer choice with democratic freedom that makes present constructions of creativity at once so potent and superficially beguiling."¹⁰

The association of creativity with post-industrialist capitalism and the consumerist and corporatist mentality obliges us to reconsider the concept of creativity and what may have been lost through its assimilation. Deleuze's attempt to contemplate creativity arises out of this backdrop as a rebuttal or refusal of this modern culture of creativity. His philosophy can help us understand how creativity's immense potential was reabsorbed by culture itself—appropriated by the same forces it worked against. Moreover, since Deleuze and Guattari define philosophy as the creation of concepts, there is a need to distinguish the philosopher's activity from that of their capitalist rivals.

Deleuzian Creativity and Fluxus Nomadology

Deleuze and Guattari's critique of capitalism is aligned with Marx, who emphasizes the way that the capitalist logic of exchange transforms social relations: "capitalism works by reworking not just social, political, and economic relations but the very subjective needs... of individuals so as to accommodate those needs to capitalism's system and structure."¹¹ According to Marx, one of the significant transformations under capitalism is that the value of a commodity is no longer found in its use-value but rather in its exchangeability (commodity abstraction). This is primarily because the aim of capitalism is to perpetuate surplus value through the perpetual flow of money. Marx famously inverts the commodity-money relation (C-M-C) arguing that the true movement of capitalism is M-C-M. This formulation suggests that commodities are merely placeholders and that capitalism's functioning depends on circulation rather than accumulation. As Hajdini explains, "the circulation of capital (M-C-M) forms an open circle, that doesn't start with need and end with satisfaction or consumption of a commodity, but instead forms an essentially limitless process."¹²

Marx speculates that this system necessitates the proliferation of needs and generates social relations bent on "creating a new need in others."¹³ In other words, "capitalism's ever-present need to produce accumulation for accumulation's sake and its concomitant project of turning everything into a commodity even turns the desires of individuals into commodities to be bought and sold, to be manipulated by the capitalist class in the production of new needs to be filled by new commodities."¹⁴ Capitalist production requires a constant feedback loop of production and obsolescence, which in turn requires generating constant desire *for consumption itself*, not just commodities. Subjective desires are the outgrowth or effect of the forces of capitalism, and therefore desire itself becomes a commodity.

In *Anti-Oedipus*, Deleuze and Guattari add to this critique by re-conceptualizing the role and nature of desire. Rather than an imaginary force based on need or lack, desire is conceived as a real force of production. Desiring-production is composed of flows and interruptions which alternate between processes of synthesis and decoding, and social production is simply desiring-production under determinate conditions.¹⁵ Thus Deleuze and Guattari analyze how desiring-production operates under determinate conditions in order to understand social relations and particular forms of subjectivization. Desire does not represent conscious desires of individuals but the state of unconscious drives.¹⁶ This is useful for understanding how individuals in society who do not stand to equally gain from capitalism remain subject to it.

Deleuze and Guattari find that the linkage between capitalism and desiring-production is particularly profound in that capitalism's axiomatic aligns with processes of production themselves; the conversion of surplus value of code into surplus of flux upon which the infinite movement of capitalism relies (M-C-M) "is enough, however, to ensure that the Desire of the most disadvantaged creature will invest with all its strength, irrespective of any economic understanding or lack of it, the capitalist field as a whole. Flows, who doesn't desire flows, and relation between flows, and breaks in flows?"¹⁷

Furthermore, Deleuze and Guattari stress that capitalism is not just defined by decoded flows, but by generalized axiomatic of decoding.¹⁸ Under these conditions, desiring production is invested in an overall axiomatic of decoding and flux. Yet, desiring-production also desires the interruption of flows, their cessation. The more accelerated and the more decoded that social forces become, the more desire there is for the soothing of desire's freneticism—that desire desires its own repression is immanent to desire itself. Suley Rolnik observes this in cognitive capitalism's takeover of the struggles and creativity of the 1960s, claiming that the more social unrest and fluidity, the greater the potential for capturing desire within predetermined paradigms:

The most common destiny of flexible subjectivity and of the freedom of creation that accompanies it is not the invention of forms of expression motivated by an attention to sensations that signal the effects of the other's existence within our resonant body. What guides us in this creation of territories for our post-Fordist flexibility is an almost hypnotic identification with the images of the world broadcast by advertising and mass culture. By offering ready-made territories to subjectivities rendered fragile by deterritorialization, these images tend to soothe their unrest.¹⁹

This rerouting of creativity energies is a phenomenon she scathingly labels "pimping"; and according to Rolnik it is a politics of capture that has steadily reached global proportions.²⁰ Her reading aligns with Deleuze and Guattari's assessment of one of the most pernicious effects of capitalism: because its *modus operandi* is to decode the significance of all codes and then recode them for its own purposes, everything is absorbed into it. An example is the punk phenomenon of the 1980s. Originally considered a countercultural force, punk was neutralized by its regurgitation as a commodity, its creative

Deleuzian Creativity and Fluxus Nomadology

impulse repackaged with a shiny seal and the promised purveyance of cool. As Pope says, “resistant or subversive gestures may themselves be quickly re-appropriated and reproduced as a saleable ‘style.’”²¹ Deleuze would add that this is predicated on the manufacture and perpetuation of a specific set of desires.

In order to maintain circulation, capitalism is “continually confronting limits and barriers that are interior and immanent to itself [yet] precisely because they are immanent, [they] let themselves be overcome only provided they are reproduced on a wider scale.”²² In other words, capitalist creativity consists in generating more objects to be consumed and the illusion of limitations to be overcome in order to create new products that surpass the old or assimilate any creative energies and desires that come unbound. But, these innovations are determined by projections of profitability and fidelity to the system—remaining within a set of predetermined possibilities that support rather than truly overturn or change the system. This is also why Deleuze and Guattari can say that, while there are many inventions and innovations resulting from capitalism, the system itself remains caught in a recursive logic that always finds a way to domesticate these rogue energies and creative tendencies. Capitalism needs to bind the schizophrenic charges and energies into a world axiomatic that always opposes the revolutionary potential of decoded flows with new interior limits.²³

One of Deleuze’s serious concerns is that the mechanisms of control which are sustained and perfected through the absolute dominance of the capitalist machine will make it more and more difficult to break out, to find lines of flight beyond these territorial constrictions. Perhaps *because* of Deleuze’s hyperawareness of this very danger, his philosophy offers resources to resist and to unearth a fundamentally different kind of creative impulse that nonetheless beats underneath the heavy weight of such a voracious system. The will to defy the control that has come to define modern society is a creative act according to Deleuze.²⁴ Though libido, as unconscious and machinic, will generally invest in the existing social field, including its most repressive forms, “it may launch a counterinvestment whereby revolutionary desire is plugged into the existing social field as a source of energy.”²⁵ This revolutionary potential is crystallized in the phrase that began this inquiry:

We do not lack communication. On the contrary, we have too much of it. We lack creation. *We lack resistance to the present.*

Significantly, Deleuze and Guattari articulate this imperative of resistance in the course of distinguishing “concept creation” as the task of philosophy,²⁶ from the mere proliferation and use of concepts in communication. Deleuze and Guattari single out communication to signify the shift from industrial production to the production of information as indicative of “the present.” This shift exacerbates the commodity’s abstraction, which only accelerates the axiomatic of capitalist decoding and the commensurate capture of desire within its order. The present form of capitalism makes commodities out of concepts, integrating them into the cycles of capital. Information and ideas circulate in a dizzying display of combinations, as long as there is profit to be made, and as long as the circulation remains within the parameters of a capitalist logic. Our reality is territorialized—coded and bound—according to the standards of capitalist domination. Communication operates as a mechanism of control by repeating and solidifying certain concepts which themselves codify existence according to the ideals of capitalism.

Deleuze and Guattari associate this type of communication with the work of the “creative class,” which has repackaged concept creation as the work of public relations agents, marketers, and advertisers.²⁷ They write: “these days, information technology, communications, and advertising are taking over the words ‘concept’ and ‘creative,’ and these ‘conceptualists’ constitute an arrogant breed that reveals the activity of selling to be capitalism’s supreme thought.”²⁸ Deleuze and Guattari intimate that the creativity of the creative class is understood as innovation on already present ideas (or products) and/or as a progression that is determined in advance by the “needs” of the market. These communicators are “imitators of art” who patch over the space of true creativity with marketable ideas: “the simulation of a packet of noodles has become the true concept, and the one who packages the product, commodity, or work of art has become the philosopher, conceptual persona, or artist.”²⁹

Thus, what is at issue is the transmutation in the concept of creativity itself. Deleuze and Guattari argue that capitalism operates through liberating flows of desire.³⁰ Because of the constant voraciousness necessary for its self-perpetuation, capitalism approximates the practice of creativity by constantly surpassing its own limits, exhausting every possible resource, which in turn facilitates the ideology that production pure and simple is creation and, by approximation, the consumption of commodities becomes a mere fetish for new products. To sustain its levels of production, requires a consumer class that is not motivated by the selection of products

Deleuzian Creativity and Fluxus Nomadology

but whose desires are calibrated solely to the consumption of products *tout court*, the fetishization of the new where the new just means materially new, nominally new, or new in terms of a different iteration. Following Marx's logic, these acts of consumption are formalized as the only possible "expressions of freedom" in this over-determined system.³¹ Marketing firms create entire campaigns around concepts of freedom and choice in order to support this incessant production, approximating ideals that appeal to their consumer-base all the while circumscribing their meaning. Reciprocally, the desire for more choices requires the constant "creation" of new products. This process has only been exacerbated in the last decades of corporatization and consumerism, where management discourse operates with the mantra, "innovate or die," indicating just how deeply the imperative for creativity has become enmeshed with corporate mentality.

Under the rubric of communication, creativity is understood as proliferation, production, or innovation, and these are all in service of a higher order of the logic of consumption—to make money by facilitating the unceasing production and consumption of commodities and to maintain the often-exploitative conditions that facilitate this order.³² Couple this with the fact that an entire industry of marketing and advertising was developed in order to promote the constant circulation of these virtual commodities, and we can now see how creativity is seen as synonymous with capitalist production and becomes, in and of itself, a key product to be circulated. Creativity becomes a transcendent mode of thinking, objectivized as the "concept of creativity."³³ What I mean by this is that, rather than some thing or some practice being creative or making a genuine contribution to changing the existential framework, the corporatist-consumerist world has created a commodity out of the concept of creativity itself, in the same way that choice and freedom have become commodified. By elevating creativity as the desired product, capitalism accomplishes its goal of maintaining itself through constant deterritorialization that has been carefully routed to produce a feedback loop of desire and energy. As Deleuze and Guattari make clear in *Anti-Oedipus*, fetishizing the new is really the capture and routinizing of desire rather than its liberation. Deleuze and Guattari recognize that capitalist production has come to guide the idea of creativity as the proliferation of options and choices, rather than any genuine thought about the creative as breaking with or challenging the status quo. Moreover, since the possibilities that it engenders are already laid out in advance, given that these choices are determined from within the parameters and needs of the capitalist system, creativity itself becomes commodified.

How can we respond to a world in which capitalism has spread itself over everything in an ever-expanding globalism and appropriated the creative for itself? In *Anti-Oedipus*, Deleuze and Guattari's energies are devoted to conceptualizing a revolutionary type of desire that disrupts the system and envisioning methods for liberating desire from capitalist enslavement, and we can situate their aims with regard to the revitalization of creativity as a counterpart to these goals. The answer, following Deleuze and Guattari, is that we must resist the present and the model of creativity it offers. At the conclusion of *What is Philosophy?*, Deleuze and Guattari attribute just such a role to the artist: "other artists are always needed to ... carry out necessary and perhaps greater destructions, thereby restoring to their predecessors the incommunicable novelty that we could no longer see."³⁴ The concept of creativity that has dominated our cultural landscape makes us blind to the truly creative act, one that actually creates something new rather than circulating fetishized facsimiles of newness. We need a different model of creativity; we need these "other" artists to turn the creative paradigm upside down in order that we begin to see what we no longer can see. Moreover, following the critique Deleuze makes of creativity understood as merely a form of proliferation and communication, creativity is something that requires a transformation of our lived reality, and cannot just be relayed as information or object to be consumed. The latter part of this essay is devoted to the creation of affects as a counter to capitalism's consumption of our desires and routing of our sensorial experience to its prerogatives. To liberate our desires, to resist control, and to exist in deterritorialized spaces is to become or participate in a nomadological existence that reinterprets from within those spatio-temporal dynamics—a creative immanence.

Now, several authors have noted that Deleuze and Guattari offer a critique of creativity and have sought in his work a revised account of creativity.³⁵ Often these contributors have drawn the distinction between the creative, the creator, or the created and Deleuzian creativity as one between creative *being* and creative *becoming* or processes. This seems like an accurate first step, though there are further resources to push this distinction much farther. My interpretation seeks to provide some nuance to these accounts through a particular set of textual and conceptual pairings. I wish to offer the contours of a potentially new model for creativity inspired by Deleuze's brief yet tantalizing remarks concerning creation: "creation traces a path between impossibilities ... taking place in bottlenecks ... A creator who isn't grabbed around the throat by a set of impossibilities is no creator."³⁶ This quote speaks to Deleuze's critique of capitalist appropriation

Deleuzian Creativity and Fluxus Nomadology

of the creative, where creativity is understood as the modification of already established ideas or the proliferation of choices and products within predetermined boundaries.

More directly, it involves Deleuze's philosophical critique of the possible as a categorical distinction rather than a change in kind, which can help us understand what is needed to liberate the concept of creativity. In his attempt to identify and advocate for what is distinctive and philosophically powerful about his new conception of the Virtual, Deleuze argues that the category of the possible is an empty form. He contends that the possible is opposed to the real merely as its conceptual double. The possible is "an image of the real, while the real is supposed to resemble the possible"; they merely re-duplicate each other, one as actual and the other as nonexistent but "possible."³⁷ If the real is merely the manifestation of the prefigured or predetermined field of possibilities, then the possible adds nothing new to the real and cannot go beyond the parameters of what is. Given that there is a conceptual identity between the two, with the only difference being that one refers to what already exists and the other to what does not, there can be nothing new thought within this paradigm. Often theories of creativity—even those that extend beyond stereotypical notions of the creative genius or the production of the new—are bound to notions of potentiality or possibility.³⁸ Rather than the realm of the possible, which Deleuze has always associated with linear temporality of the present (the Actual), creativity must tarry with the impossible (the Virtual), but what can this mean and how does one do it?³⁹

One answer, which Pelbart invokes in *Cartographies of Exhaustion*, is to interrogate Deleuze's notion of exhaustion.⁴⁰ Pelbart insists that we create by exhausting the possible. Pelbart likens this to a crisis in which the exhaustion of all possibilities corresponds to a "collective mutation, in the sense that what was once routine becomes intolerable."⁴¹ Pelbart describes exhaustion as an operation of disconnection, an unbinding of what captures and imprisons us, but he also presents exhaustion of the possible as a precondition for reaching some other mode of the possible. The possible, in the first sense, indicates only the previously determined past and present, while the second sense is directed toward the future.⁴² Aesthetically, this could mean pushing the boundaries of an art form to a point that is almost unrecognizable, causing the presumed rules of the genre to rearrange themselves, as one might say was the case with jazz's effect on music. Though I think Pelbart's intent is much more political than this and would include incorporating elements of social realities that

themselves are intolerable—to use the artwork as a space of confrontation where the intolerable is dramatized and inescapably present.

Yet, we must be very careful not to interpret exhaustion as a form of accelerationism, especially in light of the model of deterritorialization that we have associated with capitalism itself. Accelerationism has been touted as a political stance inspired by Deleuze and Guattari that addresses capitalism’s dynamic deterritorialization through accelerating forces (and strategically endorsing the impersonal processes of neoliberalism in order to bring it to its own destruction). On this view, exhaustion would mean exhausting all the possibilities inherent *in* the system. But the problem is that the system never exhausts itself of circulating concepts, forces, bodies, and affects in ever-renewed combinations meant to generate and mesmerize our desires. In other words, in a world where everything is possible, it would seem that nothing is possible to exhaust; and therefore there can be no real creation—only repetitive circulations. I argue that, rather than exhausting all possibles as in accelerationism, it is the *inexhaustible*—the idea that “you never realize all of the possible”—that exhausts the possible and that *this* is what it means to trace a path between impossibilities.⁴³ Creativity is not just invention of new things but recognition of the need to wrangle with inexhaustibility, the impossible.

II. Between Inexhaustibility and Resistance

It seems that Deleuze is participating in something of a counter-cultural zeitgeist—one which recognizes that the post-industrialist cult of creativity actually operates at the expense of another sense of creativity. Deleuze’s solution for breaking open the current regime of prepackaged desire and limitations of creative energies is to find ways to release counter-currents of desire that resist the way that the truly creative is occluded, a sentiment that finds its parallel in the practices of Fluxus. Allen Burkoff, in his commentary on Fluxus, explains how they embody this zeitgeist and provide a potential model for the liberation of social desire:

More than an art movement: Fluxus was a gigantic release of creative energy into human culture; along came this small band of Fluxus folks around the world who used radical art, strange activities, objects and performances in upside down creativity to reverse this narrowing down restrictive tendency in the evolution of human culture. They were huge cultural

Deleuzian Creativity and Fluxus Nomadology

tricksters ... by expanding and in some cases obliterating what we considered to be normal, interesting and human behavior to be. *These guys brought on the '60s ... expanded the potential and possibilities in human culture.*⁴⁴

This quote expresses the exhilaration of anticipatory potential that characterized this counter-cultural movement and—given that Fluxus has to a large extent receded from cultural memory—reminds us of how precarious these moments of resistance can be, especially in light of competing socio-economic forces and desires. It reminds us that resisting the present is an ongoing, inexhaustible task— always to come—and that teaches us that resistance must become fluent in mobility if it is to address the ever-increasing capture of desire by capitalist consumption.

This section addresses confluences between Deleuze's philosophy and Fluxus and asks, "How can Fluxus' upside down creativity help us resist these paralyzing forces of the contemporary world?" I am interested in the way that Fluxus upsets certain boundaries in the art world and releases a new set of forces therein not because I would replicate their practices but because we need to think about subversive affects in order to incorporate them into future practices. In other words, Fluxus is an example of the Deleuzian creative act, releasing new affective experiences. The affects of indeterminacy, inexhaustibility, and mobility that Fluxus produces are examples of creative resistance that delay, postpone, or even elude the present.

Dick Higgins describes the Fluxus theory of intermedia as a creative practice characterized by the fusions of existing mediums: as work that occupies the "uncharted land that lies between" existing categories of practice.⁴⁵ Their intermedial approach means that Fluxus performances operate within the paradigm of between-ness through the conscientious fusion of composition and performance, audience and performer, and aesthetic and mundane. Ken Friedman claims that intermedial art forms invoke a liminal state because they cross boundaries to establish new zones of interaction, understanding, cognition, and emotion.⁴⁶ This experience of threshold states that mark transitions and growth is like being swept up in a movement rather than participating in the disinterested contemplation of an object. This transitivity produces an affect of mobility, a zone of indeterminacy where the generative processes of life themselves can be felt; it is also meant to transform our experience of life and eliminate the subject/object boundaries that constitute us as subjective viewers

rather than intimate participants in a thoroughly interrelated complex of immanent becoming. Thus, Fluxus focuses on the process of creation itself rather than the created—and creates affects of movement that mirror life itself. As such, the artwork as event occupies the space of inexhaustibility through its provocation of incessant mobility.

Deleuze identifies the creative potential of the between as well, writing, “It’s not beginnings and endings that count, but middles. Things and thoughts advance or grow out from the middle, and that’s where you have to get to work, that’s where everything unfolds.”⁴⁷ What is important from a Deleuzian perspective is that Fluxus operates in a kind of spatio-temporal flux, finding the cracks and the fissures within the present in order to disrupt—or resist—the present. Fluxus occupies this in-between space as nomads who are in perpetual motion and transition. As such, through the multi-faceted paradigm of betweenness, Fluxus provides a model for the inexhaustible. In “The Exhausted,” Deleuze identifies four ways of exhausting the possible, the last two of which are “extenuating the potentialities of space” and “dissipating the power of the image.”⁴⁸ Elsewhere, I have identified six ways that the phenomena of Fluxus exemplifies a perpetual ‘in between.’⁴⁹ I will focus on three of these themes that help demonstrate the last two methods of exhausting the possible mentioned above: (1) the unity between art and life; (2) indeterminacy; and (3) infinite movement.

Unity Between Art and Life

Fluxus artists were pioneers in challenging the priority of the “object” in art, bringing mobility and life into the artwork and thereby bridging the distance between art and life.⁵⁰ They did this primarily through the infusion of performance aspects into work: action rather than materiality makes up the Fluxus artwork. In essence, “form in Fluxus is mobilized,”⁵¹ an attempt to prioritize the fluidity and movement in life over the artificiality of an immobile art object. As Maciunas explains, “Since artificiality implies human pre-determination, contrivance, a truer concretist *rejects pre-determination of final form* in order to perceive the reality of nature, the course of which, like that of man himself is largely indeterminate and unpredictable.”⁵² Just as life is ongoing and open-ended, they reconceived the artwork as a between-space constituted as much by distances, movements, holes, gaps, and silences as by constituent objects or final form.⁵³ This is paradigmatically evident in the phenomenon of the “event score,” which epitomizes the idea of artwork-in-flux on temporal and spatial levels. These

Deleuzian Creativity and Fluxus Nomadology

event scores typically consist of a set of minimal directions that can either be interpreted and performed, or taken up as objects of contemplation. The event score challenges the commonplace understanding or function of the artwork itself.

In these Fluxus events, the boundaries of the work and its surroundings are often dissolved. The performance aspect of the event score is, of course, but one way that this dissolution of distance is accomplished, as it focuses spatial dynamics and movement rather than reinforcing a clear subject/object divide that is incumbent to traditional object-oriented artworks.⁵⁴ But even among performance-based works, Fluxus event score events are unique in their attempt to include the audience member in the performance itself. This is yet another way of bridging the distance between art and life, by literally breaking down the barrier between the artistry on the stage and what is being viewed by the real-life audience.

A common characteristic of event scores is that they highlight everyday actions and quotidian objects, another instance of the marriage of art and life. George Brecht, for instance, describes his work as an attempt to attain “the smallest unit of the situation,” claiming that this was to ensure that “the details of everyday life, the random constellations of objects that surround us, stop going unnoticed.”⁵⁵ Simple instructions—such as for Brecht’s ‘Three Lamp Event’, whose bullet-pointed instructions read: (1) off.on; (2) on.off; (3) lamp—provide that they can be performed anywhere and by anyone, drawing attention to our most quotidian practices. In a retrospective piece entitled “Forty Years of Fluxus,” Ken Friedman explains the idea of the unity of art and life more precisely: “When Fluxus was established, the conscious goal was to erase the boundaries between art and life... Today, it is clear that the radical contribution Fluxus made to art was to suggest that there is no boundary to be erased... Another way to put it is to say that art and life are part of a unified field of reference, a single context.”⁵⁶ Typically, commentators refer to this as Fluxus’ elevation of the overlooked realm of the mundane through use of everyday objects or activities in performance.

Although many associate Fluxus’ unity of art and life with a Duchamp-esque preoccupation with found objects, I argue that the more fecund reference is John Cage’s focus on immanent surroundings and reconfiguration of music as a marriage of ambient sound and art in 4’33”. Cage’s performance “invites the audience to a multi-sensorial aesthetic appreciation of all events unfolding in time-space” and provides a model for Flux-events to come.⁵⁷ The difference that I want to underscore is between

objects as *representing* the everyday in Duchamp and the Cagean or Fluxus artwork as an event: a space in which the unity between art and life arises and happens to us in a way that provokes a new form of sensibility and a new conception of life.

Thus, it is in the manner that these quotidian objects are treated that elevates this practice beyond merely underscoring the conflation of art and the everyday. Take for example George Brecht's 1962 performance, *Drip Music*. The score offers these simple instructions: "a source of dripping water and an empty vessel are arranged so that the water falls into the vessel."⁵⁸ None of the elements are specified completely. Neither is how this arrangement should be assembled. The sparsity of instruction means that the particularities of its enactment are extremely open-ended. Moreover, the dripping water is the sole movement in this score. Imagine an audience striving to understand this piece, wondering if there is more, recognizing finally that the methodical dripping of the water is meant to produce the whole soundscape, to fill the art space. The elimination of the familiar trappings of performance deepens the engagement, the immersion of audience and work. The incessant and stark drip, drip, drip of the performance exposes the audience to a bare multiplicity, and like Cage's *4'33'*, provokes a new kind of attention—by breaking the plane of expectation in performance through this bare repetition, the performance is meant to induce a change "in kind" in the audience itself. The audience has to grapple with frustration of their expectations, which is to say that a performance will have some linearity, some narrative, some action, while attempting to understand the purpose of something so mundane. The sparsity of audio and visual stimulation has the effect of absorption rather than the more traditional distraction or stimulation. Higgins describes this as an experience of immersion: "the silence is absolutely numbing, so much of the environment has the piece become."⁵⁹

This appeal to quotidian, ambient sounds produced by the simple dripping of water awakens our senses to the world in which we are immersed: the idea that there would be an inexhaustible source of sound, music, and instrument if only we were sensitive to it and attuned to the small shifts, cadences, and contrapuntal relations of our environments—creative immanence. Brecht says: "there is perhaps nothing that is not musical. There's no moment in life that's not musical ... All instruments, musical or not, become instruments."⁶⁰ These art-events open a space in which we experience the merging of art and life, and the possibility of something new arising through the void and silence of that very fusion.

Deleuzian Creativity and Fluxus Nomadology

Thus, we may understand the coupling of art and life as a kind of becoming which signifies the reinvigoration of the concept of life itself—very much akin to Deleuze’s reorientation of ontology as a heterogenetic field of becoming populated by creative forces whose future is always indeterminate.⁶¹ Fluxus’ transformation of the art object—the event score in particular—reveals what Deleuze would call the ontological reality of creative immanence. Deleuze views the plane of immanence as an intrinsically creative process characterized not by discrete objects or things but by continuous flows. Fluxus’ unification of art and life has the potential to make us aware of this pre-personal and immanent space from which events, affects, and objects arise to become sensitive to immanence itself. As Owen Smith explains, “the idea that art is part of life ... and should therefore imitate the universal processes of flux and change” was central to Fluxus, and this resonates with Deleuze’s ontology of creative becoming.⁶² As Deleuze says, “Life alone creates such zones where living beings whirl around, and only art can reach and penetrate them in its enterprise of co-creation.”⁶³

Fluxus aims to disrupt ordinary perception in order to transform our very relation to the everyday. It is an imperative that corresponds to Deleuze and Guattari’s critique of creativity under capitalism to which I alluded earlier: it is not enough to create new things if the system in which we are immersed remains untouched. Fluxus’ aim is to change the very nature of perception, as Deleuze’s aim is to disrupt the very foundation of capitalist desire. Fluxus tries to provoke this new sensibility by radically challenging the parameters of various art forms and tarrying with their liminal boundaries, in order to break them open and exhaust their latent and unknown potentialities.

Indeterminacy

As we have seen, one of the indices of the event score’s relation to life, as well as one of the key features of Deleuze’s concept of becoming, is open-endedness, a feature which forms a bridge to our next form of inexhaustibility—indeterminacy. With the event score, the possibility of multiple temporal realizations guided by the most minimal of instructions implies a special cadence that is both iterative *and* indeterminate—a kind of Derridean iterability that succeeds in overcoming mere repetition. What is accomplished is akin to Deleuze’s dramatization of the event wherein more and more of the virtual aspect of the event is brought forth. The

model of the event score is to provide instructions that may involve the audience, challenge the performers to undertake spontaneous tasks, or be approached as contemplative spurs. These instructions are purposefully ambiguous or open-ended, hence, event scores provide flexible road maps with unforeseeable consequences—an inexhaustible futurity. Fluxus takes this prerogative to a radical extreme—devising situations that seek to privilege the unknown, by incorporating ambiguity into the score instructions, relying on audience participation which cannot be anticipated, and shifting situational constructs.⁶⁴ The multiplicity of context and inherent variability parallel the Deleuzian event, which invokes an infinite virtual field—the paradigm of inexhaustibility. Considered to be the first event labeled as Fluxus, the 1962 performance of Philip Corner’s *Piano Activities* at the *International Festival of the Newest Music* in Wiesbaden, Germany, is a paradigmatic example of the way that indeterminacy permeates the Fluxus ethos.⁶⁵ Corner provided a score with a minimum of notation and instructions, and the performers radically interpreted it to include a methodical yet random destruction of the piano as Nam June Paik plays it. The traditional sounds of the piano were “accompanied by brutal noises such as splintering wood, scratching, tearing, crushing, rubbing, hammering, that sound at times like a bomb assault was happening, and sometimes more like an unobtrusive clattering.”⁶⁶ The resulting performance was shocking to the audience, producing gaps in the audience’s expectations both in terms of the temporality of the performance (what could possibly come next) and in terms of the challenge to musical form itself. The score was meant to transcend the usual parameters of musicality and open up the possibilities of sound: to “shape something coherent out of the chaotic reservoir of sounds [residing] in the instrument and to broaden the field of possibilities for freedom in performance.”⁶⁷ It represents the breaking open of the art form from within. As the performance continues, “improvisation makes itself heard, as the players produce the most refined dynamics, relate to each other, create collective noise landscapes, and allow single sounds.”⁶⁸ A space opens; a new sensibility is born; a line of flight is released.

Perpetual Movement

Natasha Lushetich develops comparable themes of inexhaustibility through movement, transitivity, and indeterminacy by comparing Fluxus event scores to the perpetuum mobile: an object that translates input energy into motion in a perpetual cycle which also creates repercussive

Deleuzian Creativity and Fluxus Nomadology

motion in objects with which it comes into contact.⁶⁹ Because of its open-endedness and interactive nature—as well as its temporality, which resembles Bergsonian duration rather than linear temporality—“the *event score* generates perpetual performance and triggers cross-categorical ways of being and acting in the world.”⁷⁰ Lushetich shows how Brecht’s 1961 “Two Elimination Events” exemplifies a perpetual motion machine through the undecidability of its simple phrase, “Empty vessel. Empty vessel.” It is in the ambiguity of the language itself that the perpetual motion resides. Rather than just a basic repetition, the simple phrase actually defies interpretation. The phrase vacillates between assertion, conjuring an object, instruction to perform, temporal description, and prescription of how to empty, dismantling boundaries between work, audience, and performer, and disrupting the temporality of the work itself. All of the modes of interpretation given above are simultaneously present in the score, thus evincing a principle of undecidability, which Lushetich describes as perpetual movement or slippage between senses and concepts.⁷¹

We have seen how the event score explores the potentialities of space and opens up the concept of a vibrating, moving conception of betweenness (like the *perpetuum mobile* created by the score, “Empty Vessel, Empty Vessel”). Deleuze suggests that a certain kind of image approaches exhaustion with its power “to produce a void or create holes, to loosen the tourniquet of words, to mop up the transpiration of the voices.”⁷² Event scores create these vacuoles and intervals through their merging of art and life, their elevation of indeterminacy, their disruption of the commonplace, and their attention to immersive silences, pauses, and ubiquitous repetition. The tacit acknowledgement of the multiplicity of potentialities in each inexhaustible moment opens a space in which they can therefore arise. Thus, exhaustion reflects the fact that the interval in which the image arises is itself a “process” that is “no longer concerned with the objects to be combined but solely the objectless journey”—as event.⁷³ Thus the two characteristics of exhaustion necessary to “abolish the real”—(1) the most extreme indeterminacy and (2) the pursuit of the formless—are manifest in Fluxus performance and artworks. Indeterminacy was a form of resistance for Fluxus: resistance to the political and cultural present as well as what they considered to be an underlying perceptual passivity. Through these events, Fluxus promotes a conception of life “based on ambiguities, ruptures, and incongruities.”⁷⁴ Thus, the unity of art and life means that life is finally understood in its full complexity and living movement.

III. Conclusion: Fluxus Practices as Nomadological Events

By introducing movement into form and transitivity into the artwork, Fluxus practices are nomadological events. There have been attempts to interpret Fluxus as nomadological based on their international composition and movements. I differentiate my position, first, because I want to locate the nomadological moment within the artwork, not as a descriptor of their membership. Second, I worry that the latter perspective risks being too literal or importing subsequent interpretations of nomadism that lead to a less precise interpretation of the term, possibly occluding its conceptual nuance. Therefore it is important to go back to what Deleuze and Guattari mean by nomadology. First, in terms of conceptual persona, they differentiate nomads from migrants. While migrants move from point to point, the nomad exists in the *intermezzo*, the between of two points. In nomadology, what happens in between is more important than the goal of reaching another point. In other words, nomads do not necessarily move; they occupy space differently. Nomads distribute themselves in a constantly renegotiated open space, a *nomos* that is experimental and fluid. Thus, Deleuze and Guattari are not advocating that everyone literally uproot themselves, become nomads and roam the earth; they are suggesting that nomadology reveals a different way of being in relation to space and others that can be incorporated and mobilized for political activity and change. It offers a way of living outside the model of the state apparatus, which preserves itself vociferously through domination and control of spaces to make social order and rule intractably sedentary. The wandering or movement that happens via nomadology happens in place.

Voyage in place: that is the name of all intensities, even if they also develop in extension. To think is to voyage... what distinguishes the two kinds of voyages is neither a measurable quantity of movement, nor something that would be only in the mind, but the mode of spatialization, the manner of being in space, of being for space.⁷⁵

Thus, nomadology is both topological, characterized by a constantly shifting borderline, always in tension with the existing dominant social order, and noological, a critical consciousness of constantly questioning and resisting socially coded or rote paradigms.⁷⁶ A nomadological consciousness would be one that is prepared by the sensitivity to immanent life that I have advocated—a sensitivity to the affects of indeterminacy, the otherwise imperceptible, the vacuoles and holes that leave room for the future within

Deleuzian Creativity and Fluxus Nomadology

the present and can be the inspiration for drawing creative intersections and new lines of development. The affects of Fluxus prepare the sensibility necessary for the critical consciousness that is nomadology.

As Harren suggests, Fluxus' "variability enacted a dismantling, unworking, and reconstruction of the very meaning of form."⁷⁷ Thus, there is a principle of *désœuvrement* at work in Fluxus. Its formlessness—or propensity to reinvent, mutate, and transform—helps us understand Fluxus as a community without community.⁷⁸ This is interesting because not only does it provide a framework for a new nomadological way of being towards others that does not take identification and therefore exclusion as its paradigm; it also offers a re-conception of the artwork as an entity that can survive through transmutations.⁷⁹ Fluxus provides a model for art as nomadological, for affects that can become detached and extracted from their art object and reconnected for future becomings.

Finally, by applying the understanding of nomadology as a transformation of the spatiotemporal dynamics from within, I wonder if we can conceive of the Fluxus sensibility as having transcended the art world altogether and Fluxus' creative energy as having seeped into the cultural landscape. From one of the founding members of Fluxus: "The Fluxus of 1992 is not the Fluxus of 1962 and if it pretends to be—then it is fake. The real Fluxus moves out from its old center into many directions, and the paths are not easy to recognize without lining up new pieces, middle pieces and old pieces together."⁸⁰ Though for some it would seem to suggest that Fluxus is no more, that this spilling over is a kind of dissipation; perhaps by considering Deleuze's concept of virtuality we can understand that this giant release of creative energy never ceased to exist but went underground. Rolnik's work is quite suggestive in this respect. The energy and desire that has been "pimped out", i.e. captured by capitalism, doesn't have to remain so. If Fluxus can be considered an ongoing social practice that has moved underground, it can become nomadic again—it can flow. So where did that upside-down counter-cultural creativity go? It is here, persistently operating *within* and *between* the cracks and fissures of our world if only we become sensitive to it; this would truly be a minor art in Deleuze's sense, an art that happens in the intervals. Deleuze says that language can renew itself and creativity can be renewed in exhaustion—moving from the realm of the possible to the impossible, being attuned to the *imprévisible* and unimaginable that gets refused as so much detritus when it does not sync up with imperatives of growth and innovation as the indices of success that dominate this particular present; "it rises up or becomes taut in its holes, its

gaps or its silences” where others, even, have ceased to believe it is possible and where the mainstream and capitalist elite has no purchase.⁸¹

The idea is that salvation does not come from the outside; there is no eschatological future, only the eviscerated hull of a present that we have to mine. Deleuze says that a people, a future, is only made possible out of great need. We should look to those whose lives that have been made impossible by capitalism, to places where global exploitation and political erasure have created unassimilable pockets which render capitalist discourse and idealizations nonsensical and moot, in order to humbly see what kind of future and what kinds of creativity comes out of these exhausted spaces and struggles. For Deleuze, the future (minor) people, future (minor) humanity, will be a bastard people, inferior, dominated, always in becoming, always incomplete,” one that renders the values of the present, including forms of the creative that merely replicate the ideals of capital, preposterous—impossible.⁸² “Men’s only hope lies in a revolutionary becoming; the only way of casting off their shame or responding to what is intolerable.”⁸³

True change and true creativity indicate a transformation in kind rather than merely the perpetuation of the new. The “to have done with” implicit in the concept of exhaustion does not indicate an ending, but the possibility of a new beginning which has to clear away the prerogatives of a present that do not leave space for it. One way to prepare for this future is to recognize that we have to change the models that we use and the affects that we engage with. The first step would be to make people aware that these intervals and spaces exist—to find ways to hold them open. Creating and perpetuating openings and intervals, making manifest the oft-overlooked “between” where the minor, the forgotten, the exhausted reside. The forces of the future will not and should not take the same form of the elitist “creative class” mentality that papers over inequality, rejects real imaginative difference for a facsimile of creation as sleight of hand difference and trademarked innovation. Creative resistance means opening up spaces in which we can heed the cries of those whose suffering is like birthing pains bringing a new necessity into a world that has become impossible for them—if only we have the ears to hear it. Art that makes us aware of impossibility itself, that, like Fluxus, focuses on the perpetuation of the between as an inexhaustible resource, can prepare us for this transformation in kind of creation.

Deleuzian Creativity and Fluxus Nomadology

Notes

- 1 Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *What is Philosophy?*, trans. H. Tomlinson and G. Burchell (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), 108 (italics indicate authors' original emphasis).
- 2 Paul Klee, *Paul Klee on Modern Art* (London: Faber and Faber, 1966).
- 3 From the mid-1940's onward, Adorno warns against the leveling and pacifying effects of the culture industry, perpetuated by capitalism. In 1964, Susan Sontag identified a new sensibility in the art world that "sees everything in quotation marks" and "converts the serious into the frivolous," a harbinger of the demise of a certain countercultural and political energy. In terms of the growing suspicion of consumer takeover of culture, one can look to figures such as Adorno and Marcuse. Also in 1964 in *One-Dimensional Man*, Marcuse argues that cultural distractions render us too comfortable to revolt. Theodor Adorno, *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture* (London: Routledge, 1991); Susan Sontag, "Notes on 'Camp,'" In *Against Interpretation: And Other Essays* (New York: Picador, 2001), 280 & 277; Herbert Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964).
- 4 Stephen Wilmer, "After Dada: Fluxus as a Nomadic Art Movement," *New Theatre Quarterly* 33, no. 1 (2017): 59.
- 5 It is Piece Four of Sylvano Bussotti's *Five Piano Pieces for David Tudor*. Bogue calls it the most important image in the book, an example of rhizomatic art prefatory of not only the first plateau, but the book as a whole. See Ronald Bogue, "Scoring the Rhizome: Bussotti's Musical Diagram," *Deleuze Studies*, 8, no. 4 (2014): 470-490.
- 6 See Janae Sholtz, "Concluding Event," in *The Invention of a People: Heidegger and Deleuze on Art and the Political* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2015), 265-279.

- 7 Rob Pope, *Creativity: Theory, History, Practice*, (USA: Routledge, 2005), 19.
- 8 Ibid, 40.
- 9 Gerald Raunig, Gene Ray and Ulf Wuggenig, "On the Strange Case of 'Creativity' and its Troubled Resurrection," In *Critique of Creativity: Precarity, Subjectivity and Resistance in the 'Creative Industries'*, ed. Gerald Raunig, Gene Ray and Ulf Wuggenig (United Kingdom: MPG Books Group, 2011), 1. 2011, 1.
- 10 Pope, *Creativity*, 41.
- 11 Geoff Pfeifer, "The Question of Capitalist Desire: Deleuze and Guattari with Marx," *Continental Thought and Theory A Journal of Intellectual Freedom* 1, no. 4 (October 2017): 256
- 12 Simon Hajdini, "Capitalism and Repetition: Marx and Lacan," *Crisis and Critique* 1, no. 3, (2014): 224.
- 13 Tucker, Robert (ed), *The Marx Engels Reader* (New York and London: Norton, 1978), 305.
- 14 Pfeifer, "The Question of Capitalist Desire," 256.
- 15 Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 29.
- 16 See Dan Smith, Deleuze and the Question of Desire: Toward an Immanent Theory of Ethics," *Parrhesia*, No.2 (2007): 73.
- 17 Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. R. Hurley, M. Seem, and H. R. Lane (Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1983), 229.
- 18 Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 224.
- 19 Sulie Rolnik, "The Geopolitics of Pimping," trans. Brian Holmes, in *Critique of Creativity: Precarity, Subjectivity and Resistance in the 'Creative Industries'*, ed. Gerald Raunig, Gene Ray and Ulf Wuggenig (United Kingdom: MPG Books Group, 2011), 28.
- 20 Rolnik, "The Geopolitics of Pimping," 29.
- 21 Pope, *Creativity*, 13.

Deleuzian Creativity and Fluxus Nomadology

- 22 Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 259.
- 23 Deleuze and Guattari say that monetary flows are perfectly schizophrenic but bounded by the immanent axiomatic of capitalism—putting these in service of the capitalist order and that capitalism constantly arrests the schizo process and turns the subject of this process into a confined clinical entity (*Anti-Oedipus*, 246-7).
- 24 Gilles Deleuze, “What is the Creative Act?,” in *Two Regimes of Madness, Texts and Interviews 1976-1995*. edited by David Lapoujade, trans. A. Hodges, and M. Taormina (Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2007), 323-4.
- 25 Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 30.
- 26 See Deleuze, *What is Philosophy?*, 3, 7 40, 108, and 207.
- 27 Richard Florida suggests that a “creative class,” defined as innovative professionals such as programmers, designers, and information workers, will contribute to the reinvigoration of urban areas and the rise of a new economic and social order. Florida’s work is an example of the thorough imbrication of creativity and market forces, as well as the exclusivity of “creative class” based on a certain model of capitalist success. Since its publication, many critics have noted that Florida’s work did not account for how the innovations of the so-called creative class mainly service the needs of a particular class at the expense of lower-income neighborhoods. Florida, himself, came to recognize that the social emphasis on consumption and rising inequalities are significant barriers to his optimistic vision. See Richard Florida, *The Rise of the Creative Class and How It’s Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life*, (New York: Basic Books, 2004); Richard Florida, “The Rise of the Creative Class Revisited.” Citilab June 25, 2012, <https://www.citylab.com/life/2012/06/rise-creative-class-revisited/2220/>
- 28 Gilles Deleuze, *Negotiations*, 1972-1990, trans. M. Joughin (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), 137.
- 29 Deleuze and Guattari, *What is Philosophy?*, 10.
- 30 See Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*.

- 31 See Steven Shaviro, "Capitalism, Consumerism, and Waste," *The Pinocchio Theory*. July 21, 2008. <http://www.shaviro.com/Blog/?p=651>, accessed April 2017.
- 32 Raunig, et al, "On the Strange Case," 4.
- 33 Emma Jeanes, "Resisting Creativity, Creating the New. A Deleuzian Perspective on Creativity," *Creativity and Innovation Management* 15, no. 2 (2006), 127-8.
- 34 Deleuze and Guattari, *What is Philosophy?*, 204.
- 35 Pope, *Creativity*; Jeanes 2006.
- 36 Deleuze, *Negotiations*, 133.
- 37 Deleuze, Gilles. *Difference and Repetition*. trans. P. Patton (New York: Columbia Press, 1994), 211-212.
- 38 Pope, *Creativity*, xvi.
- 39 For Deleuze, the Virtual is a category that "possess a full reality by itself," only yet to be determined (Deleuze and Guattari, *What is Philosophy?*, 211).
- 40 Deleuze delineates two modes: *l'exhaustif*, (the science of exhausting the possible) and *l'exhausté* (one who renounces all need, goal, preference, or significance). Gilles Deleuze, "The Exhausted," trans. *SubStance* 24, no. 3. Issue 78. (1995), 5.
- 41 Peter Pál Pelbart, *Cartographies of Exhaustion: Nihilism Inside Out*, trans. J. Laudenberger, F. R. Palazuelos (Minneapolis: Univocal Publishing, 2015), 129-30.
- 42 Pelbart *Cartographies of Exhaustion*, 128.
- 43 Deleuze "The Exhausted," 3.
- 44 Burkoff, Alan "What is Fluxus?" You Tube Video, 4.35. April 2012, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cGZ9OS1Oj14> (transcribed from recorded interview)

Deleuzian Creativity and Fluxus Nomadology

- 45 Dick Higgins, "The Origin of 'Happening,'" *American Speech* 51, no. 3-4 (1976): 271; Dick Higgins, "Intermedia," *Leonardo* 34, no. 1 (2001): 49-50.
- 46 Ken Friedman, "Freedom? Nothingness? Time? Fluxus and the Laboratory of Ideas," *Theory Culture Society* 29, no. 7-8. (2012): 392.
- 47 Deleuze, *Negotiations*, 161.
- 48 Deleuze, "The Exhausted," 12.
- 49 "(1) temporally, as event, with no distinct beginning, or origin, and no end; (2) in terms of its composition, Fluxus is heterogeneous and hybrid. It is never possible to specify its full meaning nor its membership; (3) in terms of genre, it is anti-art, and by liberating affects from traditional modes of expression, scrambles significance, order, and purpose; (4) in terms of its aesthetic, it is in between art and life; (5) topologically, it embraces the paradigm of de-centering and offers us a way of envisioning artworks as mobile processes, rather than stable objects, and, finally, (6) for its overall paradigm, it bears the mark of indeterminacy. It accomplishes this aim by embracing uncertainty and risking randomness." Sholtz, *The Invention of a People*, 266.
- 50 Natilee Harren, *Objects without Object: The Artwork in Flux 1958-1969* (PhD diss., UCLA, 2013). <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/57q9d2m9>.
- 51 Harren, *Objects without Object*, 36.
- 52 George Maciunas, "Neo-Dada in Music, Theater, Poetry, Art," in *In the Spirit of Fluxus*, ed. Elizabeth Armstrong and Joan Rothfuss (Minneapolis: Walker Art Center, 1993), 157.
- 53 "Although Fluxus has often been historically categorized as a direction in the visual arts, it was in fact first and foremost a performance arts organization." See Owen Smith, *Fluxus the History of an Attitude* California: San Diego State University, 1998), 54.

54 Just to be clear, I am not saying that performance-art as such is “unique to Fluxus” but that it is a central component of their work; the emphasis on performance as well as the particular kind of performance is what is important. Even in the realm of performed pieces, what Fluxus was doing was considered avant-garde (as was the work of John Cage in the musical realm, which is the inspiration for Fluxus experimentations with chance and indeterminacy). I am building up a general description of the nature of an event score. One aspect is that it confounds the tendency to think of art as object; another is that event scores introduce challenges to certain parameters within the genre of performance-based art.

55 Brecht, George. “The Origin of Events,” in *Happening & Fluxus: Materialien*, exhibition catalogue, ed. H. Sohm (Cologne: Kölnischer Kunstverein, 1970), unnumbered.

56 Friedman, Ken. “Forty Years of Fluxus,” 2002. Accessed February 9, 2018. <http://www.mostowa2.net/angelpastor/kfriedman40yearsoffluxus.html>

57 Natasha Lushetich, “The Event Score as a Perpetuum Mobile,” *Text and Performance* 32, no. 1 (2012): 2.

58 George Brecht’s event score, *Drip Music (Drip Event)* (1959). See Ken Friedman, Owen Smith, and Lauren Sawchyn (Eds.), *The Fluxus Performance Workbook* (Performance Research e-Publications, 2002), 22.

59 Quote by Higgins in reference to his reaction to Satie’s “Vexations,” repeated 840 times in a 24hr performance. See Natasha Lushetich, *Fluxus: The Practice of Non-Duality* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2014, 50).

60 Darwent, Charles. “George Brecht: Composer and Artist with the Fluxus Movement Who Pioneered Conceptual Art.” *Independent* (obituaries). March 17, 2009.

61 Deleuze and Guattari *What is Philosophy?*, 199.

62 Smith, *Fluxus the History of an Attitude*, 235.

63 Deleuze and Guattari, *What is Philosophy?*, 173

Deleuzian Creativity and Fluxus Nomadology

- 64 Smith, *Fluxus the History of an Attitude*, 227.
- 65 The score is printed in Alison Knowles, Thomas Schmit, Benjamin Patterson, and Phil Corner, *The Four Suits* (New York: Something Else Press, 1965), 166–168.
- 66 “Piano Activities: FluxClang! Sensational uncovered Source of Fluxus Movement History” from *Klavierzerstörungen in Kunst und Popkultur* (Berlin: Reimer, 2012), accessed April 2017. <http://piano-activities.de/englindex.html>
- 67 “Piano Activities: FluxClang!”
- 68 “Piano Activities: FluxClang!”
- 69 Lushetich, “The Event Score as a Perpetuum Mobile,” 1-19.
- 70 Lushetich “The Event Score as a Perpetuum Mobile,” 1.
- 71 Lushetich, *Fluxus: The Practice of Non-Duality*, 49-50.
- 72 Deleuze, “The Exhausted,” 12.
- 73 Ibid.
- 74 Smith, *Fluxus the History of an Attitude*, 234.
- 75 Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia Volume 2*. trans. B. Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005), 482.
- 76 Ibid, 351–87.
- 77 Harren, *Objects without Object*, 32.
- 78 Ibid, 28.
- 79 Ibid, 32.
- 80 “Fluxus Portal for the Internet.” Fluxus Portal. 2006. Accessed July 17, 2017. <http://www.fluxus.org>
- 81 Deleuze, “The Exhausted,” 12.

82 Gilles Deleuze, *Essays Critical and Clinical*, trans. M. Greco and D. Smith (University of Minnesota Press, 1997), 14.

83 Gilles Deleuze, "Gilles Deleuze in conversation with Antonio Negri," trans. Martin Joughin, *Futur Anterieur* 1, (Spring 1990). Accessed January 2018. <http://www.generation-online.org/p/fpdeleuze3.htm>

Deleuzian Creativity and Fluxus Nomadology

References

- Adorno, Theodor. *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture*. London: Routledge, 1991.
- Bogue, Ronald. "Scoring the Rhizome: Bussotti's Musical Diagram." *Deleuze Studies*, 8, no. 4 (2014). 470-490.
- Braidotti, Rosi. *Nomadic Subjects: Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2011.
- Brecht, George. "The Origin of Events," in *Happening & Fluxus: Materialien*, exhibition catalogue, edited by H. Sohm, unnumbered, Cologne: Kölnischer Kunstverein, 1970.
- Burkoff, Alan "What is Fluxus?" You Tube Video, 4.35. April 2012, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cGZ9OS1Oj14>.
- Darwent, Charles. "George Brecht: Composer and Artist with the Fluxus Movement Who Pioneered Conceptual Art." *Independent* (obituaries). March 17, 2009. <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/obituaries/george-brecht-composer-and-artist-with-the-fluxus-movement-who-pioneered-conceptual-art-1646481.html>
- Deleuze, Gilles. "Gilles Deleuze in conversation with Antonio Negri." Trans. Martin Joughin, *Futur Anterieur* 1, (Spring 1990). Accessed January 2018. <http://www.generation-online.org/p/fpdeleuze3.htm>.
- . *Difference and Repetition*. Trans. P. Patton. New York: Columbia Press, 1994.
- . *Negotiations, 1972-1990*. Trans. M. Joughin. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.
- . "The Exhausted." Trans. *SubStance* 24, no. 3. Issue 78 (1995). 3-28.
- . *Essays Critical and Clinical*. Trans. M. Greco and D. Smith. University of Minnesota Press, 1997.
- . *Francis Bacon: Logic of Sensation*. Trans. D. Smith. University of Minnesota Press, 2005.

- . “What is the Creative Act?” In *Two Regimes of Madness, Texts and Interviews 1976-1995*. edited by David Lapoujade, Trans. A. Hodges, and M. Taormina, 312-324. Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2007.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Trans. R. Hurley, M. Seem, and H. R. Lane. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1983.
- . *What is Philosophy?* Trans. H. Tomlinson and G. Burchell. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.
- . *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia Volume 2*. Trans. B. Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005.
- Florida, Richard. *The Rise of the Creative Class and How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life*. New York: Basic Books, 2004.
- . “The Rise of the Creative Class Revisited.” *Citilab* June 25, 2012. Accessed January 2018. <https://www.citylab.com/life/2012/06/rise-creative-class-revisited/2220/>.
- “Fluxus Portal for the Internet.” Fluxus Portal. 2006. Accessed July 17, 2017. <http://www.fluxus.org>.
- Friedman, Ken. “Forty Years of Fluxus.” 2002. Accessed February 9, 2018. <http://www.mostowa2.net/angelpastor/kfriedman40yearsoffluxus.html>.
- . “Freedom? Nothingness? Time? Fluxus and the Laboratory of Ideas.” *Theory Culture Society* 29, no. 7-8 (2012). 372-398.
- Friedman, Ken, Owen Smith, and Lauren Sawchyn (Eds.), *The Fluxus Performance Workbook*. Performance Research e-Publications, 2002.
- Hajdini, Simon. “Capitalism and Repetition: Marx and Lacan.” *Crisis and Critique* 1, no. 3, (2014). 223-244.
- Harren, Natilee. *Objects without Object: The Artwork in Flux 1958-1969*, PhD diss., UCLA, 2013. <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/57q9d2m9>.
- Higgins, Dick. “The Origin of ‘Happening.’” *American Speech* 51, nos. 3-4 (1976). 271.

Deleuzian Creativity and Fluxus Nomadology

- . “Intermedia.” *Leonardo* 34, no. 1 (2001). 49-54.
- Jeanes, Emma. “Resisting Creativity, Creating the New. A Deleuzian Perspective on Creativity.” *Creativity and Innovation Management* 15, no. 2 (2006): 127-134.
- Klee, Paul. *Paul Klee on Modern Art*. London: Faber and Faber, 1966.
- Knowles, Alison, Thomas Schmit, Benjamin Patterson, and Phil Corner. *The Four Suits*. New York: Something Else Press, 1965.
- Lushetich, Natasha. “The Event Score as a Perpetuum Mobile.” *Text and Performance* 32, no. 1 (2012). 1-19.
- . *Fluxus: The Practice of Non-Duality*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2014.
- Maciunas, George. “Neo-Dada in Music, Theater, Poetry, Art.” In *In the Spirit of Fluxus*, edited by Elizabeth Armstrong and Joan Rothfuss, 156–57. Minneapolis: Walker Art Center, 1993.
- Marcuse, Herbert. *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.
- Pelbart, Peter Pál. *Cartographies of Exhaustion: Nihilism Inside Out*, Trans. J. Laudenberger, F. R. Palazuelos. Minneapolis: Univocal Publishing, 2015.
- Pfeifer, Geoff. “The Question of Capitalist Desire: Deleuze and Guattari with Marx.” *Continental Thought and Theory A Journal of Intellectual Freedom* 1, no. 4 (October 2017). 254-269.
- Pope, Rob. *Creativity: Theory, History, Practice*, USA: Routledge, 2005.
- Raunig, Gerald, Gene Ray and Ulf Wuggenig. “On the Strange Case of ‘Creativity’ and its Troubled Resurrection.” In *Critique of Creativity: Precarity, Subjectivity and Resistance in the ‘Creative Industries’*, edited by Gerald Raunig, Gene Ray and Ulf Wuggenig, 1-7. United Kingdom: MPG Books Group, 2011.
- Rolnik, Sulie. “The Geopolitics of Pimping.” Trans. Brian Holmes, In *Critique of Creativity: Precarity, Subjectivity and Resistance in the ‘Creative Industries’*, edited by Gerald Raunig, Gene Ray and Ulf Wuggenig, 23-40. United Kingdom: MPG Books Group, 2011.

- Schmidt, Gunnar. "Piano Activities: FluxClang! Sensational uncovered Source of Fluxus Movement History" from *Klavierzerstörungen in Kunst und Popkultur*. Berlin: Reimer, 2012. <http://piano-activities.de/englindex.html>.
- Shaviro, Steven. "Capitalism, Consumerism, and Waste." *The Pinocchio Theory*. July 21, 2008. Accessed April 2017. <http://www.shaviro.com/Blog/?p=651>.
- Sholtz, Janae. *The Invention of a People: Heidegger and Deleuze on Art and the Political*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2015.
- Smith, Dan. "Deleuze and the Question of Desire: Toward an Immanent Theory of Ethics." *Parrhesia*, no. 2 (2007): 66-78.
- Smith, Owen. *Fluxus the History of an Attitude*. California: San Diego State University, 1998.
- Sontag, Susan. "Notes on 'Camp'", In *Against Interpretation: And Other Essays*, 275-292. New York: Picador, 2001.
- Tucker, Robert (ed). *The Marx Engels Reader*. New York and London: Norton, 1978.
- Wilmer, Stephen. "The Spirit of Fluxus as a Nomadic Art Movement: Braidotti's Nomadism," *Nordic Theatre Studies* 26, no. 2 (2014). 85-93.
- . "After Dada: Fluxus as a Nomadic Art Movement." *New Theatre Quarterly* 33, no. 1 (2017). 59-64.

Deleuzian Creativity and Fluxus Nomadology