GEOARCHEONTOLOGIES OF THE ART AND MEDIA: THE ONTOPOLITICAL CHALLENGES OF CONTEMPORANEITY IN THE AGE OF ANTHROPOCENE

Andrija Filipović

Abstract: *The goal of this paper is to offer a conceptual framework for thinking and acting in the contemporaneity. Contemporaneity is taken to be a part of process called Anthropocene, which names the long period of human activity which has changed the environment and the Earth as a whole in such a way that in contemporaneity the difference between the nature and culture loses theoretical hold it once had. To avoid obsolete binary oppositions, such as nature/culture in the age of absolute immanence of capitalism, I develop a set of concepts the aim of which is to offer a framework in order to move away from postmodern episteme, as reflected in reading strategies in the form of discourse analysis and media representations critique, and to move towards reontologization of art and geoarcheology of media – ontopolitical geoarcheontology, in short.*

Keywords: *geoarcheontology, ontopolitics, reontologization, geoarcheology, art, media*

Contemporaneity and the Anthropocene are two concepts used to describe the current state of affairs. The difference between the two lies in the timescale they want to encompass – while the concept of contemporaneity is usually used to describe the period after the fall of Berlin wall in 1989 and the end of postmodernity,[1] the concept of Anthropocene underscores the longer duration as some use it to mark the beginning of industrial activity of Western Europe, while others use it in the way that somewhat overlaps with the concept of contemporaneity as the point in which appeared the acknowledgement that the Earth is irreversibly influenced by human activity.[2] In this paper, I will use the concept of Anthropocene in the sense of long

---

1 The history of the concept of contemporaneity is long and complex, and its meaning is in no way univocal as shown by Teri Smit (Terry Smith): "Stanje istorije umetnosti: Savremena umetnost" [The State of Art History: Contemporary Art], trans. Andrija Filipović, in: *Savremena umetnost i savremenost*, Belgrade: Orion Art, 2014, pp. 43–46.

2 See Jussi Parrika: *The anthrobscene*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015; Jedediah Purdy: *After nature: A politics for the anthropocene*. London: Harvard University Press, 2015; Wark McKenzie: *Molecular red: Theory for the anthropocene*. London: Verso, 2015. Donna Haraway introduces the concept of Chthulucene instead of Anthropocene (and Capitalocene) in order to

duration, marking the beginning of human activity which changes the environment and the Earth as a whole in such a way that in contemporaneity the difference between the nature and culture loses theoretical hold it once had. I will use the concept of contemporaneity to mark the end of period of postmodernity, and the beginning of the global political state of affairs after the end of Cold War, and the development of global neoliberal economy. I will argue that with contemporaneity in the age of Anthropocene new politics and new ontology are needed in order to adequately describe the current state of affairs and, more importantly, to find the ways of acting accordingly in such state of affairs. That new constellation of politics and ontology, their necessary closeness, I call ontopolitics following insights by Gilles Deleuze, Félix Guattari and, more recently, Brian Massumi.[3] Furthermore, I will show that we need new politics and ontology of art and media in such a state of affairs, which I call geo-ontology, bringing together the need to re-ontologize and re-politicize the contemporary art practice and geoarcheological analysis of new and old media. In other words, we need to move from discourse analysis, characteristic for postmodernity, to re-ontologization and re-politization of art in the time of contemporaneity, and from critique of media representations of constructions of various identities to geoarcheology of media.

FROM THE DISCOURSE ANALYSIS TO THE REONTOLOGIZATION OF ART

The term discourse is

> used to describe any organized body or corpus of statements and utterances governed by rules and conventions of which the user is largely unconscious. The

---

name "the system that systemizes the systems", and "entangles myriad temporalities and spatialities and myriad intra-active entities-in-assemblages—including the more-than-human, other-than-human, inhuman, and human-as-humus", Donna Haraway: "Anthropocene, capitalocene, plantationocene, chthulucene: Making kin", in: *Environmental Humanities* 6 (2015), pp. 159–165, here p. 160.

3 Deleuze and Guattari made the difference between the absolute and the relative immanence. The concept of relative immanence names the axiomatic of capitalism, which points to the fact that capitalism, through its axioms, shapes and forms everything within its reach, while absolute immanence is necessary ontological condition and thus outside of capitalist axiomatic. See Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari: *Capitalisme et schizophrénie 2: Mille plateau*. Paris: Minuit, 1980; *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*, trans. Brian Massumi. New York: Continuum, 2004. Brian Massumi goes one step further and argues that the immanence of capitalism is absolute, that there is nothing on the outside of capitalist axiomatic. See Brian Massumi: *The power at the end of the economy*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2014; *Ontopower: War, powers, and the state of perception*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2015.

very wide use of the term reflects structuralism's *promotion of the linguistic model as a model for all communication*; it thus becomes possible to speak of the discourse of advertising, or the discourse of Impressionist painting […] More generally, the new emphasis on discourse is *influenced by the thesis that language, and symbolic systems in general, is not an expression of subjectivity, but rather the agency that produces subjectivity by positioning human beings as subjects*.[4]

Considering that the notion of discourse is based on the linguistic model, an underlining idea is the idea of the text, in the sense that everything carries certain meaning or sense that is to be read or interpreted, even although the meaning is always already slipping away. The most consistent development of discourse-as-text paradigm can be found in the work of Jacques Derrida, according to who "il n'y a pas de hors-texte" differently translated as "there is no outside-text" or "there is no outside the text", but the point being the same – since everything always already depends on the work of chaining together the signifiers,[5] one can never speak of anything that is beyond the language/discourse/text without falling into the traps of what Derrida calls logocentrism and metaphysics of presence. The outside/inside or exteriority/interiority binary oppositions are rendered possible and impossible at the same time by the infrastructure of *différance*.[6] *Différance* thus calls into question the very foundations of any claim to the materiality by itself.

In a long interview by Jean-Louis Houdebine and Guy Scarpetta, Derrida says the following on the question of matter and materiality:

If I have not very often used the word "matter", it is not, as you know, because of some idealist or spiritualist kind of reservation. It is that in the logic of the phase of overturning this concept has been too often reinvested with "logocentric" values, values associated with those of thing, reality, presence in general, sensible presence, for example, substantial plenitude, content, referent, etc. Realism or sensualism—"empiricism"—are modifications of logocentrism.[7]

This quote gives us all the elements we need in order to show how *différance* disrupts any philosophy that would claim an access to the materiality itself. Given the work of *différance,* we are unable to speak of the object that is by itself or

---

4   David Macey: *The penguin dictionary of critical theory*. London: Penguin Books, 2000, p. 100, emphasis mine.

5   On the chain of signifiers and the trace see Jacques Derrida: *Positions*. Paris: Minuit, 1972; *Positions*, trans. Alan Bass. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1981, p. 26.

6   By naming *différance* an infrastructure I am following Rodolphe Gasché's interpretation of Derrida's work. See Rodolphe Gasché: *The tain of mirror: Derrida and philosophy of reflection*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986.

7   Derrida: *Positions*. pp. 64–65.

the object that is outside of the discourse/text. Or, we could but we would fall victim to the charge of logocentrism and obsolete metaphysics, materialist or otherwise. Considering that *différance* encompasses different concepts of difference such as difference as temporalization, difference as espacement, difference as sign differentiality, difference as ontico-ontological difference, the labor of this quasi-concept is multiple. *Différance* as temporalization and espacement deconstructs Husserl's and Kant's philosophies, while the *différance* as prior to ontico-ontological difference deconstructs Heidegger's fundamental ontology, while *différance* as sign differentiality points towards the issue of language, discursivity and textuality in general.

It was this last aspect that was most fecund to the development of new styles of literary criticism in 1970s in the USA (the Yale School), and somewhat later these concepts were taken up in the cultural studies from which sprang postcolonial studies and gender studies. These enabled new strategies of reading – discourse analysis – of art and art history, which opened up previously conservative academic fields to various minority readings. These changes were received with welcome at the time, but certain changes were nevertheless underway that made Guattari write in 1989 about the intellectuals and artists, using the term postmodernism to describe their philosophies, theories and practices that they just "stand around like idiots in the face of the growth of the new order of cruelty and cynicism", and that for them "[social facts] are now nothing more than erratic clouds of floating discourse in a signifying ether".[8] Furthermore, Guattari claims that for postmodernists "socius can thus be reduced to the facts of language and these latter in turn to binarisable, 'digitisable' signifying chains",[9] which is exactly what followers of Derrida, and perhaps Derrida himself, were doing at the time. For Guattari that is nothing more than "desingularizing and infantilizing reduction of capitalistic production of the signifier", which leads to "No waves. Just vogues, modulated on the markets of art and opinion by means of publicity campaigns and opinion polls".[10] Much has been done since 1989 on the moving away from this paradigm, and in this regard it is of particular interest what Brian Massumi has been writing for the past decade. His work could be tentatively contextualized within broader movements of new materialism and speculative realism. Both of these schools of thought are working on what I have called re-ontologization in general and of art in particular. Namely, both new materialism and speculative realism discard the notion that we have no access to the outside, but individual theorists and philosophers differ in particulars

---

8   Félix Guattari: *Cartographies Schizoanalytiques*. Paris: Galilée, 1989; *Schizoanalytic cartographies*, trans. Andrew Goffey. London: Bloomsbery, 2013, pp. 36, 39.

9   Ibid., p. 39.

10 Ibid., pp. 40, 39.

regarding such an access.[11] Massumi's answer to this conundrum is a resounding yes, and that outside is exactly what inside is made of — affect. But neither immanence nor transcendence is adequate concept for description of complex multidimensional continuum of (non)living, which consists out of multiplicity of beings and different degrees of reality:

> As Simondon notes, all of this makes it difficult to speak of either transcendence or immanence. No matter one does, they tend to flip over into each other, in a kind of spontaneous Deleuzian combustion. It makes little difference if the field of existence (being plus potential; the actual in its relation with the virtual) is thought of as an infinite interiority or a parallelism of mutual exteriorities. You get burned either way.[12]

Massumi criticizes the concept of subject as presented in contemporary cultural and social theories, since these theories take the subject as a position within certain structure performed and defined through various signifying and coding practices. The point is to access the body and all of its complexities in direct and unmediated way. "In motion, a body is in an immediate, unfolding relation to its own non-present potential to vary",[13] writes Massumi, which means that such a relation is at the same time real and abstract, and abstract in the sense that such a relation is "never present in position, only ever in passing".[14] This insight leads toward the one in which the abstraction of relation is "transitional immediacy of a real relation — that of a body to its own *indeterminacy*".[15] Indeterminacy is, on other hand, defined as openness of the body to other and otherwise than what the body is right now and here. Differently put, the body is a process because it is dynamic and alive. This indeterminate processuality of the body is at once its incorporeal dimension — incorporeal but real and material, inseparable but self-disjunctively coinciding. The concept of self-disjunction points to the fact that the relations between the body and its incorporeal dimension are qualitatively different. In other words, once the

---

11 New materialist theories and philosophies are usually dubbed process-oriented ontologies, while speculative realist ones object-oriented philosophies. The point of contention lies in whether one is focused on the becoming or on the beings. See Andrija Filipović: "From Transcendental Idealism to Transcendental Empiricism and Beyond: Kant, Deleuze and Flat Ontology of the Art", *SAJ: Serbian Architectural Journal* 7/2 (2015), pp. 147–156; Andrija Filipović, "Ontopolitike ahumanog: Od (proširenog polja) ljudskog do onog posle čoveka" [Ontopolitcs of the Ahuman: From (the Expanded Field) of the Human to After the Human], *Kultura* 152 (2015), pp. 10–25.

12 Brian Massumi: *Parables for the virtual: Movement, affect, sensation*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2002, p. 38.

13 Ibid., p. 4.

14 Ibid., p. 5.

15 Idem.

movement is introduced one can only speak in terms of intensities, qualities and accidents instead of extensities, quantities and substances.

The primacy of movement also speaks of ontological primacy of intensities, qualities and accidents instead of positioning within the structure. Or, the positioning within the structure is only a semblance of the quality of movement. The processual indeterminacy is ontologically prior and primary than social and cultural definition and positioning. From this point of view, it is then necessary to problematize again the nature-culture continuum, and Massumi does this by developing the thesis that the continuum is "dynamic unity of reciprocal variation".[16] Dynamic unity names the relations between the field of emergence and the semblances, in which the field constitutes virtual, incorporeal dimensions of the material, while the semblances constitute the cultural and the social. Reciprocity is found in feed-back loop between the conditions of emergence and re-conditioning of conditions through the semblances. The aim of this complex conceptual apparatus is overcoming of dualism between nature and society (affirmation of immanence), as well as the dualism between the subject and the body (affirmation of affectivity and processuality). The aim is, also, to affirm the unbreakable connection between the living and non-living, and the difference in degree (instead of kind) between the human and non-human. In that regard, there opens a completely new perspective in re-thinking the position of (non)human body in nature-society continuum, the role of art in affective activity of (non)human world, and the politics of relations within the society and between the human and non-human in everyday life which is, firstly, defined by capitalism as essential characteristic of contemporaneity.

What I call re-ontologization of art in Massumi's philosophy is the move to an ontology of event that encompasses forms of life and art in the doubleness of an event. The first side of an event is relational, and the other is qualitative. Relational dimension of an event Massumi defines as "the just-beginning on the cusp of the 'more' of the general activity of the world-ongoing turning into the singularity of the coming event".[17] Qualitative dimension is defined as "the experience coming out of bare activity into itself just so", or in other words, its thusness.[18] On one side (relational), there is disjunctivity, separation of one event among multiplicity of events in the world, and on the other (qualitative), there is conjunction, unity and continuity of becoming of that event. The difference between dimensions lies not in dichotomy between the two, but in differentiality. As such, differentiality between the relational and qualitative erases the boundaries between the subject and object

---

16   Ibid., p. 11.
17   Brian Massumi: *Semblance and event: Activist philosophy and the occurent arts*. Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 2011, p. 3.
18   Idem.

in an event. Qualitative dimension is also described as creative, speculative and aesthetic, while relational as participatory, political and pragmatic. This also means that the art as an event is at the same time both political and aesthetic, that the art is always already political as event. Considering that event removes all dualities and dichotomies "its aesthetic-politics compose a nature philosophy. The occurent arts in which it exhibits itself are politics of nature".[19] We can now see how discourse analysis fails to account for non-dual eventful side of both nature and culture (within re-onotlogization theories such difference makes little sense). Event includes both discursive and non-discursive dimensions on the plane of immanence, which means that we need new concepts to think what is shared between the two without giving any of them any sort of prioritization. Massumi, and many new materialist theoreticians, do exactly that, inventing new and more abstract concepts in order to go beyond discourse and nature-culture divide in order to find new vocabulary for the age of absolute immanence of capitalism.

FROM MEDIA REPRESENTATIONS STUDIES
TO THE GEOARCHEOLOGY OF MEDIA

Media representations studies are based on various theories of representation based on the representation understood as construction of cultural identities, people, events etc. in any medium. These studies are especially concerned with the way representations are naturalized by way of various ideologies at work in the process of construction and representation. These studies and theories developed at the wake semiotically based film studies at the cross-section of psychoanalysis, deconstruction and gender studies. As such, one can apply the same criticism Félix Guattari pointed to postmodernism and the despotism of signifier. Instead of doing the critique of ideology of various media representations I would argue that we need geoarcheology of media in order to respond to the absolute immanence of capitalism I described in the previous part of this text.

The philosophical concept of geology has been first introduced in *Capitalisme et schizophrénie* 2: *Mille plateaux* [A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia, 1980] by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari.[20] Through this concept, they develop a general theory of stratification, according to which there are various strata differing in order of magnitude or scale. Thus, there are geological, crystalline, physiochemical, organic and alloplastic strata on the plane of immanence. All of these strata are dependent of each other and mutually causative. In this sense, the

---

19   Ibid., p. 28.
20   See Deleuze & Guattari: *A thousand plateaus*. pp. 44–82.

concept of geology of new media is tentative to the very materiality of the media, instead of focusing exclusively on only one stratum (semiotic/linguistic, or in this context alloplastic stratum). As Jusi Parrika has shown, geology of the media is focused on the connections between the hardware and energy of media to the geophysical nature in the form of raw materials (minerals and metals), as well as its final destination (waste).[21]

The concept of archeology, on the other hand, points to the dimension of time of the media and their constitutive elements. It points to not only various practices, inventions and apparatuses which constituted new media in the past, but also to different relations of speed and slowness on various strata. In other words, the time of a geological stratum is different from the time of an organic stratum, and this difference entails different ontologies, epistemologies and aesthetics when approaching the various strata. By bringing the concepts of geology and archeology together in the concept of geoarcheology, which points to both synchronous and diachronous dimensions in relation to time and encompassing multiple axis in relation to space, I hope to develop a more comprehensive approach to the issue of new media.

What the chapter titled 10,000 BC: The Geology of Morals (Who Does the Earth Think It is?) in *A Thousand Plateaus* gives us is a certain kind of abstract ontology, while at the same time it gives us the map of strata that make the Earth (and the cosmos). The system of strata that make up the geology (in both physical and philosophical sense) includes at least three main strata and those are inorganic, organic and alloplastic strata. Inorganic stratum consists of molecular and molar levels, that is, it consists of formed matter and functional structure. Organic stratum is more complex and together with containing organic compounds and organic systems that make the organisms, it also possesses epistratum and parastratum. Epistratum of organic stratum deals with relations and as such it includes at least four types of relations: relations between outer milieu and inner elements, relations between elements and compounds, relations between compounds and substances, and relations between substances of content and substances of expression. Parastratum is set up through the capability of the body to act and to be acted upon in three ways: discovery of energy resources, perception and reaction. Alloplastic stratum includes both inorganic and organic stratum, but it possesses its own specificities. Alloplastic stratum is found on the level of society (social machine, *socius*), and as such it consists out of machinic assemblage of bodies (organic and inorganic) and collective assemblages of enunciation (regime of sings and social institutions).[22]

---

21   See Jussi Parikka: *A geology of media*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015.

22   For a systematic overview in the form of a table see Mark Bonta and John Protevi: *Deleuze and*

But that is not all. Inorganic, organic and alloplastic strata with all their levels and mutual relations are part and parcel of abstract machines. Deleuze and Guattari define abstract machine as a "consolidated aggregate of matter-functions (*phylum* and *diagram*)",[23] and there are three abstract machines and make up the Mechanosphere or Chaosmos. They are abstract machine of plane of consistency which consists of "*unformed matters* and *nonformal functions*",[24] and connects heterogeneous elements:

> *haecceities*, events, incorporeal transformations that are apprehended in themselves; *nomadic essences*, vague yet rigorous; *continuums of intensities* or continuous variations, which go beyond constants and variables; *becomings*, which have neither culmination nor subject, but draw one another into zones of proximity or undecidability; *smooth spaces*, composed from within striated space.[25]

The other two abstract machines are abstract machine of stratification (of Earth and cosmos into inorganic, organic and alloplastic strata), and abstract machine of over-coding or axiomatic (of capitalism),[26] which totalize and homogenize through quantification (compared to the abstract machine of plane of consistency which main function is to de-territorialize). These three and the multiplicity of relations between them make up the Mechanosphere:

> Every abstract machine is linked to other abstract machines, not only because they are inseparably political, economic, scientific, artistic, ecological, cosmic perceptive, affective, active, thinking, physical, and semiotic but because their various types are as intertwined as their operations are convergent.[27]

What we can conclude from this brief discussion of strata and three kinds of abstract machines is that there is interdependence of not only abstract machines but of abstract machines and strata as well. In other words, there is politics of strata, starting from the stratum of unformed matters to the inorganic (as geological, crystalline, and physiochemical) and moving through organic and alloplastic all the way to the cosmos itself particularly because of the abstract machine of over-coding due to its axiomatic nature. Taking in account the geological aspect of the new media means taking in account, at the same time, of synchronous politicity of space itself, since

---

geophilosophy: A guide and glossary. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004, p. 152.

23 Deleuze & Guattari: *A thousand plateaus*. p. 562.

24 Idem.

25 Ibid., p. 558.

26 The axioms of capitalism include: axiom of addition and subtraction, axiom of saturation, axiom of models and isomorphy, axiom of power, axiom of the included middle, axiom of minorities, and axiom of undecidable propositions. Ibid., pp. 501–522.

27 Ibid., p. 566.

geology in the concept of geoarcheology deals with spatial aspect of the new media, its stratification or sedimentation of strata in other words. Geology of the new media shows the politics inherent in the materiality of the media itself in the form of raw materials that make its hardware, as well as the politics of the energy and sources of energy used to power the hardware of (digital) media. Considering that the concept of geology includes all the strata, it also includes the immaterial, that is the software of the media in the form of the digital. The digital is not the world unto itself but a heavily striated and coded flux of data positioned on the plane of consistency just as the material world of everyday life (according to the principle of Deleuze's and Guattari's monistic ontology I follow in this argumentation). Hence, the concept of geoarcheology at the same time is tentative to both the materiality of infrastructure of the digital (energy, materials used in creation of datacenters, servers etc.), and the materiality of the digital itself.

Archeological part of the concept of geoarcheology is focused on diachronous aspect of the new media. Namely, it deals with the processes of becoming as the key aspect of the passage of the time. That is, it deals with the change and historicity of both the material and immaterial aspect of the new media. As Jusi Parrika shows, archeology of media is founded on the work of two theorists – Michel Foucault and Friedrich A. Kittler. Foucault is important because he has developed a way of "excavating *conditions of existence*", as that which is "digging into the background reasons why a certain object, statement, discourse or, for instance in our case, media apparatus or use habit is able to be born and be picked up and sustain itself in a cultural situation".[28] Stressing the heterogeneity of media archeology, Parikka singles out key areas that have been important in the conceptualization of historical aspect of media and they are modernity, cinema, histories of the present, and alternative histories.

Modernity has been central for the development of contemporary media and media practices, and as such it can "be seen as an era that is part of an emergence of a new sense of history".[29] If modernity has been central for the development of both contemporary media and media archeology then one can say that cinema has been not only central to modernity as such but to various media theories. Parikka argues that it was the 1970s and 1980s New Film History that was the key for developing a historical insight into the cinema media apparatus, and particularly "archival work and discovery of new films and material… and the cinema theories concerning spectatorship, power and gender".[30] Given the new discoveries and the appearance

---

28 Jussi Parikka: *What is media archeology?*. Cambridge: Polity, 2012, p. 6.
29 Ibid., p. 7.
30 Ibid., p. 9.

of new theories, much of various and alternative forms of film and media practices have been discovered leading to "modes of sensation and perception becoming embedded in an analytical view that encompassed multiple, non-linear histories".[31]

These insights have also been employed in analysis and theorization of the digital. Some of the theoreticians insisted on the radical newness of the digital media, but many others have used the methodologies, ontologies and histories based on the New Film History and spectatorship/gender studies. In that regard, Zielinski developed "deep time of media", as

> another way of developing an alternative temporality that moves away from a hegemonic linearity that demands that we should see time and history as straight lines that work towards improvement and something better […] Zielinski promotes a more paleontological time for media.[32]

Histories of the present become entangled in long duration of paleo-archeological time, instead of ahistorical, synchronous present. Given this broader view of history of new media, it is understandable that it has come to be understood that there could be and there are alternative histories. Namely, media archeology has been going through "horizontal widening of media-historical research" in the form of epistemological perversions:

> A non-mainstream approach to media cultural innovations and applications… S/M perversions of film and media history include **s**cience and medicine, **s**urveillance and the military, **s**ensory-motor coordination, and GMS and MMS in reference to the mobile communication cultures that expand how cinema and the visual are taking new forms.[33]

Archeology of new media presupposes not only history of present, but analysis of "deep time" together with alternative histories engendering alternative epistemologies and aesthetics.

★ ★ ★

Bringing together the concepts of re-ontologization of art and geoarcheology of media in the concept of geoarcheontology, I want to point out the need for materialist politics and ontology of art and media in the age of contemporaneity and Anthropocene. In contradistinction to Elisabeth A. Povinelli's use of the

---

31   Ibid., p. 10.
32   Ibid., p. 12.
33   Ibid., p. 14.

term geontology, which she defines as a mode of power operating by making the distinction between life and nonlife,[34] I use the concept to underscore the irrelevance of difference between organic and nonorganic in the sense that both are used for the quantification purposes of axiomatic within the absolute immanence of capitalism (as archeological aspect of geoarcheology shows). In other words, it is not the question of difference through which the capitalism works, but finding the possibility of agency of the materiality itself that could, by its activity emptied out of anything human,[35] offer the space for other-than the current state of affairs, and thus offer us a possibility of alternative ontology, epistemology and aesthetics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bonta, Mark and John Protevi: *Deleuze and geophilosophy: A guide and glossary*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004.

Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari: *A thousand plateaus*, Brian Massumi. London and New York: Continuum, 2004.

Derrida, Jacques: *Positions*. Paris: Minuit, 1972; *Positions*, trans. Alan Bass. Chicago: The Unviersity of Chicago Press, 1981.

Filipović, Andrija: "From transcendental idealism to transcendental empiricism and beyond: Kant, Deleuze and flat ontology of the art", *SAJ: Serbian Architectural Journal* 7/2 (2015), pp. 147–156.

Filipović, Andrija, "Ontopolitike ahumanog: Od (proširenog polja) ljudskog do onog posle čoveka", *Kultura* 152 (2015), pp. 10–25.

Gasché, Rodolphe: *The tain of mirror: Derrida and philosophy of reflection*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986.

Guattari, Félix: *Cartographies schizoanalytiques*. Paris: Galilée, 1989; *Schizoanalytic cartographies*, trans. Andrew Goffey. London: Bloomsbery, 2013.

Haraway, Donna: "Anthropocene, capitalocene, plantationocene, chthulucene: Making kin", *Environmental Humanities* 6 (2015), pp. 159–165.

Harman, Graham: *The quadruple object*. Winchester and Washington, 2011.

Macey, David: *The Penguin dictionary of critical theory*. London: Penguin Books, 2000.

---

34   See Elisabeth A. Povinelli: *Geontologies: A requiem to late liberalism*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2016.

35   The promise of such geoarcheontology I find in the work of Quentin Meillasoux and Graham Harman, among other speculative realist and new materialist philosophers and theoreticians. In Meillasoux's case it is the hyper-chaos, while in Harman's it is the aspect of the real object. See Quentin Meillasoux: *After finitude: An essay on the necessity of contingency*. London and New York, 2009; Graham Harman: *The quadruple object*. Winchester and Washington, 2011.

Massumi, Brian: *Parables for the virtual: Movement, affect, sensation*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2002.

Massumi, Brian: *Semblance and event: Activist philosophy and the occurent arts*. Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 2011.

Massumi, Brian: *The power at the end of the economy*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2014.

Massumi, Brian: *Ontopower: War, powers, and the state of perception*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2015.

Meillasoux, Quentin: *After finitude: An essay on the necessity of contingency*. London and New York, 2009.

Parikka, Jussi: *What is media archeology?*. Cambridge: Polity, 2012.

Parikka, Jussi: *A geology of media*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015.

Parikka, Jussi: *The anthrobscene*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015.

Povinelli, Elisabeth A.: *Geontologies: A requiem to late liberalism*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2016.

Purdy, Jedediah: *After nature: A politics for the anthropocene*. London: Harvard University Press, 2015.

Smit, Teri (Smith, Terry): "Stanje istorije umetnosti: Savremena umetnost" [The State of Art History: Contemporary Art], in *Savremena umetnost i savremenost*, trans. Andrija Filipović. Belgrade: Orion art, 2014, pp. 43–46.

Wark, McKenzie: *Molecular red: Theory for the anthropocene*. London: Verso, 2015.