



Watching Philosophy on YouTube

Zeigam Azizov, Artist, London

etum: 1/1 (2014), pp 53 - 64

DOI: 10.13150/05131.17

Abstract

In this essay I will insist that YouTube is a medium which makes many subjects visible, giving the visual dimension to subjects usually considered as non-visual. One of them is philosophy. Suddenly with YouTube we watch philosophy rather than reading philosophy, which makes philosophy legitimate not only as a textual but also as a visual. It creates the dialogical confrontation of watching other philosophers to talk about their philosophy. I am far from thinking that it makes philosophy easier to understand as I think it is the most dangerous and a very populist idea. I would like to look at the visualising of philosophy in the media as the possibility of different relationships, namely the visual in relation to the textual, watching in relation to reading. By looking at this question through Wittgenstein's picture theory and

Derrida's notion of 'différance' I will argue that there is a new philosophy, a visual philosophy which has come to exist alongside with conceptual, existential and analytical philosophies.

Knowledge complex

Now and then we are reminded that there is 'techniques of the self' and because of the explicit knowledge embedded in every individual we know more than we can tell [1]. However repressed by the modern ideologies there is the fear of knowledge, the fear which helps to create the 'knowledge complex' when it comes to complicated ideas, especially that of philosophy [2]. There are also unexpected events in this relation observed in the contingent space of the media. Since the media became a part and parcel of our everyday routine it doesn't simply offer pure entertainment any longer but also creates an access to sophisticated intellectual and artistic structures. Besides, the interaction with technology helps to discover the explicit knowledge, which is normally difficult to externalise. Ideally this situation provides the chance to learn different subjects individually while it opens up the platform for a dialogue on a world-wide basis. Of course it doesn't solve many problems which exist in our world in relation to the non-equal distribution of knowledge, yet it provides the possibility to think of these problems differently. In this sense one of the most exciting possibilities has become visible in the ubiquitous medium of YouTube. Through the exploration of this media and by employing notions of the 'theatre of philosophy' and 'picture theory' I would like to show how it is possible to build up one's own philosophical space independently. By taking as a critical point the current shift from realpolitik to

noopolitik of the so-called cognitive capitalism I would like to treat the visible space of this medium as an intellectual space providing possibilities for the critique and pleasure at the same time[3]. This intellectual space is made of differences, or of Derrida's differance; this is a space where one can watch philosophy while reading it[4]. It should also be noted that on the informational level YouTube offers larger possibilities in relation to nearly all the subjects of knowledge, entertainment and discourse, but my focus here will be on philosophy. One of the reasons is my desire to see a new possibility to grasp philosophy, the subject of extreme importance, which constantly reminds us about the foundational principles of knowledge. This is a necessary response and critique of 'the foundation crises', the crisis of the basic human interest associated with knowledge. But because of the increasing pragmatic reasons there is a large ignorance of the basic human interest. There is the need to 'correct' the agenda of new media by stressing the importance of this basic human interest and to employ excluded, subtracted ideas of the radical past as a 'possibility' to re-address crucial questions regarding the deepening crisis in the current world[5]. There is no closure of the past because the past consists of exclusions and repressions and is therefore continuous. In this sense the old ideas are unfinished or unresolved projects. Their failures are closely connected to the dynamic of exclusions: what is excluded in the past may be included in the present. The role of the new media is to make this problematic past visible by carefully and meaningfully discovering subtracted subjects. To escape simplicity I would like to add that this space, however foundational, can be built upon the already existing sophisticated knowledge by accepting the complexity as a challenge. In this sense my interest here is not on providing the framework which could be for or against YouTube, but the necessity to acknowledge the fact that philosophy is an important activity and the dimension of experience, which is often excluded for pragmatic reasons. When the possibility of philosophising arises we need to remember to recapitulate it and the current situation with YouTube opens up such a perspective. I would also like to stress that this perspective provides the reason for the elaboration of this missing dimension of the experience. The result of such elaboration would be the discovery of the dimensions according to which a problem can be defined. The discovery cannot be deterministic; instead it should be the advent of possibilities. The

result of the discovery is to create problems rather than a resolution. It does not realise possibility, possibility is precisely what emerges through discovery. This means that there is no linear causal path as a means to it. It happens to some degree organically with the spread of ideas in the media.

The spread of ideas disorients us and creates an impression of the loss of meaning. However, meaning is resided in the sphere of the activity of restoring defaults. On the one hand ideas still function in their relationship to reality; on the other hand they maintain their visual materiality which is condensed as the result of dissemination[6]. As such the proliferation of ideas creates a new ground for the struggle of intelligence. From this angle ideas start playing the role of restoring the lost distance between the substances and meaning while exteriorising this lost distance as knowledge. It produces knowledge of the loss; it creates the recognition of what is lost. The exteriorization of knowledge takes place in the conjecture of the lost, which belongs to the past, and the discovery, which belongs to the present. It can be said that proliferation is a toolbox, the use of which will help to restore what is missing, the possible space of learning. In this toolbox resides everything in order to conjugate the question of time with the question of supplements and techniques to systematise fragmented moments of subjectivity which are “lost” or disseminated in the space of the proliferation of ideas. Perhaps it may become clearer to humanity one day that the search for something is missing and the discovery of something excluded will never end. It is equal to the quest for eternal life for which there are enough tools and enough time in one’s life time. This search will provide new forms of thinking and proliferation and therefore a destiny of human history.

The enduring characteristics of the vision in the age of proliferation and technological transformations are embedded in a pattern of adoptability to new technological realities, social configurations and economic imperatives[7]. This pattern of adoptability allows adopting as something to make a sense out of the embodied vision. Bernard Stiegler developed an interesting idea of adopting which is different and even opposed to a more conformist notion of the adaptation. In Stiegler’s theory central to the human the lack of an essence is precious. Human is always already in need of some technical prosthesis in order to survive and to improve him/herself so as

to realise one's individual and collective goals. As such, the lack, the default of essence is paradoxically necessary to the human conceived as essentially a being that lives to transform itself, to have a significance, to contribute to the ongoing development of the collective. On the philosophical level Stiegler seems to follow the question posed by the Kantian transcendental scheme which asks the question: is it possible to free oneself by adopting techniques of the time? Schemes of adopting can be created out of the certain form of transversality. Instead of becoming adaptive, adopting should create different ways of opening up the perspective from the strict fundamentalist nature of the early decade of the 21st century. Aesthetic, conceptual and critical reinvention of a new critique of the dominant tendencies of contemporary industrial technological culture is needed which is capable of avoiding easy recuperation by the immense adoptive capacity of individuals (Stiegler, 2010).

The theatre of philosophy

A recent development of the media and in particular a ubiquitous use of YouTube facilitates possibilities to learn new skills in order to achieve goals without the mainstream dominance [8]. This possibility provides a place for the re-emergence of the intelligence that contains traces of thinking which is given birth by the meaning [9]. The meaning is a matrix of the confrontation of Plato's *khora* with the thought. Plato's *khora* (interval) is understood as a radical otherness that 'gives place' for being [10]. This is also a place which is distanced from the dominant centre. It is outside of the dominant space with attributes of the centre. It is socially marginal and symbolically central to the discourse. To place meaning outside of dominant paradigms is one of the possibilities the media provides [11]. In his project of 'spatial materialism' Lawrence Grossberg employs the Deleuzian notion of territorialisation and Stuart Hall's theory of articulation in order to define the circulation of ideology in the global. His spatial materialism insists that both territorialisation and articulation are adjectives to help to shift from the epistemological trap of critical theory and instead to become an ontological discourse (Grossberg, 2010). YouTube potentially plays this role by swerving away from dominant forms of art and by creating an 'access' to another, new

meaning which helps to recapitulate missing elements of culture. I insist that YouTube is a device which makes many subjects visible, giving the visual dimension to subjects usually considered as a non-visual. It also opens up a new perspective, “a reservoir of true enlightenment” for the self-realisation while mastering different subjects (Keller and Kim, 2010).

As I mentioned above my focus will be on a particular subject, namely philosophy, which has become surprisingly visible in the late decade. There are a number of reasons for this emergence, one of them is the need in philosophy. It is usually considered too difficult to comprehend philosophy and one of the main reasons is that it is heavily text based. Suddenly with YouTube it becomes possible to watch philosophy, rather than just reading it, which makes legitimate the philosophy not only as textually but also visually accessible [12]. It is also possible to say that the readability is attained by the visible dimension as in Ludwig Wittgenstein’s ‘picture theory of meaning’, which treats sentences of language or propositions as visual units.

In his *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* Wittgenstein famously argues for the proposition of language being meaningful as far as ‘a proposition is a picture of reality’. Propositions, he insists, show the logical form of reality by displaying it (Wittgenstein, 1961). They picture ‘states of affairs’. Despite the arguments about the contradictions of this theory as well as Wittgenstein’s own argument about the ‘non-sensual’, the nature of today’s display of philosophy on YouTube provides some insights to his theory. It is possible to picture philosophy, which creates the dialogical confrontation of watching other philosophers talk about their philosophy. In this role of performing of the thought plays the role of displaying its invisible sides and helps to visualise the overabundance of sense. This overabundance is invisible in the ‘non-sense’, as it was argued by Gilles Deleuze, stating that ‘the non-sense’ is the overabundance of the sense, waiting for its time to emerge [13]. There is nothing that can be called the ‘non-sense’ as many people would like to insist. Instead there is an excess of the sense which provides the confusion, because it is too radical to grasp. There should be the situation that emerges from this confusion (Deleuze, 2004). The choice here includes both subtracting and accepting at the same time, until the emergence of the situation which makes it possible to include. The possibility for this emergence is impossible by

textuality alone, there is another, visual dimension to philosophy which makes philosophy performative. Philosophy can be performed as it was known since Plato's dialogues and there is the 'theatre of philosophy' as it was announced by Deleuze. So philosophy demands not only to be read and thought, but it also demands to be performed and watched.

Suddenly with YouTube we watch philosophy rather than reading philosophy, which makes learning philosophy by using visual means legitimate. It is also the return to human capacities such as thinking, contemplating and discussing in another dimension. I am far from thinking that it makes philosophy easier to understand as I think it is the most dangerous and very populist idea. I am also not at all interested in some kind of "YouTube philosophy". On the contrary I am interested in improving the existing material. There is hope that an exploration of the new dimension is helpful to increase knowledge in order to provide watching philosophy as well as reading philosophy. I would like to look at the visualising of philosophy in the media as the possibility of different relationships, namely the visual in relation to the textual, watching in relation to reading. I would like to see this possibility as the resisting force to the current corruption of knowledge systems and to offer its 'radical other' instead. This 'radical other' is also helpful to introduce completely a new language to describe our times in order to escape the use of the standard language in relation to everything. I would like to look at the visualising of philosophy as the possibility of different forms to come into existence, ones that are excluded from the experience of the pragmatic reason of historicism, empiricism and relativism. I claim that there is a new way of reading philosophy visually which has come to exist alongside with conceptual, existential and analytical philosophies. It can be called visual philosophy, only if the term 'visual' is understood as the hybrid of reading and thinking, looking and perceiving and watching and performing.

I understand thinking in both collective and individual terms. It is the collective activity in a sense of its relation to history, but it is also an individual experience in terms of training as it is a hard work of learning and practicing to think freely in abstract and concrete terms, which helps to avoid the pragmatic dependence[14]. With the emergence of the media and public debates it has become clear now that the

collective experience provides an important history with the bundle of possibilities and obstacles. It has challenged modernism's program of cutting off with the past and instead urges to start a new relationship to this history, which is one of the main questions of the current crisis. One of the possibilities of the escape from this crisis is the speculative manner of theorising and building models. In fact the proliferation of means creates this possibility: having an access to many forms and ideas puts the question of selecting and cutting and mixing in order to create the ground for the speculation[15]. This process resists the rational forms of separating and dividing without taking into account any relationship between different forms of knowing[16]. The question of the philosophical knowledge at least since the adventures of post-modernity is very effectively understood as the question of fabricated consciousness and to fabricate new knowledge is the task of the digital age.

The question of the digital age

While reading lectures about Immanuel Kant, Gilles Deleuze posed the question of the electronic way of handling philosophy. On 21 March 1978 he starts his lecture by asking: "Why wouldn't there also be a synthesised or electronic way of handling philosophy" (Deleuze, 2007). Anyone who is slightly familiar with the philosophy of Kant may guess that this question is also the reference to the question of synthesis. While thinking of the electronic culture and philosophy, it is not the main question of how philosophy can be handled electronically or digitally. There is another interesting question, which I have already mentioned above as the 'crisis of foundations'[17]. While inventing complicated machines and maintaining complex ideas the study of foundational knowledge basics have been slow, as a result there is a saturation on the one hand and non-sufficiency of grasping of this saturation on the other. In relation to the ubiquitous use of new technologies one needs to study these basics often without any schooling by using online tutorials or even by word of mouth. In order to be able to maintain personal websites, to write commentaries or even to communicate by an e-mail one needs to have an idea of the basic programs and the English language. There is an impression as if this knowledge has entered into the users' mind, since everyone can

easily use electronics. There is also a shift away from the dominance of pop culture, which is intended purely for entertainment reasons. With the spread of new technologies and especially with sharing devices or social networks there is a demand of basic knowledge which opens the perspective for the post-pop age. Another reason for exclusions is the dominance of pop culture in the world of technologies which denies the access to knowledge. In our times of post-pop technologies the situation is different and users more often share difficult ideas, concepts and even whole disciplines. One such discipline is philosophy, the subject considered as one of the most complex and for this reason reluctantly accepted by many. I think the main problem is understanding philosophy, which may be true outside of the philosophical milieu. It is now possible to watch philosophy on YouTube.

YouTube poses the question of the role of knowledge as the discovery of a new space and the possibility to expand the borders of already existing spaces. It is the space of memory and may be treated for the reconstruction of what is delayed and missing. The careful reconstruction would be important in order to avoid falling prey to nostalgia. As a result of constant forgetting there is a huge gap between disciplines, epochs, images, words created by the loss of the link which is needed for their connection. Historically the complexity of understanding theories and formulas is connected to their technicality, which has created real difficulties for non-specialised people. For example, it is true that since Galileo the language of science became too specific and almost forbidding to enter into dialogue. In the age of electronics and the digital revolution, with the proliferation of social media this attitude has changed and the question of understanding has become the question of the decision: "It is up to you!" [18] Among the sophisticated tools and accessibility to almost everything on the net, it is not the question of fear of the difficulty any more, but the question of handling complexities, the engagement with complexities. This may shorten the gap between the scientific technicality and humanities. Cinema already gave us an example. YouTube is also cinematic in this sense, taking visual images seriously along with the textual.

Since the industrial revolutions the role of the visual image has become more prominent. Images that were used by visual artists for a limited audience for centuries started to spread as a result of the invention of the photography and printed press.

Historically, considering visual images as playing a role similar to ideas emerged for the first time in the eighteenth century, although this concept didn't have serious resonances. When the Scottish philosopher David Hume in his *Treatise on Human Understanding*, written in 1738 and published in 1740, suggested that visual images can be used in association with ideas and causes to make understanding possible, his ideas were ignored (Hume, 2011). Visual images are in fact taken seriously into account only in the century of the proliferation of images in art, cinema, and media.

It is only in our century that visual images can be understood as something “good to think with” or as knowledge in its own right[19]. But with this understanding neither intellect nor art should dominate, but instead the mixture of both is an important point. This also challenges the work of an artist in relation to the subject. Images are associated not only with visual art but have been understood in relation to other sources such as literary and sonic ones. Alongside their use in the arts they are also used ubiquitously in the media. Images are crucial components of business meetings and politics where spectacular slide shows and PowerPoint presentations give them an attractive tone. It is appropriate to remember the powerful phrase describing our times as the “frenzy of the visible” by the French film theorist and semiotician Christian Metz (1974). Visual images are used everywhere like words were used in the nineteenth century until their condensation and their conceptual possibilities were explored by new research structures and new disciplines, such as linguistics, literary theory etc. There is something similar under way in our times in relation to images[20].

The regular exchange between epochs, times and people is always accompanied by the appropriation of already existing statements. The ability to bring corrections into these appropriations usually ends up in surprising events, often events of the past being refreshed to be liveable again. The use of the media should include trying to correct the ‘mistakes’ of the past. This could be one of the possibilities to bring together and sort out necessary ideas. There are tools and systems which together form environments. Systems are not perfect and tools exist in order to improve systems[21]. The question is to see them (systems and tools) in their difference as well as to be able to have a critical approach[22].

The visual philosophy

Historically there are a number of philosophies coming to an existence: conceptual and existential and analytical but now it can be said that philosophy is also visual. Previously being studied as written texts, with YouTube philosophy can also be watched. It is important to note at this point that the visual indirectly resides in the previous experience of philosophy. If you take into account that writing is a visible activity and reading and visualising certain ideas is the condition of perception, then it is possible to say that the visual is the economy which derives from the historical development of philosophy in its constant attempts to expand its boundaries, to make a place for thinking. In a way philosophy has survived many centuries because it constantly questions its boundaries and constantly attempts to invest in its territory ideas that migrate from somewhere else. Philosophy itself is a space made as a result of accretion. The necessity of philosophy is inseparable from the necessity to ask questions where they proliferate. It was true from the very early ages of humanity, for example when in the late sixth century B.C. Pythagoras of Samos and his followers thought to understand the events of the world by numbers only. But as numbers were multiplied and grown they realised that there is a need to think what to do with them. Pythagoras realised that growing questions with numbers and geometrical objects cannot be dealt with by means of mathematics any longer and there was a need to open up the possible space to locate its outcome. Philosophy was created as a space for questioning, for an inquiry into things that cannot be explained just by themselves. This is also the condition of the possibility of philosophy: by questioning philosophy expands its territory. Each question as a finite being creates the condition for the infinite. In our times of the electronic, digital evolution this condition has gone up to data and the territory of thinking is expanded from reading to watching. As a result philosophy cannot only be read but it can also be shown without replacing the activity of reading. Instead it works in its difference to reading. The difference is the essential basis of a visual mechanics. It is the visual expansion of the real ever since the understanding of the real took place. The expansion of the visual dimension makes thinking possible differently and it is the progress from readability as a text to visibility as a text. The triad of text, image and sound organise an expressive dimension. There

should be a new methodology of bringing these novelties into being. There is a need in a new model which should prove that if we are becoming critical of previous models, it is despite the fast development of means and ideas. These developments make previous models as part of the experience and new models are extensions of older ones[23].

The past circulates in the present, the present holds the possible future within and most importantly there is the possibility to go back to elaborate subjects as well as there is a possibility to think of the future. Like monads of Leibniz, once snipped into grid, different forms of knowledge turned into patterns. Ideas and forms ‘communicate’ between themselves as they become programmed in the electronic space. It is becoming more difficult to distinguish between concepts and forms while the programming replaces the productivity[24]. At the same time it is the very novelty of new media to bring together different forms of knowledge without separating them. What is so interesting here is the possibility for an intellect to become engaged in a constant stream of knowledge and become immersed in it to carry on thinking.

Although initially programmed for the access of the users of YouTube, subjects are disorganized and chaotically put together according to their technical properties. Usual prejudices are abandoned here; it is purely for the use. YouTube creates the space of equality; it is a space of co-existence of all subjects equally, physics, politics, philosophy etc., visual, textual and audio, and everything else. It is also the space for the freedom of choice[25]. Compared to the book, for example, one doesn’t need the promotion from the publisher to admire the author, i.e. there is no competitiveness of publishers, say, the competition between Routledge and Penguin.

The possible new dimension of learning philosophy is a new pedagogy of YouTube. It is interesting to watch on YouTube how Herbert Marcuse talks about the degradation of the education system in 1970s and to think of the corruption in the education system of our times (Herbert Marcuse on the Frankfurt School, n.d.). This is just one example of how the retransmission of older recordings on YouTube creates a new approach to older problems. After watching Herbert Marcuse’s note on the ‘degradation of education system in 1970s’ and thinking of the education as it is now, with increased tuition fees, its administrative and managerial impact on knowledge, reducing the role of inventions and instead developing the pragmatic approach to the

education system leaves no hope but to think of the end of this system. YouTube creates the hope; but how can one implement this hope?[26] There is a hope that philosophy is now recorded and posted to YouTube and if in the nearest future universities will be accessible to privileged citizens only, one may learn philosophy on YouTube.

It is always exciting to think with the hope that we know more than we can tell. The constant studying of philosophy, by watching, thinking, reading, i.e. developing different dimensions of perception at the same time may help to develop the potential of not only learning, but also contributing to knowledge. After the impact of critical theory, which is very often perceived by its ‘negative dialectics’ only, we may also think of the necessity of not negation only, but also thinking of the alternatives, of ‘big ideas’ as it was consistently theorised by Alain Badiou[27]. Critical theory prescribes and defines diagnostics, but to motivate what we know outside of the text or picture and to make a new invention on the basis of these diagnostics will make a shift. However, as it was theorised by Derrida the deconstruction of thought constantly makes us believe that ‘there is nothing outside of the text’. Everything is the text, it is everywhere, and it is on YouTube. It can be read, it can be watched and it can be performed. The question is how to read it differently while simultaneously watching it?

[1] The expression of ‘technique of the self’ is taken from Michel Foucault (1988). The notion that there is an explicit knowledge is a reference to Michael Polanyi’s terminology known as ‘tacit knowledge’. Michael *Polanyi* insisted that there is knowledge which subjects cannot translate into the natural language and although this knowledge cannot be easily transferred, it is yet explicit (*Polanyi*, 1966).

[2] One of the most striking examples of this is an ongoing ‘theory-practice’ divide

which is usually justified by subjects for whom pragmatism is the only solution.

[3] Critics of ‘cognitive capitalism’ developed the theory that there is noopolitik which is replacing realpolitik and biopolitics. Noopolitik in some ways maybe even more dangerous than biopolitics, since it will provide the total control of knowledge as it is different from the control of body.

[4] Jacques Derrida’s use of the term *différance* refers to its French meaning as ‘relating’ and ‘deferring’. So *différance* is a double edged activity of imposing the difference and relationship at the same time.

[5] A ‘subtracted other’ is a term borrowed from Gilles Deleuze to problematize the question of the exclusion of subjects.

[6] Dissemination should be understood in terms of Derrida’s use of the term. Jacques Derrida believed that meaning is not lost, but displaced from the centre to margins and disseminated (Derrida, 1981).

[7] This is well argued in Jonathan Crary (1999). The notion of adoptability is also crucial to Bernard Stiegler’s theory. Stiegler argues that there is also a new social environment asserting a new industrial economy, which makes a shift from the consumerist society to the society of contribution. This economy became possible by the organisation of digital technologies and known to us as Youtube, Facebook, Wikipedia etc. The contributor, who combines technologies of intellect and culture, doesn’t produce or consume, but shares already existing forms and ideas. This model provides some exciting prospects for an artist to think of new ways of working. One of such prospects is the technique of adoption (Stiegler, 2010).

[8] The media creates a new form of spectacle too, which is more often associated with consumerism, but it also provides facilities for learning.

[9] My interest in the question of meaning may pose some questions for thinkers as I suggest that they eliminate the word ‘meaning’ from their encyclopaedia in favour of ‘immanence’ and close association of the concept of ‘meaning’ with the concept of ‘representation’. When some thinkers are engaged with the speculative study of a ‘meaningless sign’, they are still engaged with the meaning. After demonstrating the possibility of the meaningless sign which stands for an absolute, Quentin Meillassoux says: “The new puzzle that appears before us is the following: how can a meaningless

sign allow us to describe the world, without becoming once again a meaningful sign [...]” (Meillassoux, n.d.).

[10] Khora is the term introduced by Plato in his *Timaeus* and means ‘interval’ (Plato, 1948).

[11] It is surprising that there is still no comprehensive philosophical treatment of the notion of ‘possibility’. It was already noted in the conversation between Ernst Bloch and Theodor W. Adorno and is still awaiting its realisation (Zipes, 1989).

[12] There are different views on YouTube as a medium useful for the self-realisation. If Douglas Kellner is more hopeful, then Holly Wills describes it as “the very formal properties and architecture of which resist sustained and substantive engagement, leading instead to distraction, digression, and random combination” (Skinell, n.d.).

[13] My own work as an artist was influenced by Wittgenstein’s picture theory of meaning and its critique by Gilles Deleuze at the early stage although my work has dramatically changed since. It is a big question for me as I am engaged with questions of philosophy on one hand and working as an artist on the other. The main task of my work is to try to reinvent the language of art and because of these I deliberately use complex terms and forms in my installations and films. As a result my confrontation with the art system was ended by being recognised either as an intellectual or theorist, since most of the curators use very traditional tools to describe art work and most of the artists don’t have any courage to resist this attitude.

[14] It is extremely important to develop the independence of thinking and to learn to think as abstractly as possible. There are some very interesting texts in this regard and Martin Heidegger’s *What is a thing?* is just one of them. While elaborating on Kant’s philosophy, Heidegger describes an experience of knowledge formation (Heidegger, 1967, pp. 57-77).

[15] According to Alexandre Kojève’s reading of Hegel it is possible to say that the main problem of the recent history is pragmatic use of already existing knowledge without maintaining any new form of struggle. In his Introduction to the reading of Hegel (Kojève, 1934) Kojève traces Hegel’s philosophy from Aristotle and Plato, and understands Hegel’s dialectic as a summing up of the development of objective products of human culture rather than the work of Spirit. Kojève insisted that history

had come to an end and that now nothing really new can happen in the world; reality has become rational.

[16] Bruno Latour is famously critical of this divide and sees the proliferation of different ideas as forming of the hybrid of knowledge (see Latour and Woolgar, 1979; Latour, 1993).

[17] Jean-Luc Marion points to this question in his book (Marion, 2002).

[18] One of the arguments made by Douglas Kellner while referring to the users of YouTube is that the use of the possibilities in this media is depending upon the choice, in other words there is an effort which should be made to free one's perspective from restrictions of the official pedagogy. By taking Freire's idea that there is the possibility of a critical pedagogy, which looks at an education as a lifelong project, as opposed to a reproductive pedagogy, which is purely ideological project confined by the commercial success. The argument points to the users already having a certain form of preparation before being able to use knowledge made accessible to them. And how users practice the pedagogy of learning-by-doing as "performative pedagogy" that they effectively engage in their everyday lives as a fundamental process of meaning-making (for further reference Kellner and Kim, 2010).

[19] "Images are good to think with" is a reference to the sentiment Claude Levi-Strauss and his description of Nambakwara tribes carrying the feather in their head which enabled them to think of their everyday work.

[20] Just to give a few examples of this I would like to mention recent publications (Nancy, 2005; Rancière, 2007; Mitchell, 1994) among many others. Many universities in the USA and Europe have programs of "visual culture studies". For example *The Visual Culture Reader* (Mirzoeff, 1998) is published in occasion of the popularity of such programs.

[21] There is a constant denial of the coexistence of ideas and forms accompanying the art of modernism which is extended to the postmodern experience. For example, in his recent text Franco 'Bifo' Berardi, like Marshall McLuhan before him, considered new media as environment while denying it being a tool. Both McLuhan and Bifo are too one-sided when they see media either as a tool or as the environment. Instead, I insist there should be the recognition of the media producing differences and multiple

choices, i.e. it can be a tool as well as be treated as the environment. Technological determinism of both McLuhan and Bifo includes their treatment of the media as the conflation of means and forms. It is also true for the conceptual formalism in the late modernism and postmodernism with the tendency of treating contexts as forms (Bifo, 2012).

[22] These possibilities are underlined by thinkers such as Michel Foucault, Douglas Kellner and Jürgen Habermas among others.

[23] The extension derives from the ex-tense and being extended and it is the opening up of the perspective of moving in different times. For example, the Lumière brothers' invention of the projection as the screening is extended into new forms and theories. It is an extension of utopian ideas in the media, such as cinema. The experiment of the Lumière brothers, the projection of their film *Arrival of a train a la Ciotat* was screened in Leeds in 1895. It was also the demonstration of the possibility of two events taking place at the same time. That was the event of the invention of the engineering as well as an artistic event of the screening of the film. When their work was recognised as a new form of art the Lumière brothers were disappointed; instead they insisted in recognising their invention as the scientific event. For them it was very important to be recognised for their invention as an important stage of the development in engineering. The engineering was more fashionable in their time and they didn't want to think philosophically that any event is also a surprise. This moment of science and art together having an impact on the audience can be considered as the beginning of the penetration of these ideas into the everyday realm. What happened was the legitimacy of the fact that the invention was also an extension of this event into the real.

[24] The triumph of programming over production is marked by the use of images creating a new narrative based on the database which Lev Manovich calls a genre of new media (Manovich, 2000).

[25] Jacques Rancière thinks of art in relation to equality in similar terms (Rancière, 2011).

[26] Kellner and Kim argue that "UT could be a cradle to a critical communicative pedagogy in a multimediated society" (Kellner and Kim, 2010).

[27] Alain Badiou discusses it elsewhere (Badiou, 2010).

Works Cited

- Badiou, A., 2010. Alain Badiou Interview [WWW Document], 2010.
URL <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NPCCNmE7b9g>
(accessed 12.1.13).
- Bifo, F., 2012. The Paradox Of Media activism: The Net is Not a Tool, It's an Environment [WWW Document]. URL
<http://www.ibraaz.org/essays/49> (accessed 12.1.13).
- Crary, J., 1999. Suspensions of perception attention, spectacle, and modern culture. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Deleuze, G., 2004. The logic of sense. Continuum, London.
- Deleuze, G., 2007. On Kant: Synthesis and Time [WWW Document].
URL <http://deleuzelectures.blogspot.co.uk/2007/02/on-kant.html>
(accessed 12.1.13).
- Derrida, J., 1981. Dissemination. University Press, Chicago.
- Foucault, M., 1988. Technologies of the Self, in: Martin, L.H., Gutman, H., Hutton, P.H. (Eds.), University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst, pp. 16–49.
- Grossberg, L., 2010. Cultural studies in the future tense. Duke University Press, Durham.
- Heidegger, M., 1967. *What is a thing?* Gateway Editions, South Bend, Ind.
- Herbert Marcuse on the Frankfurt School [WWW Document], 2009.
URL <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2pzfy2izu44> (accessed 12.1.13).
- Hume, D., 2011. The essential philosophical works. Wordsworth Editions, Ware.
- Kellner, D., Kim, G., 2010. YouTube, Critical Pedagogy, and Media Activism. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* 32, 3–36.
- Kojève, A., Queneau, R., 1969. Introduction to the reading of Hegel: lectures on the phenomenology of spirit. Basic Books, New York.

- Latour, B., 1993. *We have never been modern*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Latour, B., Woolgar, S., 1979. *Laboratory life: the social construction of scientific facts*. Sage Publications, Beverly Hills.
- Manovich, L., 2000. Database as a genre of new media. *AI & Society* 14, 176–183.
- Marion, J.-L., Horner, R., Berraud, V., 2002. *In excess: studies of saturated phenomena*. Fordham University Press, New York.
- Meillassoux, Q., n.d. *Iteration, Reiteration, Repetition: A Speculative Analysis of the Meaningless Sign [WWW Document]*. URL <http://oursecretblog.com/txt/QMpaperApr12.pdf> (accessed 12.1.13).
- Metz, C., 1974. *On the Impression of Reality in the Cinema*, in: Metz, C. (Ed.), *Film Language; a Semiotics of the Cinema*. Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 3– 15.
- Mirzoeff, N., 1998. *The visual culture reader*. Routledge, London; New York.
- Mitchell, W.J.T., 1994. *Picture theory: essays on verbal and visual representation*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Nancy, J.-L., 2005. *The ground of the image*. Fordham University Press, New York.
- Plato, 1948. *The portable Plato: Protagoras, Symposium, Phaedo, and the Republic; complete, in the English translation of Benjamin Jowett*. Viking Press, New York.
- Polanyi, M., 1966. *The tacit dimension*. Doubleday, Garden City, New York.
- Rancière, J., 2007. *The future of the image*. Verso, London; New York.
- Rancière, J., 2011. *The emancipated spectator*. Verso, London.
- Skinell, R., n.d. *Circuitry in Motion: Rhetoric(al) Moves in YouTube’s Archive [WWW Document]*. URL

<http://enculturation.gmu.edu/circuitry-in-motion> (accessed 12.1.13).

Stiegler, B., 2010. *For a new critique of political economy*. Polity, Cambridge.

Wittgenstein, L., 1961. *Tractatus logico-philosophicus*. Routledge & Paul; Humanities Press, London; New York.

Zipes, J., 1988. Something's Missing: A Discussion between Ernst Bloch and Theodor W. Adorno on the Contradiction of Utopian Longing, in: Bloch, E. (Ed.), *The Utopian Function of Art and Literature: Selected Essays*. MIT Press, Cambridge, pp. 1–17.