



A DELEUZEAN APPROACH TO CONTEMPORARY FICTION: SOME QUESTIONS

ÇAĞDAŞ ROMANA DELEUZYEN BİR BAKIŞ: BAZI SORULAR

Zekiye ANTAKYALIOĞLU

Doç. Dr., Gaziantep Üniversitesi, Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi,
Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatları Bölümü, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı,
zekabe@ohtmail.com

Abstract

Deleuze approaches literary works, especially novels, conceptually. For him the question of true literature is not linked to the question of its textuality or its historicity, but to its vitality, that is, its tenor of life. Art, for him, thinks no less than philosophy, but it thinks through percepts and affects. Every literary work implies a way of living, a form of life, and must be evaluated not only critically but also clinically. Literature, then, appears as an enterprise of health. The ultimate aim of literature is to set free, in the delirium, this creation of a health or this invention of a people, that is, a possibility of life. Contemporary fiction shapes itself in ways that are different from postmodern fiction. Its sentiments and concerns are related to the realities of the new millennium and somehow in parallel with Deleuze's views on art. Understanding Deleuze, at this point, may be relevant to us in exploring the changes of tone, attitude, sentiment and concerns in contemporary fiction. This paper will offer a humble analysis of Deleuze's views on art and ask the validity of these views for the study of contemporary fiction.

Öz

Deleuze edebi eserlere, özellikle romanlara kavramsal olarak yaklaşır. Onun için gerçek edebiyat olma ölçütü, bir eserin metinselliğiyle veya tarihselliğiyle değil onun canlılığı, yaşamsal anlamıyla ilişkilidir. Ona göre sanat, felsefeden daha az düşünmez, sadece düşünceyi algılanım ve duygulanımlarla iletir. Her edebi eser bir yaşam tarzını, yaşama biçimini niteler ve bu yüzden sadece eleştirel olarak değil, klinik olarak da incelenmelidir. Bu anlamıyla edebiyat bir sağlık işidir. Yazın olarak, edebiyat olarak sağlık şu anda var olmayan insanları üretir. Edebiyatın da en önemli amacı tüm karmaşanın içinde sağlığın yaratımını, olmayan insanın üretimini, yeni yaşam olanaklarını özgür kılmaktır. Çağdaş roman, postmodern romandan farklı bir biçimde şekillenmektedir. Çağdaş romanın hassasiyetleri ve endişeleri yeni milenyumda göredir ve bir bakıma Deleuze'ün edebi görüşleriyle uyum içindedir. Deleuze'ü anlamak, bu noktada, çağdaş edebiyatta gördüğümüz tavır, hassasiyet, endişe ve ton değişimlerini araştırırken gerekli olabilir. Bu makale, çağdaş roman adını verdiğimiz eserlerin anlam ve işlevlerinin Deleuze'ün bakış açısıyla anlaşılıp anlaşılamayacağı, çağdaş romana Deleuzyen bir tavırla yaklaşıp yaklaşamayacağı ve bu deneyimin çağdaş romanı anlamlandırmada ne gibi katkıları olacağı üzerinedir.

Makale Bilgisi

Gönderildiği tarih: 15 Şubat 2018
Kabul edildiği tarih: 26 Mart 2018
Yayınlanma tarihi: 27 Haziran 2018

Article Info

Date submitted: 15 February 2018
Date accepted: 26 March 2018
Date published: 27 June 2018

Anahtar sözcükler

Gilles Deleuze; Çağdaş Roman;
Postmodern Roman; Eleştirel/ Klinik;
Sağlık

Keywords

Gilles Deleuze; Contemporary Fiction;
Postmodern Fiction; Critical/ Clinical;
Health

DOI: 10.33171/dtcjournal.2018.58.1.13

We have been in the third millennium for the last eighteen years, and as academics we feel uneasy and somewhat insecure when we talk about postmodernism as past. We all know that the postmodern moment has passed, what we do not know is how to identify the present moment. As Boxall states, “Now we witness a waning of postmodern historicism. The materiality and linearity of history was wiped out by postmodernism. 'What-happened-nextism' is over. But the new century locates itself 'after' postmodernism; it is itself a 'what-happened-next' to postmodernism” (58). In the postmodern period, talking about the end of things including the end of history, arts, science etc. was very exciting. We thought ourselves to be stuck in the present, i.e. the postmodern condition, which, we believed, had no after; we felt disconnected from the past and were proud of deconstructing the concept of historical continuity; we could not have a healthy sense of the future since we perceived, by virtue of anti-dialectical thinking, the idea

of progress as outmoded. But with the turn of the century, we found ourselves in the beginning of a new age and in the middle of a chaotic world where everything was changing so rapidly and for the worse. The only end we need to consider has become the end of the world *per se*. This world where everything is either out of joint or dying can be defined as a dystopia which all dystopic fiction of the past tried to warn us against. The 21st century still remains an unmapped territory, a global sphere with communities diverse in tone, in style, in temperament producing a diverse body of literature.

Peter Boxall, in *Twenty-First-Century* (2013), explains this shift by stating that,

[t]wentieth-century western culture [...] was dominated by a sense of the lateness of the hour, and an apocalyptic apprehension of an imminent historical completion. The predominance of the prefix ‘post’ in the compound nouns that describe later twentieth-century experience [...] is a symptom of this sense of an ending that permeates so many of our cultural environments. But with the turn of the century, we have entered into a new sense of our age. [...] With the new century, there has emerged a new commitment to the materiality of history, a fresh awareness of the reality of the past, and of our ethical obligation to bear witness to it (12).

The sense of an ending which constituted the foundation of all postmodern narratives has now given way to a sense of a beginning with the turn of the century/millennium. The fiction of the new century has already proved itself to be various in kind, form and matter, showing an eagerness for change, focusing more on essential concerns related to life and environment. Literary studies, on the other hand, falls short in meeting the demand of contemporary fiction for a watertight nomenclature. We might say that the conditions that enabled the emergence of postmodernism are still valid, just pushed to the limits. If postmodernism is the logic of late capitalism, an incredulity towards metanarratives or the replacement of reality with simulacrum, then these conditions are still prevalent in our times. However, we also know that “the waning of affect”, which was one of the distinguishing aspects of postmodernism, has become the very syndrome that postmodernism itself undergoes. When it comes to analyze contemporary fiction as what comes after postmodern fiction, which is our general tendency today, we find it difficult to determine the cause of this shift. If the same conditions that gave birth to postmodern fiction are still present, then why is contemporary fiction taking a

shape in a way which distances itself from the canonized postmodern texts? In other words, if the very infrastructure of the late capitalist mode of production remains intact, then how does the superstructure change? Or, does it? We can find the roots of postmodernism's waning of affect in the fact that the material/historical realities today require a very serious attention, and this was what postmodernist fiction chose to ignore.

Obviously, the social realities that contemporary fiction -or the fiction of the 21st century- has to cope with are not proper grounds for handling or representing them by using the theoretical base or the playful tone of postmodern fiction. Therefore it is not a surprise to see that many academic articles nowadays include statements like "*postmodernism's demise becoming a critical commonplace*," (Green 19) "*contemporary fiction in the wake of postmodernism's waning influence*" (Hoberek 233) or "*waning of the debate of postmodernism and the rise of globalization as master signifier of our time*" (Huyssen 1) and so forth. Linda Hutcheon suggested that postmodernism is now in the 21st century a thing of the past because it has become fully institutionalized, it has its canonical texts, its anthologies, primers and readers, its dictionaries and its histories (165). We tend to evaluate postmodernism which claimed the end of histories **as history**, and if we put this irony aside, we, as literary critics, do not really know how to classify the newly emerging trends of writing. We know, as Bran Nicol also claims, that "*we are following the postmodern*" ("*Following Postmodernism*" 13) but we are not quite sure how and why. It is easier for us to use the facile term "contemporary fiction" to refer to a variety of writings that emerge today, but literary studies is responsible for making a watertight definition of it.

In their introduction to *21st Century Fiction: What Happens Now*, Adiseshiah and Hildyard state that,

[t]hings have really changed in the 21st century –not just because the latest nightmares of history: the 9/11, environmental catastrophe, peak oil, financial collapse, the neo-liberal dismembering of social democratic settlement, globalized terrorism, fundamentalism, traumatic effects of them and the paranoid symptoms we all show, but because the continuing hollowing out of human cultures and economies by the pressure of globalization, consumerism and market capitalism. One effect of 9/11 was to shatter the end of history thesis. Another change is in the belief that the free market is the most efficient and democratic way of organizing our economic life,

which has been ensured by the bankruptcy of free market ideology and practice in 2008 (2-3).

Similarly, for Žižek, “*the global capitalist system is approaching an apocalyptic zero-point and its end will be brought by ecological crisis, the consequences of biogenetic revolution, imbalances within the system and the explosive growth of social divisions and exclusions*” (x). We acutely feel that we are living in the end times, and the four main apocalyptic alarms today for Žižek are: (1) population growth, (2) consumption of resources, (3) carbon-gas emissions and (4) mass extinction of species (327). Nevertheless, instead of taking on responsibilities as adults and sharing an awareness of the Anthropocene, we act like ostriches hiding our heads in the sand, or even worse, we market “apocalypse” by films, documentaries and make money out of it.

Postmodern fiction with all its feathers made of self-reflexivity, metafictional smart voices, parodic/ironic intellectual language games, intertextuality and lack of essentialism can function no better than ostriches in representing our condition today. The best thing, or maybe the only thing, postmodernist fiction ever represented was representation itself. The kind of fiction which is only concerned with fictionality *per se* might not be the voice we need today. It is therefore not surprising nowadays to see novels, films and TV series with essential social, ethical and political concerns and warnings. I agree with Sian Adiseshiah et al. that “*contemporary fiction remains a loose appellation and we need to define what we want to talk about tightly: ‘the literature of the 21st century’ or ‘contemporary literature’ is an elastic definition stretching as far back as 1945, but 21st century writing is totally different. The fiction of the last sixteen years, although it is rich, diverse and abundant is as yet largely unreported and unrepresented in academic discussion*” (4). We simply know that contemporaneity refers to the present. But do we know where it starts? Does it mark the end of the previous literary age/postmodernism? If so, can we identify the characteristics of the new age that distinguish it from the previous one?

Robert Eaglestone, in *Contemporary Fiction: A Very Short Introduction* (2013), takes postmodernism as the dominant mode in which realism was challenged in the novel in the 1980s and 1990s and identifies three main trends in contemporary fiction that challenge the postmodernist fiction: (1) a retreat from the extreme playfulness of postmodernism not as a reaction against and rejection of all the techniques of postmodernism, but rather a gentler, more accessible version of them,

with a strong interest in telling a story; (2) a return to a sort of modernism drawing on the heritage of Woolf, Joyce and Beckett; (3) a turn away from fiction as it has been understood altogether, to pursue reality with hunger. (14-17) In short, for him, there is a return to reality, or to the realist and/or modernist forms in the narratives of the new millennium.

The proposed nomenclature for our period -like “popomomo, digimodernism, altermodernism, post-postmodernism, metamodernism, hypermodernism”- indicates uneasiness in theorizing, classifying or identifying our period. Here Adiseshiah et al. notice that “modernism” as a concept is something that we cannot eliminate since we show an insistence of using it as the root term each time we attempt to find a new name for our period. Literary criticism has long been reduced to the studies of literature for the purposes of publishing and promotion falling prey to an exchange value system rather than being studies with real academic/scientific/intellectual concerns.

Deleuze somehow increases in value and relevancy at this point and may offer new grounds to evaluate contemporary fiction with his understanding of art and way of distancing himself from postmodern theories albeit our efforts to associate him with them. We can return to Deleuze to ask what stops us from creating new values, new desires or new images instead of accepting conventions, norms and values shaped and imposed by late capitalism.

Deleuze’s studies can be taken as lines of flight from the grand theory of postmodernism and a serious critique of late capitalism. As Bogue states,

[f]or him, critique is essentially active rather than receptive, a process of interpretation and evaluation that transforms and creates. It is also affirmative, but one should stress that critique is not therefore all-accepting and all-embracing. To say “yes” to everything is to say “yes” to all the sickness and poison of the negative will to power. Critique is creation, but it is also a joyous destruction of all that is negative and opposed to life. (13).

Instead of saying “yes” to everything and massively publishing for purposes other than scientific/scholarly concerns, critics have to read and analyze the transformations in literature and life. Postmodern fiction created its own form of literary studies which mainly focused on the intertextual, textual, metafictional and parodic elements inherent in the work. Nevertheless, it remained a “reactive” rather

than an “active” form of writing, saying “yes” to everything both in literature and literary studies. Robert Scholes well observed this situation as early as 1975:

Once we knew that fiction was about life and criticism was about fiction-and everything was simple. Now we know that fiction is about other fiction, is criticism in fact, or metafiction. And we know that criticism is about the impossibility of anything being about life, really, or even about fiction, or finally about anything. Criticism has taken the very idea of “aboutness” away from us...Mathematics is about mathematics, poetry is about poetry and criticism is about the impossibility of its own existence. (qtd in Bran Nicol, “Introduction” 1).

Criticism has stopped questioning the artfulness, the value and function of artworks and relating those to social, ethical and political realities due to postmodern fiction’s indifference to them. It has become metacriticism. But if contemporary fiction is returning to prepostmodern sensibilities as regards the social and moral function of art, maybe it is time for us to commence real discussions on how the literature of the 21st century is taking shape on one hand, and how criticism has to take its “aboutness” back on the other.

Similarly, Bruno Latour, the French anthropologist warns critics of our day for lacking real concerns about the issues they are studying and he resembles us to “*those mechanical toys that endlessly make the same gesture when everything else has changed around them*”, and asks “*What has become of critical spirit? Has it run out of steam? Is the job of criticism to say that there is no sure ground anywhere?*” (2004) For Latour, the new spirit of capitalism has put to good use the artistic critique that was supposed to destroy it. A real criticism, for him, is about realism dealing with matters of concern rather than matters of fact.

Deleuze lived long enough to see the rise and fall of postmodern fiction. He was a contemporary of postmodernism. However, when we read his studies on literature or art we find little or no reference to postmodern fiction. Instead, with Guattari, he focused on modernist texts and authors like Kafka, Proust, Woolf, Masoch, Sade, Beckett and Joyce. Deleuze approached art as something no less than philosophy. He always asked how a specific artwork functioned in a specific spatio-temporal context. What literature did or how it served life was a more important issue for him rather than textual or theoretical analyses of artworks. Obviously he saw no attempt at healing in postmodern fiction. He always tried to find out the force and value of change and becoming in an artwork. For him

genuine literature was minor literature and by minor literature he meant the kind of literature with a deterritorializing language, connecting the individual to a political immediacy and creating a collective assemblage of enunciation (Deleuze and Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature* 17-18). Minor literature or genuine literature had to have a social function and a revolutionizing effect by producing lines of flight, rupturing life, breaking our habitual perceptions, creating new possibilities of expression in language. It functions in the network of language system as an organic machine, “a machinic assemblage of desire” (81), a body without organs creating new forms of becoming in the rhizome. A rhizome, as our ontology of becoming, is a “chaosmos” -a term Deleuze borrows from Joyce- that is, “a chaos-become-cosmos”. In *What is Philosophy?* Deleuze and Guattari state that “art thinks no less than philosophy, but it thinks through affects and percepts” (66). For Deleuze literary style was a very important thing and he entwined it with political therapeutics. Particularly in *Essays: Critical and Clinical*, style functions crucially in the interests of health, effectively to condense, express and displace culturally invested symptoms of thought and feeling (Hughes 271). For him, “style, in a great writer, is always a style of life too, not anything at all personal, but inventing a possibility of life, a way of existing” (Smith xv). Thus he, with Guattari, studied those writers who deterritorialized themselves from and within official culture before reterritorializing themselves elsewhere.

What the art of his time lacked was creation and a resistance to the present. With this statement Deleuze might have referred to postmodernist fiction believing that, compared to the minor literature of the selected modernist writers, the fiction of his time could not revolutionize anything and spent its energies on recreating, reproducing and rewriting rather than really creating anything. From this kind of a repetition, however, a revolutionary difference would not arise. Deleuze and Guattari believed that,

[t]he creation of concepts in itself calls for a future form, for a new earth and people that do not yet exist. Europeanization does not constitute a becoming, merely the history of capitalism, which presents the becoming of subjected peoples. Art and philosophy converge at this point: the constitution of an earth and a people that are lacking as the correlate of creation [...] Democracies are majorities, but a becoming is by its nature that which eludes the majority. (*What is Philosophy?* 108).

Deleuze, with his interest in the concept of becoming, can be named as the philosopher of the “future”. The writers he keenly studied were, for him, artists of the future, creators of a people to come. As Ronald Bogue describes it,

[t]he writer, for Deleuze, is a Nietzschean physician of culture, both a symptomatologist who reads culture’s signs of sickness and health, and a therapist whose remedies promote new possibilities for life. Nietzsche’s cultural physician above all engages in an assessment of values, which entails both a diagnosis of the forces and attitudes that shape the world, and a creative deployment of forces in new configurations. The cultural physician is not simply an interpreter of signs, but also an artist who joyfully eradicates cultural pathogens and invents new values that promote and enhance life. (2).

Under the light of what Deleuze says, it would not be wrong to suggest that contemporary fiction, unlike postmodern fiction, shares with Deleuze an interest in reading cultural signs of sickness. Ecologically, socially and ethically the world is in an alarming condition and it needs healers. Therefore, contemporary fiction’s concerns for the very grave realities we experience daily can find a friendly voice in Deleuzian studies. Boxall’s diagnoses on the concerns of contemporary fiction share a lot with Deleuzian symptomatology/therapeutics. For Boxall, three strands run through the work of the widely divergent writers, and these three recurrent preoccupations are: (1) a persistent fascination with the shifted temporality that characterizes the new century, a new sense of chronoschism; (2) a new attention to the nature of our reality-its materiality, a new kind of realism; (3) a preoccupation with embodiment, the limits of the body in this new sense of materiality, space/time (10-11). Novel has always been an art form which offers us means of apprehending the present. And Boxall notices very well that the novels of the twenty-first-century are diagnostic of the social, moral, environmental and material sicknesses.

As Adiseshiah and Hildyard state, today there is a growing consensus which is critical of postmodernism’s self-reflexivity, knavish use of irony and the ludic and relativistic approach to historiography, none of which inspired much confidence in its capacity to usefully address the serious and urgent problems of the late twentieth century. In the novels of the twenty-first-century, postmodern relativistic conceptions of time, history and place tend to be replaced with politically and ethically informed patterns of temporal discontinuity, patterns that open up spaces for new possibilities. In fiction today, there is a scrambling temporal order and progression associated with the traumatic experience of violence and power (9).

If, as Green points out, “*postmodernism retroactively transformed our understanding of modernism*” (22); then I agree with Hoberek in that “*the same will inevitably be true of whatever succeeds postmodernism*” (240).

For Deleuze, “*the question of literature is not linked to the question of its textuality, or even its historicity, but to its vitality, that is its tenor of life*” (*Essays: Critical and Clinical* xvi). Every literary work implies a way of living, a form of life, and must be evaluated not only critically but also clinically. The Artist as symptomatologist has to study the signs of social illness, then as etiologist search for its causes and as therapist develop a treatment for the illness. Whereas postmodern fiction rejected to have such a function, contemporary fiction seems to be ready to turn off the playful sound of the postmodern like a mother who -fed up with her children’s noisy remixed/cover music- comes to the room to turn off the tape and reminds them that it is time to go back to homework.

This change in contemporary fiction can allude to a Deleuzian break which makes the system leak. By virtue of challenging canonized postmodern traits, the fiction of our time might assume the role of changing sensibilities in a world which undergoes very serious problems and function as social warning.

To write, for Deleuze, is to flee, is to betray, to become, to trace a line of flight. To flee is to trace an uncharted course and depart the paths of conventional sense and preexisting codes. Hence, too, there is always treason in a line of flight, a betrayal of the world of dominant significations and established order. To flee, however, is not just to escape, but also “*to make something flee, to make a system leak as one breaks a pipe. To be a traitor to dominant significations and established order is difficult for it is to create*” (Bogue 154). Literary works do not mean so much as they function. When properly constructed, they are machines that make something happen (Bogue 188).

Postmodernist literature was the literature of the cold war period following two world wars. It was a period of skepticism, inertia, irony and theory. Whereas the twenty-first-century is the period of war **as and against** terrorism, anarchy and chaos seasoned by ecological crisis, consumerism, media, internet and surveillance. We acutely feel the effects of ecocide and the imminence of Apocalypse. Just a simple return to realist and/or modernist styles of writing may suffice to express the social, political and ethical concerns. If contemporary fiction chooses to deal with serious problems tracing different lines of flight and tend to return to

prepostmodern styles, forms and sensibilities, then in parallel with this tendency we need to reschedule our literary agendas.

In *Essays: Clinical and Critical*, Deleuze outlines a new use of literature and gives it two distinct tasks: (1) to engage concrete signifying practices that are more effective than psychiatry and psychoanalysis in diagnosing ("naming" or "diagramming") the combination of mute forces that both accompany life and seem to threaten it from within; and (2), to create the assemblage of "concrete rules and abstract machines," as defined in *A Thousand Plateaus*, which are often more effective than politics in the production of "signs" corresponding to emerging modes of life and labor and new possibilities for existence (Lambert 145).

When we have a look at some of the dominant aspects of contemporary fiction, as described by Adiseshiah et al, it will be clearer to us why Deleuze should be a prominent figure for literary studies in handling contemporary fiction. The dominant aspects of contemporary fiction can be listed as:

- 1- political and ethical concerns for the serious and urgent matters of our time,
- 2- temporal discontinuity and disordering associated with the traumatic experiences
- 3- a sense of hauntedness: a return of the ghosts (this time not always from the past but from the future), and the appearance of mediums, clairvoyants and the occult
- 4- appearance of the supernatural which announces a disenchantment with the rational skepticism of postmodernity
- 5- an aesthetics of trauma
- 6- environmental nihilism, the consciousness and the effects of ecocide
- 7- deep pessimism and a sense of helplessness
- 8- a return to destabilized realism and modernist sensibilities of writing in contrast with the ludic metafiction of the late 20th century
- 9- return to dystopian fiction, detective noir, science fiction and crime fiction addressing issues like environmental crisis, ageing, anarchy, torture and a focus on the persistence of genocide in societies,
- 10- a reappraisal of possible lines of continuity with the literary realism of 1960s (10-12).

As the list suggests, there is an urge for reforming a dialectical relationship with the past reviving a sense of historical continuity so as to create a concern for the future. Will it be a “no future” formation of the present or do we need a new futurity? Hence, contemporary fiction shows an interest in symptomatology and the writers today are inclined to assume the role of clinicians. Another thing to be deduced from the list is that to be able to deal with serious illnesses a return to modernist and realist styles of writing is required.

Writers like David Peace, Kate Summerscale, Glen Duncan, Ali Smith, Trezza Azzopardi, Jeanette Winterson, Sarah Hall, Jonathan Franzen, Ian McEvan, Philip Roth, Don DeLillo and John Burnside show a tendency of reassessing modernist legacies to focus on contemporary problems. There is a tendency mixing realism with an anti-elitist modernism, and mid-twentieth century realism is considered to be a relevant model for writers today (Hodgson 20). The new century is critical of postmodern perception of history as fiction or mere narrative construction. As Boxall puts it, “*the new century is now dealing with an ethical bankruptcy because of this denial*” (41). There is new kind of struggle towards historical realism.

Contemporary writers have increasingly returned to modernist novels as spaces in and through which questions of art, life and value can be reposed and reconfigured (Hodgson 28). As Andreas Huyssen states “*the discourses of modernity and modernism have staged a remarkable comeback*”, and he reminds us “*Jean-François Lyotard’s provocative quip that any work of art has to be postmodern before it can become genuinely modern*” (1). This renewed interest in modernism in fiction is by some critics called *neo-modernist* “*which might be defined as fiction that demonstrates an interest in formal experimentation as well as seeking to reassess and reinstate realism as a valid mode of fiction*” (Redpath 35). Here what they mean by realism is the mimesis of reality as contingent, which is different from the 19th century realism (Redpath 41).

In the study of contemporary fiction do we have clear ideas of what the problems are? Can we respond to the contemporary nature of our field? Contemporary fiction has been a very productive one but the academia still needs some guidance to analyse and spot its main aspects. Obviously the fiction of the new millennium has transformed itself to become what Deleuze expected from real art: an examiner, a symptomatologist, a healer. Perhaps, the same sort of transformation is required from the academia and literary criticism, too.

To conclude, we live in a chaotic world which is undergoing natural, ecological and social problems like terrorism, consumerism, radical and intolerant ideologies, pollution, lack of communication, war, massive deaths, natural disasters, over-population, refugees and a wild capitalism which is ready to destroy everything to secure its benefits. We all know that these will culminate in severe and massive destructions. These grave facts force themselves on us as a grand narrative. The grand narrative of a dying world occupied by inhumans has to be studied as a final warning, its symptoms have to be analyzed and proper treatments have to be found. “*The shame of being a man- is there any better reason to write?*” asks Deleuze (*Essays: Critical and Clinical* 1). This is where we need to return to Deleuze in whose hands the question of literature becomes diagnostic when literary readings confront the combination of mute forces assembled from various regions –i.e. cultural, political, economic, biological, material- creating an assemblage with other signs that can be conceived as a symptomatology (Lambert 148). His attempts in *Anti-Oedipus*, to liberate the ego from the control of capitalism require a special focus. The reduction of literature and studies of it to objects of consumption subject to the demands of the literary market should concern the academia. For Deleuze, health as literature, as writing consists in inventing a people who are missing. The ultimate aim of literature is to set free, in the delirium, this creation of a health or this invention of a people, that is, a possibility of life (*Essays: Critical and Clinical* 4), which is what we need most today.

WORKS CITED

- Adiseshiah, Sian and Rupert Hildyard. “Introduction: What Happens Now.” *Twenty-First Century Fiction: What Happens Now*. London: Palgrave, 2013.
- Bogue, Ronald. *Deleuze on Literature*. London & New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Boxall, Peter. *Twenty-First-Century Fiction*. New York: Cambridge U.P., 2013.
- Deleuze, Gilles. *Essays: Critical and Clinical*. Trans. Daniel W. Smith. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari. *What is Philosophy?* Trans. Graham Burchell and Hugh Tomlinson. London: Verso, 2009.
- . *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*. Trans. Dane Polan. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012.

- Eagleton, Robert. *Contemporary Fiction: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2013.
- Green, Jeremy. *Late Postmodernism: American Fiction at the Millennium*. New York: Palgrave, 2005.
- Hoberek, Andrew. "Introduction: After Postmodernism." *Twentieth Century Literature, After Postmodernism: Form and History in Contemporary American Fiction*. 53. 3 (Fall 2007): 233-247. Web. 12 March 2016.
- Hodgson, Jennifer. "Such a Thing as Avant-Garde Has Ceased to Exist: The Hidden Legacies of the British Experimental Novel." *Twenty-First Century Fiction: What Happens Now*. London: Palgrave, 2013.
- Hughes, John. "Deleuze, Style and Literature." *Lit: Literature Interpretation Theory* 21.4 (2010): 269-284. Web. 12 March 2016.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *The Politics of Postmodernism*. 2nd Edition. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Huyssen, Andreas. "Introduction: Modernism after Postmodernity." *New German Critique* 99 (2006): 1-5. JSTOR. Web. 28 February 2016.
- Lambert, Gregg. "The Deleuzian Critique of Pure Fiction." *Substance* 26.3 (1997): 128-152. Web. 20 March 2016.
- Latour, Bruno. "Why Has Critique Run out of Steam? From Matters of Fact to Matters of Concern." Web. 27 March 2016.
- Nicol, Bran. "Following Postmodernism." *History in Western Literature*. Ed. Zekiye Antakyalıođlu. Ankara: Ürűn, 2013.
- . "Introduction." *Postmodernism and the Contemporary Novel: A Reader*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh U.P., 2002.
- Redpath, Phil. "Tough Shit Eric Auerbach: Contingency and Estrangement in David Peace's *Occupied City* and Kate Summerscale's *The Suspicions of Mr. Whicher*." *Twenty-First Century Fiction: What Happens Now*. London: Palgrave, 2013.
- Smith, Daniel W. "Introduction." *Essays: Critical and Clinical*. Trans. Daniel W. Smith. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.
- Zizek, Slavoj. *Living in the End Times*. London & New York: Verso, 2010.