

titled to ask from a work of art” (Benjamin, 1969: 234). A more recent confirmation of this insight can be found on the conceptual level in Rancière’s work on “aisthesis”, where he almost in passing enunciates what I proposed as a relevant new concept, in a notion of *immediacy*. Consequently, this means that aesthetics as a complex pluralistic discourse operates as a ubiquitous agency; it is situated in the centre of a whole network of movements of interconnected changes, which involve the sensual world and subjective identities in a way that establishes the very existence of members of a society as participants in symbolic exchanges. Aesthetics, along with its own transmutation, instigate far reaching social transformations. Hence, aesthetics itself – as theory, as artistic practice or even as some modes of lifestyle – is caught in a dialectics of multiplicity of the cultural world.

This conceptual constellation was reflected in an extensive and long lasting debate on realism in cinema. Of course, Benjamin did not have in mind film as a mirror of the so-called real world since he built his very condensed argument on the concept of “distracted perception”, which clearly hints to a “transcendentalistic” character of film. Although the cinematic moving image is always imbued by objectivity, considering that the lens of a film camera cannot but “look” at something, its gaze is always marked by subjectivity. Taking into account the fact that a cinematic production further requires chemical developing and physical montage, there is no doubt that we can only describe this production of reality with a transcendentalist metaphor in a strictly Kantian sense. The (objective) reality is always viewed by the mind’s external eye of a film camera.

Film itself as an art form most explicitly undermined the “realism hypotheses” in the so-called experimental film of the 1950s and 1960s, which also preceded video installations that brought moving images into art galleries, thus transgressing boundaries between art forms and art genres. While discussing experimental films of Brakhage, Snow, Belson and Jacobs in conjunction with Vertov, Gilles Deleuze developed the term of a *gaseous perception*. Through the drugs metaphor, reminding a reader of Carlos Castañeda, Deleuze writes about the “third state of the image, the gaseous image, beyond the solid and the liquid: to reach ‘another’ perception, which is also the genetic element of all perception. Camera-consciousness raises itself to a determination, which is no longer formal or material, but genetic and differential” (Deleuze, 1986: 85). Film, therefore, modifies reality; the reality represented by film is always marked by its intervention into it and experimental film, which equalled, say, abstract painting and cannot be de-