

**Kunsthof Station on 6 July 2013, 17:00**

**Location:** Kunsthof, Limmatstrasse 44, 8005 Zürich, and Districts 5 and 4 of Zurich. **Meeting point:** Langstrasse underpass on the side of District 4. **Ends in:** DJ set by **Dott**

# **The Difference That Makes a Difference – the Pattern that Connects**

**Psychogeography: From Urbanism to Everyday Places**

**Amélie Brisson-Darveau, Mortimer Chen, Zoë Darling,  
Benjamin Egger, Petra Elena Köhle, Sandra Lang,  
Konstantinos Manolakis, Cat Tuong Nguyen, Kika Nicolela,  
Jacqueline Poloni, Romy Rüegger, Riikka Tauriainen, Navid  
Tschopp, Nicolas Vermot Petit-Outhenin. Coordination:  
Dimitrina Sevova**

**DJ Set by Dott at Kunsthof after 22:30**

**The event is composed of urban interventions, drifting walks, strolls and performative situations and other means of cacophonous molecular machinic becoming, affected by dramatizing and diagrammatizing practices of the political forms of coordination mapping singularities. The event is oriented towards the politics of location and micropolitical locomotion as an a-signifying process animating the vital multiplicity of organization of ethico-aesthetic living forms.**

*Reality flows; we flow with it; and we call true any affirmation which, in guiding us through moving reality, gives us grip upon it and places us under more favorable conditions for acting.*  
(Henri Bergson)

*The unconscious no longer deals with persons and objects, but with trajectories and becomings; it is no longer an unconscious of commemoration, but one of mobilization, an unconscious whose objects take flight rather than remaining buried in the ground.* (Gilles Deleuze)

The event is inspired by and refers to the history of *dérive*, or drifting, of the Situationists, who appropriated the Surrealists' strolls and Walter Benjamin's idea of passage in order to realize their own "technique of locomotion without a goal," or what Deleuze and Guattari call the "schizo stroll." They are all influenced more or less directly by the French pacifist and educational reformer Célestin Freinet and the Modern School Movement he founded in 1926 based on three complementary teaching techniques. School children would go on learning walks, and take their experience of the walks as a pretext for writing free collective texts, which they composed on Freinet's printing press. Through these collective texts the pupils were committed to the current situation in their community and tried to respond to their context, because meaning is always situated, formed by the situation and by spatial interventions. *Dérive* is a means of creating a space in which meaning is not a question of reflection between smooth surfaces, or of a dominant signifier, not an automated process of opening and closing, not mediation through media. It is a form of knowledge that cannot be individualized in a defined system because it is subjectified, specific and localized with its own temporality. This is how it can follow a concrete reality in its entire sinuosity without creating representation. This is indeed learning from experience, learning from theory.

**A**t the heart of the event on 6 July lies its own singularization as a process of multiplicity composed by interventions as molecular movements and their methods of performative dramatization, starting out from different locations in the afternoon in Districts 5 and 4 of Zurich, some of them crossing Kunsthof, others taking place directly there during the evening, creating different situations, stretching invisible vectors between themselves in a heterogeneous milieu, each with its own temporality, color, intensity and invention.

An intervention means to create a situation, to evoke a mode of dramatization for becoming a form of locomotion – a machinic metabolization which is both a form of organization and a form of singularization. They are encounters, active dynamic diagrammatizations mapping those areas in town characterized by the vital phenomenon of grassroots initiatives, a molecular adaptive and ethico-aesthetic living form of resistance against the commercialization and beautification of the public environment. The question is how the space of common sense can become a common place, a place governed by individuation, which might well look entirely absurd from the point of view of common sense. The idea of the event is not to attract or communicate with the public and town, but to create a situation that directly triggers public curiosity, to stimulate inventive and peculiar situations from which new relations, processes and ideas may arise, but also reveal invisible layers of knowledge and unknown aesthetic forms, themselves spatially structured.

Why psychogeography? Why would one use the unconscious as cartographer by means of transversal techniques, and their vectors of singularization that stretch us, the logic of intensities that creates difference? Psychogeography creates an intensive field of individuation in a state of creativity, which aims to experience, to encounter, to experiment and complicate the semantic codes coming from different signifiers and create rather a field of noise than of clear statements and concepts. From this cacophonous noise the pattern of an ecological mind can appear. This stage of mind is a singularization with its own temporality of a situation, and involves flows, streams, fluxes coming from different sources in new forms of machinic becoming, and opens up towards an affective space of micropolitics.

This praxis of intervening and mobilizing heterogeneous strata and their dancing layers is not about urban geography. Psychogeography is not an attempt to redefine the urban space, browsing, scanning, exploring, and cutting it in slices in order to put it in a frame, fixing it to a detail. Every detail is part of a bigger cartographic image. Geographies are part of the large territory, the surfaces that belong to the molar. In *The Birth of Biopolitics*, Michel Foucault says that there is an interdependence between the molar, and "social entropy," the entropy that arises from a dominant subjectivity, desires for stability and fixations, all of which induce the ecological and social costs of the crisis.

Each artist's subjectivity re-tells and re-translates polyphonic stories in decentralized and small narrative patterns to excavate the memory hidden behind the anonymizing tendencies imposed by the gentrification of the urban living environment and the proliferation of control by data collecting machines and their capturing apparatuses, which tear apart the narrative tissue, whose scattering causes a break in the movement of the connecting pattern. With these situations we would like to contribute to a change in the ecology of ideas and the microclimate of mentalities that not only offer a new place to the public, but provoke a new process, a new form of exchange and metabolic circulations, and inspire the imagination on how the social environment might be composed of different living and nonliving forms that co-exist.

Because of this, the interventions of 6 July are oriented towards micropolitics. The aim of the event is not to create a new urban taxonomy through observation and judging based on formal principles. This praxis of intervention is not about investigation or reflections of knowledge by means of representation. It is both an aesthetic praxis and a knowledge praxis aimed at breaking up the axiomatic totalization of our perception, at de-naturalizing or de-atomizing them through the "disorientation of habitual reflexes." The intervention is a form of mobilization through which situations are created in which all sorts of flows enter into conjunction in human and non-human temporalities. Creating a situation is to engage with an idea of the politics of location by means of perception, by means of cognition, mobilizing both.

The micropolitical consists of both the politics of the molar and the politics of the molecular, is neither active nor passive, always in the middle between practice and theory, aiming to overcome the binary between surface and depth, and create affective resonances between and across local and global and singularities and machinic assemblages. Micropolitics consists of different techniques for creating new spaces with their own temporality within existing space and time – a curve in the line of time and a re-territorialization. These are not only forms of re-appropriation, but also forms of invention, of creating new subjectivities, a new beginning. These new subjectivities is ethico-aesthetic. They inhabit the middle ground in-between the micropolitical and its passing pattern that connects. This is a third way of approaching reality in all its dimensions, in the depth and dynamic of visible and invisible phenomena coming from so many sources. It is a way of finding orientation and points to hold on to, to allow a line of flight, to hear one's voice in the tune of the town, and to grasp one's own context.

The interventions on 6 July are non-serial experiments on how the message can be sent by other means. This needs mobilizations that rip open the envelope of the idea of creativity, material manifestations in the field of affect. Micropolitics is epistemology and ecology across all entities, across the milieu of all these invisible and small phenomena which escape the indexing and naming

system. It is what information-based ontology does not account for, what slips away from the grip of the semiotized dispositif and its system of surveillance and penetration devices.

Drifting is a double process, roaming between molar and molecular. On the one hand it structures time and space with bodies and their movements, while on the other drifting thoughts are conducive to attain a meta-stability characterized by difference and movements constituted by an internal instability and intensity. They are embodied in a metabolic praxis of the dynamic situation of molecular machinic movements, capable of connecting all these otherwise dispersed particles, of reconnecting the hitherto detached corporeal with the conscious and unknown, simply by applying the most flexible thing we have – our thoughts. Ideas are the only thing we can throw against the system of totality, which manifests itself chiefly in the notion that reality can be constructed from ready-made pieces, and in its hegemonic vision. Our mental activity is what Bergson calls “a protest against this conception of facts and laws.”

The pattern of the ecological mind unfolds in machinic registers, in the ecological praxis of group re-signification, of machinic becoming. The operators of this crystallization are fragments of an a-signifying becoming, which derives from a “primary process”, what Félix Guattari calls a “pre-objectal and pre-personal logic” in the field of affect – a world without privilege in which everything is equal to everything, the borders of which no longer correspond with a given individual. Attaining a machinic trans-conscious, “a new ‘pre-personal’ understanding of time, of the body, of sexuality” composed of heterogeneous elements, machinic and a-signifying practices allow to escape the semiotizing trap, produced by the representative system and its apparatuses in all their contradictions in the process of individuation that catches and implicates all of us.

The mediatic techniques of signifying, organizing and control of the public space in a “surveillance society” are not only capturing techniques, but also activating techniques. They are “a-signifying semiotics” that directly burst into the body or model it with its continuous touch. The semiotizing and modeling processes are meaningful and constantly moving fluxes that “trigger an action, a reaction, a behavior, an attitude” and thus constitute affective fields via bodies, thoughts, noises, images, mimicry, shades, nuances, hues, casual touches, intensity. All the while, at the molar level there is no contradiction in the relations between knowledge and space in the cognitive economy, where they constitute modes of fast commercialization which iron out all difference, flatten the relation between work and free time through new forms of control and new, even more effective machines and apparatuses which make their appearance both in the public and the private space.

The political form of coordination as discussed by Maurizio Lazzarato corresponds to a trail of questions towards a location with its context and specificity, and constitutes a spatial theater. In Gilles Deleuze’s words: “It is all these conditions which define dramatization, and its trail of questions: in which case, who, how, when, how much?” This pattern of posing questions weaves differences together and coordinates them in a “process of continuous re-signification,” creates a field of individuation, a place of “objectivity,” and opens up a new ontology of abstract forces and ideas. Bergson, writing about Claude Bernard’s philosophical method, careful to distinguish his work from synthesis and the world of representation, warns “that there is no difference between an observation well-taken and a well-founded generalization.” Between them lies representation, which is a system of modeling both one’s ideas and one’s ability to see what appears. What underlies them is argument, and they establish our ability to judge. They are the consequence of one signifying

question: What is it? A question that inevitably leads to synthesis and its classifying and indexing principles as one's views are so predetermined and embedded in the system of classification and representation that every appearance produces value rather than quality and quantity. Sooner or later every hegemonic system that pretends to be the totality of reality, turns out to be predominantly false. Bergson thus suggests that a new ontology can only be sought on a path in-between, between theory and practices, because the stage of objectivity can be found only there in this middle ground, in the transversal or passage that can "reduce the distance between master and apprentice," and translate knowledge into inventions and a creative state. Speaking with Bergson: "Invention should be everywhere!"

To take orientation is to learn from the knowledge that comes from experience, knowledge that comes from ideas, in-between theory and practice. The point is to learn how to ask, not how to name and point at, how to ask with feelings and emotions, because they are locations affected by power and knowledge, which are not restricted to either the sensible or the cognitive. In Antonio Negri's words, drawing on Spinoza, "love, only love, can determine the relation between power and knowledge."

*(Text: Dimitrina Sevova)*