

The Philosophy of Photography, Vol 3, 1, 2012; peer review.

The Paradoxical Economy of Crisis: “crisis of experience”, and the ana-economy of *Else*.

Introduction

This paper proposes a critique of the paradigm of representation drawing on Walter Benjamin’s work on technology and on Tomas Kuhn’s discussion of ‘scientific revolutions’, in order to analyse how moments of change reveal a ‘crisis’ where the shortcoming of such paradigm in engaging with the world become evident. This interdisciplinary approach merges questions from aesthetic and epistemological enquiries through the notion of *emergence* and *feedback loop* elaborated by complexity theory, proposing that the possibility of ‘making sense’, or establishing an economy, rests on a generative logic rather than the representation of an a priori meaning, and requires a reversal of temporality. Indeed the notion of crisis is directly linked to the paradigm of representation. Crises are not exceptional states, rather moments when incommensurable series, or discourses, converge and diverge simultaneously; they are paradoxical economies that escape a ‘restricted’ model and at the same time do not quite reflect a ‘general’ economy. In fact crises escape deterministic necessity entirely, they are ‘open states’ where there is simultaneously less, more, and *e/se* than what was expected in terms of value as well as meaning.

Within a wider question about the logic of emergence of meaning, this paper claims that sense is an *aesthetic space* (or event) where a distribution of the sensible does not happen without a simultaneous articulation of epistemological categories, and vice versa. The argument concentrates on this reciprocity, or inter-causality, moving from the extinction of determinism brought about by complexity theory, and introducing a *poietic* form of temporality based on the feedback loop. It aims to show that a representational paradigm is the product of a *misunderstanding of time* in the relation between epistemology and aesthetics, and that this misunderstanding stems from the projection of a cause-effect economy that reflects a specific form of ‘enframing’, or paradigm, which inevitably enters a crisis when measured against change. That is, representation reflects an economy between sign and meaning (language-reality), a world organized around a cause-effect equation. From such a paradigm all interruptions or divergences from the zero-sum of the equation appear as a crisis.

Question 1:

When discussing representation, what are the differences and the implications occurring between the logic of reproducibility specific to *production* and the complex regime of *emergence* within networks? The problem is at least twofold: first it requires understanding technology not as a transparent vehicle, as neutral means to an end, but as a medium whose process of emergence generates language-specific and time sensitive dimensions, which install an 'aesthetic space', that is, a specific set of possibilities and limitations; this, in turn, eludes both the linear subject-object equation of production and the closed necessity of the causality equation for an *open economy* where something *else* emerges, an *economy of the else* without necessity. The answer can be approached moving from Walter Benjamin's reading of *modernity* as a moment of crisis, in particular from his analysis of the concept of *technology*.¹

Crisis of Experience:

Benjamin individuated a *divergence* between the existing order of things (culture) and the new technologies of modernity, which he tried to address via the necessity of the dialectical move. Yet, his analysis can be taken beyond dialectics. In Benjamin's reading, "technology is the mastery not of nature but of the relation between nature and man; (...) in technology, a *physis* is being organized through which mankind's contact with the cosmos takes a new and different form from that which it had in nations and families"². This understanding of technology as a form of *enframing*, which, differing from Heidegger's notion³ is intrinsically time

¹ The relation between technology and representation returns in several essays; here the main references are: Walter Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction", in *Illuminations*, edited by Hannah Arendt, (London, Pimlico, 1999); "The Author as a Producer", in Vol. 2 of *Selected Writings*, edited by M.W. Jennings, Harvard University Press, 1999; and "To The Planetarium", in *One Way Street*, Vol. 1 of *Selected Writings*, edited by M.W. Jennings, Harvard University Press, 1999.

² Walter Benjamin, "To The Planetarium", in *One Way Street*, Vol. 1 of *Selected Writings*, edited by M.W. Jennings, 487, Harvard University Press, 1999.

³ See Martin Heidegger, "The Question Concerning Technology", in *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, edited by Joan Stambaugh and J. Glenn Gray, (London, Harper, 1977). For Heidegger enframing (*Gestell*) is a form of "revealing", a mode of existence, a distribution of the world that comes to light already organized in economic terms, what he calls "standing reserve"; it almost acts as the scene on which modern technologies take place. However, enframing differs

sensitive, shows technology as a *medium*: not a neutral support representing meaning, but expressing specific sensual, political, and aesthetic properties. That is, engendering a language specific meaning, as Benjamin describes in his analysis of mechanical reproducibility. Technology thus becomes a *place* and a *discourse* at once, a set of dimensions, which requires and simultaneously generates a specific epistemology that is not absolute but, rather, is specific to the aesthetic space to which it refers.

This analysis lies within a wider question regarding the possibility of preserving the integrity of experience, which Benjamin sought to explain merging neo-Kantian concerns about the validity of the traditional table of categories with the materialist concept of the forces of production as the motor of history; which in turn led him to seek to “dialectically redeem the concept of experience, by finding an appropriate way of experiencing the crisis of experience itself”⁴, that is from inside experience (escaping the a priori of the Kantian architecture). In this move the symmetry between transcendental forms of knowledge (epistemology) and experience (aesthetics), or subject and object, was already broken. Modernity as a moment of change is, for Benjamin, experienced as a crisis: a dichotomy between the old (existing social relations and traditional culture) and the ‘new’ (the potential implicit in technology). New forms of technology allow for, or have the *ability* to engender, values different to those expressed by traditional art/culture.

Question 1 again

Following Benjamin’s method, yet not his conclusions, one should ask how is it possible to address the crisis of experience from within experience; that is, retaining the phenomenological and materialist angles of the question while abandoning the necessity required by the dialectic move. Indeed, according to Benjamin the crisis stems from applying the wrong politico-epistemological structure to the present, in fact from the very application of an external theory onto history. Benjamin had defined the Kantian organization of the sensible in the transcendental aesthetic a ‘mythology’, based on the assumption or projection of

from Benjamin’s analysis of technology insofar as it encompasses all technological phenomena and as such it is nothing technological.

⁴ "Walter Benjamin", in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2011 Edition)*, Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2011/entries/benjamin/>>

a separation between subject and object⁵. Where does this leave the relationship between experience and reason? Is the present forced into representing the architecture of epistemology? There appears to be an incommensurable gap between the ephemeral forms of becoming and the transcendental forms of knowledge, which requires abandoning the opposition thesis–antithesis in favour of a different approach⁶.

The crisis is a paradigm shift; Thomas Kuhn

Benjamin identifies a *paradigm shift* in the emergence of a new technology, which throws all expectations and projections about the world into a state of crisis; the crisis of an epistemology/ideology that can no longer support the a priori distinction between subject and object of knowledge, or sign and meaning as its paradigm. Thomas Kuhn's analysis of the behaviour of scientific paradigms helps to unravel the notion of crisis beyond the impasse reached by Benjamin dialectical/messianic approach⁷. In Kuhn's argument science does not proceed by accumulation of knowledge, but through shifts of representational models of the world, where *anomalies* diverge from the paradigm until they appear as *counter instances* to the paradigm's very principle. While paradigms are projected as stable, anomalies revealed as counter instances are a moments of disorder and refloating where the established categories of a culture (its self–representation) appear no longer apt for the task of organizing the experience of the present. That is, the ontology of the wrong state of affairs leads to a crisis of expectations. But how did thought come to misrecognise the things it hoped to theorize?⁸

An *ontology* not of *being* but of *becoming*, throws a transcendental epistemology into a paradoxical state. In a paradigm shift ontology becomes unstable, yet it does not enter a process of sublation and synthesis with experience, rather it

⁵ Walter Benjamin, "On the Program of the Coming Philosophy", in *One Way Street*, Vol. 1 of *Selected Writings*, edited by M.W. Jennings, 103, Harvard University Press, 1999.

⁶ On this regard F. Laruelle proposes to distinguish a regime of 'modernity', one that always refers to a metaphysical code to which all reality must be related, from a 'contemporary' regime, which opens philosophy to reality requiring continuous redefinition. Francois Laruelle, "Towards a Philosophy we can deem Contemporary", paper presented at the Swedenborg Society, London, May 9, 2012.

⁷ Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1962)

⁸ I am indebted to Dr. Mark Walker for this comment during several conversations.

abandons the old paradigm (the past) for something *else*, without deterministic or economical equivalence. The absolute architecture of the forms of knowledge that Benjamin criticizes in Kant⁹ stems from the past becoming fossilized and assuming a position external to the present. That is, pretending to explain change from an external point of observation not affected by it; a static position of *being* preserved from *becoming*, which projects and claims a hierarchy for its exclusive privilege, that of a metalanguage describing reality and ruling over it, thus perpetuating a metaphysical structure. The problem is to develop a logic that is not 'applied to' reality as a transparent theory (representation), and that does not engender a reading of reality already structured by its projected representation; but also a logic that avoids the abyss of circular deferral produced by the returning 'always-already' introduced by postmodernity.

What is required is a move that does not foreclose the heterogeneity of the present and keeps practice and theory in a reciprocal relation of inter-causality. The question then is one of method: how can the integrity of experience be preserved, without rejecting the possibility of thought? Can the notion of *feedback loop* at play in complex systems be adopted as the logic of cohesiveness that generates meaning in the present, as synthetic but without necessity?

The 'suspension of the epistemological presupposition' of the neo-Kantian/phenomenological move opens the way for a regime of simultaneous converging and diverging serializations (technologies diverging from the existing epistemology and converging onto new discourses), which does not follow a teleology but synthesises retroactively, thus reversing the notion of temporality. While in representation there is a circular argument at play, which prevents understanding how meaning is established, serializations are heterogeneous regimes of emergence that escape the organization of the homogeneous code installed by a universal economy. That is, *a crisis is no longer an exception* to the equilibrium of the paradigm, rather it is intrinsic to the *state* of the present; the irreconcilable relation between converging and diverging series. These must not be mistaken for the traditional partition that keeps thought, epistemology, and the transcendental on one side and sensible and history on the other; a partition that implies that it is technology, or history, which diverges from epistemology and ontology. On the contrary, in a moment of change/crisis the emerging of new

⁹ Benjamin, "On the Program of the Coming Philosophy".

questions or distributions is not exclusively coming from the side of the sensible/experience, the 'new' can be a conceptual space as much as an sensual space. Indeed, it is not only technology, or experience, that 'runs ahead' and re-launches the questions of the paradigm in a new direction, as the materialist tradition proposes, rather it seems that it is the very logic of thought, when presenting itself as theory/epistemology (converging, defining, and closing), to be upset by escaping divergent series. Thus in a crisis the passage is from the anomaly of an epistemology in a paradoxical state, to an *ana-economy*, not in self-contradiction and in need of solution, but simply open.

But there is more. Beyond the first level of ontological instability, as Kuhn indicates, different paradigms install different sets of aesthetic-epistemological dimensions (aesthetic spaces), engendering specific questions for specific problems. They are incommensurable and irreconcilable. Proximity or simultaneity of paradigms does not guarantee a translation. There is no bridging between paradigms, only replacing. The lack of a space 'in between' is exactly where the crisis lays: the impossibility of an economy to engage with an open state, the morphing of an *open present*.

The Extraordinary:

The question must be pushed past a linear oppositional logic between separate models of thought. A crisis is experienced because simultaneous divergent series are irreconcilable. Indeed, Kuhn points out that the passing from the stable state of a paradigm (normal science) to the next happens while the paradigm is in function, throwing science into an extraordinary state. The traditional 'in between' must be seen instead as a *moment of differentiation*; not A and B (or A=A for this matter), but *now* and *open*, the open present. The crisis is indeed the impossibility of smooth conversion; the lack of a third place between paradigms; the absence of an external or absolute code that permits the translation-transmission of information. There is no possibility of translating tradition into modernity, or analogue into network whilst preserving the previous capabilities and values, the equation is incomplete: it is just (x), the present, and openness. Normality (stable paradigms) borders the open. The extraordinary is a moment of divergence, not a third place on the background of two ordinary paradigms; it does not constitute a dualistic alterity with normal science. Rather it is the paradoxical state where the whole distribution of the sensible and

epistemology must be reconfigured, the horizon where the present appears as a finite and yet unbound surface.

Difference is part of the Event

It must then be asked what happens between the open and the dimensions of the universe of meaning. Is the open simply void? If the crisis must be addressed from inside experience, the event must have all of its causes and possibilities inside what happens, not elsewhere. If the open is just the returning of difference, difference must be part of the event; not outside, not something else, but the very lack of boundary to the happening of the event.

The Sensual as Dimensions of Meaning

The technologies and discourses that reciprocally expand and articulate in the present are the dimensions of its identity; an instrument is nothing but a set of limitations (folds/dimensions), an absolutely smooth space would not allow any meaning to emerge. Rather than an economy between signifier and signified (or language and the world) sense emerges from play amongst the possibilities of the very technologies in action, their *abilities*, and the conceptual space opened by discourses¹⁰, in an internal (*restricted*) economy whose values and meaning coincide with its grammar¹¹. This is an *immersive* logic, which eludes the necessity of an external signification, and shows that technology is a discourse as much as discourses are sensual.

Real Question 1

Rather than concentrating on the dichotomy between aesthetics and epistemology (or technology and ideology) the focus should be the logic of emergence in the event: if the epistemological and aesthetic dimensions are

¹⁰ Samuel Weber draws an interesting link between Benjamin and Derrida: *iteration*, the ability of a given technology to engender repetitions, becomes the motor that sets possible patterns in motion, allowing sense to take place. See Samuel Weber, *Benjamin's -abilities*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 2008).

¹¹ In *Philosophical Grammar* Wittgenstein describes meaning as *grammar*: the play of a language not representing an external sense, but whose only denotation is the working of its internal rules. In other words the rules of language constitute the dimensions of its aesthetic space, effectively showing that a language is a technology and conversely that technology is a language. See Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Grammar* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1974).

generated in the event and if their logic is internal to it, that is, if epistemological and aesthetic dimensions coincide and expand in the extension of the event, then what happens to time?

The crisis is 'now', Retroactivity

Indeed, production and generation are divergent logics: the first follows a linear separation of subject-object in a process of accumulation, while the second is the result of a 'complex' move: the emergence generated by complex interactions whose properties were not implicit in the previous state of the system; a network logic, whose primary mode of operation is to open new links where there were none. This, rather than implementing pre-existing values, implies a retroactive form of synthesis based on a regime of reciprocity without the determinism of a linear cause-effect economy between discourses and practices, or between epistemology and aesthetic; a move not growing from an origin, but always from the 'now' (the present). The teleological linear time of Benjamin's expectations is here abandoned for the present as a moment of open transition.

Time in the Crisis of Experience

If for Benjamin "*the present is defined as a time of crisis and transition*, and philosophical experience (truth) is associated with the glimpse within the present, via the past, of an utopian future that would bring history to an end"¹², this retaining the past into the future with a sublating synthesis postulates a teleological timeline where the present acts as a step in function to an end; 'standing in' on behalf of the future, representing it, effectively installing a economy between the past, the now, and what is yet to come. Whereas a process of emergence rather than containing these steps, *reassembles* the present into a new surface, in a process where statistical probability replaces necessity. Such emergence, a serialization or extension of patterns, is still mediation but retroactively, recognized as synthesis only from inside its specific dimensions once they are installed. Such new surface escapes both determinism and teleology and is incommensurable with the previous state. Here probability is not a time to come or a set of options to choose from, but openness. Emergence is

¹² "Walter Benjamin", in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2011 Edition)*, Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2011/entries/benjamin/>>

the generation of a logic internal to the event, an event that takes place each time in different ways.

No Teleology and positive *enframing*: Ecology

Hence, the redemption of experience that Benjamin sought cannot happen without a *simultaneous* reorganization of the forms of knowledge. That is, the logic of an event is the reciprocal organization of the distribution of the sensible and the articulation of epistemology in the extension of its dimensions. Here the enframing turns *positive*, it is an affirmative expansion of dimensions without 'outside'; the 'clearing', the coming into light of an horizon as the organization of the world, no longer constitutes a simultaneous concealing move, because all references to authenticity are abandoned in favour of emerging surfaces. Moreover, if for Heidegger a horizon conceals the authentic relationship to Being, which as authentic is also unique, an open present, which expands from the reciprocity and simultaneity of a complex logic, does not need to rest on a 'ground', on the contrary its being 'open' implies a plurality of possibilities of arrangements and distributions. The heterogeneity of probability supersedes linear necessity; other possibilities, other universes are not affected by the happening of the present one. The topical logic of cohesion of surfaces is an *ecology*, a constant re-distribution of an open equilibrium¹³.

The Present as Crisis, the 'now' is open

In an environment where time is not an arrow travelling from the past into the future (or 'present is not the future of a past', as Deleuze put it) and the synthesis of serialization is retroactive, the present is *always* a state of crisis. The emergence from complex interactions figures as crisis, since it changes the self-representation of the existing order of things without 'calling time'. It rearranges the present into a new paradigm, rather than answering previous questions. Thus the crisis is more than the impossibility of determinism, or unpredictability, it is heterogeneity seen from inside the paradigm of homogeneous representation. Therefore a paradigm is an 'aesthetic space' (an articulation of the sensible and of epistemology), a *topos*; it has inner dimensions, which it has generated and it is constantly reaffirming. A paradigm acts as a *restricted economy*, whose values

¹³ Regarding the notion of *ecology*, see Isabelle Stengers, *Cosmopolitiques 2*, Paris, La Découverte, 1997.

and exchanges are valid and limited only to its internal dimensions. Such economies are the internal or 'normal' side of the paradigm; they require a denial of the possibility of a critical state. Crisis instead is that which cannot be calculated, represented inside the existing system; it is the extraordinary moment opening onto the 'sovereign silence' of a general economy¹⁴, where incommensurability and heterogeneity are interrupting the equation.

In passing from a restricted economy (of cause-effect, thesis-antithesis, sign-meaning, built around a "=" sign resolvable in a "zero sum"¹⁵), to a general economy where something is lost for the lack of outer boundary, there is a *paradoxical economy*, which yields a different value (*else*) than the one expected; a crisis that indicates loss and gain, waste and value at the same time, yet not symmetric, but divergent, incommensurable and therefore irreconcilable. As such the crisis exposes the limits of representation. The equilibrium of a new ecology is an *economy of the else*, or *ana-economy*.

Crisis of Experience is Paradox rather than Antithesis

Crisis is not an antithetic moment that lacks a synthetic solution, nor a matter of passing from state to state, but the moment of the same redistributing its dimensions. It is the paradox of a 'thesis/now' that changes without passing through an antithesis. Divergence reconceptualises the notion of crisis as de-territorializing while re-territorializing in a different direction. The paradox is not a return to a Humean scepticism, rather it stems from attempting to describe becoming from the point of view of being.

Paradoxes as Divergence and Simultaneity

Indeed, the simultaneity of series in the paradox conceals a remixing, which is the operation of a *feedback loop*. In this returning the 'next round' will be different; that is, divergence taking place while still converging, yet converging differently each time, or converging as difference¹⁶. Kuhn had already seen this:

¹⁴ See Jacques Derrida, "From Restricted to General Economy, an Hegelianism without reserve", in *Writing and Difference*, London Routledge, 1967

¹⁵ The concept of "zero sum" has been introduced by Prof. Sue Golding during a cycle of seminars in 2010-2011

¹⁶ See Gilles Deleuze, "Nietzsche", in *Pure Immanence; Essays on a Life*, 1965 (New York, Zone Books, 2001)

“the decision to reject a paradigm is always the decision to accept another”¹⁷. Out of the volatility of a delta of interpretations in a crisis only comes the restructuring of the question; a new ‘fold’, in the state of affairs, non-linear and non-necessary. Problems do not find synthetic solutions; rather they are superseded by new problems via a re-alignment of epistemological and aesthetic dimensions. A crisis is end and beginning at the same time, series diverging and converging on the same surface, in the same body-word. In the crisis the feedback loop generates new economies whose values are not measured against an absolute background but only internally. These are retroactive synthesis, not completions but the cohesion of a new ecological distribution/equilibrium, recognized as synthesis *a posteriori*, that is, only once they are installed. Therefore the anomaly is not the moment of crisis, but the economical representation of reality. In fact, the present is an open state or ana-economy where the incommensurable *else* emerges. This leads to another question:

Question 2: Dirty Passages

How passing from one paradigm’s dimensions to another paradigm’s dimensions takes place? If the open equation of a ana-economy installs incommensurable dimensions each time it returns, what happens when one paradigm is reconfigured into another? While ‘sovereign silence’ is the ultimate ana-economy, do local shifts retain some continuity or each shift drifts off into the infinity of the extraordinary?

Dimensions and Dirty Passages. The logic of *elsewhere*.

The work of the feedback loop appears to be fuzzy. If experience cannot be ‘reduced’ to an absolute/transcendental code (that of a pure text, information code, or commodity); if there isn’t an a-priori equation that permits a complete and even economic exchange, nor a clean and clear demarcation, then the passage will always be dirty, breaking edges, wasteful and mismatching, wasting potential, not matching every plug, USB, or shape; and at the same time it will require more and generate *else* than that which the previous system’s dimensions could offer as potential or permit as limits. This breaking and meeting of different dimensions of meaning, is then as wasteful as it can be generative.

¹⁷ Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, (Chicago-London, University of Chicago Press), 77

Indeed, the crisis is not forever lost in a paradox; rather the emptiness of the sovereign silence of a general economy is the condition for the circulation of the feedback loop. The economical logic reconfigured as ecology shows a new distribution as *open distribution*, and the present as a state of disequilibrium. Yet, this does not make openness a resource as negativity is in Hegelian dialectic, nor it represents any form of dualism, rather it is the plain lack of the boundary of necessity. Ecology is the open equilibrium produced by *change within the same* and resting on disequilibrium; while productive and wasteful, it is always affirmative, *poietic*; it 'makes sense' (as Kuhn stated, there is no abandoning of one paradigm without already adopting another). Instead of a process of production based on cause-effect linearity, the ecology of a network is a matter of *emergence*; its logic is internal to the event, based on the event's dimensions and articulating them at the same time. Identity, the surface, is synthesized/mediated in the present as ecology: an *emergence of the present in the present* (this is not to say that historical crisis are necessarily painless, ecologies are not a happy Disneyland parks but *entangled* redistributions).

Open present, disequilibrium: time and *Chaosmos*

If epistemology is the representation/projection of a world of Being, inevitably it will run into a crisis when encountering unexpected data that refer to Becoming. Deleuze introduced the concept of *chaosmos* to indicate what is outside the organized linearity of this time-universe¹⁸. Yet, chaosmos is only probability, not virtual or future to come, an open present; it implies a non-linear, non-teleological time being created in the passing from *chaos to order*¹⁹. The present is the heterogeneous moment where chaos and order coexist; a frontier between the organized/determined past (time) and chaos, which just for ease of description is called future. The open present is non representational and non economical (representation would be a present that must become future, or a future that must happen). Crisis is universality's inability to calculate

¹⁸ Gilles Deleuze, *The Logic of Sense*, Series 24, trans. Charles Stivale (London, Continuum, 1990)

¹⁹ Ilya Prigogine & Isabelle Stengers, *From Chaos to Order*, (London, HarperCollins, 1985). On this regard John Gribbin's notion of multiverse is also interesting, in particular the description of time/entropy in the second law of thermodynamics: without irreversible changes in the system there is no 'passing' of time. Ref: John Gribbing, *In Search of the Multiverse*, (Penguin, London, 2009).

multiversality, where the economy of past–future, energy–entropy, is always broken/open; in fact it was never whole. It does not yield what it was expected to produce in the past and at the same time it is generating something that the past had no necessity for, something that was not implicit in it. The feedback loop between order and chaos generates something new without necessity; in it, the present and time are generated together *retroactively*. Moreover, here the open is not the postmodern lack of ground, or infinite deferral, or the ‘always–already’ of a trace. It completely reverses the Cartesian deterministic mechanicism, without reintroducing void in the equation. Therefore, a crisis of experience requires a phenomenology directed not towards the ‘thing itself’, but towards the present: a *phenomenology of the surface*.

Paradox and Divergence

The paradigm shift is a heterogeneous ‘portmanteau’ moment for different series, a *domino turn* where one tile allows several simultaneous different directions, a crossroad of practices; it escapes or exceeds the existing paradigm, which produced the existing logic. In it incommensurability is the logical chaos between probability and time. In the heterogeneous paradox of divergence shifts are progressive nuances or messy crushes, not translations. Moreover there is no original state from which divergence moves, or a state of nature, or total noise; the event of sense is the crisis of another sense. One is always already immersed in language, one learns to speak and think while learning the dimensions of language/grammar²⁰.

Multiple Vectors, Disequilibrium, create Time and Space.

The new surface generated by the simultaneous converging while diverging is in excess of an economy; converging–diverging act as vectors ‘pulling’ in different directions from one point, which is not a centre at rest but is created by these tensions between disequilibrium and probability. These simultaneous movements generate time/space rather than being located in them. Interestingly Althusser had already approached the event of revolution as a critical threshold where the simultaneous alignment of several different segments or variables at their critical

²⁰ See Lyotard critique of St. Augustine’s semiotic theory, in François Lyotard, *Libidinal Economy*, chapter 2, trans Iain Hamilton Grant (London, Continuum, 2004)

level of intensity generates change²¹; yet, in spite of the similarity, topological emergence takes place without the support of an external timeline; in fact the synthesis a posteriori of complexity logic installs an aesthetic temporality which is a *poietic* form of time.

Heterogeneity escapes Economy: the making of Time.

Indeed, heterogeneity escapes economies not on the background of time, but in making time. The passage between economy and economy exposes the open general economy or openness that (ana)envelops them. The present/meaning is tangent to chaos, an extraordinary moment of quantum openness, which clashes with the paradigm of determinism and representation. It is not a matter of a leap into 'nothing', rather just reaching the 'end' of one paradigm's set of dimensions. That is, the logic of becoming is internal to the event; it opens with it, yet without the authenticity that Heidegger sought, rather each time differently. Such extraordinary leap threatens the authority of the language-paradigm for a multitude of meaningful practices, which, rather than seeking a 'ground', are finding local passages, internal links, and temporary bridges to generate value and escape. In this light, since it abandons both the ideology of the possibility of an ultimate object of knowledge and the notion of a *noumenon*, the articulation of epistemology not only coincides with the distribution of the sensible, but –as Rancière describes– shows that the aesthetic dimensions of the phenomenon are intrinsically political²².

Physical and Political Laws – Foreclosing the Present

If the heterogeneity of the event is not preserved, an installed theory in its process of normalization will pronounce laws representing the paradigm as a priori. A crisis will be regarded as an exception and normalization will re-close the open gap, re-mark the boundary of the paradigm-society, re-construct a whole; performing, that is, a process of inclusion-exclusion where the possibility of difference is entirely silenced, made not to exist. Questions that *cannot be asked*, that are outside the paradigm's equation, become non-problems, invisible. However it is important to stress that this cannot be deemed the

²¹ Luis Althusser, Étienne Balibar, *Reading the Capital*, trans Ben Brewster, 1970, <http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/althusser/1968/reading-capital/index.htm>

²² see Jacques Rancière, *The Politics of Aesthetics*, London, Continuum, 2000

alienation of an originary state²³, rather it is the separation of thought from the sensible, or the separation of meaning from the language that produces it; a separation that will always create a political divide and limit access to the existing discourse to those who are already included, as Rancière shows in his discussion of the politics of aesthetics²⁴.

Conclusions: A new form of Materialism.

The question then focuses on the *inside* of the event, *emergence* is a logic in itself, which abandons the spatialization of time for the temporalization of an aesthetic space as incommensurable: a place that *is* without representing, a *topos*. Indeed, if the event is change/becoming, rather than teleological development, then it does not need an 'outside'. A *ana*-economy is an *affirmative* event, it is the moment that differentiates *sense* from *silence*, not from non-sense. The causes and elements of change are all internal to the event, and they can take place because of openness. This is at the same time more complex and simpler than the 'returning of difference'. The specific/inner logic of incommensurable economies means that each event's internal logic emerges from the interactions of the elements that constitute it; that is, the elements that constitute the present. Deleuze resorted to the '*univocity* of events', a transcendental space of pure difference, to explain becoming²⁵. Yet, the fact that the event can happen rests only on it *not being bound*, open; the 'cause', how the event happens is site-specific, internal, and therefore retroactive. As such the *eventum tantum* excludes any totalizing argument, it is finite but not bound, a *ana*-totality.

²³ This is a problem that to some extent seems to taint Luce Irigaray's argument in her critique of Heidegger, where logos' rigour silences a fluid movement, see Luce Irigaray, *The Forgetting of Air in Martin Heidegger*, trans. Mary Beth Mader (Austin, University of Texas Press, 1999); a similar problem is at the base of Agamben's analysis which finds exception always being present at both 'ends' of the law, or the humanity captured by an 'apparatus'; see respectively Giorgio Agamben, *Stato di Eccezione – Homo Sacer 2*, (Torino, Bollati Boringhieri, 2003) and *Che cos'è un Dispositivo*, (Roma, Nottetempo, 2006).

²⁴ On this regard, Foucault's continuity of regimes of power through the -alleged- exceptional state of war and the stable periods of peace is correct; indeed, it is representation that makes the state appear, by marking a boundary, and installing a equation or code to guarantee the organization of an otherwise heterogeneous surface. See Michel Foucault, *Society Must be Defended*, seminars 2 and 3, trans. David Macey (London, Penguin, 2004).

²⁵ Gilles Deleuze, *Logic of Sense*, Series 24, trans. Charles Stivale (London, Continuum, 1990).

In the case of the shift from analogue to digital operations, from production to generation, the passage must really be seen behaving in the light of the rhizome: a heterogeneity whose dimensions take place by subtraction: 'n-1'²⁶; where 'n' is the infinity of probability. As such the synthetic meaning/present is always mediated, but not teleological. The poietic logic of emergence introduces a new philosophy of history based on the affirmative logic of the medium/technology. This abandons both scientific determinism and the 'determinism' of a strict materialistic analysis for a regime of *emergence of the present in the present*. A point in space, a moment in history, or a concept in thought are no longer anchored to a main meta-narrative nor lost in the abyss, rather self-generating it via resonances and interferences.

Postscript on Value

Definition of Value: Process only –Network Economy

The passage from chaos to order as described by Prigogine–Stengers returns in Kuhn analysis of paradigm's behaviour as something that has value not because it is absolute, or is measured against an absolute, but because it functions, it is *cohesive*; because, albeit for a while only, it creates links with other parts which allow flow, exchange, circulation, correspondences and –most importantly– the creation of new links within the network. *Process* is all there is to the notion of value and meaning. Value is what is implementable in a discourse according to its dimensions and reciprocally as one of its dimensions. Ultimately, Deleuze's shift from traditional western logic, which based its hierarchy on nouns–subjects, to verbs (gerunds and infinitives) and their declinations converging on body/subjects is a logic of series and patterns that *generates space/time* rather than happening on their background. Hence *individuation* is the convergence, the temporary resonance of segments with the same frequency, the temporary alignment of different patterns. Economies, representations, translation are not between simultaneous values, but between the present and the past in the inner logic of each event: "*one is always smaller than what one is becoming, and bigger*

²⁶ Gilles Deleuze & Félix Guattari, *A Thousands Plateaux*, Rhizome introduction, trans Brian Massumi (London, Continuum, 2004).

*than what one was*²⁷. Therefore, in the *eventum tantum*, the passing from chaos to order requires, or only permits, a *phenomenology of the present*. The ‘thing itself’ is the surface, the present, not a logical depth, while the past is the epistemological presupposition that tends to foreclose it. In the logic of heterogeneous emergence the artistic coincides with the political; indeed it should be noted that after the *Logic of Sense* Deleuze arrives at the *Logic of Sensation* not as a different kind of logic, but as the only logic possible: that of some specific works of a specific artist, rather than of art as a whole.

²⁷ Deleuze, *Logic of Sense*, Series 1, trans. Charles Stivale (London, Continuum, 1990); my italics.