

The radical semantics and the splintered structure that i have used to write this paper, are both reflexive to my ontological approach to art making. For this reason, the structural construct of this paper is splintered into points of singularities with which, I will try to hinder the disillusioned and irreversible loop of the cybernetic spectacle.

The elucidation of the spectacle and the “object”

As long as necessity is socially dreamed, dreaming will remain a social necessity. The spectacle is the bad dream of a modern society in chains and ultimately expresses nothing more than its wish for sleep. The spectacle is the guardian of that sleep”. (Guy Debord, the society of the spectacle, 21) In this context, Guy Debord attacks the spectacle, that is, the fabricated and disillusioned commodities of capitalist modern societies that has emerged during post world war II. Furthermore, this disillusioned commodity of the culture industry has only one wretched function, that is, to derange the user/ consumer, thus, making him feel closer to his false ontology. This means, total appropriation of the user by the constituents of the culture industry such as advertising, theatre, computers, cars, pop culture, and also the verbal semiotics of the cultural industry that became objects themselves such as Glamour, Wow, Fabulous etc. When this happens, the user converts into a corporeal object consumed by the spectacle rather than the other way around and the vicious cycle of consumption loops back onto itself. Thus, the consumer transforms into an end-user for commodity. By doing so, the consumed object in the spectacle becomes corporeal “which” aims to dictate

it's end user. Lastly, this loop is maintained and prolonged through space and time by the mere fact of the continuation of the spectacle.

Space and time are inter-programmed in the spectacle:

“In its most advanced sector, concentrated capitalism orients itself towards the sale of "completely equipped" blocks of time”. (Debord, 111) In other words, time in the spectacle is a pseudo-time for its mere synthetic fabrication, hence, delivered to the user in a package. If that is the case, time in the spectacle is invented by the spectacle itself. Therefore, the pseudo-time, could be disassembled, assembled back, fixed etc... Nevertheless, If time needs space to be propelled forward from point A to B to C etc... then time and space are correlated. To repeat, time in the spectacle is made, hence and by default, space is customized and tailored to fit the disillusioned fabricated time. As a result, space and time in the spectacle are both interrelated or inter-programmed for mere fabrication. For this reason, space and time in the spectacle are systems rather than natural, hence, they are cybernetics for the mere fact of their inter-programmability. Therefore, in the spectacle, space and time could be delivered to the user in one package. So, when the user opens the package of space and time that is delivered to him by the spectacle, he/she has the option to choose between different disillusioned choices that are all collective stimuli and in the sense that, they are shared with others in the spectacle. When this happens, his individuality is dissolved, thus, flushed out of his persona. In other words it is only the repetitive collective laughter that supervenes in the spectacle. Therefore, the end result will be a sheer reproductive exteroception. Because, the stimulus he is being exposed to does not belong to him/her, since the spectacle offers

him/her nothing more than a reproductive laughter. Above all, this reproducible laughter belongs to the user/consumer, but however, it does not belong to his individuality or, true ontology. On the contrary, it belongs to his false ontology. To sum up, and as a result, it is unlikely for one's exteroception not to be programmed in the cybernetic spectacle. However, it all depends on one's self consciousness if one wants to use his individuality as a tool to hinder the closed and static loop of the spectacle, that i will converse about later on in this paper.

The static loop of the spectacle:

“This was a static type of society that organized time, true to its immediate experience of nature, on a cyclical model” (Guy Debord, the society of the spectacle, 126) According to Gilles Deleuze, “Movement does not just shift a body from one point to another (translation) in each block of movement, bodies transform and become, so each movement transforms the whole of time by producing new becomings”. (Colebrook, 2002: 44) In this case, repetition of action in a certain space and time does not produce new becomings by the mere fact that it loops onto itself, hence producing the same image and same becomings over and over. For this reason, repetition becomes static and at one point, self-obstructive. To explain, If we take the example of a certain number of people in a given theatre watching a movie, thus, being exposed by the same images that are conducive to a unified or, a collective-introspective feel. As a result, this visual and auditory stimuli that all people will be exposed to, creates repetition in the time and space in it's entirety. Furthermore, this repetition creates a rift in the timeframe sequence

of that moment of collective laughter in particular, for it's mere redundancy. When this happens, mobility is obstructed, thus, the sequence in that space becomes a-mobile. That is, as if time had taken a still picture of itself over and over again. For this reason, time stalls and collapses on to itself by mere repetition. In other words, the next time we all laugh together, time will cease to exist and we will laugh forever...

Repetition is a-mobile in the “Deleuzian space”

“Enduring or duration is not the connection of a series of points that are all pretty much the same; it is the flow of differing difference”. (Gilles Deleuze, Colebrook, 2002: 44). In contrast and in the case of repetition, the mere fact of it's lack of impulsive patterns, results in the connection of series of points that are all pretty much the same. Therefore, repetition does not flow in in the “Deleuzian space”. When this happens, repetition becomes reductive rather than productive. For this reason, repetition is a-mobile. Furthermore, according to Deleuze, “To think of the new as a ‘blip’ is to think of time as a sequence that has it's disruption but then flows on”. (Gilles Deleuze, Colebrook, 2002: 63) In this context, the word ‘blip’ means total deviation and derailment of of its own sequence. In this case, repetition could not have blips in it's sequence or otherwise, it stops repeating itself. Moreover, if blips were to infiltrate repetition, they hinder it's repetitive sequence, thus, the repetition mutates into a series of transient patterns instead.

The digital reiteration is static:

In the binary digital, the bit has only 2 values of 1's and 0's; 1 as high, or on and 0 as low, or off. So, the binary digital, works in this sense; 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0... Or, on off on off on off on off on off on off on off on off on off... This means, 1's and 0's loops over and over up to the point where the loop becomes static for mere dis-alternation in it's own time and space. In other words, and in this subject matter, space and time are dis-altered because of mere repetition. For this reason, the repetition of 1's and 0's over and over dis-alter the computational loop, thus, making it static. As an illustration, If we take the example of an assembly line, the same thing happens, in the sense that, the loop of the line loops onto itself with no alteration in it's function. At a certain point, the loop of the line becomes static in time and space for it's mere repetition. For this reason, since this mechanical loop is the by-product of the spectacle in it's construct, thus both the computational loop and the assembly line loop are part of the constituents of the spectacle. In addition, according to S. Vinograd and F.D Cowen, "In the boolean function it is this redundancy (repetition of movement) that allows the degrading effects of malfunctioning modules to be reduced, since each aggregate operates on a repeated signal carried by the bundle". (Reliable Computation in the Presence of Noise. In his book, scientist S.Vinograd conversed about the fact how essential redundancy is for the boolean function. "The remainder of the message is redundant and conveys no new information. Since randomness, by definition implies an absence of rhythmic patterns , it is merely impossible to reliably guess what will come next. For this line of reasoning, the author suggests that the more

random the message is, the more information it conveys". (Kathleen Hayles, The digital dialectic, 77, MIT press, 1999) In the context of the binary digital, the absence of patterns is obvious through the repetition of 1's and 0's. For this reason, the insertion of patterns in the binary digital creates a new discourse, thus, deconstructing the binary digital through the obstruction of it's own loop. When this happen, the binary digital takes on a new meaning, thus, it becomes independent from the spectacle. When this happen, the altered binary digital falls out of the spectacle. This means, and in contrast, If any given loop keeps on repeating itself over and over without being altered neither varied, it collapses onto itself, thus, creating a rift in it's own flow of time and space, thus the loop is discontinuous. For this reason, this discontinuity hinders the movement of time/space whereby the loop becomes static. Besides, the difference between a still frame and a sequence of moving but repetitive frames is no difference, for repetition stalls movement.

A faulty space in the spectacle is conducive to an impulsive physical language.

"If we are looking for a character who records what unfolds in this scene, it would have to be the unhappy architect who, through his blunders, ends up being responsible for most of the disaster". (Michel Chion, The Films of Jaques Tati, 2003) According to Jaques Tati's 1967 Playtime movie) In my view, and according to Jaque Tati's playtime; and in the architectural context, architectural situationism is the ramification of a faulty space in the spectacle. In other words, architectural situationism supervenes as a result of the collapse of the architectural modern space. That is, when architecture

becomes a stumbling block rather than a spatial aid, hence, the user of that space, will be obligated to inspect alternative ways of how to bypass faulty constructions and hasty designed paths in that given space. Hence having no choice but to alter the path that the architect had created for him. By doing so, the user would be instantiating his own spectacle, thus appropriating his own physical language in that given space. For this reason, and as a result, because of an error in the architectural space, man appropriates a self impulsive physical language in that faulty space. As I mentioned above, since impulsive disposition falls out of the spectacle, hence, the user becomes a situationist as a result of an “error” in that space. For all of the above reasons, the ramification of the architect’s faulty design is the emergence of the some kind of a new language. Moreover, can this new language induce new media? The answer for this, will probably require extensive theoretical rigor and scientific proof. However, what I can substantiate is, the symbiotic relation between man and the error for the error’s sheer affectivity. Lastly, I am not criticizing architecture neither Jaques Tati was, but however, Tati conversed about the space in modern architecture as being conducive in picturing the language of errors. Thus, Jaques Tati saw in architecture as an emancipator for the user of the space to create his own spectacle. All things considered, could we induce that any language (verbal or physical) without impulse is bound to repeat itself, hence, self obstruct, for only impulse keeps it sentient?

The affective error:

“Errors are assumed to occur during synaptic transmissions in the transmission of signals of modules as well as in modules themselves. These synaptic errors are assumed to be of two kinds, those that block an input signal and those that spontaneously produce a fictitious input signal” (S.Vinograd. Coen, reliable computation in the presence of noise, S vinograd, coen)

If some errors in the boolean function are regarded by computer scientists to be fictitious input signals, then these errors should be redundant, thus, neutral or in-affective when they occur. Furthermore, If we analyze the semantic of the fictitious in this case, this means, that these signals are not real or imaginary. However, they are still scientifically looked at as signals even though they are fictitious ones. Thus, since these fictitious signals alter the code and mutate the digital binary by adding transient patterns to the loop of 1 and 0 of the digital bit. For this reason, these fictitious signals are affective. If according to S. Vinograd synaptic errors produce spontaneity, therefore, these errors are self propelled and impulsive. This means, these errors create their own language as opposed to the conventional code that is created by the computer scientist himself, for the conventional code is deprived from it's self language. Could we induce that the errors that became input signals according to the author are epistemological in the sense that they create a new meaning to the loop that makes the loop evaluate itself. If that is the case, and for this reason, affective errors creates new semantics that fuse with 1's and 0's which forces the loop to reconsider itself. In other words, to reconsider itself by mere fact of it's infusion with affective errors.

Moreover, in brief, according to Gilles Deleuze, the concept of “deteritorialisation” frees a possibility or event from its actual origins, body and place” (Gilles Deleuze by Claire Colebrook) Consequently, the affective error frees the digital binary loop from its origins by the fact of mere alteration. In other words the affective error frees the code and as a result the code appropriates its own self language that I mentioned above. “deteritorialisation produces an image of pure affect, there is a sensation that it is not referred to a specific body or place” Since S.Vinograd conversed about the fact that errors create input signals but rather fictitious, thus, these errors are not referred to any specific body or place for they are fictitious. For all of the above reason, affective errors ‘deteritorialise’ the digital binary (computational loop). This, creates a new context to the static loop of the computational system.

Errors are points of singularity:

To start with, singularity in the mathematical sense, means any function that takes an infinite value. In theory, an affective error, is a point of singularity for the mere fact that its outcome is random and impulsive. In this case, it's nearly impossible to predict what outcome errors might produce. For this reason, errors take infinite value in their disposition. Let's take the example of feedback noise, the frequency that feedback forges could never be anticipated due to its impulsive outcome. For this reason, feedback creates its own impulsive language.

Individuality as an error in the “Degaulian” government:

“History, which had hitherto appeared express nothing more than the activity of individual members of the ruling class, and had thus been conceived of as a chronology of events was now perceived in its general movement an inexorable movement that crushed individuals before it”. (Debord, society of the spectacle) Moreover, Situationism nurtured a feeling of anti-systematization and individuality that sparked of the unrest of the 1968 student revolution in Paris. In fact, it is widely discussed that the student revolution wasn’t about literally subverting the “Degaulian” government, but rather, it was to impede the traditional values of the system back then and in it’s entirety. Besides that, the main catalyst of the unrest, was the student’s sheer individuality and liberalism such as, the demand for equalities, sexual liberation, human rights, freedom of speech, that with all of which they fought the conventionality of the traditional sociopolitical Degaulian system. On the other hand, despite that the youth were only expressing themselves, Charles Degaul and his government dealt with the unrest as if their demands were errors in the system that needed to be obliterated at any cost. As a result, the Degaulian authority took radical decisions, up to the point that Degaul deployed an entire workforce on the streets, in addition to creating a military operations headquarters. “May 1968 was a watershed in French life, a holy moment of liberation for many, when youth coalesced, the workers listened and the semi-royal French government of Charles de Gaulle took fright”. (The Taipei Times, <http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/editorials/archives/2008/05/02/20034108090>) In other words, The ramification of the 1968 unrest turned out to be the emergence of the new liberal France. Point in fact, in the

case of the student revolution in Paris, what was regarded as an error for the old system, that is, individuality, had actually infiltrated the loop of the static society that Guy Debord conversed about. Thus, individuality obstructed the static society, in its norms and traditions, therefore it hindered its repetition. When this happened, the fusion of the “blip” and the system had created new sociopolitical patterns which resulted in the emergence of the new liberal France.

Le détournement digital (The digital détournement)

détournement, was the insertion of errors in the system of culture industry that Guy Debord and the Situationists international along with the rebellious students of 1968, all of which tried to upload in the spectacle. In brief, *détournement* is the hijacking of any artifact that belongs to the spectacle to derail its meaning in order for one to make it fit his/her own milieu. To repeat, *détournement* was originally a revolutionary tool, which was used and implemented by the rebellious students during the 1968 revolution in Paris. For this reason, situationism was a major threat to corporate or mainstream art. In analogy, if the structure of the digital binary is organic in the way it functions, through unbounded building blocks of 1's and 0's bits, then, we need a certain antigen to disrupt or destabilize that “digital chain”. In the context of the digital binary, the error will act as antigen, thus, subverting the digital chain. When this happens, the error will induce diversion and deviation in the original disposition of the digital chain. For this reason, the affective error induces digital *détournement*. When *détournement* supervenes in the digital chain, errors construct their own situations in the digital chain. Hence, a new physical language emerges. For all of the above reasons, could digital

détournement subvert the repetitive binary bit and derail it's use and thus, new media emerges? Nevertheless, for this to happen, we need a contextual catalyst. Perhaps the accumulation of bios new media that dictates our daily lives or us being pinned in the limitations of mainstream software of the industry. Or perhaps, the ceaseless appropriation of the bit by colossal multinational money making companies that dictates our lives, thus, package and promote the bit as part of the spectacle's commodity. Might that be the catalyst of a future upset, thus emulating the 1968 student student revolution? But this time, a digital revolution, instead?

The Détournement of the code:

Could the user appropriate or subvert the code and take control of it's impact, thus changing it's meaning to his own demands? if so, in what way he/she could do so? In analysis, a faulty C++ code will function despite it's faultiness. Nevertheless, it's functionality becomes impulsive rather than predetermined. For this reason, the faulty code mutates and, thus, it appropriates it's own impulsive language in the digital space. For instance, if we converse about a code that was originally written to reverse the direction of a certain DC motor. In this context, the user could per instance, hinder it's original meaning or function through playing around with it's code, thus hijacking it's meaning. When this happen, the code mutates and induces an impulsive new language. Additionally, the code reconstructs itself and thus, it becomes an impulsive function rather than a predetermined function. To repeat, when the user hijacked the code he thus appropriated the code to his own true ontology. For this reason digital *Détournement* supervenes. In the first place,

for the 1968 student revolution in Paris, the students/protestors used *Détournement* du spectacle that is the appropriation of artifacts and objects from within the spectacle and through the derailment and distortion of their meaning they defended their own individuality, which resulted in the new liberal France. Just in the same way, pour *le détournement de code*, the user's creates his own cybernetic spectacle through the derailment of the cybernetic spectacle, that is, through the sheer use of the affective error. Lastly, i am not trying to subvert capitalism neither to create an uprising through the appropriation of the code or the digital bit. However, what i am trying to converse about is the phenomenology of the error and its impulsive disposition. Above all, I can never reach a conclusion or predetermine the end result of the error in the code since it s only true outcome is sheer impulsiveness.

The *Détournement* of social exposure:

Lastly, the reason why I have chosen to write about this subject matter, for mere fact of it's correlation with my final thesis project. Accordingly, in my thesis project, I am tackling the amount of subjective media exposure that the user's stimuli is pinned with by the spectacle itself. For this reason, The social Fader (device that gives one the option to adjust the volume of exposure between the east and west in any medium one is interacting with) that I will be developing throughout the course of my graduate studies in the Digital Arts and New Media program studies, will hopefully give the chance to the user to appropriate his own social exposure on any given medium he will be

interacting with, be it, visual or musical. Hence, the user will hijack the social exposure dictated on him by the media.

*It is contentious in fact, as it runs counter to Marxist logic of bourgeois = individualistic/monadic = hegemony of capitalism... In his book *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man*, Marshall McLuhan claims otherwise, repetition for him wear down the individual, and reproduce her/him in the form of mediated representations ("spectacle" for Debord)*

Bibliography:

Society of the Spectacle, by Guy Debord, published by Zone Books New York, 1994

The Films of Jaques Tati, by Michel Chion, published by Guernica, 2003

Reliable Computation in The presence of Noise, by S Winograd and F. D. Cowan, published by MIT Press, 1963

The interactive Spectacle, By Shaleph O'neill and HCI group, Napier University Edinburgh

The Taipei Times, <http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/editorials/archives/2008/05/02/20034108090> 12-09-2008

Kathleen Hayles, The digital dialectic, published by MIT press, 1999

The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man, Marshall McLuhan, published by University Toronto Press, 1962

Gilles Deleuze, excerpt from *moveby Claire Cole Brook*, published by Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, 2002