



## Ontokinethics: Metapolitics of Becoming in Affective Hypercapital

Jaime del Val

Current modes of domination require a new understanding of movement that exceeds the platonic tradition of metaphysics of presence: not the movement of things but movement as the only ontological substrate, from which thingness itself may emerge. Through an ontology of becoming that redefines movement beyond the Aristotelian legacy we may understand power in terms of movement and how in the Information era and the explosion of Big Data new modes of power (new modes of movement alignment, of choreographies, of Panchoreographic) emerge.

The Panchoreographic as kinetic power that aligns the movements of matter at all scales, from the nano- bio- and neuro- to the individual, social, urban, land and geo- scales, is a multifaceted metabody of movement alignments superposing multiple choreographies of perception that, especially since ancient Greece, have favoured a particular kind of visual domination, and the attempt to fix movement in forms. From the birth of Geometry through Renaissance perspective to ubiquitous interfaces designed in the secret laboratories of corporations, the perceptual revolutions of power have a kinetic ontology: of fixation and hierarchy of perception, and thus of our movements and relations, our affects and desires, our bodies and sexes, that become more and more the object of quantification in the Big Data Era as we become extensions of a planetary hypercyborg. This affective hypercapital of kinetic alignment of bodies at all scales requires a reinvention of movement in ontological, political and ethical-ecological dimensions: an ontokinethics, or metagenethics, an ontopolitics and metapolitics, an ontoethics and metaethics.

Ontokinethics, as an ontology of the becoming, foregrounds an understanding of movement as both incipient and relational, as proposed by Erin Manning (2009). Inciency points to the non actualised potentials, the preacceleration of movement towards the unpredictable. Relationality points to the multiplicities of forces in interaction and the immanent intervals they generate. Both inciency and relationality point to movement not as property of already given entities within an actualised extension, but as ontogenetic: as generative of reality, of extension, of perception, of thinking and affect.

Ontokinethics has groundings in the traditions of Process Philosophy and of Philosophy of Becoming, as well as in other disciplines: from Heraclitus and Taoism, to Spinoza and Nietzsche, from Simondon, Bergson and Whitehead, to Deleuze, Guattari, Derrida and Foucault, from neurosciences and quantum physics to contemporary philosophers such as Brian Massumi, Erin Manning, Luciana Parisi or Karen Barad.

In a world of relational forces in constant motion we need an understanding of motion not as that which happens between given identities and forms, in a given extensive space, but of movement as constitutive of all that is. Form appears thus as residue at two different levels: as the partial actualisation of a movement that is exceeding its actualisations, and as relative to certain regimes of alignment of movement that generate a fixed mode of perception.

Potentiality on the other hand is neither absence nor presence, but creative movement of becoming: it is not the deferral of an unreachable idea (as identity is) but an ontogenetic gesture that exceeds what it creates:

double gesture of creation. Amorphogenesis is this very process of formation that is not directed to the fixation into forms, but where movement is always exceeding its formations into new undefined potentials, thus placing the emphasis on emergence and becoming.

The ontology of becoming is also an epistemology since it accounts for the ways in which consciousness is formed as an effect of movement relations, as many cognitive sciences suggest, such as enactive cognition theories by Francisco Varela (1993).

Ontokinethics is also an ethics, since it inverts the traditional priority of identity over change, whereby traditionally, identity has served the purpose of establishing universalist sets of values and conceptions of the Good. Such fixations of being are in radical contradiction with the multiplicity of movements of becoming, the creative potentials of the forces of life, and bring forward a violence implicit in the imposition of a universalist, homogenising construct.

Not only is it necessary to problematise the unity of identity versus multiplicity, but foremostly its fixity. Multiplicity cannot be only of already given identities. The potentiality of movement as the permanent opening into the yet-unthinkable opens up a new domain of multiplicity as related to becoming, to the emergence of what is not yet existing or thinkable, the yet-impossible, which, as soon as it becomes possible is already being exceeded by movement, that points to new potentials. Movement and change is thus not only of the already given, but is an opening towards the yet unthinkable.

The fixation and foregrounding of identity over movement and change, is thus a negation and annihilation of the creative forces of life. We invert thus the traditional account of nihilism understood as the negation of universal values that is derived from the logic of identity: metaphysics of identity is the true nihilism.

This opens up a new horizon for ethics, in which it is necessary to interpret movement as it happens in each complex relational context in terms of its alignment in choreographies or trajectories of replication and homogenisation (nihilistic drive, reactive forces) or its opening of potentials, its indeterminacy (affirmative drive, active forces).

A relational field of forces is a metabody, which, doesn't rely on individuation of events and limits, but on the consistence and immanence of the relations that are experienced, which include movement alignments such

as those which constitute power relations in the social field, and also the amorphogenetic field, the much larger field of murmuring potentials. Metabodies are defined by affects (modes, rhythms and contacts of relation of forces) and desire (incipience and directionality of the relation of forces). The interpretation of the active and reactive forces operating in movement can be traced through multiple alignments of movement that traverse the social field at all levels: choreographies of verbal language and writing, of urban space and state bureaucracy, of transport and media, of information and code, of visual culture and perspective, of binary gender and sexuality constructions, of family and education: complex and multiple alignments of movement which foreclose its potentials, as it gets choreographed in increasingly multifaceted, binary, circular, and linear programmes of pre-emption.

These metaprogrammes constitute the pancoreographic as the movement alignments that constitute a given social field. The different forms of alignment account for different interrelated strata in the pancoreographic, according to the different alignments of despotic, disciplinary and control societies. In control society elements of prior alignments survive, appropriated and recodified by the new alignments of capitalism and Information, that choreograph thinking and bodies in molecular scales, assimilating every useless flow of desire and affect into capitalist flows (Parisi 2004).

Information as pattern distinct from its material substrates, and meaning as entity distinct from signifiers, conform transcendental entities analogue to platonic ideas and the christian God, thereby subduing the forces of life to a predefined, unreachable fiction, a negative alignment that structures other alignments, a metaprogramme that has implicit a line of abolition and death.

Ontokinethics is the ground for a new kind of creative science in which the question is not after the nature and origin of things in a quest to control and fix them, but to understand their potentials for transformation, for generating movement ecologies that foster multiplicity and change rather than alignments of replication.

Ontokinethics is also a pragmatics and a politics that opens up a new field of agency, not of a unitary subject and its free will, but of movement ecologies. Metaformativity is the rhizomatic and deconstructive science that interprets the alignments of movement and generates new conditions for movement ecologies.

Ontokinethics, by understanding the nihilistic alignments of movement that are foundational to individual and social, discursive and identity formations, allow for new kinds of agency that are not reduced to the given structures of a discourse and its possibilities for oppositional or subverted iteration, but of infinitesimal movements of disalignment that may open up the given trajectories to new potentials, thus inducing disalignments that don't imply violent realignments of the macrostructures, but imperceptible creative moves.

Ontokinethics is an ecology that allows for the emergence of new kinds of movement that does not foster the formation and sustainment of dominant power relations tending to actualisation and fixation, but the emergence of metastable fields of potentials.

Ontokinethics is a new form of applied physiology and health, in which the illness of a culture and a body can be traced in its implicit nihilistic alignments of foreclosure, vs. the open, creative, affirmative moves to indeterminacy.

Ontokinethics is a radically dionysian aesthetics of the amorphous. Metaformance is the process of permanent transformation of perception that accounts for this aesthetics, where there is no defined set of senses but a changing field of multimodal capacities.

Ontokinethics is metalogic and metadiscursive in so far as it considers thinking a form of movement, of alignment of movement, that doesn't describe, but creates new reality. At the same time Ontokinethics challenges and investigates the very conditions of possibility of thinking understood as movement and its relation to perceptual movements and other modes of alignment.

Ontokinethics radically challenges the account of thinking in terms of ideas, and of language in terms of meanings, and proposes instead an understanding of thinking and language as creative movements, as affects and impingements that generate difference and the emergence of the new. Difference (Deleuze 2002) and

Differance (Derrida 1989) are thus not subdued to identity. Differential difference, as the movement of potentials that exceed actualisations are about creative differential intervals between forces that don't fix themselves in patterns of visual domination.

Ontokinethics also challenges linear time and extensive space conceptions in so far as they are the result of perceptual alignments. Movement, as force and intensity, generates time-space irreducible to linearity. Every embodied field of relations generates irreducible time-space dimensions, intensities, modalities or qualities.

Ontokinethics subverts Plato's ontology of form, which posits binary sex in the foundations of western metaphysics, by assigning form and being to man, and formlessness and non-being to woman, as mere receptacle for the self-replication of man (Butler 1993). In contrast to this binary conception of sex, related to form and reproduction, Ontokinethics proposes an understanding of desire as excess of the movement of the forces that can flow potentially in any direction, far from aligning itself with binary macro-structures, creating directionality altogether, or a-directional spatiotemporalities. Microsexes are the molecular flows of desire of a body irreducible to form (postanatomical body) which subvert the binary foundations of western metaphysics not through oppositional macro-alignments, but through infinitesimal disalignments of movement.

Ontokinethics appears as an urgent response, not only to longstanding traditions of dogmatic nihilistic thinking, but also to implicit power in late capitalism, which operates through the production, orchestration and assimilation of desire and affects within capitalist flows.

An ontokinethic approach is needed in order to understand and dismantle the new implicit fascism as multiplicities are pre-empted into homogenising market flows while concealing the extreme violence of its structures: an ontoethics and metaethics of becoming for a metapolitics and ontopolitics of movements to come.

#### References:

- Barad, Karen. 2007. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Duke University Press
- Butler, Judith. 1993. *Bodies that matter – On the discursive limits of “sex”*. New York. Routledge
- Deleuze, Gilles & Guattari, Félix. 1988. *Mil Mesetas. Capitalismo y Esquizofrenia. 2ª parte*. Valencia, Pre-textos.
- Hayles, Katherine. 1999. *How we Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, literature and Informatics*. University of Chicago Press
- Manning, Erin. 2009. *Relationescapes. Movement. Art, philosophy*. MIT Press
- Massumi, Brian. 2002. *Parables for the Virtual. Movement, Affect, Sensation*. Durham & London, Duke Univ. Press.
- Parisi, Luciana. 2004. *Abstract Sex, Philosophy, Biotechnology and the Mutations of Desire*. Continuum.



IMF 2014 Madrid - Partner meeting



IMF 2014 Madrid - Jaime del Val