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Abstract

The aim of this paper is above all to provide a more adequate understanding of practices of hijacking urban space as they are exploited in today’s art interventions. It is common to trace such practices back to practices of art production that were introduced as early as the 1960s by the Situationists. However, in order to get a clearer understanding of what is peculiar to current interventionist practices, I will argue that we need to shift the focus of attention from this art historian genealogy toward the intervention itself. The techniques used in art interventions today may thus be the same, or at least similar, to those of the avant-garde, but the aesthetic effects achieved by exploiting them are different. In this paper, I will show how a signaletic non-representational approach is central for understanding these aesthetic effects and how they differ from similar practices used by the Situationists and in critical art.
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Over the last two decades or so, artists, designers, and architects have to an increasing degree used the urban environment as their preferred platform for making interventions of various sorts: urban hacktivism, radical cartography, tactical media interventions, guerilla gardening, and so on. In so doing, they have not only raised central questions concerning the domination of consumer society and capitalist interests on our cities but also made many interventionist techniques available for escaping this dominance, for instance, by letting people take active part in shaping the city according to their own idiosyncratic needs and desires. As has been pointed out occasionally, such interventionist techniques often draw more or less deliberately upon critical practices of art production that were introduced as early as the 1960s by the Situationists. However, in order to get a clearer understanding of what is peculiar to current interventionist practices, I will argue that we need to shift the focus of attention from this art historian genealogy toward the interventions themselves. The techniques used in contemporary art interventions may thus be the same, or at least similar, to those of the avant-garde, but the disruptive effects achieved by exploiting them are different. For instance, these effects cannot be properly understood according to the avant-garde project of redefining or broadening the boundaries of art, nor should they be interpreted in the light of the grandiose social utopias or revolutionary hopes so dear to the avant-garde. Nonetheless, it is precisely in the intimate interweaving between aesthetics and the political that an interesting
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answer to the disruptive effects of current interventionist practices is to be found.

In this article, I shall argue that an analytical shift of attention from sign to signal, from representation to non-representational, is central for understanding how aesthetics and the political come together in contemporary interventionists’ practices. Ever since the advent of post-structuralism, scholars have struggled to move beyond the limitations inherent in the structuralist idea that aesthetic experiences could be appropriately modelled upon the notion of the sign. Some of the critique raised against the sign is that it presupposes a fixated subject position that is inscribed into a discursive system being definable according to rigid dichotomies.2

The justification of such a critique becomes evident if we turn toward interventionist practices. Thus, the disruptive effect of interventions consists precisely in destabilising discursively entrenched subject positions, thereby casting the individual into new processes of subjectification and enunciation. These processes cannot be understood as acts of communication but must be conceived of as signaletic events beyond the level of signs. By signaletic events, I am thinking in particular, in this essay, of affective and sensory modulations that are triggered by interventionists’ practices and which may evoke changes in people’s ways of saying, doing, seeing, thinking, and being.

The analytical value of the notion of affective modulation lies in its ability to uncover how current interventionist practices in urban space may open up for a new relationship between the aesthetic and the political that is distinctly different from Situationism and critical art, even though current practices use techniques similar to these previous art movements. In order to demonstrate the soundness of this argument, I will provide an analysis of two recent projects both of which employ détournement as their preferred technique.

The first project is made by the anonymous British art collective CutUp, who uses techniques of détournement as an expressive tactic for rewriting the messages of billboards in urban space. In so doing, the billboard becomes a site not only for the communication of messages or signs but also for intensive signaletic events, which—through affective modulation—disrupts people’s normal way of seeing and thinking.

The second project is made by the urban hacktivist Santiago Cirugeda and shows how functions of everyday objects such as dumpsters and scaffolds can be detoured so that they become Do-It-Yourself tools enabling local people in a district or neighborhood to create new social roles and modes of affectively engaging with each other in urban space. While both of these projects thus exploit Situationists’ techniques and practices, my main argument is that they lead to disruptive effects that are foreign to the work of Situationist art. In order to make that judgment, it is of course necessary to have ground for comparison, which is what the following section will provide by giving some background introduction on how détournement was originally conceived.

**FROM DÉTOURNÉMENT TO BILLBOARD HIJACKING AND URBAN HACKTIVISM**

The notion of “détournement” must be understood as part of a long tradition for making the city a preferred site for critical aesthetic practices. From the Situationists to architectural groups such as Team 10 up until the Reclaim the Streets movement in the 1980s and today’s street art, artists, designers, and architects have exploited artistic means for constructing what Thrift calls “counter-publics” to the existing social order.3

Common to these movements is the idea that life in the city is too often limited by rules of consumerism or capitalists interests that prescribe certain patterns of behavior and feelings while out-ruling others. Typically, access to the inner city, for instance, to living there, is made available only to higher income groups, and the urban environment is often programmed so as to intensify activities of buying and consuming. Urban space is thus enveloped into seductive visual signs, adverts, and images coding the urban experience according to certain marketing and brand ideologies.

The “society of the spectacle” is a term introduced by Asger Jorn, Guy Debord, Attila Kotanyi, and Raoul Vaneigem and other members of the Situationists International as part of their critique of capitalism’s influence on urban planning and architecture in the aftermath of the Second World War: “Urbanism is comparable to the advertising propagated around Coca-Cola—pure spectacular
ideology,” said Kotányiand and Vaneigem. In particular, the Situationists reacted against the functional city, which came out as a result of the Modernist movement in architecture and the planning theory behind which was encapsulated in the so-called Athens Charter. Roughly speaking, the Athens Charter represented the belief that the modern city should be divided into “zones” defined by their support of basic functions (work, living, leisure, shopping, etc.) and “lines of transportation” that were able to increase productivity and the flow of commodities from the assembling line onto the shelves in the supermarket. Hence, efficiency and economic interest of the industry were often put up high on the architect’s agenda, while places for the spontaneous unfolding of people’s daily life were hard to find as can be seen for instance in Le Corbusier’s original master plan for Chandigarh.

Central to the Situationist critique of the spectacle is the idea that it conceals real processes of exploitation and modes of subjectification. Thus, the society of the spectacle was criticized for turning people into passive consumers (or “spectators”) and for reducing their independence and creativity, while at the same time leaving no room for those groups of society who are not in a position to consume in a manner deemed appropriate, i.e. those Zygmunt Bauman has later defined as “defective consumers.”

Détournement is one of the artistic means heralded by Asger Jorn and Guy Débord for its capability to emancipate people from the power of the spectacle. Basically, détournement has to do with transgressing “the rules of consumerism by stealing and redistributing its products and images,” so that the vacuous promise of a better world become evident. In line with Rancière, one could make a distinction between two forms of critique of the spectacle that may result from the use of détournement. Either détournement can be used to construct expressions that defamiliarize the spectators so that they must take on a distanced critical reflection upon the spectacle’s underlying processes of exploitation. Or détournement can be used to turn the passive spectator, notably the exploited proletarian or worker, into a vital participant who would rebel against capitalist society. In both instances the term “spectator” is used in the sense of denoting a passive subject constrained in its ability to act by a one-dimensional focus in society on consumerism and capitalist interests.

While such a background understanding makes sense in relation to the aesthetic theories of the Situationists, we should be careful, as Rancière has convincingly argued, not to apply it uncritically onto today’s art forms. First, he says, aesthetic effects rupture the whole idea of there being a determinate link between artistic means and political aims: “there is no straightforward road from the fact of looking at a spectacle to the fact of understanding the state of the world: no direct road from intellectual awareness to political action.” Second, many artists would be reluctant to the Situationist’s idea of instructing the spectator or to use art to dictate a lesson or convey a message: “They simply wish to produce a form of consciousness, an intensity of feeling, an energy for action.” These thoughts are important for understanding the projects by CutUp collective.

DÉTOURNÉMENT AS BILLBOARD HIJACKING

The media hijacking techniques of the British art collective CutUp bear many similarities with the technique of détournement. Disguising themselves in yellow vests as if they were local authority workers, the CutUp members sneak into urban space where they tear down billboard posters. Choosing the billboard as their preferred medium seems by no means to be a coincidence. The billboard is a spectacle par excellence; it has almost become an altar of consumer society for displaying products or campaigns, which is strategically placed in the urban landscape in order to catch the eyes of passers-by and to evoke particular kinds of thoughts and feelings.

By tearing down the billboard posters, CutUp collective do not simply wish to destroy the spectacle. Rather, their tactic consists in reconfiguring it by way of détournement, i.e. cutting up the billboard posters into pixelated pieces, which are then put together again and reconfigured into collages so that entirely new expressions on the billboards emerge: faces that express fear, agony, and anxiety—feelings that are foreign or stands in direct contrast to those commonly associated with the products shown on billboards.

An example of this can be found in CutUp’s hijacking of the O2 billboard on Kingsland Road.
in East London. On YouTube, a video documents how members of the group tear down a billboard poster of a mobile phone (see Figure 1). This poster is then cut up and reordered so that all the pieces are made into a close-up image of a screaming face, which is placed onto another poster displaying Transport of London’s Needless Jam campaign. The Needless Jam campaign was launched in 2005 to warn drivers that, if they illegally park on the so-called red route, they would be fined £100. The red route forms just 5% of London’s roads but carries 33% of its traffic. What the campaign aimed at preventing was “careless parking” along the route that would clog up the route and cause needless (traffic) jam.

The artistic intention underlying the creation of a screaming face on the billboard is not obvious. Rather, the reconfigured image makes the viewer wonder, what exactly is the relation between the face and the overall message of the campaign? Apart from this, CutUp’s billboard hijacking raises a number of questions relevant for the analysis of image as a site for signaletic events: How do we account for the disruptive aesthetic effects produced by this reconfigured image? Does the notion of détournement adequately capture these effects? What is the effect of this billboard hijacking on the spectator? Wherein lies the political potential of the image (if there is any)? How is the disruptive aesthetic effect of these images different from earlier forms of critical art?

In order to shed light on this set of questions, I will draw upon Rancière’s analytical concept of the “intolerable image.”

THE O2 BILLBOARD AS INTOLERABLE IMAGE

In The Emancipated Spectator, Rancière introduces the notion of the intolerable image in order to account for the way in which affectively disturbing images can have an emancipatory effect on the spectator. But even more importantly, Rancière’s notion of the intolerable image allows us to make some valuable analytical distinctions between the emancipatory effect achieved by using collage in critical art and the effect of collage as used in CutUp’s billboard hijacking. All of this will become more evident if we take a closer look at Rancière’s reflections upon the intolerable images as found in critical art.

In critical art, the use of intolerable images is premised upon the assumption “that the viewer is incapable of recognizing the relation between image circulation, power, and capital and seeks to lead her or him to recognize the horrors of the world (war, capital, misogyny, etc.).” More precisely, the intolerable image is thought of as being able to “build awareness of the mechanism

Figure 1. CutUP Collective: hijacking of the O2 billboard on Kingsland Road in East London. Hacktivist action documented on YouTube.
of domination to turn the spectator into a conscious agent of world transformation.”

As an example of such an image, Ranciè re mentions Martha Rosler’s “Bringing the War Home,” a series of collages made out of photographs from the Vietnamese war and advertising images of American life style. In one of these collages, we find ourselves staring at a Vietnamese man standing in the gracious space of a high fashion modernist apartment while holding a dead child in his arms. By using this technique of collage, Rosler literally brings the death and pain caused by the war into the living room of the American consumers. The collage creates a clash between two heterogeneous visual elements, thereby affecting a rupture in people’s normal way of seeing, which calls for an examination of the causes of this sensory form of strangeness.

At the time of its production, it was supposed that Rosler’s art was intended to open the eyes of those who enjoyed the happiness of consumer society to the intolerability of the reality of war and to make them feel guilty about supporting American imperialism with their life style, i.e. the power that among many was deemed responsible for the Vietnam war.

However, while it may be viable in respect to Rosler’s artwork to see it as part of a larger macropolitical narrative structuring and controlling the reception of the image, in CutUp’s billboard, the associative link between the close-up of the screaming face and a political system of beliefs is blurred and therefore cannot be established. One could of course contend that the screaming face of the boy could be interpreted as representing the “dark side” of global capitalism. The scream would thus metonymically represent the pain experienced by all those child workers in the so-called third world countries who are being exploited as a result of the outsourced manufacturing of consumer products. Yet, this associative link is blocked by the fact that the close-up is superimposed upon a campaign against illegal traffic behaviour, not a commercial for consumer products. In this way, the clash between the boy and a traffic campaign creates an ambiguity of contextual information in the image that resists any attempt of identifying the boy as a child worker, of being exploited by brute capitalist forces, and so on. Instead, the spectator is left dangling in an open interpretational gap without a possibility to decode the content of the image according to any logic of representation.

This is also why the political effect of CutUp’s O2 billboard cannot be grasped by either of the two effects described above: distant critical reflection or active participation. This because, each of these two effects is based upon the idea that political effects always have to do with a struggle between pairs of oppositions, ideological systems, power structures, etc. The reconfigured billboard is irreducible to any such dichotomies, because it refrains from offering an alternative to the existing world order. It is neither a clear-cut socialist critique of capitalism nor an instruction of the spectator to stop consuming. The effect is rather that of redistributing the signaletic material of urban experience, of affectively attuning the body and senses of the spectator into a felt engagement with the screaming face on the billboard without instigating any discursive roles for whom the individual should be or how she or he is expected to behave. The meaning of this intolerable image consists exactly in a felt quality of experience rather than a message. Because of its strong effect on the spectator, the image evokes an aesthetic experience that makes no sense within the existing configuration of the sensible, but which calls for new processes of subjectification. These processes are what the notion of event has been introduced in order to account for, for instance, by Brian Massumi:

What is in question is precisely the emergence of the subject, its primary constitution, or its re-emergence and reconstitution. The subject of an experience emerges from a field of conditions which are not that subject yet [...] it’s not intentional in the sense of already carrying a subject-object polarity. It’s a brewing, the world stirring. It’s a coming event through which such categories will return. Their rearising depends on the event. It’s not the event that depends on their already being in place.

Insofar as it disrupts conventionalized roles for the subject, CutUp’s hijacking of the O2 billboard becomes a paramount example of what Ranciè re refers to as “art in the aesthetic regime,” or what Malik and Philips more recently suggest should be rephrased as “aesthetics-art.” In contrast to critical art, in aesthetics-art, the intolerable image is not controlled by a structuring narrative or logic of signification. Rather, the intolerable image
makes a shift of analysis necessary away from art’s socially driven claims toward its capacity to instantiate a politics through its affectively disturbing material.

Politics in Rancière’s philosophy must be understood in relation to what is called “the police order.” The police order is that system of power in a society that governs the appearance of bodies and organizes places, ways of speaking, ways of being, and ways of doing. In fact, the original O2 billboard could be seen as a sign of the police order insofar as it dictates an appropriate way of acting and behaving in traffic. It prescribes certain roles for the individual, a specific pattern of behaviour for the civic body.

However, CutUp’s hijacking of the billboard disestablishes the police order. By way of collage, this intolerable image brings together heterogeneous elements, making a scary-looking screaming face appear that destabilizes the dominating regime of signs. It produces a body and a capacity for enunciation not previously identifiable within this given field of urban experience.

Affective modulation accounts in large part for the disruptive aestheticopolitical effect of the reconfigured image on the billboard. Affective modulation must be differed from what is known as “emotion regulation.” Emotions are inherently representational phenomena; they are about something, as their primary function is to help appraise this something as being good or bad for the individual. Hence, emotion regulation is to be understood as a transition from one representational state to another. In contrast, affective modulation is not about something; it is not representational or intentional in the sense that a situation or an object is not (yet) associated with them by a subject. Instead, affective modulation should be conceived of as events situated at a signaletic level as they refer to felt changes and transitions in bodily states.

Needless to say, there exists a close relationship between emotions and affects. For instance, fear of snakes is usually accompanied by sudden changes in bodily states (racing heartbeat, swear pouring out in the palm of the hand, etc.), but it is important not to confuse the two. Fear is not reducible to racing heartbeats. It would be more accurate to say that affects such as racing heartbeats serve as part of a more elaborate warning system and that emotions are what is constitutive for the organism-world relationship.

The hijacked billboard by CutUp collective owes its effect on the spectator to affective modulation, not emotion regulation. Insofar as it blocks any attempt to frame or contextualize the screaming face of the boy, it is impossible to associate its facial expressions with a situation or object, and so emotions is not so much what is at stake here. Rather, its effect resides first and foremost in an affective modulation: the eliciting of a gut reaction or diffuse feeling of being uncomfortable without knowing why. This unsettling feeling is what makes this intolerable image different from critical art, because while critical art works can still be interpreted within and as a reaction against the police order, the intolerable image of the reconfigured billboard has no place within this order.

While this section has focused on détourner as an interventionist practice of hijacking and rewriting commercial images in urban space, the next section will look more closely at how détourner can also be used to hack the delimitations forced upon urban space by the police order.

**DÉTOURNÉMENT AS HACKING URBAN SPACE**

In most cities, urban planning legislation destines the citizen to act according to certain rules and instructions in the sense that it only allows people to experience and do certain things, but not others. These instructions may even be materialized into the physical fabric of the urban environment. The so-called sleeping policemen are tiny metal knobs built into the pavement in order to make it impossible for skaters to skate in public areas; benches in parks and public spaces are deliberately designed so that homeless people are prevented from sleeping on them, and so on. Yet, at times, the consequences of legislative power are far from being transparent and often they conflict with the interests of those living in the city. For instance, citizens are typically not allowed to plant a tree at the corner of their street or to construct a seesaw in front of the local café for their kids to have fun while they are drinking a cup of coffee even though the owner of the café and a majority in their community thinks that this is a good idea.
However, Santiago Cirugeda’s *Recetas Urbanas* (Urban Prescriptions), which is the second project that I will delve into, shows how détournement can be used to hack urban regulations and thereby enabling local people to take active part in the shaping of their city. More specifically, Cirugeda uses détournement as an interventionist tactic for stealing and turning everyday objects and products into participatory tools with which people can build temporary installations in urban space of their own wish and desires (Figure 2).

In the *Taking back the street*–project, for instance, Cirugeda invents a set of hacking instructions for transforming dumpsters into urban installations for playful social interactions. While people have to go through long bureaucratic procedures to get a permission to rebuild or transform urban space, local authorities usually have no problem with people setting up dumpsters on streets and squares if they are used for the purpose of cleaning a street, refurbishing an apartment, etc. Cirugeda’s urban hacktivism shows that this opens up the opportunity not for breaking, but for bending the law. His hacking instructions thus encourage people to turn dumpsters into, for instance small-scale public playgrounds, swimming pools, parks, and so on. Surprisingly, the dumpster, which is normally conceived of as a highly functional object for destructive actions (throwing out waste, garbage, and obsolete products), then becomes an object for constructive actions and creativity.

Cirugeda’s urban hacktivism bears many similarities with practices found within critical design. For example, in the early work of Krzysztof Wodiczko and more recently in projects by Anthony Dunne and Fiona Raby objects are also cast into public space in order to raise critical awareness of how ideologies and power constrain our everyday life or to spur people to construct counter-publics to the existing world order. Interestingly, Dunne introduces the notion of “aesthetics of use” to characterise the effect that designers want to achieve through this practice. Aesthetics of use thus refers to the idea of inventing a new role for design objects as discourse where functionality can be used to criticise the limits that products or ideologies impose on our actions.22 Yet, there are subtle differences between the practice of critical design and Cirugeda’s.

First, while the objects of critical design are typically new objects and functional prototypes designed to evoke feelings of estrangement and through this feeling raise critical awareness, Cirugeda does not design new objects but explore how already existing objects of society can be employed for new and unintended use. In this sense, his practice comes closer to détournement as conceived of by the Situationist as the stealing and transforming of everyday objects.

Second, while proponents of critical design most often has critical reflection as their ultimate goal, Cirugeda practice aims at increasing the possibilities for people to actively take part in changing conditions imposed on their everyday life. At the surface of it, this seems to be identical to détournement being used as a technique for turning the passive spectator into a vital participant who would rebel against capitalist society (cf. above). However, despite the connotations associated with the title of the *Taking back the street*–project, Cirugeda does not so much encourage people to rebel against society, but rather to re-appropriate the city without breaking the law.

This interventionist practice should be seen as being inherently aesthetic and political. It is aesthetic in the sense that it introduces everyday objects in order to “redistribute space, time, and forms of activity” and it is political insofar as it subverts the conventionalized relation between who an individual is and what she or he is or does. For instance, the dumpsters affect an opening of a question as what it is to be a citizen and what rights a citizen has for appropriating and inhabiting public space.

Again, it is important to notice that the effect of this interventionist tactic resides in a subtle

Figure 2. Santiago Cirugeda: *Taking back the street / Recuperar la calle* (1997–). Urban Hacktivism. © Santiago Cirugeda.
affective modulation rather than in a feeling of estrangement (critical design) or a social revolt against capitalist society (as dreamt of by the Situationists). The ultimate goal of *Taking back the street* is not the realization of grandiose social utopias through violent acts, riots, or revolution but a non-violent unsettling of the self-evidence with which existing systems of power control and restrict the unfolding of people’s everyday behavior and interaction. The disruptive effect of the dumpsters lies in the way in which they cut across hierarchies between practices and discourses working to establish not functional zones, but affective zones of forces and events in the sense of Kwinter where new processes of subjectification are momentary free to take place. By re-appropriating urban space with these dumpsters, people’s felt sense of belonging to that space, their affective attunement so to speak, is modulated and matched with new ways of doing and acting in urban space. This fundamentally changes the prescribed roles and places of the police order making it possible for the body to reconnect with other bodies, thereby constructing a new community of relations.

**CONCLUDING REMARKS**

In this article, I have argued that even though the CutUp collective and Santiago Cirugeda use détournement as their preferred tactic for subverting the power of the spectacle, the emancipatory effect of doing so is different from those envisaged by the Situationists and the proponents of critical art. For instance, the strong expressions of the screaming face affectively engage the spectator in a way that is different from distant reflection and which is also not intended to trigger a social revolt against authorities. It is a third disruptive effect, that of opening a gap between seeing and thinking, thinking and feeling, by introducing heterogeneous objects that defy the denotative logic of representation and sign systems.

Second, while détournement for the Situationists and proponents of critical art came to represent an artistic means for fulfilling macropolitical aims, CutUp’s reconfigured billboard and Cirugeda’s hacking of urban regulations seem to affect the spectator at a more subtle micropolitical level. Its effect is to produce an intensity of feeling, an energy for incipient actions, without instructing the citizen what to do and what to feel about this doing. As such, the use of détournement in current interventionist practices is not to be understood according to logics of transmission or communication but rather according to what Massumi appropriately calls a “logic of affect.”

For Massumi, this logic of affect is synonymous with “an event logic.” This is because affects are conceived of as felt transitions “where a body passes from one state of capacitation to a diminished or augmented state of capacitation.” In Cirugeda’s work, the event logic has to do with augmenting the capacitation of the body for connecting with other bodies in a larger social network, while in CutUp media hijacking, it is about the capacitation of the individual body being modulated by a rewriting and redistributing of commercial images. In both projects, the individual body is cast into new processes of subjectification, events where what is at stake is the emergence or reconstitution of the subject. This is precisely why the analytical notion of sign is insufficient for accounting for the disruptive effects of current practices of détournement. Because, the notion of the sign is intimately tightened up with the idea of a world where a subject experiences objects and entities according to a pre-ordered system of sign categories. Indeed, this was the core assumption underlying the structuralist school of thought within phenomenology, namely that the subject’s intentional stance toward the world was conceivable in terms of representational acts. What I have tried to show in this essay is that détournement in interventionists practices opens up toward an affective region of presubjective processes beyond the level of signs and representational acts—at the level of affective events.

Moreover, in the present study, I have also attempted to broaden the analysis of affective events from changes in bodily states to their potential for actions and doings. For this purpose, I have been drawing upon Rancière’s philosophy as an analytical framework for explaining that affective modulation must be defined according to two constitutive aspects: an aesthetic and a political aspect. The aesthetic aspect has to do with the way in which interventionist practices affectively modulate people’s engagement and sensing of the world. The political aspect, on the
other hand, reside in the way that affective modulation, according to the theory of affect in reference to Brian Massumi may also open up for new processes of subjectification where the individual lives through alternative experiences of who she is, what she’s capable of doing, saying, and feeling. The aesthetic and political aspects are entangled and taken together as they account for the disruptive effect of hijacking urban space.
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