

Brian Massumi [Credits](#)

*The force-to-own-time operates in an interval smaller than the smallest perceivable. "The target is perception," always and at every band along the full spectrum (28). Even in the thick of things, when conflict boils over and force-against-force is to be engaged, the force-to-own-time must still operate. It must squeeze into an interval smaller than the smallest perceivable between actions, so as to condition the enemy's reaction. This is the "shock" of shock and awe. The exercise of force-against-force is qualitatively different from the force-to-own-time, but if its exercise is separated from the force-to-own-time it rapidly loses its effectiveness. The force-to-own-time is infra-level force. It is infra-active because it occurs in a smaller-than-smallest interval between actions.*

Massumi, Brian. (2015). *Ontopower*. Duke university pr. Kindle quote, p.73.

Shock and Awe, Baghdad 2003. [Credits](#)

In this flyer, we stand the challenge of *unlearning* from C.G. Jung, in the sense of moving *from* the symbolism *to* the semiotics of archetypes. The deep psychological foundation of his theory of archetypes, also leads to their arrest. Defining them, as it were, beyond the working *agent intellect*.

Even as they are located between subject and object—in the affect—the problem of their arrest is salient e.g. in Brian Massumi's critique of onto-power in his book on [War, Powers and the State of Perception](#), in which the *shock-and-awe* of war-acts features a *power to prime* and *to own time*.

Despite its deeply unsettling insights into contemporary strategies of warfare, the book's *performative* dimension places it in the *war-theatre* it seeks to unravel (and unsettle with its scope of [criticality](#)). Its present relevance lies in the transposition of shock-and-awe to *hit-and-impact*.

That is, the broader of how the *hit* of [events](#) have an *impact* of segmentation in an *ongoing* activity: that is, the *impact* of [segmenting actions](#)—... *at the smaller than smallest interval*. That is, a logic broadened to the hit-and-impact of events in general: their power to own time, and to *prime*.

Massumi (2015, p. 65) approaches the latter in these terms: "A major area of research has been the phenomenon of 'priming.' This refers to the capacity of micro-events occurring in the attentional gap to modulate the coming perception." Which provides *agentic semiotics* with a foundation.

Within this framework it is possible to define semiosis in the productive-receptive mode of remembrance that applies to the tail: i.e., the time-lag that extends *ongoing* activities to a *somatic* mode of attention, that defines within the agent intellect, where signs are signifying elements of agency.

That is, signifying elements of semiosis within the arms-length *proxemics* where signs can exist. A similar perspective can be derived from what Anthony Dunne calls the [electrosphere](#)—in his book [Hertzian tales](#)—and can also determine the semiotics of the *rhizôme* as ventured by [U. Eco](#).

Semiotics (and semiosis) thus conceived is *never* completely embodied, *nor* completely external, but articulates in affective realm that will *vary* in terms of *active/passive* repertoires. As part of a passive repertoire, the Jungian archetypes are kept in *excess*—as it were—and durably *out of* access.

The semiotic turn from symbolism—the *arrest* of its archetypes at one end, their wieldy *rhetorics* at the other end—relies on transposable active entities (they can be moved and splice across activities), that are not organised in parallel but affords the kind of four-way agency inherent in QUADs (#04).

That is, with the term and opposite (Klein group) as *dimensional axes*, and their inversions as their *coordinates*. Accordingly, orthogonality between coordinate dimensions need not reflect a Cartesian philosophical framework (e.g. when opposite terms are not assumed to be exclusive, but articulate).