

Discussion and Publication Launch: Sunday 1 March, 3-5pm
Discussion event led by artist and writer Stephanie Moran. **All Welcome**

Join Böse, Field and Utley in conversation, examining questions raised by the exhibition - in particular around painting, process, intuition and abstraction – that are addressed in Moran’s exhibition text.

“If *thought* is an act, and painting a process *modelling* thought, what structures these thought-acts? Intuition is a component of thinking, a grasping of patterns in order to operate in a hostile, inherently foreign and deeply unknowable world environment^[1] For Reza Negarestani intuition constitutes a basic level of abstraction. Where intuition demonstrates a fundamental human neuro-biological response, instinct may form its embodied counterpart qua set of sense memory reflexes.^[2]”

“The use of intuition maintains the “emotional and intuitional” tradition of abstraction outlined by Alfred Barr^[3], continued through 80’s psychological readings by writers such as Kristeva and Fuller, and still persisting in an ‘affective turn’.^[4] Intuition as a premise may be overly vague, anti-intellectual mystification, obscuration or reaction; it may over-privilege the body, in ‘embodiment’ and reliance on instinct in itself without the necessary ‘intertwining of intuition and reason’ to complete the ‘act of thought’.^[5] The kind of potential Negarestani describes for ‘bootlegging’ and ‘changing the shape of thought’ through mathematical abstraction *may* have an equivalent in abstract affectivity and its ‘structures of feeling’, but these need to be thought rigorously and specifically in art to be meaningful or useful.^[6]”

“How much are creative processes connected to gender? When biologically and neuro-biologically founded instinct and intuition inform working processes, does that make painting inherently gendered? Or is there a process of temporal retrieval of painting substance that comes from a pre-subjective, pre-gendered biological?”

[1] Reza Negarestani and James Trafford speaking at ‘*Radical Geometries*’, Tate Britain, 10 December 2014

[2] Reza Negarestani, ‘Torture Concrete’, 2014

[3] Alfred H. Barr Jr, catalogue introduction ‘Cubism and Abstract Art’, New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1936, p19.

[4] La Caze and Lloyd locate this turn in cultural theory, coalescing in the 90s, coming out of “phenomonological and post-phenomonological theories of embodiment; cybernetics and theories of the human/machine/inorganic; non-Cartesian traditions in philosophy; aspects of psychological and psychoanalytic theory; traditions critical of normalising power including feminism, queer, and subaltern and disability studies; a collection of attempts to react to the linguistic turn; critical theories and histories of the emotions; and aspects of science and neurology.” Marguerite La Caze and Henry Martyn Lloyd, ‘Editors’ Introduction: Philosophy and the Affective Turn’, *Parrhesia* 13, 2011, p2

[5] James Trafford, op cit.

[6] In the way that affect has been philosophically theorized and politicized in Deleuze: “Affects, according to Deleuze in his deployment of Spinoza’s work, are independent of their subject. With Guattari he developed an anti-oedipal philosophy of desire and theorised art as a bloc of sensations, a compound of perceptions and of affects.” La Caze and Lloyd, *ibid*, p1

Extract from a text by Stephanie Moran.

For a copy of the full text, please email Stephanie@marmiteprize.org