



INDIVIDUATING
SIMONDON
100 YEARS AND BEYOND

BOOK OF ABSTRACTS

**INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
INDIVIDUATING SIMONDON: 100 YEARS AND BEYOND**

School of Arts and Humanities, University of Lisbon
12-14 November 2024

Organizing Committee

RICARDO MENDOZA-CANALES (Praxis-CFUL, University of Lisbon) – Coordinator

MAURA CECI (Praxis-CFUL, University of Lisbon)

ANTONIO ORALDI (Praxis-CFUL, University of Lisbon)

ERIK LIND (HPhil, University of Lisbon)

Managerial and Technical Support

MOIRIKA REKER (CFUL)

PEDRO NATÁRIO (FLUL)

This event is funded by Portuguese national funds through FCT – Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, I.P., in the scope of the project UIDB/00310/2020. Event organized as part of the activities of Praxis-CFUL

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE INDIVIDUATING SIMONDON: 100 YEARS AND BEYOND

School of Arts and Humanities, University of Lisbon
12-14 November 2024

For decades, Gilbert Simondon was a mere footnote in the influential works of Gilles Deleuze, Jean Baudrillard, or Herbert Marcuse. Despite belonging to the same generation as leading French philosophers such as Deleuze, Foucault, or Derrida, Simondon remained relatively obscure, lacking the fame and recognition enjoyed by his peers. He began to gain recognition as a philosopher of technology following the publication of his first and most renowned work, *Du mode d'existence des objets techniques* (1958), which served as his secondary doctoral dissertation. However, given the limited interest in the topic at the time, his work remained a distant reference, accessible only within French-speaking circles. Compounded by the challenges surrounding the publication of his primary doctoral dissertation, *L'individuation à la lumière des notions de forme et information* (published in two separate parts with over thirty years between them), and the divergence of Simondon's intellectual interests from the mainstream philosophies of his era, his contributions were confined to a niche field of research. Today, the continued publication of his previously unpublished works, coupled with extensive translations into various philosophical languages, has provided scholars with a broader understanding of his philosophical project. This has allowed for a greater appreciation of its radical unity, consistency, breadth, and depth. In celebration of the centenary of Gilbert Simondon's birth, the international conference *Individuating Simondon: 100 Years and Beyond* aims to provide a renewed examination of Simondon's lifetime publications as well as his posthumously published courses and materials. Our goal is to assess his legacy and potential, thereby expanding the reach and impact of his philosophical contributions and the transductive possibilities they offer for interdisciplinary work.

KEYNOTE SPEAKERS

ANDREA BARDIN	9
ANNE ALOMBERT	10
DANIELA VOSS	11
GIOVANNI CARROZZINI	12
JEAN-HUGUES BARTHÉLÉMY	13
PABLO ESTEBAN RODRÍGUEZ	14
VINCENT BONTEMS	15
YUK HUI	16

PARTICIPANTS

ALEX RIEDEL	17
ANDREA COLOMBO	18
ANDREA ZOPPI	19
ANTONIO ORALDI	20
ASHLEY WOODWARD	21
CATARINA PATRÍCIO	22
CLÉMENTINE LESSARD	23
DARRYL CRESSMAN	24
ERIK BORDELEAU	25
ERIK LIND	26
ERINÇ ASLANBOĞA	27
GIOVANNI MENEGALLE	28
GREGORIO TENTI	29
GUILLERMO RODRÍGUEZ ALONSO	30
JACQUELINE BELLON	31
JOHANNES SCHICK	32
LUIS G. MÉRIDA	33
MANUEL BOGALHEIRO	34
MARCO FERRARI	35
MARIA CORTEZ	36
MARIA PRIETO	37
NICOLÒ PIOLI	38
NOEMI PURKRÁBKOVÁ	39
RENZO FILINICH	40
RICARDO MENDOZA-CANALES	41
SILVESTRE GRISTINA	42
SJOERD VAN TUINEN	43
SNJEŽANA ŠIMIĆ	44
STÉPHANIE KROKIDA	45
SUSANA AIRES	46
VALENTIN DENIS	47
VICENTE MONTENEGRO	48
VINÍCIUS PORTELLA	49
WILLIAM PÉREZ-PORRAS	50

ANDREA BARDIN

University of Padua/Oxford Brookes University
andrea.bardin@unipd.it

SIMONDON'S POLITICS OF HUMAN NATURE

The concept of “techno-symbolic medium” I draw from Simondon will be key to my questioning of modern political anthropology along with the notions of individual agency and social order it harbours. Through this concept, Simondon’s idea of the transindividual opens to a non-anthropocentric theory of the role played by “human nature” in social system dynamics, and it allows for an inventive understanding of the relationship between the theorisation of human nature, the impact of the new technologies, and the exercise of politics. This is what, I believe, fuels today the interest in Simondon’s work in a direction that is not only ontological and epistemological, but also philosophical-political. The theoretical implication of Simondon’s approach is that human nature can be part of a recurring process of political (conceptual and practical) invention, its normative pendant is that a social system’s metastability must be maintained for such political invention to take place.

BIO

Andrea Bardin is an Associate Professor at the University of Padua and an associate researcher at Oxford Brookes University. His academic specialization lies in political theory and the history of political thought, with a focus on the intersections of science, technology, and politics in early modern and twentieth-century French philosophy. He has published extensively on Thomas Hobbes and Gilbert Simondon, exploring, in particular, the impact of Descartes’s mechanical philosophy on Hobbes’s political ideas and the influence of French philosophy, epistemology, and classical sociology on Simondon’s theory of individuation. Bardin is the author of *Epistemology and Political Philosophy in Gilbert Simondon: Individuation, Technics, Social Systems* (2015).

ANNE ALOMBERT

University of Paris 8

anne.alombert@univ-paris8.fr

THINKING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND DIGITAL AUTOMATION WITH GILBERT SIMONDON AND BERNARD STIEGLER [FR]*

In this communication, I will draw on Simondon's reflections to analyze the new "technical objects" constituted by so-called "generative artificial intelligences," based on machine-learning technologies. I will first remind Simondon's critique of cybernetic analogies between living beings and automata, which calls into question the very notion of "machine learning," as well as his critique of the "myth of the robot," which implies deconstructing the notion of "artificial intelligence." I will then attempt to understand the new "technical hypnosis" engendered by these devices, and the new processes of alienation they provoke. I will then look at how Stiegler's theory extends and transforms this Simondonian critique, by envisaging technical objects as pharmacological prostheses, whose digital stage is likely to engender a process of generalized proletarianization. Finally, I try to conceive and imagine "open objects" and "technical culture" in the context of algorithmic automation. I will then show how Stiegler's proposals for hermeneutic web and contributory technologies complement Simondon's intuitions.

* Presentation in French

BIO

Anne Alombert is an Assistant Professor (*maîtresse de conférences*) of Contemporary French Philosophy at the University of Paris 8. A former student of the École Normale Supérieure de Lyon, she holds an agrégation in philosophy and earned her Ph.D. with a dissertation on Derrida and Simondon's views on technology. Her research examines the intersections of life, technology, and mind in the history of philosophy, as well as the anthropological implications of contemporary technological transformations. She is the author of *Penser l'humain et la technique. Derrida et Simondon après la métaphysique* (2023).

DANIELA VOSS

University of Hildesheim

vossda@uni-hildesheim.de

TOPOLOGY OF LIVING SYSTEMS AND LINEARITY OF GENETIC CODE

The “Geology of Morals” section of *A Thousand Plateaus* has more references to Simondon than any other text by Deleuze and Guattari. In this chapter, they present a ‘geological’ theory of the earth system, understood as comprising inorganic, organic and alloplastic ‘strata.’ These strata are not ontologically primary but rather ‘residues’ of processes of stratification and destratification, drawing unformed matters and free intensities from a plane of consistency. This is broadly similar to the architecture of Simondon’s theory of individuation. He distinguishes various domains of nature but regards them as secondary results of physical, biological, psychic and social regimes of individuation, whereas nature itself can be considered as ‘*apeiron*’ in the sense that pre-Socratic philosophers defined it, i.e. pre-individual, unlimited potentiality. However, what makes Deleuze and Guattari’s theory markedly different is the fourfold conceptual distinction between expression and content, form and substance – a distinction that originates in the structuralist linguistics of Louis Hjelmslev but which they adapt to a new use. This ‘net’ of differences allows them to take account of phenomena that Simondon’s physical paradigm cannot fully accommodate. The relation of ‘double articulation’ between expression and content varies with each stratification, in effect becoming increasingly ‘detached’. The ‘uniqueness’ of the organic stratum resides in the fact that the expression of the genetic code maintains a certain independence from the content of molecular interactions in a three-dimensional dynamic system. This presentation explores the particular themes of the topology of living systems, gathered from Simondon’s description of the way that living beings are in contact with and coupled to the external milieu, and Deleuze and Guattari’s emphasis on the linearity of the genetic code. The goal is to bring both aspects together in a broader view of epigenetic expression of the gene.

BIO

Daniela Voss is Associate Lecturer in the Department of Philosophy at the University of Hildesheim. Her fields of research include contemporary French theory, early modern and Post-Kantian philosophy and, more recently, philosophy of technology and the life sciences. She is the author of *Conditions of Thought: Deleuze and Transcendental Ideas* (Edinburgh UP, 2013) and co-editor with Craig Lundy of *At the Edges of Thought: Deleuze and Post-Kantian Philosophy* (Edinburgh UP, 2015). Her journal publications include those in *Angelaki*; *Australasian Philosophical Review*; *Continental Philosophy Review*; *Culture, Theory & Critique*; *Deleuze and Guattari Studies*; *Parrhesia*; *Philosophy & Social Criticism*.

GIOVANNI CARROZZINI

University of Salento

giovanncarrozzini@gmail.com

SIMONDON AT THE UNIVERSITY OF POITIERS [FR]*

This lecture offers an overview of Gilbert Simondon's teaching at the Faculty of Letters and Humanities at the University of Poitiers. After teaching at the Lycée Descartes in Tours, Simondon joined Poitiers, where he taught from 1955 until 1963, before moving to a professorship in General Psychology at the Sorbonne - Paris Descartes, which he held until his early retirement. The first section will present historical insights into Simondon's role at Poitiers, his collaborations with colleagues, and the academic initiatives he introduced. The second section delves into the core themes of his lectures on Human Sciences between 1955 and 1958. Drawing on detailed notes by Jean-Marie Charpentier and the notebooks kept by Simondon's wife, this analysis reconstructs the primary content and intellectual framework of these lectures.

* Presentation in French

BIO

Giovanni Carrozzini holds a PhD in historical-philosophical disciplines from the University of Salento (Lecce) and currently teaches history and philosophy in secondary schools. His research focuses on French philosophy, epistemology, and the history of science and technology. As one of the leading international specialists on Simondon, Carrozzini has translated several of Simondon's works into Italian and has authored significant publications, including *Simondoniana. Commento analitico e storico-critico de «L'individuazione alla luce delle nozioni di forma e d'informazione» di Gilbert Simondon* (2021) and *Gilbert Simondon filosofo della mentalité technique* (2011), among others.

JEAN-HUGUES BARTHÉLÉMY

Center for Contemporary Ethics at the University of Tours

jh.barthelemy@gmail.com

TRANSCENDENCE AND SELF-TRANSCENDENCE: SIMONDON AS A MILIEU

The centenary of the philosopher to whom I have devoted 25 years of work, both monographic and collective, from my —deeply moved— discovery of his work in 1989 to my *Life and Technology: An Inquiry into and beyond Simondon* in 2015, including my monographs in French and the *Cahiers Simondon*, is an opportunity for me to return to what pushed me to delve into this thought at a time when it was not yet the subject of studies. I want to first say here what is, in my eyes, both central and decisive in this philosophy. This is why I will first return to the few major themes that my Master 1 and Master 2 dissertations, then my doctoral thesis (2000-2003), the origin of the two parts of *Penser l'individuation* (2005), had explored. But if the discovery of this work was truly overwhelming for me, it is because Simondon's genetic ontology offered me the ontology of individuation that my own global youth project, "Philosophical Relativity," needed. Since my Master 1, this project has in fact animated all my work, and *La Société de l'invention* (2018) then *La Philosophie du paradoxe* (2024), where I secondaryize genetic ontology which is no longer "first philosophy" (Simondon), are the real beginning of its concretization. This is why the second part of my intervention will complete the internal critique that I have addressed to Simondon since my doctoral thesis by problematizing here, and in an unprecedented way, the enigmatic passage of *ILFI* where Simondon writes in particular that "the concept of transcendence takes anteriority for exteriority."

BIO

Jean-Hugues Barthélémy holds a PhD in epistemology and is a researcher at the Center for Contemporary Ethics at the University of Tours. An author of several key works on the philosophy of Gilbert Simondon, he also directed the *Cahiers Simondon* from 2009 to 2015 and led the Centre international des études simondoniennes (CIDES) at the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme of Paris-North from 2014 to 2019. Since 2018, with his seminal book *La Société de l'invention: Pour une architecture philosophique de l'âge écologique*, he has returned to his early philosophical project, which led him to publish *Ego Alter: Dialogues pour l'avenir de la Terre* in 2021 and *Manifeste pour l'écologie humaine* in 2022. His new book, *La Philosophie du paradoxe: Prolégomènes à la Relativité philosophique* (November 2024), clarifies the methodology for a holistic but radically anti-dogmatic system of individuation of sense(-making) that human ecology should become.

PABLO ESTEBAN RODRÍGUEZ

University of Buenos Aires
prodriguez@sociales.uba.ar

DIGITAL NETWORKS BETWEEN CONCRETIZATION AND THE TRANSINDIVIDUAL: DATA, ALGORITHMS, AND PLATFORMS

In *On the Mode of Existence of Technical Objects (MEOT)*, Simondon develops three core frameworks for studying technical objects: the process of concretization; the triadic model of elements, individuals, and technical ensembles; and the analysis of technicity, which traces the evolution from the initial rupture of magical unity to the role of technical objects as supports for transindividual relations via reticulated processes. In *Individuation in Light of Notions of Form and Information (ILFI)*, Simondon explores the transindividual from a different perspective, focusing on ethics and the affective-emotive model. Recently, the concept of the transindividual has emerged as a central analytic for examining the interactions between Big Data, algorithmic systems, and digital platforms within networked infrastructures. This paper aims to expand on these contemporary interpretations of the transindividual by proposing two research trajectories: first, an examination of Simondon's concept of the "technical network," and second, a closer analysis of the affective-emotive dimensions in the processes of psychic and collective individuation. Through these lenses, this study seeks to enrich our understanding of the transindividual's relevance in digital networks today.

BIO

Pablo "Manolo" Rodríguez is an Associate Professor at the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Buenos Aires (UBA) and an Independent Researcher at the Argentine National Council of Research (CONICET). He holds a degree in Communication Sciences and a PhD in Social Sciences from the University of Buenos Aires, as well as a master's degree from Université de Paris I-Panthéon Sorbonne. His published works include *Historia de la información* (2012) and *Las palabras en las cosas: Saber, poder y subjetivación entre algoritmos y biomoléculas* (2019). He has also co-edited *Amar a las máquinas: Cultura y técnica en Gilbert Simondon* (2015) and *La salud inalcanzable: Biopolítica molecular y medicalización de la vida cotidiana* (2017).

VINCENT BONTEMS

Atomic Energy and Alternative Energies Commission (CEA)

vincent.bontems@cea.fr

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN THE LIGHT OF SCIENTIFIC FICTIONS: SIMONDON AND LEM

Despite the growing excitement among philosophers regarding new-generation conversational agents (Transformers), the philosophy of technology still struggles to fully grasp the technological and techno-political challenges posed by Artificial Intelligence (AI). Following a brief technical characterization of the artificial generation of meanings, we will demonstrate how the opacity of these techno-logical processes raises serious concerns about their alienating consequences when integrated into political decision-making processes. Gilbert Simondon's philosophy of technology, while urging caution in the face of the common anthropomorphic speculations of philosophers, also calls upon us to expand our cognitive and affective understanding of the ongoing processes in order to address the challenges posed by cyber-democracy through "scientific fictions." Stanislaw Lem's insights into "Intellectronics," drawn from his science-fiction-philosophical work (*Summa Technologiae*, 1966), provide valuable perspectives for deepening this reflection.

BIO

Vincent Bontems is a philosopher of science and technology. Director of research at CEA, professor at Paris-Saclay University, co-director of the Master's degree in Management of Technology and Innovation at Paris-Sciences-Lettres, director of the "L'Âne d'or" collection published by Les Belles Lettres, he teaches at ENS Paris, ENS Paris-Saclay, INSTN and Institut Pasteur. He has written extensively on the philosophies of Gaston Bachelard and Gilbert Simondon. His latest book is *Au nom de l'Innovation. Finalités et modalités de la recherche au XXIe siècle* (Belles Lettres, 2023). In 2024, he will publish a book entitled *Fictions Scientifiques* in a new collection dedicated to Multiversalism.

YUK HUI

Erasmus University Rotterdam

hui@esphil.eur.nl

TENDENCY AND INTUITION IN SIMONDON'S GENESIS OF TECHNICALITY

This talk primarily examines the use of the term tendency in Simondon's *On the Mode of Existence of Technical Objects* (1958). Simondon uses this term on various occasions, but more specifically in Part III, "The Genesis of Technicality," to describe processes of bifurcation. For example, a magic unity splits into a religious tendency and a technical tendency, each of which then further bifurcates into a theoretical and a practical part. This article will 1) trace the term tendency back to its primary source in Bergson's *The Two Sources of Morality and Religion* (1932) and its continuation in André Leroi-Gourhan's *Milieu et Technique* (1945), 2) analyze how Simondon's appropriation of the term incorporates both Bergson's and Leroi-Gourhan's conceptions of tendency in the genesis of technicality, and 3) explore how this reworking necessitates a reinterpretation of Bergson's method of intuition.

BIO

Yuk Hui is Professor of Philosophy at Erasmus University Rotterdam where he holds the Chair of Human Conditions. He is author of several monographs including *On the Existence of Digital Objects* (2016), *The Question Concerning Technology in China. An Essay in Cosmotechnics* (2023, 3rd reprint), *Recursivity and Contingency* (2019), *Art and Cosmotechnics* (3rd print 2023), and more recently *Post-Europe* (2024) and *Machine and Sovereignty* (2024). His works have been translated into a dozen languages. He is a juror of the Berggruen Prize for Philosophy and Culture since 2020, and convenor of the Research Network for Philosophy and Technology since 2014.

ALEX RIEDEL

Fordham University
ariedel1@fordham.edu

AN INQUIRY INTO SIMONDONIAN SINGULARITY AND INDIVIDUALITY

In *L'Individu et sa genèse physico-biologique*, Simondon designates what he calls a “singularity” as that which is capable of bringing about a break in a metastable equilibrium. That which is singular is, for Simondon, a sort of impurity that is non-identical with the equilibrium that it disrupts. However, in disrupting, any singularity can also be understood as information, in the general sense borrowed from cybernetics. As information, that is, any singularity can crystallize (to use one of Simondon’s metaphors) disparate “orders of magnitude” that then results in the (never-ending) structuration of “individuality.” That which is singular both breaks and also then produces yet another (individual) equilibrium. A singularity, therefore, is thus distinguished from an individual, in a similar way that a cause is distinct from its effect. For Simondon, this movement is crucial for understanding individuation. Indeed, this distinction between the singular and the individual is to a significant extent one of the aspects of Simondon’s ontological project that, for Deleuze, as stated in his review of Simondon, exhibits a “wealth and originality” that is striking “when they’re not outright inspiring.” However, although there are important differences between what is singular and what is individual in Simondon’s work, I maintain that there are also crucial similarities that need to be emphasized as well. Although a singularity is by definition that of the “pre-individual,” functionally conceived as an informational rupture of equilibrium, individuality can also function in much the same way. It is possible that every individual, by coming to inform an order of magnitude other to it, can also disturb established equilibriums (however unstable). The possibility to disorganize structures is indeed one of the characteristics that define individuality’s openness and vulnerability to the process of individuation. To show this, then, I give an explication of how Simondon understands the singular and the individual in *L'Individu et sa genèse physico-biologique*. I then give commentary on how some of the recent literature has understood this distinction before then foregrounding their similarities in light of their respective roles in the movement of ontogenesis. Lastly, I show that the most significant consequence of this analysis is that, for Simondon, an individual may more precisely be understood as not only individuating, but also as informing, in a way similar to how the singular informs and disrupts disparate domains of being. This is to say that an individual is its individuation, but is also its information of heterogeneous orders of magnitude.

BIO

Alex Riedel is a PhD student in philosophy at Fordham University. He received a bachelor’s degree in philosophy from The Ohio State University as well as a master’s degree in philosophy from Yale University. His work has recently dealt with the late-twentieth century French debate on community between Nancy and Blanchot, the issues of performativity in the political queries of Derrida, and the use of Schelling’s *Naturphilosophie* in contemporary forms of materialism.

ANDREA COLOMBO

Università di Udine/Università di Padova

andrea.colombo@unipd.it

SIMONDON'S ENGAGEMENT WITH PERCEPTION THROUGH THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

This paper examines Gilbert Simondon's 1964-1965 course on perception, currently being translated into Italian for the first time. Simondon's philosophy has often been explored through his notions of individuation, technoaesthetics, and the transindividual. However, his course on perception, a lesser-known yet crucial part of his oeuvre, reveals a profound historical dimension that reinterprets the entire trajectory of philosophy through the lens of perception. The course meticulously traces the development of philosophical thought from ancient to modern times, highlighting how the concept of perception has been pivotal in shaping philosophical discourse. Simondon's approach is not merely historical; he offers a transductive analysis that bridges different epochs and schools of thought, demonstrating the continuity and transformation of ideas about perception. In this translation project, I uncover how Simondon engages with key philosophical figures, such as Aristotle, Descartes, and Kant, to construct a genealogical map of perception. He critiques and recontextualizes their theories, arguing that perception is not a passive reception of sensory data but an active process of individuation. This process, according to Simondon, is fundamental to understanding the genesis of knowledge and the structure of reality itself. By focusing on the historical dimension of Simondon's thought, this paper aims to broaden the current understanding of his philosophy. It positions his course on perception as a critical piece that connects his theoretical work on individuation and technics with a rich philosophical tradition. Moreover, it highlights the relevance of Simondon's insights for contemporary debates in epistemology, ontology, and the philosophy of technology. The translation process itself brings to light the nuanced and complex nature of Simondon's ideas, which are often lost in translation. By providing a meticulous and faithful Italian rendition, this project seeks to make Simondon's thought accessible to a wider audience and to stimulate further research and discussion within the Italian philosophical community. In conclusion, this paper not only introduces a significant yet underexplored aspect of Simondon's work but also underscores the importance of perception in his overall philosophical project. The insights gained from this course on perception can enhance our understanding of Simondon's contributions and their interdisciplinary potential, offering new avenues for research and application across various fields of study.

BIO

Andrea Colombo is a postdoctoral researcher at the University of Udine and an adjunct professor of Contemporary Philosophy at the University of Padua. His research focuses on the relationship between the sciences and philosophy, with a particular emphasis on empiricism and its various developments throughout the twentieth century, especially in the works of William James, Gilbert Simondon, and Gilles Deleuze. He is the author of *Immanenza e molteplicità. Gilles Deleuze e le matematiche del Novecento* (Mimesis, 2023) and has edited and translated *Essays on Radical Empiricism* by William James (Mimesis, 2023), *Intensive Science and Virtual Philosophy* by Manuel DeLanda (Meltemi, 2022), and *Mathematics and Sense* by Giuseppe Longo (Mimesis, 2021). Currently, he is translating Simondon's 1964-1965 course on perception into Italian.

ANDREA ZOPPIS

University of Ferrara
andrea.zoppis@unife.it

THE TECHNO-AESTHETIC STRUCTURE OF THE ORIGINARY

This presentation takes its starting point from Simondon's assertion that "the techno-aesthetic feeling seems to be a more primitive category than aesthetic feeling alone, or the technical aspect considered from the angle of functionality alone (which is an impoverishing perspective)." Thus, considering the Simondonian notion of techno-aesthetics, it becomes necessary to rethink our primitive relationship with nature. The purpose of this talk is to retrace some salient points of Simondon's work to investigate the scope of the notion of techno-aesthetics concerning humans' primordial and sensible experience of reality in its technological articulations. Firstly, I will examine the magical dimension of experience as described in the Third Part of *On the Mode of Existence of Technical Objects*. As part of the theory of the "phases of culture", the magical phase is conceived as the primordial and undivided dimension of the subject-object relationship, preceding the bifurcation between the technical and religious phases of human experience. Although the shift between technique and religion has not yet occurred, these two aspects already implicitly organize the magical dimension, articulating it gestaltically according to a reticular structure of key points not yet separated from the ground. To understand the aesthetic insertion of these key points in human beings' experience, it will then be useful to consider the status of images in the course Imagination and Invention. According to Simondon, images are to be understood as "quasi-organisms" – irreducible to conceptualisation and partially autonomous from subjects – that transindividually inhabit human beings and their milieu. Their function is therefore not reducible to the cognitive perception of what is present in experience. Rather, their motor tendencies precede conscious perception itself, orienting human beings according to a "savage" mode of perception and action" in the reticular structure of the magical dimension. To address the aesthetic dimension of experience as the basis for comprehending the primitive insertion of human beings into nature, aesthetics must therefore be rethought techno-aesthetically. This means not reducing it to its contemplative and representative function but rather accounting for the motor perceptual feature held by action, «as something orgasmic», that is, according to a certain «pleasure of action». Thus, the notion of techno-aesthetics allows us to comprehend the sensible dimension of human experience in its primordial motricity, i.e. according to humans' primitive technically articulated insertion into the natural world, thereby paving the way for a reflection on the features of the inherent technophanic power of technicity.

BIO

Andrea Zoppis is a PhD Candidate for the Joint PhD Programme Transcendental Philosophy and Reflexive Society proposed by the University of Ferrara (Italy) and the Pontifical University of Curitiba, Paran , (Brazil). His research is dedicated to an in-depth examination of Gilbert Simondon's notion of Techno-Aesthetics from the aesthetic perspective of Mikel Dufrenne's philosophy. His latest published papers in Italian include "L'essere grezzo della tecnica" for the journal Chiasmi International, and in French, "Entre Merleau-Ponty et Simondon: notes pour une approche  cologique   la technologie num rique", for the journal Mimesis Scenari.

ANTONIO ORALDI

University of Lisbon

antonio.oraldi@edu.ulisboa.pt

TECHNICS AND LIBERATION IN MARCUSE AND SIMONDON

Marcuse cites Simondon's *On the Mode of Existence of Technical Objects* (1958) in important passages for the elaboration of his critical theory of technology in *One-Dimensional Man* (1964). Marcuse's engagement with Simondon not only allows him to take a distance from Heidegger (Picchi, 2022), but it also serves the purpose of strengthening both his critique of technology and the concept of liberatory technology. Some scholars have pointed out the inadequacies in Marcuse's reading of Simondon (Angus, 2019; Bardin, 2018; Toscano, 2009), which was limited to *MEOT*, as well as the contrast between a means-to-end conception of technology and an organological one (Stiegler, 1998). Others highlighted the continuities between the two thinkers, for instance on the concern for alienation and its connection with technology (Barthelemy, 2008), the critique of technocracy (Guchet, 2010), and the technical materialization of values (Feenberg, 2017). Following this strand of thought, I will note significant continuities concerning the relation between technics, work, and liberation, arguing for their fruitfulness with the elaboration of a critical theory of technology. Both thinkers see liberation as involving the affirmation of a new relation with technology by detaching it from the paradigm of work. Marcuse critiques a dominant technological rationality based on the intensive extraction of both human and non-human energies, arguing for the necessity of social and anthropological transformation as inseparable from the development of an alternative technology (1964; 1969). Simondon, on the other hand, contends that technics should not be reduced to mere utility (1958) and that work reproduces the hylomorphic schema (1964). I will suggest that Simondon's concept of technicity can further substantiate Marcuse's vision of liberatory technics as oriented to the transformation of work, while Marcuse's Marxist critique of capitalist automation highlights the socio-economic modes of capture as barriers to realizing the technical culture envisioned by Simondon.

BIO

Antonio Oraldi is a PhD candidate in Philosophy at the Centre of Philosophy (CFUL), University of Lisbon, and member of the Praxis Research Group (Praxis-CFUL). Working across philosophy of technology, critical social theory, and political philosophy, his research focuses on questions around automation, subject, power, and freedom. Recent publications include "Cyber-physical Environments and Political Subjects: Notes on Cyber-physical Citizenship" in *Technopolitics: Charting the Unknown* (Dialética, 2024), and "Technology and Society in Habermas' Early Social Theory: Towards a Critical Theory of Technology beyond Instrumentalism" (*Krisis | Journal for Contemporary Philosophy*, 2023).

ASHLEY WOODWARD

University of Dundee

a.z.woodward@dundee.ac.uk

INFORMATION AND ITS SUPPORT: THE SIMONDON-STIEGLER CONTROVERSY

Simondon's idea of information is a key feature of his legacy, since it is the notion that he himself positioned as central to his encyclopaedic thought, and as best suited to overcoming technical alienation. Given that our contemporary world is now dominated by information technologies, this concept acts as a thread which attaches his work to the current situation, gives it a commanding relevance, and holds the potential to transform how we understand and live with our current technological condition. However, information has had an uncomfortable place in Simondon's reception. While clearly being central to much of his work, for a long time many interpreters largely ignored or side-lined it. In some of his last writings, Bernard Stiegler directly attacked this notion of Simondon's. This paper aims to unpack and address this criticism. Simondon proposed a notion of 'primary information,' construed as the formula of individuation, more fundamental but not opposed to communicational information theory. In Stiegler's assessment, however, Simondon's notion of information is incoherent and contradictory. The crux of Stiegler's critique is that Simondon implies an idea of information *independent of any support*. For Stiegler, whose philosophy made the very possibility of thought hinge on an exterior inscription, this idea seems inadmissible. Moreover, Stiegler faults Simondon for not seeing the inherent dangers of calculative information theory (its *pharmacological* character) which have led to all the problems of contemporary computational information capitalism. Without denying the pertinence of Stiegler's critique of information capitalism, the paper offers a qualified defence of Simondon, arguing that for him there is no information without support, but neither is there any support *prior to* the informational processes which simultaneously produce it. Information and its support are individuated together, or in Stiegler's terms, there is a *default of origin* of information.

BIO

Ashley Woodward is Senior Lecturer in Philosophy at the University of Dundee. He is an editor of *Parrhesia: A Journal of Critical Philosophy*, and together with its other editors he produced the first volume of essays on Simondon in English, first as a special issue (2011), then as the book *Gilbert Simondon: Being and Technology* (2012). He has recently contributed a chapter to *The Idea and Practice of Philosophy in Gilbert Simondon* (2023), and he has co-translated Raymond Ruyer's *Cybernetics and the Origins of Information* (2023) and one of Bernard Stiegler's earliest works, 'Technologies of Memory and Imagination' (*Parrhesia*, 2018).

CATARINA PATRÍCIO

Lusófona University/CICANT
catarina.patricio@ulusofona.pt

STORYTELLING IN MINOR TECHNICS AND THE FUTURE OF ENCYCLOPEDIISM

Gilbert Simondon's philosophy offers a profound framework for comprehending the complex relationship between humans and technical objects. The distinction between minor and major technics are the two poles identified in his philosophy — the former encompassing the practical, hands-on engagement with technical objects and processes, the latter referring to the abstract, theoretical, and systematic understanding of technology through science, engineering, and academic study. Crucially, Simondon's concept of encyclopedism represents a higher-level approach that seeks to reconcile and integrate these two modes of engagement with technical knowledge in a "synthesis." Digital transition challenges knowledge transmission, and so does the rise of AI with its sophisticated capacities for information aggregation. Pressing concerns about the role of human storytelling and knowledge curation have to be raised when debating the future of encyclopedism. Borges' "Funes, the Memorious" (1942) serves as a cautionary story, drawing parallels between extraordinary memory and the limits AI systems face. Funes' meticulous yet tragically isolating information processing, mirrors the complexities of navigating the contemporary landscape of data abundance because being a total archive and a metaphor for total mnemotechnics isn't a sufficient condition for knowledge retention. In this context, we argue that the power of storytelling in minor technics emerges as a vital *élan* for creating knowledge transfer. By harnessing the tacit knowledge and lived experiences (*Erfahrung*) of technical individuals, this approach bridges the gap between abstract thought and practical application. Particularly effective in educational settings, but not exclusively, the integration of storytelling as a means of technical retention within minor technics is not merely the connection of theory to real-world relevance, but also, and foremost, it instigates human curiosity, that which is essential before any technical invention. This communication is an attempt to explore the transductive possibilities inherent in Simondon's philosophical framework, examining how the interplay between minor and major technics, as well as the pursuit of encyclopedism, can inform innovative approaches to knowledge retention, dissemination, and engagement. By embracing the symbiosis of human storytelling and technological innovation, our proposal assumes that a more interconnected and effective knowledge ecosystem can be raised, one that will navigate the challenges of the digital age while honouring the depth and shades of lived experience (*Erfahrung*).

BIO

Catarina Patrício holds a Master's in Anthropology and a PhD in Communication, both from NOVA-FCSH. Her area of specialization is contemporary culture and new technologies. She is also a visual artist, graduated in Painting from the Faculty of Fine Arts at the University of Lisbon (1998-2003) and studied photography at FH Bielefeld. She has received grants and fellowships from the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT) and support for artistic creation by the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation. Since 2010, Catarina has been a professor in the Department of Cinema and Media Arts at ECATI - Universidade Lusófona, and she served as a guest professor at NOVA-FCSH in 2022-2023. An integrated researcher at CICANT, she regularly publishes essays and exhibits her artistic work.

CLÉMENTINE LESSARD

ENS-Lyon and University of Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne

clementine.lessard@ens-lyon.fr

TOWARDS A NEW NATURALISM? SIMONDON'S REINVENTION OF PHYSIS

'Nature' is a Greek invention. This thesis, defended in 1989 by Geoffrey Lloyd, played a great role in the development of another thesis, that we are more familiar with: that of Philippe Descola, in *Beyond Nature and Culture*. Naturalism is not the only ontology, but one of four modes of identification alongside totemism, animism and analogism. But while Aristotle is obviously part of "our" naturalism, is this also true of Ionian physiology, this inquiry into nature initiated in the 6th century B.C., and so often presented as the origin of modern science and ontology? In light of Descola and Bruno Latour, I argue that Simondon's reception and re-cultivation of early Greek philosophy show a way out of traditional naturalism. Is this a reinvention of naturalism, or a departure towards another ontology? To address this question, we need to examine the meaning of *physis*, both in Ionian Physiology and in Simondon. In Simondon's study of individuation, *physis* is not a "domain" or a "substance," but an open plurality of ontogenetic processes. To grasp and organize such realities, the scholastic classification by genus and species proves unsatisfactory. Hence the need for a transductive and analogical method, which Simondon admits 'can seem quite primitive', because "it is in fact similar to that of the Ionian 'Physiologists'" (*ILFI*, p. 87). I argue that through his use of the notion of *physis*, which is no longer separated from *tekhne* in an analogical and relational epistemology, Simondon invents a naturalism that could also correspond to what Descola envisioned as a "new analogism."

BIO

Clémentine Lessard is a PhD candidate at the ENS de Lyon, where she is completing a thesis on « *Phúsis* and *Tekhnè* in Simondon: Reception and Transduction of an Ancient Heritage » under the supervision of Laurent Lavaud (ENS de Lyon) and Frédéric Fruteau de Laclós (Paris 1 Panthéon Sorbonne). In light of Simondon's reception of the pre-Socratics, Plato and Aristotle, her research focuses on the metaphysical, epistemological and cultural relations between nature and technology. She is interested in the philosophy of nature, the epistemology of analogy and techno-aesthetics, both ancient and contemporary. She has recently published: "Back to Physis: Simondon's Metaphysics," in A. Bardin et. al., *The Edinburgh Companion to Simondon* (forthcoming) and "Energetics of Philosophical Systems," in C. Maigné et. al., *The Idea and Practice of Philosophy in Gilbert Simondon* (2024).

DARRYL CRESSMAN

Maastricht University

darryl.cressman@maastrichtuniversity.nl

SIMONDON AS A CRITICAL THEORIST OF TECHNOLOGY

Gilbert Simondon maintains a unique position within the philosophy of technology. Unlike other mid-twentieth century philosophers who wrote about technology, such as Martin Heidegger, Herbert Marcuse, or Lewis Mumford, Simondon does not appear to develop his ideas about technology from a distinct philosophical tradition, such as phenomenology or Marxism; indeed, it is quite difficult to place Simondon within any specific tradition. This is evident by the numerous different attempts to place his thought on technology alongside philosophers ranging from Bergson and Leroi-Gourhan to Marx and Heidegger to Latour and Deleuze. Despite this, Simondon's work on technology has had a significant influence amongst philosophers of technology and in particular critical theorists of technology, including Herbert Marcuse, Andrew Feenberg, and Bernard Stiegler. This has proven to be an interesting development in regard to Simondon's place within the philosophy of technology; although not a critical philosopher of technology in the conventional sense, his influence can be traced across a number of critical approaches to technology. In this presentation, I want to examine in more detail how it is that Simondon's work on technology has been translated by different writers into one from which a critical theory can be developed. Focusing less on Simondon than on how his work has been taken up by critical theorists of technology, I will explore in detail how writers such as Marcuse, Feenberg, and Stiegler, draw upon Simondon to contribute to their own critical theories of technology. From this, I argue that across this work the appeal of Simondon for critical theorists is that he recognizes that technology materializes a dialectical tension between continuity and change. Balancing both the technical artifact itself and moments of concretization while also including the long-term continuities against which change seems imperceptible enables a unique starting point from which a critical perspective on technology can be developed.

BIO

Dr. Darryl Cressman is an assistant professor in the philosophy department at Maastricht University (NL). He works in the philosophy of technology and has published essays and books on the work of Andrew Feenberg, Herbert Marcuse, and other philosophers of technology. His current research is focused on the history of the philosophy of technology, specifically French philosophy of technology, and the relationship between historical time and the philosophical study of technology.

ERIK BORDELEAU

NOVA University Lisbon
erikbordeleau@fsh.unl.pt

METASTABILIZING SIMONDON

The Simondon studies revival we observe these days in certain areas of contemporary academia concerned with cybernetics and the philosophy of digital technology dates back, at least in French radical left and para-deleuzian political milieus, to the early 2000s. One can trace this renewed interest back to Muriel Combes' *Individu et Collectivité: Une philosophie du transindividuel*, an insightful introduction to Simondon's work published as early as 1999 that was eventually translated to English in 2012 by Montreal-based media theorist Thomas Lamarre. Another less systematic if equally significant trace of this diffuse interest in matters of collective individuation can be observed in *Une biopolitique mineure*, a famous interview with Giorgio Agamben published in January 2000 in the French journal *Vacarme*, in which he would cite Simondon as a major influence when it comes to characterize the impersonal powers composing a life, prefiguring his essay "Genius" (*Profanazione*, 2005). Otherwise, a more recognizable hallmark of this early stage revival was the publication, in 2004, of a special issue of the French journal *Multitudes*, gathering illustrious thinkers such as Paolo Virno, Alberto Toscano, Isabelle Stengers, Yves Citton or Bernard Aspe, who was Muriel Combes' partner at the time and who would eventually publish *Simondon: Politique du transindividuel* (2012), a book based on a thesis he defended back in 2001. Last but not least, the re-publication of *L'individuation psychique et collective* in 2007, with a preface by Bernard Stiegler, sealed up Simondon's fate as an essential figure when it comes to think information, collective life and technology. In this presentation, I would like to interrogate further the actual metastable conditions of crystallization of the Simondon-germ in relation with its current associated, i.e. essentially academic, milieu. To this effect, I wish to revisit Stengers' prescient article "Resisting to Simondon," in which she addresses the core speculative sequence individuation-transduction-transindividuality and re-situates it in relation to its 'original' interpretation in Deleuze's work. If the metastable milieu is defined as being "rich in energy and poor in structure," how should we approach the relative structural 'impoverishment' of an academic milieu that has become host to such virulent looping back of Simondonian general ideas?

BIO

Erik Bordeleau is a philosopher, curator, fugitive planner and media theorist based between Berlin and Lisbon, where he is currently researcher in Cinema and Philosophy at the NOVA University. He obtained his PhD in Comparative literature (Montreal University, 2009) with a thesis on Chinese contemporary cinema, globalization and politics of anonymity. He has published and co-edited several books and articles in different languages at the intersection of political philosophy, contemporary art, world cinema, blockchain cultures, finance and media theory.

ERIK LIND

University of Lisbon
eriklind@edu.ulisboa.pt

THE NOTION OF “FORM” AND ITS APPLICATION IN MERLEAU-PONTY’S AND SIMONDON’S THOUGHT

It is common, when comparing the philosophical projects of Merleau-Ponty and Simondon, to emphasize an essential divergence of perspectives concerning the topic of perception. Despite the undeniably influence which Merleau-Ponty’s thought exercised on Simondon’s (without excluding the possibility of a reciprocal influence), a comparative analysis would sooner or later have to come to terms with the irreconcilable opposition which separates the phenomenological approach (the thesis of the primacy of perception) and the ontogenetic one (for which perception is just one phase of individuation among others). While there is some truth to this reading, I will argue that it is somewhat superficial and misguided. It rests on a certain misunderstanding of what the primacy-thesis actually entails in Merleau-Ponty’s philosophy (and perhaps on an underestimation of the role of perception in Simondon). In order to show what I mean by this, I will turn to the concept of “form,” understood in the sense of Gestalt psychology, and how Merleau-Ponty and Simondon each evaluate its philosophical significance. *Prima facie*, the concept of form seems to lead us back to the path of the irreconcilable. Whereas Merleau-Ponty appreciates the promise of applying Gestalt psychology’s concept of form to the phenomenological description of perception, Simondon argues that this concept is insufficient to account for the genesis of forms, which leads him to elaborate a certain notion of “information” instead. Nonetheless, I believe that the concept of form plays an important role in Simondon’s philosophy. It plays the role of being a necessary condition of information, much like it is a condition of perception for Merleau-Ponty. Seen in this light, it opens up a possibility of converging perspectives which I would like to explore (albeit briefly and in a summary way). In this context, special consideration will be given to the Gestalt psychological figure-ground distinction and the principle of “good form” (*Prägnanz*).

BIO

Erik Lind is a PhD fellow in the Center of Philosophy at the University of Lisbon and a visiting scholar at the Husserl Archives in Paris. He is currently working on a PhD project dealing with the concept of form in Merleau-Ponty’s philosophy.

ERINÇ ASLANBOĞA

Galatasaray University
easlanboga@gsu.edu.tr

FROM VITAL INDIVIDUATION TO TECHNICAL CONCRETISATION: OPERATORY ANALOGIES IN SIMONDON

At the intersection of *ILFI* and *MEOT*, this paper aims to address together Simondon's two main problems, that of vital individuation and that of technical concretisation, around operatory analogy in order to question our relations with current techniques as well as with the living beings highlighting the new perspectives offered by his thought. It's Simondon's critique of the ambiguous similarity between the automaton, the machine and the living organism that will be the point of entry into the subject. The evaluation of the degree of technicality of the automaton, of the closed and open technical object in terms of their margin of indeterminacy will be one of the paths that will lead us to the question of the rapprochement of technical objects to living beings. It will be a question of discussing the modalities of this rapprochement which aims to explain the differences, leaving aside the external, morphological and structural assimilative similarities. The limits of the rapprochement between the technical and the living will be addressed in order to reveal the need as well as the conditions of possibilities of their coupling which requires an asymmetrical relation. Therefore, in this paper we propose to address the following questions: What are the risks, disadvantages and dangers of establishing relations of identity, structural similarities between technical and living beings? How are these problems perpetuated and still reflected today in the way we conceive current techniques? How does the perspective offered by the Simondonian analogy, by the identities of operatory relations, allow us to think anew about techniques and livings as well as their possible coupling?

BIO

Erinç Aslanboğa is an assistant professor at Galatasaray University in Turkey. She earned her PhD in Philosophy from the University of Paris 8. Her areas of specialization include contemporary continental philosophy, philosophy of the subject, and the philosophy of technics, with a particular focus on the works of Georges Canguilhem, Michel Foucault, and Gilbert Simondon.

GIOVANNI MENEGALLE

University of London Institute in Paris (ULIP)

giovanni.menegalle@ulip.ln.ac.uk

SIMONDON AS A COLD WAR THINKER

This paper aims to underscore the centrality of the Cold War moment for an understanding of the political stakes of Simondon's work. To do this, it will highlight three key areas in which his thinking can be seen to converge with some of the prominent currents of non-Marxist social theory of the period: (1) the macro-sociological notion of a unitary or convergent "industrial society" or "civilisation," promoted by Cold War liberals such as Raymond Aron in the 1950s, but also underlying the work of intellectual figures from the non-Communist left like Georges Friedmann; (2) the idea of the "end of ideology," also articulated by Aron, and of an overcoming of both liberal capitalism and communism through new forms of integrative community, such as those put forward by Catholic intellectuals around the journal *Esprit*; (3) an account and critique of "alienation" conceived as the result not of capitalist property relations but modern industrial production in general. While Simondon's analysis in works such as *METO* echoes this framework of "industrial society," his normative project eschews the politics of productivity espoused by the likes of Aron in line with the technocratic consensus of the Cold War era. At the same time, Simondon puts forward his own post-ideological vision aimed at a recovery of the values of "technicity" (openness, invention, universality) in opposition to the closed schemas of pre-industrial culture, a conception which, at least in certain ways, reflects the Catholic personalist thinking of his teacher and mentor Jean Lacroix. As the paper will try to show, such a contextual reading can help resituate the political ambiguities of Simondon's work in relation to several important intellectual currents of the Cold War period that had also sought to transcend ideological and class war in favour of the social system's "metastable functioning."

BIO

Giovanni Menegalle is a teaching fellow in French Studies and International Politics at the University of London Institute in Paris. He completed a doctoral thesis on Derrida and phenomenology at the University of Cambridge and was then British Academy Research Fellow at King's College London. His current research looks at the reception of cybernetics and information theory in post-war French philosophy, including figures like Gilbert Simondon, Raymond Ruyer, and Abraham Moles. His work has appeared in *Radical Philosophy*, *French Studies*, *Angelaki*, *Oxford Literary Review*, and *Paragraph*, and is contributing a chapter to the forthcoming *Edinburgh Companion to Simondon* edited by Andrea Bardin and Gregorio Trenti.

GREGORIO TENTI

Pompeu Fabra University of Barcelona
gregorio.tenti@upf.edu

TECHNOGENESIS OF THE EARTH. SIMONDON AND PLANETARY INFRASTRUCTURES

Gilbert Simondon was among the first to observe the rise of planetary technologies and to frame it in an original philosophical perspective. Already since *On the Mode of Existence of Technical Objects*, Simondon claimed that technology is animated by an ecumenic tendency which was manifesting in the technical ensembles of the informational era: the network objects. Technology was constructing the Earth as a new “techno-geographic environment” of planetary proportions. Simondon observed a new kind of alienation, a “technocratic” tendency at work in the networks’ vertiginous immensity; but he also believed that planetary technologies bore new genetic tendencies going towards the further “completion of nature”. This paper is a critical examination of Simondon’s analysis of planetary networks in light of today’s ecopolitical discourse and infrastructure thinking. Simondon’s notion of the “completion” of nature must be confronted with the more and more looming threat of Earth’s depletion. Infrastructure technocracy, on the other hand, must be acknowledged as triumphant and properly analyzed. A Simondonian critique of infrastructure might be able to rework the notions of interface, technological self-regulation and scalability as soon as it disposes of the neo-humanistic and neo-romantic delusions of a harmony between nature and technology. One way to go along this path is to amplify the aesthetic solution that Simondon suggests and immediately discards towards the end of *On the Mode of Existence of Technical Objects*. A (techno-)aesthetic re-sensibilization of relations would offer a way to situate the human collectives in the techno-planetary environment and proportionate them to the earthly network through the reappropriation of interfaces. In the last section of this paper, the aesthetic way is reinterpreted as a creative concretization that does not sublimate but rather amplifies reality.

BIO

Gregorio Tenti is Marie Skłodowska-Curie Postdoctoral Fellow at the Pompeu Fabra University of Barcelona. He has studied at the University of Turin, the University of Genoa, the Freie University of Berlin and the University of Cologne. He is the author of *Estetica e morfologia in Gilbert Simondon* (2020), *L'estetica di Friedrich Schleiermacher* (2023) and Bracha Ettinger’s *Notebooks. Another Aesthetics for Psychoanalysis* (forthcoming 2024). He is also the co-editor, along with Andrea Bardin, Marco Ferrari and Anaïs Nony, of the *Edinburgh Companion to Gilbert Simondon* (forthcoming 2025). His research project addresses the links between language and extinction.

GUILLERMO RODRÍGUEZ ALONSO

University of Santiago de Compostela
guillermo.r.alonso.usc@gmail.com

THE DRAMA OF MATTER. ALCHEMY AND ALLAGMATICS [ES]*

Alchemy is a topic that Simondon addresses in a particular way in one of his courses, *Naissance de la technologie* (1970), and mentions in a few others. My aim is to analyze the reasons behind this interest. Firstly, the alchemical or hermetic doctrine is based on a metaphysics of operations that unites theoretical knowledge and practical knowledge. Besides requiring an initiatory commitment and mystical knowledge, it reveals a true obsession with the drama of matter, with flows and directions: with hacceties. It is, therefore, a system of thought that pays special attention to transformations, processes, and technical operations. Secondly, alchemy presents an analogical reality. When an alchemist works with matter, striving for the transmutation of metals, they are also seeking spiritual transmutation and elevation, as the outer work is a reflection of the inner work. Similarly, beings are connected through operational analogy rather than structural resemblance: metals are conceived in the womb of the earth, the homunculus can be born from inorganic matter, etc. Thirdly, hermeticism establishes a particular relationship with the technical or technical mindset. In alchemy, alongside the refined system of symbols, emblems, and formulas, we also find an extensive repertoire of technical operations. It is through a specific relationship with the technical that alchemy puts into practice a natural philosophy that allows one to think about the genesis of beings not through abstract form and matter alone, but also by involving energy, timely moments, and information. This represents a specific phase in the development of the technical mindset, a process that will culminate in a third hermeticism: cybernetics.

* Presentation in Spanish with English

BIO

Guillermo Rodríguez has BA Art History, MA in Art and Thought, and a PhD in Philosophy from the University of Santiago de Compostela (Spain), with a dissertation entitled “La hipótesis allagmática. Ontología e individuación en el pensamiento de Gilbert Simondon.” Currently, he is a postdoctoral researcher at the University of Santiago de Compostela. He has published in several national and international journals on various topics, particularly the relationship between art and technology.

JACQUELINE BELLON

Eberhard Karl University of Tübingen
jacqueline.bellon@uni-tuebingen.de

TWO SIMONDONIAN CRITIQUES OF GESTALT THEORY AND A CONTEMPORARY PROPOSAL OF HOW TO INVESTIGATE MULTIDIMENSIONAL GROUNDS INSTEAD OF SYNTHETIC FIGURES

Simondon uses the gestalt theoretical distinction between figure and ground as a constitutive element for a variety of his approaches to his objects of investigation in a way that makes this distinction a fundamental thought figure within his philosophy. However, in *On the Mode of Existence of Technical Objects*, he emphasizes that before using this distinction its limitations must be considered. In the proposed presentation I contextualize two aspects he critiques in that regard: First, I discuss what Simondon perceives as a fixation on stable equilibria and the idea of finality in Gestalt Theory. Specifically, I analyze some Gestalt Theorists' and their 'fore fathers' writings and compare their notions of equilibria with Simondon's critique. Moreover, I contextualize the idea of finality within the history of ideas at the turn of the 20th century including the discourse around the 'heat death of the universe' and talk about how Simondon's idea of metastability emphasizes on 'the living' (without proclaiming an *élan vital*) by using the notion of metastable equilibria instead of stable ones. Second, I discuss Simondon's pledge to analyze the grounds instead of putting merely attention to the figures and figurations. While he gives some first sketches in *MEOT* of what an analysis of the grounds could entail, he admits that such an investigation may be quite complicated and does not pursue this approach in depth. In my contribution, I want to give an example of how a contemporary investigation of the grounds may be similarly challenging but highly promising regarding an element of the current technology of generative AI: I will conceptualize the so called latent space of Large Language Models (LLMs) and Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) as the grounds entailing the potentiality from which the figures that we finally see as synthetic outputs 'emerge', or rather, get chosen. This will include an explanation of the multidimensional vector space and of how cybernetic systems such as machine learning algorithms may be understood as navigating this space of potentiality on a trajectory providing actualization in the form of specific outputs.

BIO

Jacqueline Bellon teaches and researches within the fields of philosophy of technology, epistemology, history of ideas, applied AI, theory of culture, theory of science, and science practice research. Research interests include human-technology relations, philosophy of psychology, generative AI and intersections of science communication and the arts. Her dissertation "Gilbert Simondon's Individuation Theory and Philosophy of Technology" contextualizes concepts and notions from *ILFI*, *MEOT* and *Imagination and Invention* within the intellectual history of the 20th century and analyses the main principles in the theoretical build-up of Simondon's thought system with regard to theorems loaned from other sciences to explain how his individuation theory can be so broad and still specific enough to be applicable to such diverse investigation objects as technical objects and mental images.

JOHANNES SCHICK

University of Siegen

johannes.schick@uni-siegen.de

TECHNICITY AND INTUITION: TOWARDS A PROCESS PHILOSOPHY OF TECHNOLOGY

One can claim that Bergson's philosophical thinking is essentially occupied with an attempt to mobilize concepts, to grasp operations in their becoming and to show the short comings of a reductionist understanding of the human mind as well as of vital forces. This "process philosophy" reserves "intuition" as a method for mobile, dynamic phenomena that cannot be reduced to static entities. It even seems as if the workings and products of the intelligence of the "homo faber" – the tool making animal – are diametrically opposed to intuition. Intuition appears to stand in contrast to the technical, tool-producing aspect of intelligence. It is envisioned as a faculty for grasping phenomena and human practices "*sub specie durationis*," meaning in their temporal, dynamic genesis, whereas intelligence is primarily a technique of homo faber for translating the dynamic, temporal nature of reality into static elements. Although technical objects—products of human intelligence—seem to neglect the temporal aspect emphasized by intuition, a crucial epistemological question arises: how can we comprehend technical processes as dynamic and vital phenomena or is it enough to consider them in terms of the tool-making intelligence? Gilbert Simondon offers an interpretation of Bergson that integrates the method of intuition into his philosophy of technology. For him, Bergson's ontology cannot address the processes of individuation sufficiently, since it does not provide an account for the dynamic operations within matter. Accordingly, technical operations are understood as ongoing processes that establish a reciprocal causality among technical ensembles, nature, and human beings: "The technical operation is a movement, a commutation, a transition; it accomplishes a journey through reality, and continues the generative impulse" and is itself an ongoing process without a natural, preconceived end.

This talk will explore the relationship between intuition and technicity, aiming to develop a comprehensive understanding of intuition as a methodological tool within a process philosophy of technology. To this end, I will outline Bergson's view of intuition and examine how Simondon applies this framework to technical realities. Intuition, in this context, serves as an epistemological tool for grasping technical operations and situating the human being within technical ensembles. Intuition provides the epistemological means to grasp technical operations as well as the situation of the human being in relation to technical ensembles.

BIO

Johannes F.M. Schick is currently leading the research project "Cultur, Practice, Technique: The foundation of international anthropology of techniques in the Durkheim-School." He was the scientific coordinator of the SFB 1187 Media of Cooperation (2022- 2024). Between 2017 and 2021 he led of the research project "Action, Operation, Gesture: Technology as Interdisciplinary Anthropology" at the a.r.t.e.s. Graduate School-University of Cologne. His research focuses on interdisciplinary (techno-)anthropology, Bergson's philosophy of life and the relationship between anthropology and philosophy. He is also interested in phenomenological psychiatry, the phenomenon of creativity, systems theory and practice theory. He is the author of *Erlebte Wirklichkeit. Zum Verhältnis von Intuition zu Emotion bei Henri Bergson* (Berlin/Münster, 2012).

LUIS G. MÉRIDA

Autonomous University of Barcelona
gonzalez.merida.luis@gmail.com

SIMONDON'S PARADIGMATIC ETHICS [ES]*

In the conclusions of *ILFI*, Simondon very briefly outlines the rudiments of an ethics of becoming, which, despite appearing at the end of the text, would be fundamental to the philosophy of individuation. Ethics would be the inherent or immanent normativity in the operation of individuation. The theory of the act then explains ethical reality and defines it as the constructive and productive relationship of norms and values in the act of individuation that we call the moral act, always corresponding to a certain human-machine coupling. Ethics, as the very reflection on the act and about the act, should be understood as the development and refinement of praxeological technologies that are concrete, always in contact with reality, and are, by definition, provisional. In my book *Campos de forma*, I sought to show the consequences of this for the critique of structural finalism, or teleology, in Simondon. As *MEOT* highlights, the introduction of technique as a symbol for psychic individualization points to a continuity, however granular it may be, between ethics and politics, with the direction from the former to the latter being the objective and social correlate of the transindividual. Simondonian reformism has metaphysical roots and points toward a techno-politology (political technology and technical politology). Nevertheless, there seems to be a rather overlooked aspect here. What would the implications of what has just been said be for the ethical strand of this framework? It is well known, although sometimes not sufficiently emphasized, that analogical reasoning and ontogenetic paradigmaticism hold a central place in Simondon's thought. *If axiomatizing the ethics of individuation is fundamentally axiomatizing the individuation of ethics, we must consider the role of paradigms in moral reflection.* A paradigmatic ethics would consist of an ethics of (human and machinic) models that, insofar as it is rooted in the core of the act, can embrace the intuitions of the ethical theories that, from different angles, occupy that same in-between (virtue ethics, care ethics, capability ethics, etc.), attempting to invent/discover the very fabric that is stretched and neglected between principles and consequences, in the shadow of hylomorphism. Therefore, now, it would be a matter of examining some of the basic notions that would come into play from such an ethical perspective.

* Presentation in Spanish with English

BIO

Luis G. Mérida holds a PhD in Philosophy from the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB). As specialist in the works of Arthur Schopenhauer, Gilbert Simondon and Bernard Stiegler, his main areas of research are the philosophy of technique, epistemology, metaphysics and philosophical pessimism. He is the author of *Campos de forma. La axiomatización de la ontogénesis en Gilbert Simondon* (2023), in which he proposes an unprecedented and unitary interpretation of the philosophy of individuation, starting from the question of the axiomatization of ontogenesis and the notion of morphogenetic field. He is co-coordinator of the seminars on contemporary pessimism held fortnightly at the University of Barcelona (UB).

MANUEL BOGALHEIRO

Lusófona University/CICANT
manuel.bogalheiro@ulusofona.pt

OPEN MACHINES: FROM INDETERMINACY TO THE INCOMPUTABLE IN THE AGE OF ALGORITHMIC AUTOMATION

According to Simondon, “the true progressive perfecting of machines corresponds not to an increase of automatism, but on the contrary to the fact that the operation of a machine harbors a certain margin of indeterminacy.” (1958, p. 12) This margin can be understood as the openness of a machine to a series of dimensions—technical, human, natural—that react recursively on its operation, in the sense that it cannot be anticipated, either at the moment of its “invention” or each time it is activated by an operator. Among these dimensions, Simondon identifies the openness to—and integration of—the exteriority of the machine’s natural environment (*milieu associé*); the openness in time of their successive improvements through the virtualities contained in their operating schemes; the openness in space to the reticularity with other machines; or the openness, in the sense of interactivity, with the information coming from the machine’s operator/user. Following Canguilhem (1947), Simondon proposes a non-mechanistic and non-teleological conception of machine. We propose to reexamine Simondon’s perspective considering the notion of algorithmic automation (Parisi, 2014), an approach that incorporates indeterminacy and contingency at the core of computation. As exemplified in spatio-temporal forms and structures in the field of architecture or design, algorithmic automation embraces the elemental properties of materials and their generative rules through inductive rather than deductive logics, making materiality itself the engine of machine processing (not a formal pre-arrangement). The margin of indeterminacy to which Simondon refers can be related, in this context, to what Parisi calls the *incomputable*. Challenging the centrality of human subjectivity and control (the “servo-mechanic model of technology”), the incomputable emancipates a machinic rationality which can be seen as a new phase of the program of mechanology.

BIO

Manuel Bogalheiro is assistant professor at the Lusófona University and visiting assistant professor at the NOVA University Lisbon. He earned a PhD in Communication Sciences—Contemporary Culture and New Technologies, with a thesis entitled “Materiality and Technicity: research into technical objectuality.” He is a researcher at CICANT and a member of the Philosophy of Communication Section of ECREA. He is deputy director of the PhD in Media Arts and Communication at ULósofona. His research interests include materialities of media, philosophy of technology and cultural theory. He is (co-)editor of *Crítica das Mediações Totais - Perspectivas Expandidas dos Media* (2021), *Expressões Visuais Disruptivas no Espaço Público* (2021), and *Evaluation of Design-Driven Research* (2022).

MARCO FERRARI

University of Padua

marco.ferrari.992@gmail.com

TRANSDUCTING CYBERNETICS, OR WHAT PLACE FOR CYBERNETICS IN SIMONDON'S PHILOSOPHY?

This paper aims to clarify cybernetics' role in Gilbert Simondon's philosophical work—from the earliest unpublished manuscripts to his last university lectures, including his two doctoral dissertations. I will try to show how extraordinarily complex and subtle the French philosopher's interpretation of cybernetics is since it allows us to understand, beyond any reductionism, the most profound theoretical scope of cybernetics and make its limits and problems visible. By applying a central concept of his philosophy to Simondon's thought, I will try to read this movement in terms of *transduction*. In the first part of the paper, I will show how Simondon was reticent to grasp both the wholly imaginary coincidence between cybernetics and a growing fascination with the science fiction horizons opened up by robotics and the exquisitely technical and engineering coincidence of cybernetics with the increasing impressive developments in automation and information theory, instead recognizing in Norbert Wiener's creation the germs of a new and very specific *axiomatic of science*. On this basis, in the second part, I will try to identify the limits of cybernetics, which, in my view, coincide with those of such axiomatic. By attempting to give an organic format to several references scattered throughout Simondon's work, I will show that these limits are essentially two: i) the inter-scientific mediation of cybernetics, instead of establishing actual and operational *scientific analogies*, would proceed through the individuation of imaginary and structural *pseudo-scientific* or *ideological resemblances*; ii) the cybernetic treatment of the concept of information would betray its anchoring in a *deterministic* (albeit not mechanistic) and *substantialistic* (albeit declined in a dynamic and genetic evolutionary sense) ontology. Lastly, in the third and final part, I will show how what Simondon calls *allagmatic* represents (also) the taking on of these limits and, at the same time, their revivification in the direction of new and different resolutions.

BIO

Marco Ferrari is a research fellow in Political Philosophy at the University of Padua. His research interests are mainly in the history of the human, social, and political sciences, questioned from a historical-epistemological perspective. He has published several works (book chapters and journal articles) on Hegel, Lacan, Badiou, Foucault, Simondon, psychoanalysis, and cybernetics. His most recent publications include the Italian edition of Wiener's *Cybernetics, or Control and Communication in the Animal and the Machine* (Orthotes, forthcoming 2025); *Cibernetica e filosofia politica. Storia e critica di un ostacolo epistemologico* (Orthotes, 2024); *Filosofia, psicoanalisi, politica. Un laboratorio* (Padova University Press 2024); *Leggere ... o peggio. Il Seminario XIX di Jacques Lacan* (Galaad, 2023); the Italian edition of Badiou's *Being and Event* and *Logics of Worlds* (Mimesis, 2018 and 2019).

MARIA CORTEZ

State University of Campinas

maria.salviano@gmail.com

INDIVIDUATION, INFORMATION, AND DIGITAL COMMUNICATION

How could Simondon's philosophy contribute to the study of digital communication, especially regarding the various ways human and technology interact in social media? Inspired by some questions that emerged when working with the universe of computational political propaganda, this research proposes to approach a context that combines modes of operation as diverse as algorithmic structure and meaning with the Simondonian concepts of individuation and information. After the increased use of robots in political campaigns, there was a fear that democracy had been hollowed out by technology; after all, it seemed that the use of the right technique to spread political messages would be enough to win an election. However, the fact that this type of strategy has worked does not mean that it will always do: to better understand this universe, it is necessary to delve into how computational political propaganda operates, how digital communication produces realities. In this sense, Simondon's thinking can bring relevant contributions to this field of study. His philosophy of information, for instance, differs significantly from the ways information is traditionally understood in communication and in cybernetics: with an operative nature, it is not something that is sent from a sender to a receiver, but the very operation of contact between them that causes a transformation. In a scenario where existence is conceived in terms of relations, it is possible to diverge from a logic in which communication is considered as ways of control and conditioning. Thus, what happens in the digital realm could be understood as a collective construction between different existences. It does not mean that there are no concerns in this universe, but changing the way of looking at them could help to combat abuses that may occur. Instead of demonizing technology, it could be more interesting to operate critically, together.

BIO

Maria Cortez is a PhD student in Social Sciences at the Institute of Philosophy and Human Sciences of the University of Campinas (IFCH-UNICAMP). She has a master's degree in Scientific and Cultural Dissemination, carried out at the Institute of Language Studies of UNICAMP, and a bachelor's degree in journalism from Faculdade Cásper Líbero. She is a member of *the Gilbert Simondon Studies Group* based at the postgraduate program in Sociology at UNICAMP, and of the "Information, Communication, Technology and Society" research group (ICTS) at the Laboratory for Advanced Studies in Journalism at UNICAMP. Her research is focused on human-technical relations, especially their political and aesthetic aspects. Recent academic interests and activities include areas such as computational propaganda, digital activism, artificial intelligence, technoaesthetics, and philosophy of technology.

MARIA PRIETO

Manchester Architecture Research Centre
mprieto@mymail.ciis.edu

TRANSINDIVIDUATION THROUGH DESIGN PRACTICE: AN EMBODIED INQUIRY INTO THE DYNAMICS OF TRANSDUCTION IN ARCHITECTURE

Simondon's profound influence on the philosophy of technology has gradually gained recognition in the field of architecture. With recent interests in his ideas on individuation, transindividuation, and transduction, the gradual incorporation of these concepts into the understanding of architectural design in a time of ecological collapse is allowing to explore the transformative potential of design practice under a new light. Simondon's philosophy provides a robust framework for rethinking architecture in a way that is deeply entangled with human experience, technology and ecology. This abstract explores Simondon's concepts of transindividuation and transduction in intersection with architectural design practice, with current examples from the field of cosmotechnical humanities. This study sheds light into design practice as it involves the interplay among human, other than human and more than human beings, built environments, and technological infrastructures. Through the lens of transindividuation influenced by technical objects and collective environments, design practice is regarded as not static but perpetually evolving through process-relational dynamics. Individual and collective design participants are formed and transformed through continuous interaction with technical and social milieus, while designers create spaces that not only respond to users' needs but also engage with broader ecological and technological conditions, entanglements and networks. Transduction, on the other hand, provides a dynamic framework for understanding the transformative process in design practice, whereby new structures and meanings emerge through mediation and interaction within the design process. Moreover, the speculative approach of cosmotechnical humanities—a transdisciplinary approach combining philosophy, technology, and cultural studies—advocates for an architecture that becomes an evolving composition of local cultural practices with planetary technological advancements. In brief, by adopting Simondon's concepts of transindividuation and transduction and the principles of cosmotechnical humanities, our architectural understanding is deepened and expanded with a more integral, inclusive and transformative view of design practice, facilitating collective individuation and fostering more ecologically resonant design methodologies.

BIO

Maria Prieto is an architect, an artist, an activist-scholar and a somatic educator. Based in Manchester, she combines architectural theory and practice with speculative art, human experience and fieldwork, by delving into participatory-embodied inquiries into the process-relational dynamics of transindividuation and transduction in the ecology of design practice. With doctoral backgrounds from The University of Manchester (anthropology of architecture, ANT and STS) and California Institute of Integral Studies (somatic psychology), her work cultivates liberatory epistemics drawing on territorial narratives of suffering, crisis and injustice, aiming at co-assembling the gaia- political foothold of a design cosmopraxis for lively-just environmental futures.

NICOLÒ PIOLI

Sapienza Università di Roma

nicolo.pioli@uniroma1.it

BEING TRAPPED BY THE ART OBJECT. RETHINKING TECHNO-AESTHETICS THROUGH ALFRED GELL'S THEORY OF ENCHANTMENT

My talk will argue that the methodological perspective that Gilbert Simondon called techno-aesthetics can shed light on the current research regarding the agency of art objects. When laying the foundations of techno-aesthetics, Simondon targeted a few examples that provided an outline of the characteristics of the experience of the encounter with objects, be they technical or artistic. Techno-aesthetics remains an unfinished project in Simondon's work, that must be confronted with his general system of thought and his conception of perception. I will interpret some of the implications of Simondon's perspective as the effort to sketch an aesthetic reflection on the experience of the resistance of an object, that focuses in particular on when this experience is characterized by harmony: for example, the accordance between embodied gesture and scheme fostered by the object; the pleasure engendered by the play of imagination and figure; the compatibility of an object and its environment. I aim to show that there is a type of experience, one characterized by bewilderment, the feeling of being trapped, and the difficulty of overcoming physical or psychological resistance, that Simondon did not consider and that might extend techno-aesthetics into a new field of analysis. This experience of the power of the art object was taken into account by Alfred Gell through the notion of "technology of enchantment." Gell developed an influential theory of agency that considers art as the medium of social power. I will show why his methodological premises might benefit from reconsidering the role of aesthetics in the understanding of the experience of art. In conclusion, I will highlight the complementarity between Simondon's conception of techno-aesthetics and Gell's conception of enchantment as the experience of being controlled by an object.

BIO

Nicolò Piolo is currently a PhD student in Philosophy at Sapienza University of Rome, where he also completed his master's degree, including a research period at Université Sorbonne Nouvelle in Paris. He has been a scholarship recipient at the Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Filosofici (IISF). His research focuses on aesthetics, particularly on image agency and its relationship to memory, bodily perception, gesture, and the expression of emotion. His dissertation centers on Gilbert Simondon's notion of "milieu," examining its sources and the debates it sparked regarding the relationship between organism and environment, with special attention to Simondon's theory of the image.

NOEMI PURKRÁBKOVÁ

The Film and TV School of the Academy of Performing Arts in Prague (FAMU)

noempurkrabkova@gmail.com

IMAGINATION IN LIGHT OF THE ALGORITHM: SIMONDON'S IMAGE CYCLE IN THE AGE OF GENERATIVE IMAGES

The paper introduces Simondon's concept of the "image cycle" into the burgeoning discourse surrounding generative algorithms, proposing that it can provide a compelling reframing of the frequently debated issue of "artificial" imagination. Following Simondon's treatment of the process of imagination and the role of the (mental) image within it, as articulated in lectures published in *Imagination and Invention*, I argue that recent developments in generative imaging substantiate some of the properties he already observed. The current media landscape complicates the persistent understanding of imagination as an inherently human faculty located within an individual mind, and instead accords with Simondon's emphasis on the processual, evolutionary nature of imagination, as well as a less subjectivist understanding of the mental image itself. It is through the image—a relatively independent *quasi-organism* "living in our consciousness like an intruder disturbing the order of a household"—and its genetic cycle that Simondon posits an open, transductive ecosystem that allows us to abandon many frameworks modelled around the lingering centrality of the individual human being as the measure of all things, and to move beyond "genuinely human" or "purely Technical" descriptions of creativity. Recent technological advances in generative imaging only show us the externality that was always there: the externality of the (mental) image that, as Simondon demonstrates, never fully belonged to an imaging consciousness and which, now more convincingly, evidences the image cycle of imagination as a shared, ontogenetic movement. I therefore argue that this notion of the image cycle can help us understand the growing entanglement of human imaginative processes and algorithmic generativity and face the perceptual and cognitive challenges of the dynamic interplay between mental and technical images unfolding today.

BIO

Noemi Purkrábková is a media theorist, art writer, curator and co-founder of BCAAsystem, an amorphous audio-visual collective exploring territories between music and visual arts. She is a PhD candidate at the Department of Film Studies at the Faculty of Philosophy at Charles University in Prague, researching the ontogenetic qualities of generative images within and without contemporary moving image art. She is an assistant professor at the Department of Photography, Film and TV School of the Academy of Performing Arts in Prague. As the in-house editor of *Art Antiques* magazine, she regularly contributes to this and several other publications.

RENZO FILINICH

University of the Witwatersrand
renzo.filinich@wits.ac.za

THE EYE IN THE MEDIA AND AS A MEDIUM: MATERIALITY AND TECHNICAL INDIVIDUATION

Analysing the thoughts of theorists of technique and technology such as Gilbert Simondon (1958) and Bernard Stiegler (2018), we conclude that technique and technology constitute modes of individuals and their environment, as opposed to simple tools that prolong pre-existing capacities in individuals. Indeed, technique and technology enable diverse modes of individuation, whether at the individual, psychic, or social level. Thus, each time change implies new technologies that structure the milieu suspending the existing programs. Stiegler called that suspension an *epoché*. This presentation aims to account for the current material transformations that occur due to the interaction between the individual and new computational systems. These transformations have led to reformulate, to put in *epoché*, the old paradigms that focused on vision, perception, and the image from an anthropological point of view. To get there, I will explore the philosophical and theoretical resonances of artefacts from the perspective of Simondon's information processing system approach. Additionally, I will incorporate Stiegler's concept of deanthropologization to account for the new relationships that must be defined between individuals and machines, where classic concepts — such as the relationship between the image and human vision — must be reviewed. Currently, images are not limited to the visual because, as code, they can be processed by algorithms which do not need to “see”. Today, we also face a shift in scale, with an enormous mass of data that can be easily processed by algorithms, but not by individual humans. This is why the transformation of information into digital images or dataviz, that allow us to understand abstract and complex datafication, can be thought to establish new material relationships of individuation between algorithms and living beings.

BIO

Renzo Filinich is a postdoctoral researcher at the Faculty of Arts at Wits University in Johannesburg. He earned his PhD in Interdisciplinary Studies on Thought, Culture, and Society from the University of Valparaiso, and he holds a master's degree in Media Arts from the University of Chile. His research interests encompass technological culture and aesthetics. In addition to his academic work, he is a resident artist at the Posthuman Art Network and serves as an associate researcher with the Research Network for Philosophy and Technology, directed by Yuk Hui.

RICARDO MENDOZA-CANALES

University of Lisbon

rcanales@letras.ulisboa.pt

RESONANCE: IT'S ABOUT TIME

This paper explores an expansion of Simondon's concept of "internal resonance" beyond its conventional energetic interpretation, positing it as a dynamic interplay between bodies (living and inert) that encompasses two interrelated series of transductive modulations: sensation-perception-action and affects-affectivity-emotion. While Simondon's notions of psychic and collective individuation typically focuses on an intertwining of an ongoing individualization and reticular individual interrelations, the role of embodied temporality in these processes remains underexamined. By analyzing the latter sections of Simondon's chapter on psychical individuation and the introductory section on collective individuation, I argue that Simondon's thought, while challenging traditional philosophies of consciousness, does not fully deviate from Merleau-Ponty's emphasis on embodied subjectivity. Simondon's conception of consciousness as a mediation of corporeal becomings, involving both an ascent and descent movement from and to the present through the body, suggests a temporal continuity linking psychical and collective individuations within a psychosomatic being "that is both somatic and social." This paper contends that the present, as a transductive operation linking past and future, repositions Simondon's theory of affective-emotivity within an embodied "transtemporality." The implications provide a groundwork for a renewed, Simondonian perspective on Merleau-Ponty's "perceptual field," conceptualizing it instead as a "field of resonance" that integrates embodied memory, imagination, and social affectivity in a temporally embedded experience.

BIO

Ricardo Mendoza-Canales holds a PhD in Philosophy from the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (2015, Special Prize Award). He is currently FCT Junior Researcher at the University of Lisbon's School of Arts and Humanities, affiliated with its Centre of Philosophy (CFUL), where he coordinates the Practical Philosophy Research Group (Praxis-CFUL). Previously, he was an FCT postdoctoral fellow at CFUL (2017-2020) and a research fellow at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. His research focuses on contemporary continental philosophy, particularly the study of imagination in aesthetics, politics, and culture. He has authored two books: *Husserl* (Barcelona: RBA, 2016) and *Imagen y Experiencia. La fenomenología husserliana de la fantasía (1898-1913)* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, Forthcoming); and edited *Merleau-Ponty: Institution-Ontology-Politics* (Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

SILVESTRE GRISTINA

University of Ferrara

silvestre.gristina@phd.unipd.it

ON THE NON-NEUTRAL MODE OF EXISTENCE OF THE TECHNICAL OBJECT AND ITS POSSIBLE EXAPTATIONS: FOR A MATERIALISTIC PHILOSOPHY OF TECHNOLOGY BETWEEN SIMONDON AND PANZIERI

In *On the Capitalistic Use of Machines*, Raniero Panzieri provides elements for understanding the non-neutrality of science and technological objects. These are indeed marked by class knowledge and contain a specific purpose. In the case of machines, Panzieri shows that the capitalist use of them does not relieve the worker, but rather increases the degree of exploitation of labor power. This raises a question: is an alternative, socialist, use of machines possible? My talk aims to answer this question from a Simondonian perspective, using the lens of Simondon's *Mode of Existence of technical objects*. In the first part of the talk, I will present Panzieri's position and show the problematic nature of his conclusions. The machine designed for capitalist production is marked in its material composition, in its mode of existence, by capital interest. In this sense, it is not enough to use a machine in a "socialist" way, because it would reproduce the defects of capitalist use, materially inscribed in it. There are two solutions: either to build a new technical object "marked" by socialist reasons; or analyze unforeseen possibilities for the evolution of the capitalist technical object. In the second part, I will use Simondon to investigate the second hypothesis, drawing from his concept of "exaptation" of the technical object: there could be components of the machines, accessory elements in their capitalist design, which, re-functionalized in a socialist environment, produce an evolutionary adaptation that leads to a new way of existence of the same technical object. In the conclusions, I will show how, through the combination of Panzieri and Simondon, it might be possible to start a discussion on a materialist philosophy of technology, aimed at the genetic analysis of the production of the technical object and the criticism of any alleged non-neutrality of its mode of existence.

BIO

Silvestre Gristina is a post-doctoral fellow at the University of Ferrara and a teaching assistant at the University of Padua, where he also received his PhD in 2023. He will undertake a Marie Curie Global Fellow (THiMe) between the University of Padua and the University of California, Santa Cruz, from 2025 to 2028. His research focuses on the methodology of the history of philosophy and the material origins of philosophical concepts. His current postdoctoral project aims to develop a method for reading the history of philosophy and political thought that rejects the linear, ideological logic of abstract succession and improvement between theoretical positions. He is particularly interested in exploring the political potential of Simondon's thought within the context of philosophy and technology.

SJOERD VAN TUINEN

Erasmus University Rotterdam
vantuinen@esphil.eur.nl

CONTINENTAL MODAL METAPHYSICS: THE CASE OF SIMONDON

Starting from an observation made by the Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben, I seek to extract from Simondon's oeuvre the outline of what could be called a 'continental modal metaphysics.' Agamben suggests that the difference between analytical and continental philosophy goes back to the unresolved tension between the logical notion of modality (the four modal categories of necessity, possibility, contingency, impossibility that quantify the reality of some given thing) and the ontological concept, already found in scholastic discussions on the problem of individuation by Scotus and Suárez, of a mode that is itself real yet not like things, and that applies to existence itself understood as reality, actuality, or operativity (*Wirklichkeit*). My argument consists of two steps. (i) I will first identify problems with both logical and ontological understandings of modality. The first problem is that of modal indeterminacy: in what way does the possible exist? Either actuality functions as the measure of the other modes, or all modes are just modes of something else, the meaning of which remains unclear. The second problem is that of modal exhaustion: the problem of modal indeterminacy is usually contained by limiting the thought and accomplishment of the possible to the actual. From the sometimes-actual to the always actual, the metaphysics of presence blocks the very notion of a possibility that remains upstream of actuality. Now most of continental modal philosophy is driven by a sense of how easily the sense of possibility gets lost. It consists of a defense of possibility that is, firstly, not complementary to the real but strictly a part of it, and secondly, that is more rather than less than the actual. In Simondon, too, what is at stake is the reality of the possible not as essence resembling existence to varying degrees, but as a further modification of existence—as an unprecedented phase shift. In order to approach the operation of ontogenesis from the point of view of difference, we must modalize the relation itself between potential and actual: what passes from potential to actual is not an essence mirroring existence, but the modality or sense in which existence—or the phase space of being—alters itself. At the same time, Simondon's work sometimes reads like a 'highway (*autoroute*, Stengers)' to individuation in which the co-belonging of modes in abstract or suspended potentiality again tends to be made subordinate to the processes of concretization. Simondon is philosophy in the major key: too much attachment to truth, order, and harmony, but perhaps too little problematization, that is, too much didactics and too little sense of impotentiality, of the otherwise of potential. It thus leaves too limited room for practicing with metastabilization and inoperativity.

BIO

Sjoerd van Tuinen is Associate Professor of Philosophy at Erasmus University Rotterdam. After his PhD (Ghent 2009) on neo-monadological accounts of the production of subjectivity, he has had visiting affiliations with universities in London, Berlin, Vienna, New York, Princeton and Lisbon. His work is in social and political philosophy, metaphysics, aesthetics and the history of philosophy. Recent monographs: *The Dialectic of Ressentiment: Pedagogy of a Concept* (Routledge, 2023) and *The Philosophy of Mannerism: From Aesthetics to Modal Metaphysics* (Bloomsbury, 2022).

SNJEŽANA ŠIMIĆ

Centre de recherches sur les arts et le langage — EHESS/Paris
snjezanasimic08@gmail.com

SIMONDON AND THE AESTHETICS OF PHOTOGRAPHY

Considering photography's inherently technical nature, it is surprising that Simondon's philosophy of technology and technoaesthetics have had minimal influence on dominant theories of photography, which tend to focus primarily on the image and our experience of it. This paper aims to address this gap by offering an alternative aesthetic conceptualization of photography, inspired by key aspects of Simondon's thought. First, Simondon's philosophy of technology allows us to articulate a more dynamic view of technology, recognizing its inherent indeterminacy and the partial autonomy of machines. This perspective challenges the notion of photography as a closed, deterministic mechanism completely opposed to human creativity, and instead opens up the possibility of viewing technical "concretization" as a source of its aesthetic potential. Second, Simondon's concept of technoaesthetics suggests that every technical object can reach its aesthetic potential when reconsidered in terms of its technicity and, as such, inserted into the (human) world. The notion of "operativity" bridges the technological and aesthetic realms, expanding the (techno)aesthetic beyond mere subjectivity and contemplation and offering a new perspective for rethinking photography. Third, even when focusing on the photographic image, Simondon —unlike more abstract and anthropocentric phenomenological or semiotic approaches— sees the image as a material process of individuation, an "organic" entity. These points underline the importance of non-anthropocentric elements in shaping a different aesthetics of photography, while also supporting the view that photography enables non art (technology) to become art by dispossessing it, as suggested by Rancière.

BIO

Snježana Šimić holds a PhD in Aesthetics (École des hautes études en sciences sociales, Paris) and is currently a research associate at Centre de recherches sur les arts et le langage (CRAL, EHESS/CNRS, Paris). She also holds a Master's degree in Aesthetics and Philosophy of Art from Sorbonne Université and in Philosophy and French from The University of Zagreb. She has taught aesthetics and philosophy of art as a temporary teaching and research associate at the University of Rennes 2 and has been a DAAD Junior Fellow at Freie Universität in Berlin.

STÉPHANIE KROKIDA

Boston College
krokida@bc.edu

DELEUZE, SIMONDON AND THE SUBJECT OF BECOMING

Simondon, as perhaps *the* thinker of individuation, is also one who places the individual and, through it, the subject at the heart of his thought. Granted, a subject far removed from any substantialism and conceived of through and in individuation, a subject nonetheless. Deleuze, on the other hand, albeit self-admittedly influenced by Simondon, is better known for his vehement attack on subjectivity, although more than enough passages can attest to the great importance both the subject and the individual have for his philosophy. This presentation will focus on Deleuze, but only to demonstrate that a recourse to Simondon will be necessary so as to address the impasse found in the former's thought. I first plan to track the historical development of Deleuze's thoughts on subjectivity. Going from *Différence et Répétition*, where the stress is given to pre-individual singularities and the fractured subject (*Je fêlé*), to *Mille Plateaux* where the constituted subject comes to be paradoxically both attacked and better accounted for, to his final steps towards subjectivity in *Le Plî*, I will examine what exactly it is that he negated in his attacks and argue it was an already outdated subject, that of modernity. I'll argue that the reasons behind this have to do with Deleuze's rejection of phenomenology (despite his liking of many Sartrean positions) and the liking he took to process philosophy. Subjectivity, nonetheless, does not have to exhaust itself in such a conception—as has been ingeniously demonstrated by Simondon—and indeed Deleuze seems to move towards a more charitable position with time. I aim to show, then, that even in his early writings there was a place for subjectivity—albeit his critical stance towards it—which came into its own later in his life. This is where a return to Simondon will prove indispensable, as his thought of individuation as a constantly ongoing process will hand us the tools to legitimise the subject as simultaneously process and product of this process. Simondon seem to have anticipated and in some ways deepened Deleuze's later musings on this radically transformed, but no less real subject. A subject in which actuality and virtuality are constantly coupled on equal footing in a way that can put forth becoming while not denying continuity. A subject where process and sedimentation do not have to be mutually exclusive and which sees being as becoming.

BIO

Stéphanie Krokida is a PhD student at Boston College. She also holds a MA in contemporary philosophy from Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne (2023) and a degree in medicine (2021). Her research focuses on the ontology of subjectivity, which she explores through the lens of continental philosophy and more specifically phenomenology and 20th century French thought (most notably Deleuze). She is trying to articulate a theory which, while vehemently opposed to no-self theories, also rejects the substance view of the subject so as to bridge subjectivity and process ontology.

SUSANA AIRES

King's College London

susana.a.gomes@kcl.ac.uk

A SIMONDONIAN APPROACH TO AI: TOWARDS AN ONTOGENESIS OF DEEP LEARNING MODELS

As artificial intelligence (AI) technologies proliferate across all domains of life, many have highlighted their risks, including issues of bias, disinformation and automated decision-making. These growing concerns often pertain to three characteristics of the complex computational models underlying contemporary AI systems: 1) their opacity, 2) significant degree of autonomy and 3) generative capacity. In this talk, I will demonstrate how the work of Gilbert Simondon can foster a deeper, techno-philosophical understanding of complex models that helps grasp their operation and think their potentialities beyond the common frames of control, surveillance and behaviour prediction. By complex computational models, I understand Deep Learning (DL) techniques, which are at the basis of recent breakthroughs in AI. Contrary to rules-based models, DL models emerge from the processing of data, iteratively updating the model until optimal functioning is reached. Due to being modelled directly from data in a complex, nonlinear fashion, these models are commonly characterised as black boxes, with their inner functioning being often dismissed to the benefit of studying the more tangible data inputs and outputs. On the contrary, Simondon's individuation theory (2017) can shed new light on the operation of complex models, through an ontogenetic exploration of the data-model relation at the basis of their individuation. Specifically, I will foreground my analysis on the Simondonian concepts of information and technicity. Simondon's operative view of information, as resonance of tension and organisational dimension of individuation (2017), can help us grasp the singularities of the data-model relation, the *hic et nunc* of the individuating encounter, challenging the formula model-equals-data. Technicity, understood as functionality and expressive of a productive capacity of technical objects beyond usage (Simondon, 2012, 2014), invites us to zoom into the technicities of the data-model relation, fostering a reflection on its generativity as the articulation, amplification and integration of localised potentials as functionality.

BIO

Susana Aires is doctoral candidate in Digital Humanities at King's College London, where she also works as teaching assistant. Her current research project develops a techno-philosophical method for interpreting complex computational models drawing on the work of Gilbert Simondon. Susana's research interests include AI, datafication and philosophy of technology.

VALENTIN DENIS

École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales - Paris
valentin.denis@ehess.fr

TECHNOLOGY AS A MODE OF EXISTENCE: FROM SIMONDON TO LATOUR

The Investigation into Modes of Existence (2012), a book that Bruno Latour regarded as his *magnum opus*, owes its title more to Étienne Souriau (*Les Différents modes d'existence*, 1943) than to Gilbert Simondon (*Du mode d'existence des objets techniques*, 1958). However, one should not underestimate the importance of the role that Latour ascribes to Simondon in his work on a specific mode of existence: that of technique. Latour particularly emphasizes Simondon's decisive influence in "Prendre le pli des techniques" (*Réseaux*, 2010), an article where it becomes clear that his entire conception of technology must be measured against the gesture initiated by Simondon. The focus of my presentation will be, on one hand, to assess what Latour actually owes to Simondon in his conceptualization of the technical fact through the concept of modes of existence, and on the other hand, to show how Latour nevertheless distinguishes himself from his predecessor. Rather than separating debts and differences, I will follow the evolution of Latour's relationship with Simondon chronologically, initially concentrating on the period of actor-network theory (ANT), during which it seems challenging to find parallels with Simondon, as Latour explicitly opposes any technological evolutionism to emphasize the social production of technical choices. I will then turn to the second major phase of Latour's work, which is the official conversion to philosophy and the project of an inquiry into modes of existence, culminating in 2012 with "An Inquiry into Modes of Existence." In this second phase, Latour explicitly aligns himself with Simondon, and we will see the authors converge in their critique of substantialism in the philosophy of technology. Latour radicalizes this critique by shifting from an analysis in terms of "modes of existence of technical objects" to an analysis in terms of "technical mode of existence."

BIO

Valentin Denis is a doctoral student at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales (EHESS), where he studies under the supervision of Bruno Karsenti. A former student at the École Normale Supérieure (Ulm) and agrégé in philosophy, his research intersects the philosophy of technology and the philosophy of the social sciences. His thesis focuses on the implications of the anthropology of techniques developed at the Centre de Sociologie de l'Innovation (CSI) by scholars such as Bruno Latour, Michel Callon, and Madeleine Akrich. He aims to explore how this perspective can inform a philosophy that fully addresses the social inscription of techniques. The relationship between Latour and Simondon is a central concern of his thesis, particularly regarding the history of the philosophy of techniques.

VICENTE MONTENEGRO

University of Los Lagos

vicente.montenegro@ulagos.cl

BETWEEN SIMONDON AND ALTHUSSER. SEARCHING FOR THE “STRUCTURALIST HERO”

In “How do we recognize structuralism?” (1972), Deleuze concluded his analysis by bringing up the figure of a “structuralist *hero*” as a possible answer to the problem of “structural mutations,” as thought by Foucault, or of forms of transition from one structure to another, as can be found in the works of Althusser and Balibar: “there is a structuralist hero: neither God nor man, neither personal nor universal, it is without an identity, made of non-personal individuations and pre-individual singularities.” In this way, Deleuze seemed to introduce Simondon’s philosophy as a possible way out of the dead end into which structuralism seems to lead. Actually, Simondon’s work can be understood as a perspective that “overcomes” the famous opposition between genesis and structure. But the introduction of Simondon’s thought in the context of a general balance of the structuralist movement can be read either as a way of “overcoming” structuralism (into something that can only partially be called “post-structuralism”), or else, as the logical outcome of an interrogation that has already begun in the works that are recognized as “structuralist” (an argument that Balibar himself includes in his commented article “Structuralism: A Destitution of the Subject?”). Following this last clue, and taking into consideration a series of works that, in the wake of Althusser’s work, have explored the possible affinities between Simondon’s philosophy of the transindividual and certain concepts of Marxism (Etienne Balibar, Vittorio Morfino and Jason Read), in this paper, I would like to propose a “Simondonian” reading of Althusser’s theory, more precisely, a transindividual reading of the concept of structural causality, ideological interpellation, and aleatory materialism, with the aim to show that (1) this reading allows us to avoid (even refute) the different reductionist readings that have been made of Althusser’s main theoretical positions (his rigid “structuralism,” the “functionalism” of his theory of ideology, the “irrationality” of his aleatory materialism); (2) this reading will allow to show the limits, even the blindness, of Simondon’s own view of Marxism, and more precisely, of contemporary readings of Marxism (such as the one Althusser elaborates); and (3), in a way analogous to what can be observed in the case of his reading of Spinoza, Simondon’s theory of individuation, and particularly his concept of the transindividual, indeed appears to be highly compatible with concepts developed in Marxist theory, and particularly fruitful in his dialogue with Althusser’s “structural Marxism.”

BIO

Vicente Montenegro obtained his PhD in Philosophy at Université de Toulouse II–Jean Jaurès and Università degli Studi di Milano–Bicocca with a dissertation on Althusser and the deconstruction of Marxism. He is a teacher and an adjunct researcher at Universidad de Los Lagos (Osorno, Chile), where he conducts a Postdoctoral Fondecyt research grant (2023 2026, n° 3230180), on Althusser and Simondon’s philosophy of the transindividual. He recently published *Los fines de la identificación. Althusser y el teatro* (La Cebra/Palinodia, 2023), co edited with Alejandro Fielbaum, which gathers a series of essays on Althusser’s writings on theatre and ideology, which includes contributions by Etienne Balibar, Judith Butler, Warren Montag, Guillaume Sibertin-Blanc, Vittorio Morfino and Giorgos Fourtounis, as well as new Spanish translations of Althusser’s own writings, including an unpublished text, “Why Theater?” (still unavailable in French).

VINÍCIUS PORTELLA

Rio de Janeiro State University

viniciusportella@gmail.com

UNLIMITED NOISE: FIGURE & GROUND IN SIMONDON

This presentation will try to articulate the importance of the figure/ground scheme in Gilbert Simondon's philosophy. This scheme seems to play a very important role in his work, not only featuring in discussions of human perception but also serving as his phasic model for culture as well as for the functioning of so-called "complete analogies." And yet it does not tend to be thoroughly discussed by most of this commentators. To understand the rather expansive use that Simondon makes of this scheme, which he took from Gestalt psychology, we have to first interrogate the epistemological role of images and figures in Simondon's thought more generally, in particular his use of the crystal and the process of crystallization. In order to do so, we will briefly retrieve the critique that Isabelle Stengers makes of Simondon's use of scientific concepts, as well as previous discussions around the epistemological dimension of his thought made by authors such as Muriel Combes, Jean-Hughes Barthélémy and Jean-Manuel Heredia. What does his singular use of the figure/ground scheme as a generative model of individuation means for the value of an analogy in Simondon's thought, and what does that entail for our understanding of the epistemological nature of his images and conceptual schemas more generally? Can we consider the ground to be the necessary generative milieu for the emergence of any figure, just like the pre-individual field of potential is necessary for the emergence of any individual (as briefly suggested by Jacqueline Bellon)? Should the crystal be considered a kind of absolute romantic image, like Heredia proposes? There are some of the questions which the presentation will attempt to formulate, and hopefully answer.

BIO

Vinicius Portella is a fiction writer, editor, and independent researcher/media theorist born in Brazil. He holds an MA from Dartmouth College and a PhD from Rio de Janeiro State University, both in Comparative Literature. Since 2018, his research has primarily focused on the works of Gilbert Simondon, particularly exploring the concepts of rhythm, media, and noise through an interdisciplinary aesthetics of information. In 2023, he published a collection of short stories titled *O Inconsciente Corporativo*. Currently, he works at Editora Machado and resides in Rio de Janeiro.

WILLIAM PÉREZ-PORRAS

Stony Brook University

william.perez-porras@stonybrook.edu

ONTOPOIESIS: ONTOLOGY AS A PRACTICAL TASK IN SIMONDON'S INDIVIDUATION

This paper addresses the question concerning the meaning of “ontology” in Gilbert’s Simondon’s *Individuation in the Light of Notions of Form and Information*. In this work, Simondon outlines three fundamental and sequential tasks of philosophy: first philosophy, theory of knowledge, and ontology. Whereas he identifies what the two first tasks must address (ontogenesis in the case of the former and both a theory of relation and the sensation-perception binomial in the case of the latter), Simondon does not specify what exactly ontology must do *qua* philosophical area of inquiry. I argue that what the author calls “ontology” is not so much a theoretical area of reflection as it is a practical task. To accomplish this, I carry out an immanent reading of Simondon’s remarks on philosophy and present my argument in three main stages. First, I outline a model of individuation processes by articulating the notions of problematic, invention, and metastability as follows: in their ever metastable condition, individuals face problematics, which they solve through inventions of new form. Second, I apply this model to the tasks of philosophy, thus showing that what Simondon calls “ontology” consists in the invention of new forms of being that result from the problematics pertaining to the objects of the theory of knowledge. When psychic and collective individuals face problematics in their relations, sensations, perceptions, actions, and concepts, new forms of being must be invented. In this sense, more than an onto-logy, what we have is an onto-poiesis; in other words, rather than a discourse on being, we have a making of being. To further this, I explore in the third section the notions of experimentation and transindividuality. Overall, I claim that Simondon’s rendering of ontology as *ontopoiesis* is to be understood as the invention of new forms of being through transindividual experimentations.

BIO

William Pérez-Porras is a PhD student in the Philosophy Department at Stony Brook University. His primary research focus is on Gilbert Simondon’s philosophy of nature and technology. He also has a strong interest in phenomenology, visual and cultural studies, and aesthetics—topics he explored in his master’s thesis, “Entre la conciencia y la acción: la constitución de subjetividad a partir de imágenes en el pensamiento de Husserl.”



UNIVERSIDADE
DE LISBOA



LETRAS
LISBOA



Fundação
para a Ciência
e a Tecnologia

This work is funded by Portuguese national funds through
FCT - Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, I.P., within the project UIDB/FIL/00310/2020