

We Are at Home Today as an Analytical Machine: Fetishizing-Listening and Affective Ritornellos of 2019 Protests in Moscow

by DMITRII BOCHKOV

Abstract

During the Summer 2019 protests in Moscow, the musical performances became significant political (sonic) actors who seemed to elaborate new concepts of protest in the conditions of uncertain crisis. Against the background of artists who had already obtained a protest aura, it is the September 29 performance of Khadn Dadn, a Moscow art-pop group whose apolitical lyrics stood out in a paradoxical and provocative way. Combining phenomenological and ontological branches of sound studies would reveal the molar affects of such sonic action given that political rally is grasped as a sonorous archipelago in a certain tempo-spatial regime that imposes floating but perceptible frames. Moreover, the schizoanalytic perspective includes the configurations of the unconscious and desire provides an avenue of conceptualizing sonorous as a libido of the social body that threatens the monopoly of protest discourse. This is crucial in the context of a large-scale political rally that constitutes a space where the realms of rhizomatic discursivity and material flow morph into an indistinguishable noise leaving no room for recognition. The rhythmic sonorous remains in an unstable condition of being-(un)perceived in the same manner as the splitting of the centered political self does.

Introduction

Therefore, the music of a well-ordered age is calm and cheerful, and so is its government. The music of a restive age is excited and fierce, and its government is perverted. The music of a decaying state is sentimental and sad, and its government is imperiled.

Hermann Hesse

There is a common cultural tradition to frame the analysis of protest song as an object of research in terms of its rhetoric, centering on the dichotomy of performer and audience (cf. Knupp 1981; Stewart 1991). Since many scholars have often claimed that rhetoric catalyzed by the protest song's performance contributes to the self-creating of a protest (and political) subjectivity, it is not surprising that such a framework unveils deep

psychological roots in the perception of demonstrations. As social philosopher Richard Gregg conventionally posits it, «the primary appeal of the rhetoric of protest is to the protestors themselves, who feel the need for psychological refurbishing and affirmation» (Gregg 1971: 74). However, the sonorous space of a protest rally supported by musical performances and constituting of the complex noise including mixing flows of yells, slogans, whistles, and vocal fermentation seems to be far from the clear, abstract models constructed by the scholars of rhetoric.

One of the first things that comes to mind when thinking of a political demonstration is loudness, a set of diverse, intense sounds. It is obvious that music is a significant component of any social activism, but in the living context of a protest rally, it seems more appropriate to consider it as a sonic phenomenon. Since the ‘terrain’ of the crowded protest rally is not ‘flat’ and there are areas remote from the main stage, the words and the music itself may become nearly indistinguishable. Such a sonic phenomenon may serve as an important instance of power (Quintero 2019) that operates at various affective perceptive stages; here I refer to the distinction between aurality (mainly seen as a social practice) and ubiquitous listening (Kassabian 2013). Generally, Anahid Kassabian proposes to interpret *listening* as a «range of engagements» that intertwines the two domains of hearing (physiological) and listening (intentional or conscious) frequently observed as opposing notions. What differentiates «ubiquitous listening» from aurality is that the researchers of the latter seek to grasp a «sonic culture» whether based on technological or media objects (Stern 2003) or, for example, on philosophical perceptions from different European epochs (Erlmann 2010). As Jonathan Stern famously puts it, despite that «the phenomenon of sound [...] rest at the in-between point of culture and nature», it is true that «the language that we use to describe sound and hearing comes weighted down with decades or centuries of cultural baggage» (Stern 2003: 10). «Ubiquitous listening», in addition to it, introduces the problem of «distributed» (rhizomatic) as well as «distributing subjectivity» and therefore shifts the emphasis to the pre-discursive nature of sonority. So, the listening of the musical protest performance on the demonstration turns out to be closer to being ubiquitous; such listening cannot be avoided and creates a certain (political) environment by distributing the non-individual subjectivity.

Returning to the issue of protest rhetoric, such an absence of affective hierarchy or rather primacy of any mode of perception in the context of living *protest noise* paradoxically creates incentives for an autonomous action of a demonstrator. This action is constituted by the process of recognition: a demonstrator is supposed to decode a symbolic system out of the indistinguishable *noise* and then recognize it as a musical composition. In a way, it may be compared to what Gilles Deleuze called a «differentiation» — a procedure of translating the virtual (a heterogeneous noise, in this case) into actual (Deleuze 1994: 211). In that regard, following the logic of psychological affirmation, the tradition of protest songs may be called a conservative one; this is, in part, explains why the Russian protest songs like *Стены* (The Walls) or *Шла Саша по улице* (Sasha walked along the

highway) have a long tradition of performance during the political rallies. The initial knowledge of the specific song tends to precede the process of recognition and frequently results in large-scale singing-along. But that still leaves open the issue of how does it work if a demonstrator/s is unfamiliar with a currently playing song and can barely hear it? Does the music remain in the state of virtual noise, while a protester turns into an ‘inattentive listener’?

And now, let us look at the context of the 2019 Moscow Protests sometimes also referred to as the political crises (Pertsev 2019, July 26; Mukhametshina 2019, July 22) due to their mass character. It seems to be that nobody had expected that the protest would be this large-scale since most Moscow City Duma elections held every 5 years since 1993 are usually not reported as widely when compared with legislative, regional, or, especially, presidential elections. If a potential candidate is not nominated by any political party represented in the State Duma, they are qualified as independent and need to collect a sufficient number of voters’ signatures to be registered for running for a deputy. So, the refusal of the Moscow City Election Commission to register the majority of opposition candidates based on the graphological analysis of the collected voters’ signatures (Sergeeva 2019, July 17) provoked the massive protest movement which started July 2019 (Mukhametshina 2019, July 14) and continued up to the elections in September 2019. Due to the information provided by the White Counter, there were ~ 22,500 people gathered on the approved rally on June 20 (Mukhametshina 2019, July 22), then ~ 50000–60000 people gathered on an unapproved rally on August 10 (Korzhova, Kornya and Ivanov 2019, August 11) and finally ~ 25,200 people gathered on an approved rally on 29 September (Kharatiian 2019, October 1). All three actions took place in the very center of Moscow, at the Sakharov Avenue that is considered to be a symbolic place for Russian protest movements. Basically, the articulated claims of the demonstrators are as follows: to register the unregistered candidates; to stop police and authorities’ violence; to release political prisoners. What interests me here is a certain feature of the movement highlighted by Meduza (one of the most influential Russian independent online newspapers) as one which distinguishes the 2019 political actions from the previous protests in Moscow and the Russian Federation in general. More specifically, the protest movement as a whole not only «has dramatically changed» and has become more flexible and self-organized (Karcev 2019, August 7), but also indicated a new substantial «driving force», namely, students from the Moscow universities (Kravcova 2019, September 27). And, indeed, the participation of young students beaten by the police and the OMON was discussed and debated extensively in the independent as well as pro-government media.

What is more significant in the context of my research, the musical performances themselves became significant political actors during the hot Summer of 2019. The authorities of Moscow chose an unusual strategy of sonorous countermeasures to seemingly erode the number of young demonstrators. At the days of rallies with an expectedly large turnout seemingly out of nowhere, without any provisional information, musical festivals

were held in the Gorky Park (Bakin 2019, August 7). It was quite obvious that music has become a political issue: while some popular Russian artists were performing on stage at Gorky Park, others were shouting slogans at the Sakharov Avenue. The anti-government line-up in Summer and Fall 2019 consisted of more or less conventional protest performers like *Krovostok* and *Neschastniy Sluchay* as well as ‘newcomers’ such as 22-year-old rapper Face who gained a large audience by performing trap music and then made a turn towards the political, or the rave music duo IC3PEAK who came to fame due to shut-down live concerts and violent lyrics. The very performance of these young musicians seemed to elaborate new concepts of protest and a new political paradigm. And against the background of these artists who had already obtained a certain protest aura, it is the September 29 performance of *Khadn Dadn*, a Moscow group that ‘invented’ its own genre — Lyaoakyn, a mix of sentimental art-pop, indie-electronic, and folklore tunes — whose lack of political lyrics or even banned concerts, stood out in a paradoxical way. Basically, it is this uncommon sonic case of *Khadn Dadn* grasped by the means of participant observation that I seek to consider as an analytical machine affectively distributing the split political distributed subjectivity in the contravention of recognition. Now, in order to do this, I shall model a schizoanalytical conceptualization of the protest rally as a collective assemblage of enunciation and of Sakharov Avenue itself as a sonorous archipelago, speaking in terms of contemporary sound studies theory.

Sonorous Deleuze

It may be assumed that it is what Antonin Artaud called «the exclusive dictatorship of words» (Artaud 2018: 28) that makes the domain of sound a sticking point for the scholars who seek to formulate a new way of speaking about sonic events without oversimplification. Actually, some recent works reveal the tendency to «go beyond» the words and to theoretically approach a «sound writing» (Kapchan 2017), a «sonic fiction» (Holt 2019), or even «be(com)ing “in-resonance-with”» (Wargo 2020). What distinguishes these attempts of reassembling the mode of academic writing is the emphasis on the performativity of sonic knowledge that places it in close quarters with an ethnographic method of participant observation. More specifically, the researcher of sound is supposed, instead of endlessly referring to cultural representations, to come into contact with a «non-discursive form of affective transmission resulting from acts of listening» (Kapchan 2017: 2). This, therefore, implies that the very method and theory constitute a common interaction of sonic research: the act of performative listening transduces the sonorous into physicality that «vibrate[s] our very skin and bones» (Cusick 2017: 40). This is eventually followed by the exploration of this immersive aural practice — by what Wargo characterizes as a «postintentional phenomenology» (Wargo 2020: 2). As a result, such kind of sonic research concentrates on the specific and affective perception, importantly

staying away from any hint on the universality of sonority.

As a consequence, the perception of this type inevitably involves a figure of a listener; to come into being, the sound must be perceived. But when Christoph Cox in his well-known essay claims that sound not only avoids any setting into the chains of signification but constitutes «an anonymous flux» (Cox 2011: 155), the metaphor of a lonely wood and fallen branch that no human hears seems much less radical. In that case, sound might exist despite not being audible; this assumption reveals, broadly speaking, an ontological approach to sound, to its materiality. Then, in his later work *Sonic Flux: Sound, Art, and Metaphysics*, Cox asserts that ontology of sound is «flat (no entity differs from any other in ontological status); and being is univocal (said in one and the same sense of everything that exists)» and «distinguishes the intensive processes of production from actual empirical individuals» (Cox 2018: 132). Actually, this ontological basis, which Cox extensively has borrowed from DeLanda, can be considered as a common to sound studies theory: the sound whether considered as an object, wave, flux, event or resonance enters into relations with a human or nonhuman entity on equal ground. This field, there is no doubt, is especially contingent, but, as Casey O’Callaghan posits it, any ontological conceptualization should be unambiguous upon «where in space and time sounds exist» (O’Callaghan 2017: 17). So, to grasp various ontological facets the authors actively make use of tempo-spatial concepts, like acoustic territories (LaBelle 2010), oceans of the sound (Toop 1995), or sonic warfare (Goodman 2010).

The conditional theoretical line consolidates the diverse branches of the contemporary sound studies seems to originate from Deleuzian-Guattarian thought — or, as Brian Kane elaborates it in his critique, from the metaphysical dichotomy of actual and virtual (Kane 2015: 3). And, indeed, the very structure of Steve Goodman’s *Sonic Warfare: Sound, Affect, and the Ecology of Fear* replicates the composition of *A Thousand Plateaus*, whereas Kassabian directly points out that a Deleuzian rhizome, alongside Haraway’s cyborgs, is a famous version of what she calls «distributed subjectivity» (Kassabian 2013: xxiv). What is more, scholars, and that is especially evident in the field of sound studies, tend to adopt the way of thinking of Deleuze and late Guattari of utilizing various pieces of art as a machine that demonstrates the consistency of concept. Drawing from *Difference and repetition*, Kane points out that the ontological paradigm of sound emerges from the notion of virtuality, namely, a potential natural force (the sound itself) that turns the actual into reality. And the core point here is a tendency towards the in-depth separation of affect from cognitive ratio (Kane 2015: 7); sonic culture alternatively seeks to find out some intersection points of mind and body, rather than disconnects them. Then, in his analysis of Cox’s speculation upon sound-art, Kane highlights the contravention of ontological principle: «there is no object that better exemplifies being an object than any other object» (ibid: 12). To put it bluntly, why the specific piece of (sound) art is supposed to ‘reflect’ ontologically the virtual nature of sound better and clearer than another one? And, therefore, one may make a logical assumption can be made that the ontology of sound is but a

great promise of its virtuality.

More radically, the recent turn to sonorous materiality (along with, for instance, ontological turn in social anthropology) is also criticized for its seeming claim for universality. Despite the explicitly articulated appeal to take off the anthropocentric glasses commonly shared by the researchers of affect, materiality, and ontology in any domain, including the sound, Marie Thompson asserts that there is an urge of generalization hiding under the guise of this ontological argumentation (Thompson 2017: 2). The very strategy of avoiding any cultural signification is, moreover, considered as racial and Eurocentric optics; the contemporary ontological turn, in these terms, dramatically transforms into a (re)turn of colonial paradigm. Equally essential, that these ontological metaphors, like Goodman's sonic warfare, while seeming so broad, in fact, are too narrow to be deployed in the specific research of wartime sound (Sykes 2018). To sum up, the main critical concern is how the ontologically described ideal conditions can correlate with the living context where the sonorous actually exists.

Now, I would like to make an emphasis on one of the key concepts of the vast Deleuzian-Guattarian theory, which seems to be missed by the ontology of sound's critics: on the production of desire explained in machinic terms (Deleuze & Guattari 1983: 25–26). On top of that, such a concept reopens the psychical perspective repeatedly being indicated by the scholars of the rhetoric of protest songs. The interconnected desiring machines (as an alternative to Freud's theatre of representations collective model of the unconscious) produce not only the social (as many Deleuzian scholars point out) but the desire itself. That kind of unconscious production of the social also seems tricky, but this extension may shed some light on the situation: «desiring-machines are not in our heads, in our imagination, they are inside the social and technical machines themselves» (Guattari 2008: 106). The concept of desire, therefore, constitutes assemblages of the social and the technical by investing into them and by alienating from the individuation of libido (Ibid: 155). What is important, the desire is not pre-subjective, it does not precede the self or the social (self of social), it precedes «the separation between the familiarized self and the social» (Ibid: 245). That is means, that the domain of desire does not overlap the domain of power; desire thus cannot be translated into power or vice versa — desire can be translated only into desire.

In a similar vein, the desire as a component of the sound may be perceived as a machine. But, on the contrary, the very act of listening — or a «desiring-listening», a concept elaborated by theorist François Bonnet in the context of the sonorous archipelago (Bonnet 2016) — seems to be directly connected to the realm of power. While being stuck between non-machinic desire and power, the desiring-listening seeks to possess the sonorous and to transform it into audible and discursive, to objectify the sound. The jouissance is not inherent to the sonorous itself, but exactly to grasping the sound as an object as well as to entering into sonic relationships. As Bonnet puts it,

By virtue of this, the sound-object must be understood at once as the object formed by listening — as the condition of the audibility of sound — and as the *objectal projection* of listening's desire. Listening is not neutral and apathic. It is always a will to listen, a desire [*even if this desire is unconscious* — D.B.] to listen. (Bonnet 2016: 136)

Being conceived as an (im)material object by the means of desiring-listening, the sound may be fetishized that is considered as a consequence of listening and then become a substitute of real desire (Ibid: 156). The fetishized object acts as a medium, may be reified then in a certain instrument, performer, or social phenomenon — and then should be considered as one of the plural manifestations of desiring-machine. In this vein, it is worth adding that fetish constitutes a «point of subjectification» (Deleuze & Guattari 1987: 589), the only legitimate and actual thing to desire. The fetishizing-listening thus provokes only objectal investments and opens a perspective for sonic phantasms. Following the Guattarian appeal — «the mythic and phantasmatic lure of psychoanalysis must be resisted, it must be played with, rather than cultivated and tended like an ornamental garden» (Guattari 2000: 39) — I have to note that if the «plastic thinking of sound» (Bonnet 2016: 239) is even possible, it should be based on the reconfiguration of the subject, not sonic phantasms.

The sonorous archipelago is not precisely an ontology, but rather a specific epistemological model, because «there is no ontology of sound to be discovered or established» (Ibid: 324). Its main claim of make sound plastic or «manipulable» (Ibid: 233) ultimately exists at the intersection of phenomenological and ontological approaches. The very figure of archipelago highlights that juxtaposition: «just as objects presuppose structure, the [*sonic* — D.B.] islet presupposes the [*sonorous* — D.B.] archipelago» (Ibid: 256). However, the archipelago does not seek to be transformed into a rigid and visible structure (Ibid: 268). Whereas the isles of the archipelago only seem to be individually separated or interconnected, they remain the same components of the vast sea bottom, the sounds are always the part of some undifferentiated or even cosmic sonority. This model, without any doubt, is deeply inspired by Deleuzian-Guattarian deterritorialization (Ibid: 272); the sound, similarly to territory, always tends to leave its discursive regime. If one puts a sea-shell to ear, one grasps a trace of a sea.

Why is *Khadn Dadn* capable of creating cartographies of existential territories?

There is one thing, the core concept of the creative work of *Khadn Dadn*, a female-fronted band formed in Moscow in 2016: it is its unique genre *lyaoakyn* after which their second album is named (Khadn Dadn 2019). As Varvara Kraminova, a solo singer and a songwriter, describes it, there is an intertwinement of two essential elements: *lyao-* [lyao-] means rollicking and ethnic tunes, while *-акын* [-akyn] indicated an optics of an intimate experience (Boyarinov 2018, October 11). In truth, I doubt if there is any definite

etymology of that word and still, it may be compared to ‘aqyn’, which refers to Turkic poets performing their improvisations to the accompaniment of a dombra; the very form of improvisation tends to unseal specific direct relationships with the environment hic et nunc. However, what is more significant, *lyaoakyn* may be theoretically translated into a method of affective exploration of various existential territories; one may observe how that geographical principle operates from their very first album (*Tajnyj Al'bom*, literally, «secret album») released in 2017. Let's take for example a song *Nakcichevan*: the piece opens with a clear meditative loop-structure performed on a synthesizer. That initial loop will further culminate in the refrain:

И мы поедem в Нахичевань
[And we will go to Nakhichevan]
А мы поедem в Нахичевань
[Well, we will go to Nakhichevan]
А мы поедem в Нахичевань
[Well, we will go to Nakhichevan]
А мы поедem в Нахичевань
[Well, we will go to Nakhichevan]
(Khadn Dadn 2017)

One may notice that such cyclic sonic structures affectively close to meditation tend to inosculate with the repeated verses in the refrain as a culmination permeates through various *Khadn Dadn's* pieces. In a way, this sonic/discursive engagement can be compared to ritornello: a kind of rhythmic and melodic refrain (like a bird's song, a twitter, or ancient Greek regional musical scale) the constitutes the territory (Deleuze & Guattari 1987: 312). The repetition creates a rhythm, then rhythm delineates a territory out of a chaotic space. Furthermore, Guattari directly connects the notion of «ritornello» to the realm of affect by involving a notion of «existential territory», a subjectivity grasped in temporal-spatial terms; the ritornellos, therefore, are «reiterative discursive consequences that are closed in upon themselves and whose function is an extrinsic catalyzing of existential affects» (Guattari 1996: 162). The «existential» here refers to the «existential» completion of subjectivity. The ritornello is not necessarily complex, it may be simple, but the cyclic tune. The repeated «we will go to», alongside the synthesizer, concurrently reveals a perspective of spatial exploration close to the affective go-along method: an auditor 'goes along' the Varvara's voice through different locations and find themselves being lured into a loop. The existential completion would be marked by the arrival to this city; then the motif of Nakhichevan will unwrap in a more detailed way:

Развесили ковры, и криками с балконов
[The carpets are hung out, and with yells from the balconies]
Загудел правый берег Дона

[the right bank of the Don is beginning to roar]
До самого утра всю ночь протанцевали
[All night through there has been dancing]
Армяне, армяне, в Нахичеване
[Armenians, Armenians, in Nakhichevan]
Армяне, армяне, в Нахичеване
[Armenians, Armenians, in Nakhichevan]
(Khadn Dadn 2017)

Here's the same loop enriched with a geographical specification, «the right bank of the Don», points at *Nakhichevan-na-Donu*, one of the districts of Rostov-on-Don, the biggest South-Western Russian city. This spatial exploration is based not only on sonic and performative sensations, highlighted in cited verses («yells», «roaring of the Don», «have been dancing»), but also on the personal imaginative experience of the songwriter. Varvara has shared that this song has been inspired not by real events, but rather is based on an impression from a promenade in the streets of the ancient Armenian district of Rostov — and there were no Armenians at all (Boyarinov 2018, October 11). It is therefore a landscape of Don and Nakhichevan that produces the sound or, how Deleuze and Guattari put it, «the melodic landscape is no longer a melody associated with a landscape; the melody itself is a sonorous landscape» (Deleuze & Guattari 1987: 318). Such a form of a sonorous travelogue should imply special nomadic relations with the territory — namely, deterritorialization — from one location to another, from Rostov to Taganrog, 60 km further west:

Каждый метр асфальта — огромная дырка
[Every meter of pavement is a giant hole]
Таганрог, почему ты начинаешься с рынка
[Taganrog, why do you begin with a marketplace?]
(Khadn Dadn 2017)

It should be pointed out that these lyrics reveals another key feature of the *lyaoakyn* affective method, it operates with more-than-individual and sometimes massive categories of «we», «Armenians», southern cities like Rostov-on-Don or Taganrog, Central Russian ones like Moscow or Ryazan or even Siberian like Novosibirsk. Who are «we»? «We» is always more-than-one, is an enunciation of subject-group; the collective form of subjectivity absorbs an auditor/s into any sonorous-spatial-discursive field of affect that emerged from the piece. «We» constitute an assemblage of enunciation. The auditor/s at the very moment of listening already becomes a component of this affective journey, since «there is no longer a tripartite division between a field of reality [the world] and a field of representation [the book or rather CD — D.B.] and a field of subjectivity [the author]» (Deleuze & Guattari 1987: 23). There is no instance of the power of the author; the

processes of deterritorialization, as well as parallel reterritorialization that are interconnected, are contingent on creating new assemblages. *Khadn Dadn* deals with these assemblages of different scales in which the sentimental female voice of Varvara is never isolated. This assemblage also might be uncanny:

Мы принимаем на свой страх и на риск
[We're accepting at our own risk]
Твою громаду, Новосибирск
[Your mass, Novosibirsk]
Куда ведешь, ответь, не молчи
[Where are you leading, say something, don't keep silent]
И переулок пропадает в ночи
[And the lane is vanishing in the night]
(Khadn Dadn 2017)

At this point, one may observe the central ritornello unsealing the seeming opposite dynamics to spatial exploration in the piece titled *Мы сегодня дома* [We are at home today]. It is that kind of inner dynamics that implicitly faces no limits in a more radical way that other songs on Nakhichevan, Taganrog, or Novosibirsk imply:

Мы сегодня дома
[We're at home today]
Завтра тоже дома
[Tomorrow we're also at home]
Послезавтра дома
[The day after tomorrow we're also at home]
Послепослезавтра тоже дома
[The day after the day after tomorrow we're also at home]
(Ibid)

Indeed, at first glance, it would seem that these mantra-like lyrics are out of the picture of the endless travelogue of *Tajnyj Al'bom*. However, it clearly illustrates what is a ritornello as a constitutive component of mapping cartography. Here, an initial loop-structure of the synthesizer's tune accompanied by a steady rhythm and repeated verses incorporate one in each other and start to mutually culminate at the very beginning. Moreover, this culmination is even expected to be endless: by this logic, the day after the day after the day after tomorrow can be easily imagined. The figure of «home» is the most significant in this context and evoke associations directly to *A Thousand Plateaus*:

Now we are at home. But home does not preexist: it was necessary to draw a circle around that uncertain and fragile center, to organize a limited space. [...] But now the components are used for organizing a space, not for the momentary determination of

a center. The forces of chaos are kept outside as much as possible, and the interior space protects the germinal forces of a task to fulfill or a deed to do. (Deleuze & Guattari 1987: 311)

The ritornello of voice, synthesizer, and rhythm constructs this home, at which «we» may be forever through sound: «sonorous or vocal components are very important: a wall of sound, or at least a wall with some sonic bricks in it» (Ibid). While territory is, without any doubt, implicitly rhythmic or sonorous, I think that *Khadn Dadn* deals rather with a milieu of home because of that endless culmination, «it is where things pick up speed» (Ibid: 25). It is a construction of home out of chaos (as a milieu); the rhythm itself doesn't stand against the chaos but transcodes it. There is also a conceptual metaphor provided by Guattari that rearticulates this model in the context of return: «a child singing in the night because it is afraid of the dark seeks to regain control of events that deterritorialized too quickly for her liking and started to proliferate on the side of the cosmos and the Imaginary» (Guattari 2011: 107). That very child song being a ritornello thus is conducive to the return, to the return of milieu.

Schizoanalysis of split political subjectivity

By following this logic of deterritorialization one would find herself (or «we» would find ourselves) at the *Khadn Dadn* performance on September 29th at Sakharov Avenue. According to its title — in support of political prisoners — this final massive rally from the summer series of protest demonstrations is considered to be a reaction to the police violence and Moscow case. The RANEPА Research Group of Contemporary Folklore (at which I acted as a volunteer) in collaboration with the White Counter (an informal organization that estimates the size of protest) were conducted a series of sociological polls which had been designed for assessment of the quantity, the age, the gender and the degree of involvement of demonstrators. What is crucial, the diagram of scales of age (cf. Figure 1.) reveal a significant decline (in comparison to the previous massive action of protest on August 10th) in those considered main accelerators of protest (Kravcova 2019, September 27) — «25 years or less» and «26–35 years old». In fact, the scale of age «25 years and less» that includes the majority of *Khadn Dadn*'s (that is at the moment of 2019 undoubtedly a very niche indie-group contrasted with *Neschastny Sluchai* rock-group active since 1983) audience is constituted by ~ 5000 of demonstrators against ~ 25,200 people as a general picture. It hardly assembles the fifth part: an average demonstrator most likely is unfamiliar with *Khadn Dadn*'s creative work and can barely hear the lyrics through the heterogeneous noise at the Sakharov Avenue.

Under such conditions, the ritornellos as a part of affective spatial exploration of *Khadn Dadn* tend to transcode the apolitical and non-protest verses with a reference to a new regime of discursivity. The stage acts as an islet, being a part of the sonorous archipelago,

as an islet that constitutes the discursive regime aspiring to monopolize the space of protest: the organizers of the rally are speaking from the stage and articulating a symbolic order. The looped lyrics, therefore, seek to transcode this symbolic order; so, here, for example, are the extracts from the three of four songs were performed by *Khadn Dadn*:

Рязань, Рязань
[Ryazan, Ryazan]
Пацаны, не бейте в голову меня
[Fellas, don't you hit me in the head]
Пацаны, только в голову не бейте
[Fellas, just don't hit me, not the head]
(Khadn Dadn 2019)

Но я хочу гулять
[But I want to take a walk]
Мне ничто не сможет помешать
[There's nothing to prevent me]
Можно я пойду гулять?
[Am I allowed to take a walk?]
Я ведь так хочу гулять
[‘cause I would love to walk so much]
(Ibid)

Небо акрами, вот так расклад
[Acres of sky, oh what a deal]
Господи, какая же сегодня Москва
[Gosh, what a Moscow today/Lord, see what Moscow's like today]
(Khadn Dadn 2017)

It is worth mentioning that the original context of these songs from their second album is connected to the journey to Ryazan, the city in Central Russia (where does Ryazan come into the matter of Moscow events?), and the schoolboy's reluctance to doing homework. However, in the regime of discursivity of protest rally the verses like «fellas, don't hit me in the head» or «I would love to walk so much» turn out to be significant protest referents; while the former has been understood in the light of unprecedented police violence and numerous detentions in Moscow, the latter refers to protest rhetoric of justification for presenting on an unapproved demonstration: we're just strolling, you can't restrict us of strolling. Then a ritornello of «Gosh, what a Moscow today» has seemed to illustrate a whole affective perception of the rally; this perception is dramatically opposed to the ritornello of «We are at home today» that is not, by all tokens, congruent with the regime of protest discourse:

Вы езджайте там без нас
[Do go without us]
Погуляйте там за нас
[Take a walk instead of us]
Хорошенько погуляйте
[Have a nice walk]
Всем привет передавайте
[And send our regards to everyone]
(Ibid)

Without any doubt, these lines like «go without us» and then «please dress warmly» (especially, considering that September 29th was a rainy day) as well as the general appeal to stay at home have provoked a patchy response from the demonstrators; one may observe how this performance has received mixed reviews in the Twitter account of an artist Petr Verzilov (Verzilov 2019, September 29), who has announced at the stage *Khadn Dadn's* entrance. However, what interests me here is not a controversial reception of their performance, but the way how the seeming sonorous dichotomy of «We are at home today» and «Gosh, what a Moscow today» has constituted an analytical machine may be grasped by the means of Guattarian metamodelization. «Schizoanalysis does not thus choose one modelization to the exclusion of another» (Guattari 1995: 60–61) — notes Guattari in his solo late work *Chaosmosis*, willing to emphasize that metamodelization (which is frequently used by Guattari as a synonymous to schizoanalytic mapping) creates cartography out of an unconscious without referring to preexisting models. It is important to stress that this «unconscious» in schizoanalytic terms is not relevant to the individual, but the collective form of assemblage of enunciation, the very instance where subjectivity, due to Guattari, is produced (Ibid: 5). The substantial lack of Other or Signifier pushes unconscious to plunge into the chaos of material Fluxes, abstract machines, territories, universes, and various modes of subjectification — or production of subjectivity. An analytic assemblage, in such conditions, possesses different ways of operation — in the case of *Khadn Dadn*, it is essentially «a creative mutation that binds [...] a group without them even being aware of it» (Guattari 2013: 19). In truth, Bonnet's project of sonorous archipelagos should be also considered as schizoanalytical (or schizological, as Bonnet puts it); conventionally one deals with a sonorous event, a possibility of audible perception and the auditor itself, whereas the schizoanalytical approach leaves a small room where sound may exist between being-perceived and being-unperceived (Bonnet 2016: 91). There is a small room for *Khadn Dadn's* pieces, considering that not only the music, but any word is sonorous (Guattari 1995: 15), especially in the context of its articulation during the performance at the rally.

Furthermore, the aim of *Khadn Dadn* as an analytical machine is to detect various disruptions in the numerous links and connections in the assemblage of enunciation — at last, «a machine may be defined as a *system of interruptions* or breaks» (Deleuze & Guattari

1983: 38). Of course, it may seem that it is the very dichotomy of «we are at home today» and «what a Moscow today» that depicts this disruption with today's reality. But, actually, the piece *Москва* [Moscow] reveals its own inner dynamics of interruption. One of the initial lines — *Господи, какая же сегодня Москва* — constitutes a variation in two (as a minimum) readings or, rather, auditions: it can be transcoded like «Gosh, what a Moscow today» as well as «Lord, see what Moscow's like today». This discrepancy is crucial because the latter involves a figure of Big Other in contradiction with affective enunciation. Such an audition completely remodels the further lyrics — attempt to tear down a *солнце картонное* [sun made of cardboard] may be heard as a metaphor of power — is now authorized by the Lord as well as the regime of protest discourse. The only thing here to desire is to be oppressed. Indeed, it stands in stark difference to the affective desire of tearing down a sun. The relief of the 'sea floor' of the Sakharov avenue is not flat though, and there are islets with various degrees of audibility that are not necessarily directly connected to the islet-stage. In other words, the heterogeneous noise creates a breeding ground of various looped (mis)interpretations of the discursive regime and therefore various breakdowns — of the splitting of political self.

Here, I seek to briefly depict how *Khadn Dadn* as the analytical machine creates a kind of map of this splitting by the means proposed by Guattari in *Schizoanalytic Cartographies* (Guattari 2012: 32) — by adding a concept of «libido» to the «unconscious». One should consider the overlapping of these realms — of the unconscious that is fetishizing-listening and of energetic libido as a sonorous itself — as a catalyzer of the assemblage of enunciation. The libido thus does not imply desire that is the integral of fetishizing-listening, whereas I consider it as a pure sonorous. Later Guattari himself associated libido rather with material Flux (Guattari 1995: 126), than with vibrating energy. Thus, the «signifying structure does not transcend» (Guattari 2012: 24) the sonorous that transforms it into the performative, a-signifying structure of rhizomatic discursivity and material flows. The whole matrix that designates the relations between the sonorous and the fetishizing-listening consists of four ontological functors (Guattari 1995: 60); actual and possible Abstract Machines (rhizomatic discursivity) that are integrals of actual and real Fluxes (structures of sound) and then virtual and possible Universes (fetishized anticipations) that are integrals of virtual and real Territories (Self). Due to this metamodel, the sonorous of *Khadn Dadn* interacts with actual realms of the phylum of abstract machines producing the discursivity and of flows that implies the musical structures, signals, etc. By the same token, the unconscious stands at a crossroads between the virtual representations provoked anticipations as well as the regime of protest discursivity and virtual territories of self. As Guattari posits is, the only possible singular processes actualize through the connection of abstract machines and the universes of reference (Guattari 2012: 30–32). But since the analyzing machine of *Khadn Dadn* reveals disruptions, like «We are at home today» vs. the regime of protest discourse or «Gosh, what a Moscow today» vs. «Lord, see what Moscow's like today», the process of fetishization remains uncompleted that makes

this connection impossible. Hence, the only option is the sonorous-flux that includes not only sonic structures but also voices, signals, yells, and noise, and gains on the territory of self, like tide gains on the archipelago. At this very moment, the political subjectivity re-territorializes drawn by the ritornello into a loop, splits, and then begins to operate as a component of assemblage, of the sonorous archipelago of Sakharov Avenue.

Conclusion

My main claim is that the schizoanalytical project serves as a basis for combining phenomenological and ontological branches of contemporary sound studies theory based on Deleuzian-Guattarian thought. Also, it borrows the key characteristics from both of them, namely, the emphasis on the performativity of sonic knowledge and affective perception as well as the involvement of various tempo-spatial models, such as sonorous archipelago. The sonorous archipelago of the Sakharov Avenue may be grasped in a certain tempo-spatial regime that imposes floating but perceptible frames. Moreover, this schizoanalytic perspective based on elaborations made by Guattari in his later solo works includes the configurations of the unconscious and desire seems to provide an avenue of conceptualizing sonic events as assemblages of enunciation. This is crucial in the context of a large-scale political rally that constitutes a specific space where the emerging realms of rhizomatic discursivity and material flow morph into an indistinguishable noise leaving no room for recognition. Finally, affective ritornellos in this living context seek to create new milieus and to erase any instance of power, producing the regime of protest discursivity.

The sonorous remains, speaking in terms of Bonnet, in an unstable condition of being-(un)perceived in the same manner as the splitting of the centered political self remains being-(un)perceived. As a consequence, the sonic structures of *Khadn Dadn* which acts as an analytical machine and concurrently frames distributed subjectivity knock the bottom out of the regime of protest discourse and threaten its monopoly. The sonorous archipelago of political rally thus is shaped as the assemblage of enunciation that tends to go beyond the singular form of the subject (one may observe in a figure of lonely picketer) and, more importantly, reveals «new representations and propositions» (Guattari 2013: 17). Without any doubt, they tend to midwife the new mode of production of sonic decentered subjectivity.

The comparison of the scales of ages of 10.08 and 29.09. rallies provided by the research group of contemporary folklore in collaboration with the White Counter

Figure 1.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Artaud, Antonin (2018). *The Theatre and Its Double*. London: Alma Classics.
- Bakin, Ignat (2019, August 7). "Park Gor'kogo gotovit festival' na 10 avgusta. Muzykanty otkazyvayutsya ot uchastiya". Retrieved from: https://www.znak.com/2019-08-07/park_gorkogo_gotovit_festival_meat_beat_na_10_avgusta_muzykanty_otkazyvayutsya_ot_uchastiya.
- Boyarinov, D. (2018, October 11). "«Hadn dadn» i zashifrovannyj «pesnyagram»". Retrieved from: https://www.colta.ru/articles/music_modern/19393-hadn-dadn-i-zashifrovannyj-pesnyagram.
- Cox, C. (2011). "Beyond Representation and Signification: Toward a Sonic Materialism". *Journal of visual culture*, 10(2), 145-161.
- Cox, C. (2018). *Sonic Flux: Sound, Art, and Metaphysics*. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.

- Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and repetition*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1983). *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis & London: University of Minnesota.
- Erlmann, V. (2010). *Reason and resonance: A history of modern aurality* (p. 23). New York: Zone Books.
- Goodman, S. (2010). *Sonic Warfare: Sound, Affect and the Ecology of Fear*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Gregg, R. B. (1971). "The ego-function of the rhetoric of protest". *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 71-91.
- Guattari, F. (1995). *Chaosmosis: An ethico-aesthetic paradigm*. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Guattari, F. (1996). "Ritornellos and Existential Affects". In Genosko, G., *The Guattari Reader*. Oxford, UK; Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers.
- Guattari, F. (2000). *Three Ecologies*. London & New Brunswick: The Athlone Press.
- Guattari, F. (2008). *Chaosophy: Texts and Interviews 1972–1977*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).
- Guattari, F. (2011). *The Machinic Unconscious: Essays in Schizoanalysis*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).
- Guattari, F. (2012). *Schizoanalytic Cartographies*. London: A&C Black.
- Holt, M. (2019). *Pop Music and Hip Ennui: A Sonic Fiction of Capitalist Realism*. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing USA.
- Khadn Dadn (2017). *Tajnyj Al'bom* [CD].
- Khadn Dadn (2019). *Lyaoakyn* [CD].
- Mukhametshina, E. (2019, July 14). "Gudkova i Sobol' ne puskeyut na vybory v Mosgor-dumu". Retrieved from: <https://www.vedomosti.ru/politics/articles/2019/07/14/806505-gudkova-sobol>.
- Mukhametshina, E. (2019, July 22). "Politicheskij krizis v Moskve mozhet usilit'sya". Retrieved from: <https://www.vedomosti.ru/politics/articles/2019/07/21/806931-politicheskii-krizis>.
- Brian, K. (2015) "Sound studies without auditory culture: a critique of the ontological turn". *Sound Studies*, 1:1, 2-21.
- Kapchan, D. (ed.) (2017). *Theorizing Sound Writing*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.
- Karcev, D. (2019, August 7). "Protest radikal'no izmenilsya. Ob'yasnyaem po punktam — kak imenno". Retrieved from: <https://meduza.io/feature/2019/08/07/totalnyy-protest>.
- Kassabian, A. (2013). *Ubiquitous listening: Affect, attention, and distributed subjectivity*. Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press.

- Kharatiian, K. (2019 October 1). "Pochemu 25 200 chelovek na prospekte Saharova – eto mnogo". Retrieved from: <https://www.vedomosti.ru/opinion/articles/2019/10/01/812483-25-200-chelovek>.
- Knupp, R.E. (1981). "A time for every purpose under heaven: Rhetorical dimensions of protest music". *Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 46:4, 377-389.
- Korzhova, D., Kornya, A., & Ivanov, M. (2019 August 11). "Rost protestov govorit o glubinyh protivorechiyah mezhdru vlast'yu i grazhdanami". Retrieved from: <https://www.vedomosti.ru/politics/articles/2019/08/11/808580-rost-protestov-govorit>.
- Kravcova, I. (2019, September 27). "Otvazhilis' povzroslet". Retrieved from: <https://meduza.io/feature/2019/09/27/otvazhilis-povzroslet>.
- LaBelle, B. (2010). *Acoustic Territories: Sound Culture and Everyday Life*. London: Continuum.
- Pertsev, A. (2019, July 26). "Metanie tortami drug v druga: kto vinovat, chto v Moskve razrazilsya politicheskij crisis. I pochemu meriya k nemu okazalas' ne gotova". Retrieved from: <https://meduza.io/feature/2019/07/26/moskovskiy-krizis>.
- Quintero, M. B. (2019). "Loudness, Excess, Power". In Steingo, G., & Sykes, J. (eds.), *Re-mapping Sound Studies*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Sergeeva, L. (2019, July 17). "Podpisnye istiny". Retrieved from: <https://www.kommer-sant.ru/doc/4033092>.
- Sterne, J. (2003). *The audible past: Cultural origins of sound reproduction*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Stewart, C. (1991) "The ego function of protest songs: An application of Gregg's theory of protest rhetoric". *Communication Studies*, 42:3, 240-253.
- Thompson, M. (2017). "Whiteness and the ontological turn in sound studies". *Parallax*, 23(3), 266-282.
- Toop, D. (1995). *Ocean of Sound: Aether Talk, Ambient Sound and Imaginary Worlds*. London: Serpent's Tail.
- Verzilov, P. (2019, September 29). "Vystuplenie chudesnyh Hadn Dadn na mitinge segodnya". Retrieved from: https://twitter.com/gruppa_voina/status/1178345005884362755.
- Wargo, J. M. (2020). "Be(com)ing 'in-resonance-with' research: Improvising a postintentional phenomenology through sound and sonic composition". *Qualitative Inquiry*, 26(5), 440-446.