

**AFFECTIVE TERRITORIES:
CARTOGRAPHY OF *ACONCHEGO* AS CARTOGRAPHY OF POWER**

Jan Simon Hutta

orcid.org/0000-0002-3261-9743

Universidade de Bayreuth

Bayreuth, Alemanha

Email: jan.hutta@uni-bayreuth.de

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35416/geoatos.v5i12.6581>

Abstract

The paper introduces an affective approach to the study of territory and territoriality. Previous discussions of ‘territoriality’, it is shown, have commonly focused on symbolic dimensions. Where affect has been addressed, it has been mostly in relation to the ‘topophilic bond’ of people and territory. Instead, the paper suggests understanding both re- and deterritorialization processes as inherently affective. This draws attention to how a series of affective ‘vectors’ – including fear and *aconchego* – intensify or dampen de- and reterritorializations. Moreover, it sheds new light on the formation of capacities of acting in spatial context. To develop this argument, the paper draws on approaches to affect that are inspired by Gilles Deleuze’s reading of Spinoza. It then uses the examples of fear and what in Portuguese is called *aconchego* to illustrate some of the analytic questions thus arising. What emerges is an affective cartography that entails understanding power relations as affective, rendering previous distinctions between ‘territory’ and ‘territoriality’ questionable.

Key words: Territory; Territoriality; Affect; Topophilia; Fear.

**TERRITÓRIOS ‘AFETIVOS’:
CARTOGRAFIA DE *ACONCHEGO* COMO CARTOGRAFIA DO PODER**

Resumo

O artigo apresenta uma abordagem afetiva para o estudo de território e territorialidade. Discussões prévias sobre territorialidade, comumente, estiveram focadas nas dimensões simbólicas, nas quais o afeto esteve relacionado, principalmente, a uma ligação topofílica das pessoas com o território. Em vez disso, o presente artigo propõe o entendimento dos processos de desterritorialização e reterritorialização como processos inerentemente afetivos. Chamamos à atenção para como uma série de vetores afetivos incluindo medo e *aconchego* – intensificam e abrandam a desterritorialização e a reterritorialização. Além disso, lançamos uma nova luz na formação da capacidade de ação no contexto espacial. Para desenvolvimento dos argumentos o artigo nos baseamos em abordagens do afeto inspiradas nas leituras que Gilles Deleuze faz de Spinoza. Em seguida, utilizamos os exemplos do medo e *aconchego* para ilustrar algumas das questões analíticas que surgiram. O que emerge é uma cartografia afetiva que implica no entendimento das relações de poder e afeto que tornam as distinções anteriores entre território e territorialidade questionáveis.

Palavras-chave: Território; Territorialidade; Afeto; Topofilia; Medo.

TERRITORIOS ‘AFECTIVOS’: CARTOGRAFÍA DE ACONCHEGO COMO CARTOGRAFÍA DEL PODER

Resumen

El artículo introduce un enfoque afectivo al estudio del territorio y la territorialidad. Las discusiones anteriores sobre la "territorialidad", como se muestra, se han centrado comúnmente en dimensiones simbólicas. Donde se ha abordado el afecto, ha sido principalmente en relación con el "vínculo topofílico" de las personas y el territorio. En su lugar, el documento sugiere entender los procesos de re y desterritorialización como inherentemente afectivos. Esto llama la atención sobre cómo una serie de "vectores" afectivos, incluidos el miedo y el aconchego, intensifican o amortiguan las desterritorializaciones y las reterritorializaciones. Además, arroja nueva luz sobre la formación de capacidades de actuar en un contexto espacial. Para desarrollar este argumento, el documento se basa en los enfoques de afecto que se inspiran en la lectura de Spinoza de Gilles Deleuze. Luego utiliza los ejemplos de miedo y lo que en portugués se llama aconchego para ilustrar algunas de las preguntas analíticas que surgen. Lo que surge es una cartografía afectiva que implica entender las relaciones de poder como afectivas, lo que hace dudosas las distinciones anteriores entre "territorio" y "territorialidad".

Palabras-clave: Territorio; Territorialidad; Afecto; Topofilia; Miedo.

Introduction

Territories are inherently affective; this seems to be clear. Their affective dimension has hitherto been addressed through notions such as topophilia and place, or *lugar*, which highlight people’s attachment to a place. Often, the term ‘territoriality’ has been used here to emphasize the subjective appropriation of territory and the construction of territorial identity through symbolic registers, in contradistinction to ‘territory’, which commonly relates to actors’ political-economic domination and control of spaces (HAESBAERT, 2004). However, the spaces people inhabit are generative of a multiplicity of ‘affective’ dynamics that extend far beyond topophilia – the love of place – or its opposite, topophobia and fear. ‘Affects’ – in the broader sense deriving from philosophy and psychology – such as confidence, curiosity, rage, shame, disgust or guilt often take shape in and through spatial relations (see ANDERSON, 2014; BONDI et al., 2005). Such affective and emotional dynamics can be seen as integral to subjects’ ongoing practices (WETHERELL, 2012). What is more, though, territories are not only affectively experienced; affects also shape capacities to inhabit territoriality or to leave it, to de- and reterritorialize space. It is this affective dimension of de- and reterritorialization that this essay focuses on.

At the time of writing, I am under the impression of the fears and anxieties – especially on the left – that have circulated in Brazil and abroad in connection to Jair Bolsonaro’s election as president in October 2018. Scholars from a variety of disciplines have scrutinized the role of affects and the emotions in political contestations (e.g. AHMED, 2014; GOODWIN et al., 2009; GOULD, 2009; GAMMERL et al., 2017; PUAR, 2011). But the Brazilian events bring into strong relief how capacities *to inhabit, appropriate and control spaces* – territorialization processes in other words – are connected to affects. Capacities to create territories in urban and rural spaces have been radically constrained for some – not least through fear – while they have increased for others – especially for those stylizing Bolsonaro as a figure of hope and redemption (see HUTTA, 2019).

Bearing in mind this affective dimension of territorialization processes, in this essay I want to reorient the prevalent approach to affect in previous discussions on territoriality in three ways. Firstly, I suggest that affect is indicative of modifications in capacities to act – a modification that results from a body’s encounters in its interactions with other bodies. Affect in this understanding – which is inspired by Gilles Deleuze’s reading of Spinoza – is more than a subjective valuation of individuals: it is a relational dynamism unfolding among bodies in interaction in and with space. Based on this understanding, I suggest, secondly, that affects are not only expressed or experienced *in* territory, they are also *constitutive of* territory (and its undoing). And thirdly, I argue that topophilia is not the only or primary affective relation between subjects and territories, as has often been suggested. Rather, I consider the relations among affect on the one hand and de- or reterritorialization on the other as contingent: reterritorialization can go along with negative affect, just as deterritorialization can elicit positive affect.

As I will show, these three reorientations – towards affective modifications in the capacity to act; towards affect’s constitutive force; and towards the contingent relations among affect and de- or territorialisation – profoundly challenge writings on modernization and urbanization in geography and sociology that have associated territoriality with topophilia and the realization of human potential, and deterritorialization with alienation and fear. Furthermore, these reorientations will also allow us to re-consider the relations between ‘territory’ and ‘territoriality’. Affective dynamism, in the proposed understanding, subsists not only within people’s meaningful ‘territorialities’, but also within the powerful processes through which political and economic ‘territories’ are created or destroyed. In a post-

humanistic understanding, ‘territories’ can be considered as just as affective as ‘territorialities’ – even if their ‘affect’ resides not necessarily within the experience of a subject. This essay is therefore an invitation to study the affective shaping of capacities to act in space – whether this means dwelling, appropriating, dominating or something else.

In what follows, I will first look at how affect and the emotions have been approached in previous discussions of territoriality, arguing that affect has often been sidelined by a focus on symbols, representations and values. I will then introduce an understanding of affect as powerful ‘vector’ that intensifies or dampens de- and reterritorialization processes, which are simultaneously ‘felt’ in a certain way. To flesh out this understanding, I first comment on discussions of fear in the city and topophilia and then argue in favour of a renewed engagement with joyful affects such as *aconchego*. Such an engagement, I suggest, not only helps further illuminate the issue of power – which has been central to the notion of ‘territory’ – it also opens up productive pathways for approaching the contingent constitution and unmaking of territory beyond the idealized notion of topophilia and the teleological discourse of modernization.

Territor(iality) – beyond symbols and values?

The notion of territoriality in Latin-American geography has opened up a vital arena for the discussion of spatial formations of identities, processes of subjectification, as well as contestations and resistance. Marcos Aurelio SAQUET and Eliseu Savério SPOSITO understand ‘territoriality’ as “the quality that territory gains according to its utilization or apprehension by humans” (2009 p. 11).¹ This understanding picks up on humanistic approaches in geography, which in the 1970s and 80s sought to counter the discipline’s quantitative and positivistic orientation. Often, the notion of ‘territoriality’ is further specified as “‘image’ or symbol of a territory”, as HAESBAERT (2007 p. 40) observes. The use of this notion of territoriality has opened the view towards how subjects appropriate material and imagined spaces and how territory and identity co-constitute each other – whether in the progressive practices of the ‘territorial movements’ addressed by Raúl ZIBECHI (2012), or in the territorial enclosures of nationalism and “identitarian essentialization” (HAESBAERT 2007, p. 50; see also ARAUJO and HAESBAERT, 2007). This approach has complemented analyses of the political domination of territorialization processes – classically focused on the

control of resources and people – with an investigation of the cultural dimensions. HAESBAERT has thus proposed an integrated understanding,

para encarar sempre o território dentro de um *continuum* que se estende da apropriação mais especificamente simbólica (no seu extremo, uma ‘terrialidade sem território’) até a dominação funcional em sentido mais estrito (no seu extremo, mas apenas enquanto ‘tipo ideal’, um ‘território estritamente funcional’) (2007 p. 40).

However, while lending itself to such an integrated understanding of material and cultural dimensions, cultural practices of territorialization have mostly been conceptualized in linguistic and iconographic terms – consonant with the bulk of socio-cultural theory informed by structuralism, poststructuralism and symbolic interactionism. This symbolic dimension surfaces, for instance, when HAESBAERT notes – citing his earlier work – “there is no territory without some kind of identification and (positive or negative) *symbolic valorization* of space by its inhabitants” (2007 p. 38; emphasis added). And further, drawing on Bourdieu,

Hoje, num mundo em que o simbolismo da cultura é presença fundamental em todas as esferas da vida, o território não poderia fugir à regra e se vê cada vez mais mergulhado nas tramas de um ‘poder simbólico’ [Bourdieu] que tudo parece arrebatat (IBID.; emphasis added).

In a similar vein, Araujo understands ‘territory’ as “a taxonomy objectified through relational geodesic *referencing of signs*” (ARAUJO, 2007 p. 24; emphasis added). Likewise, the renewed engagement with the French geographer Jean Gottmann, who proposed a kind of ‘psychosomatic’ conception of territory (MUSCARÀ, 2009), has revolved chiefly around territory’s ‘iconographic’ dimension.

To be sure, works in this vein have shown the great importance of symbolism and iconography in spatial formations at various scales. For instance, territoriality has been shown to exert significant power in shaping the ‘imagined community’ (B. Anderson) of a nation-state or in developing an iconography that makes a space recognizable as a regional landscape. Works focusing on identities and contested relations among dominant and subaltern groups have moreover brought out how specific meanings are attributed to spatial elements in processes of appropriation and disappropriation. Furthermore, discussions of ‘trans-’ and ‘multi-territoriality’ (see HAESBAERT, 2004) have investigated the symbolic and representational modifications and hybridizations in contexts of migration and diaspora, also pointing to the significance of memorializing and imagining spaces.

As I have argued in the introduction, however, processes of de- and reterritorialization are not only meaningful, they are also inherently affective. What role has affectivity played in these discussions, then? Affect has paradoxically been emphasized and neglected at the same time. On the one hand, affect has been granted a central role. The term appears frequently in definitions of territory and territoriality, for instance in Brunet et al.'s dictionary *Les Mots de la Géographie*, where one of several definitions specifies territory as a notion that is at the same time “juridical, social and cultural, *and even affective*” (cited in HAESBAERT 2004: 39; emphasis added). In a similar vein, Marcos Aurelio SAQUET notes, “Humans play a central role in the formation of any territory, as they crystalize *affective*, symbolic relations of influence, conflicts, identities etc.” (2009 p. 85; emphasis added). Territory's affective dimension is commonly equated in these debates with what the French geographers Bonnemaïson and Cambrézy call a ‘principle of identification’ and ‘belonging’. This principle, they note, “explains the intensity of the relation to the territory” (cited in HAESBAERT, 2004 p. 72). And further, territory “cannot be perceived as mere possession or as an entity external to the society that inhabits it. It is part of identity, *the source of an essentially affective or even amorous relation.*” (IBID.; emphasis added)

This idea of an affectively ‘intense’ relation to territory picks up on the notion of ‘topophilia’, ‘the love of place’, developed by the humanist geographer Yi-Fu Tuan in the wake of French philosopher Gaston Bachelard. The use of the terms ‘affect’ and ‘affective’ is close to the term’s connotation of ‘affectionateness’ or ‘tenderness’ in Romance languages. I will return to this (narrow) focus on topophilia and belonging later on. What I want to highlight here is that the affective is commonly mentioned in the same breath as the symbolic; and it is the notion of the symbolic, rather than the affective, that is often placed centre stage, attributing to affect the status of a derivative concept. But can territoriality’s affectivity really be derived from its symbolic dimension? Let us take a closer look at this epistemological attribution of affect to the symbolic.

The association of symbolic and affective dimensions is particularly pronounced in the idealist and humanist strands of geography. Here, the symbolic and the affective are seen as two related aspects of the human practice of imbuing space with ‘values’. Bonnemaïson and Cambrézy thus note, “The power of the territorial bond reveals that space is *invested with values* that are not only material, but also ethical, spiritual, *symbolic and affective*” (cited in HAESBAERT, 2004, p. 72; emphasis added). In a similar vein, TUAN (1974), who has

placed ‘values’ in the subtitle of his landmark monograph *Topophilia*, conceives of values as psychological motivations that “direct energies to goals” (p. 1). As he argues in this book, these motivations are related to cultural ideals and world views that take shape in social context. For instance, according to Tuan, the appreciation of ‘rural life’ in North Atlantic societies forms a ‘value’ that has spurred on suburbanization processes. In a similar vein, ARAUJO (2007) mentions ‘value’ (*valor*) as what creates a synthesis between identity and territory on the level of sense: “the synthesis is accomplished through the georeferencing of the *foundational value* attributed to identity: Brazilians are cordial; Brazil is the territory of cordiality” (p. 31; emphasis added). The affective relation of ‘cordiality’ is construed here as a societal ‘value’ that is based on a foundational myth. It is through this epistemology of values that affectivity, while explicitly addressed in the humanistic framework, is subordinated to the symbolic: the ‘topophilic’ valorisation of rural life or cordiality are understood as affective aspects of a larger valorisation process that is chiefly symbolic and leads to the cultural representations of landscapes and national territory.

This privileging of the symbolic over the affective is even more pronounced in another landmark reference in humanistic geography: Gaston Bachelard’s *The Poetics of Space*. In this phenomenological work, which has paved the way for Tuan’s discussion of topophilia, affect is even said to be *erased by value*. Talking about ‘values of expansion’, which for BACHELARD is at the centre of experienced space, the author notes:

To designate space that has been experienced as affective space [...] does not, however, go to the root of space dreams. The poet goes deeper when he uncovers a poetic space that does not enclose us in affectivity. Indeed, whatever the affectivity that colors a given space, whether sad or ponderous, once it is poetically expressed, the sadness is diminished, the ponderousness lightened. Poetic space [...] assumes values of expansion. (1994 p. 201).

Expansion is rendered here as a core ‘value’ that is somehow non-affective; any affectivity that might be at work in space is said to evaporate in the moment of its expression in poetic images, which Bachelard conceives as the most authentic form of spatial experience. Curiously, though, when analysing poetically experienced space, the phenomenologist still resorts to affectively laden formulations, such as someone’s “real affection” (BACHELARD, 1994 p. 77) for a drawer, “the positive *joy* that accompanies the opening of a new box” (p. 83; emphasis added), or wardrobes that are “affectionately cared for” (p. 81). Affect is thus

simultaneously there and not there: it is constitutive of toponophilia, yet eclipsed by linguistic expression and dissolved into ‘value’.

There is therefore a conceptual lacuna at the very heart of the humanistic tradition of geography. Despite persistent references to affective terms such as ‘topophilia’ or ‘belonging’, affectivity has not been elaborated in the same depth as iconography or semiotics. Where affectivity is addressed in its own terms, this is commonly in relation to environmental stimuli perceived through the senses and producing affective responses that are then cognitively processed (e.g. TUAN, 1974). Apart from the course that social research has taken in the wake of Western philosophy’s linguistic turn, we might relate this privileging of cognition and representation to the longer history of favouring mind over body, and reason over the emotions in modern philosophy since Descartes (see SPELMAN, 1989). On the backdrop of this history of hierarchisation, it might not be surprising that Bachelard associates the ‘value of expansion’ with a particular *idea* expressed in language, rather with the *affect* that such expansion might elicit. Even in Henri Lefebvre’s work, which pays much attention to affect, desires and bodily rhythms, lived experience is ultimately framed as ‘spatial representation’, conceived through the production of symbolisms.

Overall, we might thus say that engagements with affect in humanistic geography fall into a gap in the middle of a two-tier ontology: on the one hand the ontology of ‘perceptions’, which relies on psychological – and sometimes phenomenological – approaches that deal with the cognitive ordering of environmental stimuli; and, on the other, the ontology of ‘values’, which relies on the analysis of iconographies and symbolic representations relating to cultural ideals and world views. While these two ontological planes are sometimes related to each other – as when TUAN (1974 p. 246) considers how perception is influenced by values – the affectivity traversing and exceeding perceptions and representations is not properly explored.

Turning towards affect

Challenging the humanistic tradition, what has been labelled ‘affect theory’ – a diverse range of approaches from geography, sociology, psychology, cultural studies, feminism and queer theory – has emphasized the irreducibility of affect to meaning and signification (see AHMED, 2014; CLOUGH, 2008; DOWLING *forthcoming*; GREGG and SEIGWORTH, 2010; ANDERSON and HARRISON, 2010; LORIMER, 2007). Affective

dynamism has been posed here as immanent to life itself, rather than being contained by a subject's experience or perception (see SEIGWORTH and GREGG, 2010; PUAR, 2007; THRIFT, 2004). 'Affect' is understood here, not in the sense of 'affectionateness', but in the wider philosophical sense. Affect is seen here as fundamentally relational and processual, an understanding that has been inspired especially by Gilles DELEUZE's (1988a; 1990) reading of the Enlightenment philosopher Baruch Spinoza. In this understanding, affect emerges from encounters among bodies, which persistently 'affect' one another in beneficial or detrimental, 'joyful' or 'saddening' ways. In thus indexing beneficial or detrimental encounters, affect is viewed as signalling modifications in the bodies' agential capacities. This is because a body's agency – what Spinoza calls *potentia agendi*, the power of acting – is seen as constituted by the relations among this body's various components, which are modified by these encounters. Good encounters combine well with a body, intensifying certain of its relations. These encounters generate 'felicitous' affect: they make somebody – or at least part of some 'body' – 'happy', as they increase its capacity to act. Conversely, negative encounters cause 'sad' affect, as they diminish its capacity to act. Different bodies are seen as having differential capacities of affecting and being affected by other bodies without being destroyed. Encounters thus modify the intensities of bodily relations, engendering ongoing variations of 'happiness' and 'sadness', even if only in very minute and subtle ways (see BROWN and STENNER, 2001).

This basic conception has opened up an analytic approach that starts out from relationally shaped capacities of acting, rather than from human needs or values. Bodies are defined here, not so much through their given forms and properties, but through their intensities, which are related to their specific capacities of affecting and being affected. As these capacities show only in relational encounters and interactions, differentiating and defining bodies in abstract and ideal ways is of little purchase. As DELEUZE and GUATTARI note in *A Thousand Plateaus*:

We know nothing about a body until we know what it can do, in other words, what its affects are, how they can or cannot enter into composition with other affects, with the affects of another body, either to destroy that body or to be destroyed by it, either to exchange actions and passions with it or to join with it in composing a more powerful body. (2004 p. 257)

Each body can thus be seen as composed of other bodies that have entered into affective compositions of a certain intensity. For instance, hands that are capable of joyfully affecting other bodies through touch can combine with an attentive vision and a calming speech to form a caring body (which is not necessarily confined to a human individual). One can thus affect and be affected by a multiplicity of bodies at different scales at the same time – including in contradictory ways. Furthermore, a body’s very affects enter into constellations with other affects. Someone’s love can conjoin with someone else’s ambition, just as someone’s anger can combine with someone else’s fear. ‘Body’ is understood in the widest possible sense here. As DELEUZE notes, “A body can be anything; it can be an animal, a body of sounds, a mind or an idea; it can be a linguistic corps, a social body, a collectivity” (1988a p. 127). Even though not any kind of body can affect or combine with any other kind of body, bodily compositions take shape through different registers and at different scales, generating manifold and complex affective arrangements. I can be affected at the same time by a sound, an idea, and a physical touch, each ‘affect’ enhancing or diminishing my power of acting in a specific way, eliciting variations of ‘happiness’ or ‘sadness’ that might conjoin or cause friction.

One can thus think of the world as composed of affective encounters, exchanges and compositions among heterogeneous bodies, which persistently modify each other’s agential capacities. Human subjects and other bodies are implicated in this affective dynamism, not only through their perception or subjective experiences of affects, but through the ongoing intensification and dampening of bodily relations, which persistently re-shape agential capacities. Although in principle variations of affect can be sensed, a subject cannot always fully perceive or experience them – which is why perception is not a primary epistemic target here.²

While many writings within so-called ‘affect theory’ share this broad understanding of affective dynamism as immanent to the world, there is great variance in how such dynamism and its relation to space are studied. Some authors have focused on bodily modifications at the level of the autonomous nervous system (e.g. CONNOLLY, 2002); some have looked at spatial atmospheres (e.g. GANDY, 2017; NAY, 2019) others have scrutinized the shaping of bodily capacities through biopower (e.g. ANDERSON, 2012); affective dynamics in racialization (e.g. LIM, 2010), or the capitalist valorisation of affective subjectivities (see DOWLING, *forthcoming*) – to give just a few examples. These various

writings are far from consistent. Besides Deleuze's reading of Spinoza, authors have mobilized a range of approaches, including phenomenology, pragmatism, experimental psychology and neuroscience, semiotics, and Marxian or Foucauldian theory. And whereas several authors have engaged specific affects such as hope, boredom, love or melancholia, others have worked "with a notion of broad tendencies and lines of force" (THRIFT, 2004 p. 60).

Some of these writings have also received serious criticisms. They have been critiqued for conceptualizing relations between affect and signification as too dichotomous (MAZZARELLA, 2009), as relying on simplistic readings of neuroscientific research (LEYS, 2011), as neglecting the importance of socially constructed positionalities (see SHARP, 2009), or as underestimating the continued relevance of discourse (WETHERELL, 2012). While I share some of these concerns, I still think a Deleuze-inspired understanding of affect opens up vital pathways for geographic research through its epistemic shift from humanistic conceptions of subjective experience to the dynamism of bodily encounters: to bodies' differential capacities of affecting and being affected; to modifications of these capacities; and to the sense-able effects of these modifications (cf. ANDERSON, 2014).

In particular, this epistemic shift can illuminate in new ways what Derek McCormack calls 'affective spaces'. Such spaces, MCCORMACK argues, share three characteristics:

First, these spaces are relational – they involve nonreducible relations between bodies, and between bodies and other kinds of things, including artifacts, ideas, and concepts, where neither these things nor bodies are ever stable themselves. Second, affective spaces are processual: that is, they exist as worlds in ontogenetic transformation whose variations can be sensed through different techniques of attention, participation, and involvement – techniques that can and should be cultivated as part of the process of thinking. Third, affective spaces are nonrepresentational: that is, their force does not necessarily cross a threshold of cognitive representation in order to make a difference with the potential to be felt. (2013 p. 4)

Even though I do not agree that bodies are never stable – this depends on temporality and scale – these characteristics give useful indications of how affective spaces can be approached. Such spaces are dynamically constituted through the relational interactions amongst different kinds of bodies. Further, since the bodies involved in affective encounter 'can be anything', affects can be seen as always already pervading spaces. A subject

entering a space thus enters an affective dynamism, with which it begins interacting. On an experiential level, such dynamism might be perceived as a space's 'atmosphere', which can be experienced as cheerful and welcoming, or as frightening and repelling – and often in different ways by different subjects (see AHMED, 2014). But spaces can also be seen as affective independently of a subjects' perception. For instance, I can leave the seminar room after hours of teaching feeling energised or exhausted, only realizing afterwards that something about the space and its various relationalities has been affectively enlivening or depleting. If we consider the multiplicity of bodily compositions and interactions taking place in a seminar room – which involves not only diverse forms, speeds and kinds of conversation, but also ways of looking and facial expression, bodily postures and habitus, evoked memories and imaginations, as well as room temperature, noise, architecture or aesthetics – it should not come as a surprise that I am not able to fully perceive on which level I have been positively or negatively affected, which bodily compositions or destructions have taken place, or which affects have combined or rubbed against one another – even if I can learn to become more attentive to such dynamics. What can often be clearly sensed, though, is the overall *effect* of these various affects, as they modify bodies' power of acting and can therefore be seen as 'forces' pervading space.

It is this 'dispositional' aspect of affect as a force that shapes bodily capacities that I want to focus on in what follows. Mobilizing Deleuze's understanding (derived from the philosopher Henri Bergson) of an 'actual' world that is shaped by 'virtual' relations of force, Ben Anderson notes, "Movements of affect are always accompanied by a real but virtual knot of tendencies and latencies that generate differences and divergences in what becomes actual." (ANDERSON, 2006 p. 738) While this virtual affective force is often "vague", "fragile" and "fleeting" (IBID.), it can nonetheless be sensed – as an 'atmosphere', a 'feeling', a 'sensation', a 'shock', a 'thisness'... It generates modifications "in the multilayered sensibility from which thinking takes place" (IBID.). Affective spaces, in this sense, do not only 'feel' a certain way, they also shape capacities of perceiving, thinking and acting. This understanding of affect as a dispositional or virtual force is of particular relevance in the present context, as it opens up new ways of approaching de- and reterritorialization.

Affective de- and reterritorialization

Uses of space are full of encounters and interactions in and with space (even though spatial control from a distance would be worth further scrutiny). These encounters and interactions can be seen as inherently affective in the Spinozian sense: they shape capacities to inhabit, act in and appropriate spaces. Negative encounters in and with space go along with negative affects, which might be sensed and narrated as fear, anxiety, disgust, shame or guilt, for example. These affective encounters do not ‘combine well’ and therefore constrain capacities to act, hindering the appropriation of spaces and the formation of territory. Conversely, positive affects – e.g. joy, confidence, desire – arise from ‘felicitous’ encounters, which are facilitators of such appropriation.

What implications does this have regarding de- and reterritorialization? The very formation of territory – and its disbanding – goes along with affective variation: entering or leaving a territory, partaking in its construction or destruction always ‘feels’ a certain way – it can elicit joy or anxiety, excitement or frustration, anger or shame. This brings into relief what I have called affect’s constitutive force: affect is not only an effect that is felt, it is also a driver or blocker of de- and reterritorialization processes. When a deterritorialization process is felicitous, when it ‘feels good’, to put it simply, it is more likely to gain traction and speed up; whereas when it is infelicitous and elicits, say, shame or anxiety, these affects can block the deterritorialization process – and the same goes for reterritorialization. In this sense, affect is not only an effect, it is also a driver or blocker of these processes. It can be understood as a set of *vectors* that instigate or hinder de- or reterritorialization.

Such an understanding also opens up new pathways for approaching the affectivity of ‘territory’ itself. Even before any de- or reterritorialization take place, spaces can be seen as traversed by affective vectors, in the sense of virtual dispositions – forces pulling into a certain direction – that might or might not actualize. When such forces exceed a certain threshold, they actualize in de- and reterritorialization processes. Wherever such processes produce territories – i.e. creating repetitiveness among its constitutive elements (HAESBAERT, 2013), these forces do not merely stop operating, even though they might subside or modify their orientation. Rather, the affective dispositions that have supported the (re-)territorialization processes persist, assisting in holding its elements together – or pulling towards further de- and reterritorialization. As DELEUZE and GUATTARI put it,

“the most shut-up house opens onto a universe” (1994 p. 180). Territorial consistency is thus connected to affective forces.

Such affective forces are not limited to a ‘topophilic bond’ among subjects and spaces, though. Positive affect is not necessarily associated with territorialization, just as there is no essential link between negative affect and deterritorialization. The relations among affect and de- or reterritorialization are rather contingent: deterritorialization can feel good or bad, it can enhance or constrain agential capacities, and the same goes for reterritorialization. Moreover, there is great variety regarding *what* affective de- and reterritorialization processes enable at which scale, as the ‘bodies’ involved ‘can be anything’ – a state, a community, a habitus, a body of thought, and so on. This calls for a nuanced cartography that traces affectivity across multiple registers, including subjectivities, collectivities, spatial arrangements as well as discursive and institutional settings. Let us explore, then, some of the analytic questions that arise from this understanding of affective de- and reterritorialization in relation to some prominent discussions in geography. For this purpose, I will return to fear of crime in cities on the one hand and topophilia on the other, which can be approached from such an affective perspective.

An affective approach to fear

Discussions on fear in the city have contributed to a nuanced understanding of how negative affect is wired into urban life. Architecture and urban planning incorporate fears and their social construction, as various authors have shown (see BANNISTER and FYFE, 2001). Especially subaltern groups have moreover been constructed as ‘dangerous’, thus legitimising their exclusion and control (see ENGLAND and SIMON, 2010; SHIRLOW and PAIN, 2003). Not least in the postcolonial context of Latin-American cities, discourses of fear have been shaped by 19th-century urban reforms and policing, associating black and poor populations with disease, delinquency and ‘disorder’ (BATISTA, 2003). With the proliferation of insecurities and new forms of exclusion related to neoliberal transformations, as well as the expansion of illicit markets and armed violent actors, concerns with violence have led to an intensification of fear narratives, also spurred on by excessive media coverage (SOUZA, 2008). These narratives – and the real experiences with which they are associated – have made militarized police interventions as well as the expansion of the private security sector in middle-class communities seem natural (CALDEIRA, 2000; SPOSITO and GÓES,

2013; SOUZA, 2008). At the same time, especially (white) women have been socially constructed as naturally fearful and in need of male protection (VALENTINE, 1989). Feminist geographers in particular have brought into relief how fear of assaults constrains the movements of women and other subaltern subjects in urban space (see PAIN, 1997).

These various discussions suggest that fear can be understood as a variegated dynamism that operates through urban politics, spatial development, discursive formations and lived practice. This complexity has led to some conceptual vagueness, though, regarding the relations among affective and discursive registers. In humanistic writings, fear has tended to be viewed as an emotion emerging from the material and representational ‘landscapes’ that humans construct in the face of ontological insecurity and vulnerability (TUAN, 1979). In many writings from urban geography, the analytic focus has been placed even more strongly on social representations of violence and discursive constructions of insecurity. While this focus on representations and discourses remains vital for understanding how fear operates, it has not illuminated how fear operates as a vector of de- and reterritorialization. A sharpened focus on the re-shaping of agential capacities through affective dynamics can enhance our understanding of these processes.

As a point of departure, we can draw on writings that have posed fear in the city as a constraining and even damaging dynamism. Elizabeth Stanko, for instance, views fear “as a destructive force, interfering with full participation in everyday life in a civilized society” (quoted in ENGLAND and SIMON, 2010 p. 203). What does ‘destructive force’ mean, though, and how does it operate? There are various different ways in which fear can hinder people’s participation in everyday life, including through avoidance behaviour and discriminatory forms of securitization. To get at some of the affective dynamics at work here, I want to offer a rereading of Teresa CALDEIRA’s (2000) account on how events were narrated and folded into social practices in the context of São Paulo around 1990.

In her discussion of fear narratives in São Paulo, Caldeira notes that many of the residents of the community she researched referred to a traumatic event of violence that caused a rupture in their confidential use of spaces. “They represent an event”, the author comments, “that had the power to interrupt the uneventful flux of everyday life, changing its quality for ever – an event that stands out because of its absurdity and gratuitousness.” (CALDEIRA, 2000 p. 27) In an affective reading, this ‘event’ can be viewed as an encounter that intervenes at the level of bodily intensities. Something in a body’s relations with other

bodies, which had formed an ‘uneventful flux of everyday life’, is permanently altered. Perhaps the memory of a feeling of disempowerment or shame attaches itself to the act of leaving the house or taking the bus; perhaps the use of certain spaces elicits a defensive tension in the body that speeds up the rhythm of walking; perhaps a facial expression in other people signals threat. Whatever the exact modifications in bodily relations, what is narrated as persisting fear has the effect of constraining affective capacities to inhabit spaces: “Life does not go on as it used to. Many people repeated to me, ‘You never lose that fear.’”

(IBID.) What ensue are often reactions like:

enclosing the home, moving, restricting children’s activities, hiring private guards, not going out at night, and avoiding certain areas in town, all actions that reinforce a feeling of loss and restriction as well as the perception of a chaotic existence in a dangerous place. (CALDEIRA, 2000 p. 28)

This passage moreover suggests that affects such as feelings of loss and restriction might combine with fear, producing a complex landscape of mutually reinforcing affects. Ensuing from an affective event – an eventful ‘encounter’ – fear can thus cause a rupture in people’s relations with spaces, deterring them from appropriating these spaces, or incentivising self-isolation and securitization.

The affective event is however not constricted to a singular occurrence. Rather, it reverberates through memories and, importantly, its narration. In fact, Caldeira found that the retelling of violent events in a number of social situations led to the formation of crime narratives that were simplistically organized around a harmonious ‘before’ and a violent ‘after’ as well as stereotypical depictions of threats. Affective encounters can thus also unfold as memories are inserted into social discourse. A closer consideration of the affective dynamism at work raises some further questions. To what extent are fear narratives mobilized as a discursive strategy of legitimization? Where have defensive architecture and securitization become routine forms of reterritorialization that operate through conjunctures of investment strategies, planning and government? When are defensive actions shaped by aspirations for a middle-class lifestyle? To what extent do fear and desire feed into or displace one another? In their research in smaller Brazilian cities, SPOSITO and GÓES (2013) have found, for instance, that articulations of fear are often accumulated through media discourses, rather than grounded in actual experiences. Similarly, in my own research in Berlin-Neukölln (HUTTA, 2009), a resident who in a tenants’ meeting advocated for CCTV

cameras, saying they make people feel safer, in a subsequent interview stated that she actually never experienced fear herself.

Thus considering whether affective dynamics are intensified through narratives, or whether discourses are enacted without corresponding affectivity is important especially for research endeavours that strive for social transformation. If fears circulate as a discursive figure for the legitimization of security measures, then analysing how ‘dangerous’ subjects and places as well as positions of ‘victims’ and ‘perpetrators’ are socially constructed is key. Inasmuch as fear also shapes spatial agency on an affective level, though, discursive interventions might be insufficient. A better understanding of how fear is intensified, decreased or transformed is then also needed. Intervening at the level of affect means first of all altering its conditions of emergence. For example, according to the so-called ‘social control thesis’, fear increases when people cannot exercise control over their own lives or over the behaviours of others (BANNISTER and FYFE, 2001 p. 809). Moreover, ‘bold’ spatial practices, such as walking the streets with confidence, can be cultivated so that those commonly viewed as vulnerable – especially women – “can take their space and enjoy it” (KOSKELA, 1997 p. 305). Moreover, the affective dynamism in which fear is situated can be extended beyond the individual level. As SHIRLOW and PAIN astutely note, “fear can work in positive and less socially divisive ways in bringing people together to fight injustice and hate crimes” (2003, pp. 22-23). As an example, the authors mention “the neighbourhoods where communities have protested about attacks on asylum seekers and Muslims” (IBID.). Such a perspective on the transformative effects of fear indicates that the very intensity that constrains subjects’ power of acting can also modulate into an enabling intensity (akin to the way in which Sigmund Freud described transformations of aggressive into libidinous affects and vice versa).

Finally, the same authors indicate the need to carefully consider the scales and registers through which fearful affects operate when they note that “fear and risk can be pleasurable for some groups in certain places” (SHIRLOW and PAIN, 2003, p. 24). While, a negative affect, fear primarily suggests a diminution in a body’s capacities of acting, on another level it can produce the pleasurable thrill of risk and loss of control. For, as already TUAN noted, “It is a mistake to think that human beings always seek stability and order” (1979, p. 10). If we want to understand the significance of fear in relation to de- and reterritorialization, it is thus not enough to take for granted that fear hinders the

appropriation of spaces. Rather, we need to trace the specific de- and reterritorialization processes with which it is associated. What is more, when our interest lies with emancipatory and enabling processes of spatialization, an affective approach also calls for an engagement with affects that index an enhancement of capacities of acting. It is to such affects that I will now turn.

From topophilia to the cartography of *aconchego*

De- or reterritorializing movements and positive affect can be mutually reinforcing. The intensities of joy, pride or eroticism pervading an LGBT parade can – at least temporarily – wash away the anxieties that have hindered people’s appropriation of city streets. Like fear, such joyful affects might linger on beyond their singular occurrence, reverberating through narrations and images. On such a tack, Michael HARDT and Antonio NEGRI (2011) have discussed how transformative politics can be harnessed through an intensification of ‘felicitous’ encounters in cities. The *de*-territorialization of prevalent spatial organization – the heteronormative coding of signs and practices, the orientation towards competitive individualism, and so on – goes along with positive affects here. At the same time, joyful *re*-territorializations that create new capacities of acting might take place through the proliferation of new meanings, practices and structures.

This way of considering positive affect in connection to both de- and reterritorialization differs from discussions in the humanistic vein that have drawn on what Bachelard has called ‘topophilia’, literally: ‘the love of place’. TUAN calls topophilia “the affective bond between people and place or setting” (1974 p. 4). While Tuan’s approach brings into relief a range of dimensions through which joyful relations with places are created – from visual pleasure and physical contact or perceptions of health and vitality to a sense of familiarity and ownership or dreams of an ideal world – this approach is limited to the ‘bond’ that attaches people to places and is associated with tropes of familiarity and ownership. Humanistic geography continues here Martin Heidegger’s metaphysics of dwelling and habitation, where authentic human being in the world means accumulating memories of place-bound intimacy. In this view, human potential is actualized first and foremost where people dwell and take root, whereas movement and transformation – as instigated by the intensified circulation of goods and people under globalized capitalism – are associated with alienation. This “sedentarist metaphysics” (CRESSWELL, 2006 p. 26) has been challenged

by various scholars that have interrogated the “identitarian essentialization” (HAESBAERT, 2007 p. 50) of place as well as the idealization of the ‘home’ as a place of refuge (e.g. ROSE, 1993).

In order to move from the idealistic conception of topophilia as subjects’ authentic bond to spaces towards an analysis of positive affects’ contingent relation to re- and deterritorialization, I have proposed an affective cartography of security in the sense of the German notion of ‘*Geborgenheit*’, or what in Portuguese might best be named ‘*aconchego*’ (see HUTTA, 2009; 2015). These notions differ from understandings of safety and security in the discussion of fear, where security is defined in negative terms (absence of fear). Rather, *geborgenheit* and *aconchego* are constituted through positive affective intensities. They denote relational dynamics of ‘holding’ and ‘easing-in’: dynamics among, on the one hand, a spatial context – whether inter-subjective, collective, material, narrated or imagined – that is capable of holding someone or some kind of body, and, on the other hand, the body’s capacity to comfortably ease into, nest within or open up towards this spatiality. The analysis in this affective cartography is focused, not so much on the ‘topophilic’ relations this might create, and more on the role *aconchego* intensities play in de- and reterritorializations. Whereas topophilia has hitherto been associated exclusively with the affirmation of territory and belonging (territorialisation/reterritorialization), my aim is to draw attention to the contingent processes of re- and deterritorialization.

Aconchego can form part of hegemonic as well as subaltern processes of de- and reterritorialization. Moreover, it may figure in such processes without directly indexing some kind of bond between people and place. For instance, 19th-century images of Brazilian families of Portuguese decent often depict *aconchegante* scenes, where family members are affectionately oriented towards one another, the bodies of adults forming a holding environment for children. Such homely *aconchego* scenes have at the same time been constitutive of the heterosexist and racist reterritorialization practices of the patriarchal landowners, which have been anchored in family relations (FARIA, 2001). From an affective perspective, the issue here is not only how the family has been imagined and represented, but how the affective intensities it has instigated have been tied into reterritorializing practices, for instance by fostering relations of dependency (see HUTTA, 2019). The ways in which affective dynamics are constitutive of territorialities is therefore way more intricate than a focus on topophilia suggests.

Likewise, aconchego intensities can be constitutive of subaltern de- and reterritorializations. In the poem that a participant of one of my research workshops wrote, aconchego is traced from *o lar* (the home) through *o mar* (the sea) and *o bar* (the bar), from the “aconchego de um Barão” (the aconchego of a Baron) to “de qualquer outro ‘varão’” (“of any other man”).³ Written and recited by a genderqueer gay artist, the evocation of aconchego across diverse spaces – intimate and/or heteronormative space (home), open and public spaces (the sea, home), spaces of homoerotic relations (the aconchego of a Baron/of any other man) – instigates de- and reterritorializing vectors that might or might not actualize in material territories. In another queer piece of poetry, black trans artist Linn da Quebrada has invoked the ‘*cool aconchegante*’, playing with the homophones ‘*cool*’/‘*cu*’ (cool/ass). This affirmation signals a de- and reterritorialization of the very body through aconchego intensities, implicitly confronting the long history of legal and moral sanctions imposed on anal pleasures under Christian colonization. The mobilization of aconchego intensities might further be traced in African-Diasporic cultural practices or in home-making techniques of people without stable homes.

Thus tracing aconchego across different sites can bring into relief a range of affective dynamics that instigate de- and reterritorialization movements, which might actualize in the formation of territories (or not). Such an analysis could be further elaborated by investigating the affective vectors subsisting within given territories, and how these vectors hold a territory together or pull it apart. Apart from scrutinizing people’s attachment to place, or – in a more critical vein – how reterritorializations are promoted through ‘safe-keeping practices’ (FANGHANEL, 2015), it is thus worth investigating the de- and reterritorializing processes in which hegemonic as well as subaltern mobilizations of affects such as aconchego are implicated. Such an affective cartography is not only about how people experience their spatial environments. In view of the multiscale processes of affecting and being affected in which any experience is situated, it is also about dynamics of power.

Affective territories: a question of power

Considering affect in connection to de- and reterritorialization puts pressure on distinctions between ‘territoriality’ as meaningful and ‘territory’ as political, economic or

functional. This is because affective de- and reterritorialization operates not only through semiotics, representations and subjective experience, but also through political, economic and material registers. Territory is ‘affective’, not only inasmuch people feel attached to a spatial context; rather, the powerful de- and reterritorializing processes that form the conditions for subjective experience are inherently affective. Power relations can be seen here as shaping capacities to affect and be affected as part of multiscalar de- and reterritorialization processes. As Ben ANDERSON remarks in his discussion of the ‘affective turn’, “forms of power work through affective life. [...] Understanding how power functions in the early twenty-first century requires that we trace how power operates through affect and how affective life is imbued with relations of power [...]” (2014 p. 8)

Such a focus on power moves the cartography of affect right into the geographic discussion of ‘territory’. Marcos Aurelio SAQUET, for instance, conceives power relations as “constituting force fields that are economic, political and cultural ([im-]material), in myriad combinations” (2009 p. 82). In a similar vein, Marcelo Lopes de SOUZA (2009 p. 67) talks about ‘force fields’ (*campos de força*) of spatialized power, invoking Foucault’s notion of the ‘microphysics of power’. Moreover, Saquet and Lopes de Souza, alongside Haesbaert and others, have called for considering any given territory in relation to processes of de- and reterritorialization. A focus on affects can further illuminate how such ‘force fields’ are simultaneously connected to de- and reterritorializing processes that are spurred on by affective dispositional vectors. Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari have explicitly developed such an affective reading of power. In *A Thousand Plateaus*, DELEUZE and GUATTARI (2004) conceive of ‘diagrams’ of power – a term Foucault uses to describe Jeremy Bentham’s panopticon – as technologies that reterritorialize bodily capacities of affecting and being affected. For instance, within the purview of the panopticon, subjects become governable through their attentiveness to the controlling gaze – a specific shaping of their capacities to be affected that signals a reterritorializing process. In his subsequent discussion of Foucault, DELEUZE (1988) extends the view towards the *detrterritorializing* vectors that subsist within any diagram. Whereas Foucault’s diagram designates “the fixed form of a set of relations between forces”, DELEUZE notes, this fixed set of relations between forces, “never exhausts force, which can enter into other relations and compositions” (1988 p. 89). The diagrams that ‘fix’ capacities to affect and be affected are therefore traversed by vectors that point towards “other relations and compositions”. For instance, the subject targeted by a

panopticon might turn the normalizing gaze into an erotic affect, or she might use the increased attentiveness to being seen as a means to escape control. Such responses, then, redirect the forces that compose a formation of power, generating other kinds of affects and strengthening vectors of de- and reterritorialization.

Affective dynamics, then, act as constitutive forces, intensifying, dampening and re-orientating de- and reterritorializations. Imposing norms or parading on streets, imprisoning people and becoming imprisoned, tearing down houses or being evicted, remembering an assault or securitizing a neighbourhood, holding someone or easing into a space – all these spatial processes and practices have a certain ‘feel’ to them. These feelings, though, are not just subjective evaluations; they do not only add emotional layers – fear, joy, anger, sadness, aconchego, desire – to whatever strategies of power might be at work. Rather, these feelings are indicative of powerful de- and reterritorialization processes that constrain, enhance or reshape bodies’ capacities of acting in specific ways: a city street becomes accessible, a movement is constrained, a subjectivity is marked as ‘delinquent’, an investment opportunity is created, a liveliness is destroyed. The affective dimension of these powerful changes in capacities of acting acquires its own constitutive force, as what feels good tends to be affirmed, and what feels bad tends to be evaded, as Spinoza has taught us (intricate dynamics leading to an affirmation of the horrid or making unexpected things attractive notwithstanding).

Importantly, affects do not only operate on a micro scale. The affects supporting de- and reterritorialization may unfold at any level of bodily compositions, from individual to society, from cellular to cosmic planes. For instance, SHIRLOW and PAIN have emphasised “the ways in which fear is constructed in different spaces at different scales – from the body (the focus of much crime), the household (where most violence takes place), the locality and the nation state, to global processes such as migration and conflict which give ‘fear’ new forms” (2003, p. 23). In a similar vein, PAIN and SMITH (2008) have shown how fears multiplying in urban contexts are increasingly connected to a geopolitical scale through globalized discourses around the ‘war on terror’. If we consider such multiscale *discourses* in connection to *affective relations among bodies*, we can begin tracing the concrete processes, practices and territorialities that are thereby enabled or disabled. The constraining of bodies through fear on one level can go along with bodily expansion on another.

For instance, the fears of a ‘Muslim invasion’ that have proliferated among some white Europeans may lead to constrictions regarding the agency of racialized men who have been represented as sexually aggressive – as well as of women, when they uncritically adopt this image and avoid certain city spaces. On another level, these fears might perpetuate white Europeans’ hegemony over those coded as ‘others’, instigating multiple regimes of exclusion and control that persistently reterritorialize urban and national spaces (see EL-TAYEB, 2011). Discursive constructions, technologies of control and affective dynamics thus interact at various scales. Becoming resistant in the face of such multifaceted assemblages of power then also demands the amplification of non-phobic affects that foster other de- and reterritorializations.

Discussão

In this paper, I have proposed an affective cartography that moves away from the prevalent focus on the topophilic bond between subjects and places, and towards the tracing of relations among de- or reterritorialization on the one hand and modifications in capacities of acting on the other. Given the tendency of affects to intensify or inhibit de- and reterritorialization processes, affects can be understood as a constitutive force that is intimately associated with power formations. We can think of this force as a set of vectors that operate on a multiplicity of scales, involving not only physical bodies, but also semiotics, sounds, images or ideas (HUTTA, 2015). What ensues are complex affective landscapes, where some affects are perceived and amplified and others are ignored or suppressed. A key task of any critical affective cartography is thus to interrogate the prevalent forms of amplifying or ignoring affect along with their associated de- and reterritorializing processes – and to move towards other affective articulations.

The relations among affect and de- or territorialisation are contingent, as I have further argued. There is no essential linkage, for instance, between territory and aconchego; just as there is no authentic essence of aconchego or topophilia. In this sense, the cartography of aconchego I have proposed is first and foremost illustrative. It indicates, how what might appear as subjects’ ‘authentic’ experience of space can be approached as an affective dynamism that is contingently associated with power relations. In thus considering relations among affective dynamism and power, my aim was to counteract the segmentation of geographic enquiry into subjective and symbolic appropriation (territoriality) on the one hand

and political-economic domination or control (territory) on the other. The ‘integrated perspective’ that has thus been proposed goes beyond merely adding ‘subjective territoriality’ to political-economic ‘territory’. Rather, the aim has been to move towards an understanding of any de- and reterritorialization as affective. While affects can often be sensed by subjects, they unfold as part and parcel of such wider processes.

The proposed approach runs against the grain of discussions that have followed the tack of modernization theory in sociology, anthropology and political science. Processes of bureaucratic state formation, industrialization or urban fragmentation have been associated here with a waning of the affective relations said to be characteristic of community life. Even authors who have challenged simplistic accounts of modernization and globalization as straightforward deterritorializations of bounded communities – and who have instead highlighted new forms of ‘multi-’ and ‘transterritoriality’ (HAESBAERT, 2004) – have relied on similar conceptions of affectivity as the bonding of subjects and places. Carlos FORTUNA, for instance, conceives of ‘(micro)territorialities’ as “modes of sociation around values, subjectivities and affects” (2012 p. 199). ‘Affects’ are approached here as subjects’ ‘affective associations’ that are capable of countering an increasing fragmentation of urban spaces by fostering new social territorialities. In a similar vein, HAESBAERT (2004) draws on Robert Sack to point out that modern US society is not being just “cold and abstract” but also creates “contexts of affect and signification” (p. 90). While these writings call attention to the proliferation of new forms of bonds and communities under conditions of globalization, they limit their conception of affect to the ‘affectionate’ association among subjects and the topophilic bonding of subjects and spaces. In the understanding proposed in this paper, by contrast, the deterritorialization processes that have been described as the becoming-abstract of society can be seen as *inherently* affective. This affectivity shows not only in the emergence of new affective communities, or in negative affects such as fear that might go along with ‘alienation’. Rather, deterritorialization can be generative of all sorts of affects, including pleasurable ones, such as the joy of enhanced agency.

While conceiving of the relations among affect and de- or reterritorialization as contingent thus challenges approaches that have associated positive affect with people’s bond to territory, it also calls into question the opposite tendency of locating progressive politics exclusively in *de*-territorialization. This tendency has manifested in some of the recent engagements with Deleuze and Guattari in Brazilian psychology and anthropology (see

PASSOS et al., 2009). Consonant with my present argument, authors in this vein have picked up on Deleuze and Guattari's understanding of a cartography that targets "the processual plane of the constitution of forces that act simultaneously on subjective formations and on the production of reality" (ROMERO und ZAMORA, 2016 pp. 452–453). In relation to urban space, however, these authors have emphasized especially the deterritorialized 'fluxes' of affect that introduce a 'disquiet' (*desassossego*) in the sense of perturbations of common schemes of recognition (see ROMERO and ZAMORA, 2016 p. 458). The focus here is on the "attentive opening of the body to the collective plane of forces in the midst of the world" (Pozzana, quoted in ROMERO and ZAMORA, 2016 p. 454). While this focus on deterritorializing forces chimes with Deleuze's reading of the diagram introduced earlier, these writings have a tendency of associating deterritorialization with progressive politics and reterritorialization with hegemonic formations of power.

For instance, Luis Antônio BAPTISTA (2008) uses the example of a black woman who lives on street-vending and sleeps on a street in Ipanema in Rio de Janeiro, keeping a paper box with personal items such as photographs close to herself. In the early morning, agents of the city take her belongings, wake her up and send her to a shelter for homeless people, promising her new clothes. After she discovers that these promises were delusive and that she her box has been disposed of, she laboriously fills a new box that she finds at the Casas Bahia store with personal items, and looks for a new place to sleep. This example brings out strongly how arduous the process of creating the most basic territory can be. Interestingly, the author locates resistance, not in such processes of reterritorialization, but in its opposite:

Nas cidades como campo de combate, podemos fazer da insurgência um ato criativo, à semelhança da teimosa caixa de papelão das Casas Bahia, prenhe de artes da existência contando histórias intermináveis. Nessas cidades, a vida não nos dá sossego. Nada está em paz, concluído, definitivamente perdido. *No desassossego, virtualidades de resistências podem enfrentar o mórbido desencanto.* (BAPTISTA, 2008 p. 177; emphasis added)

"In the disquiet, virtualities of resistance are able to confront the morbid disenchantment", the author notes. But don't the "virtualities of resistance" presented in this story emerge precisely from the woman's untiring capacity to recreate some – however fragile – kind of aconchego in the midst of this "city as field of combat"? Rather than limiting our view to desassossego as condition of resistance, we might thus also consider how subaltern

home-making practices can harness material and affective conditions for subaltern ways of inhabiting city spaces. “*Todo o sossego | de um bom aconchego!*” – ‘All the calmness and peace | Of a good aconchego – to use another verse from Marcelo Taurino’s poem. For more often than not, what we confront are intricate dynamics of de- and reterritorialization that are associated with equally complex articulations of affect. Which kinds of capacities and power relations are thereby reinforced or destabilized depends on the concrete social and spatial context in which they operate.

References

- AHMED, S. **The Cultural Politics of Emotion**. New York: Routledge, 2014.
- AHMED, S. Atmospheric Walls. Feministkilljoys, 2014. Available at <https://feministkilljoys.com/2014/09/15/atmospheric-walls/>.
- ANDERSON, B. Becoming and being hopeful. Towards a theory of affect. **Environment and Planning D: Society and Space**, 24 (5), pp. 733–752, 2006. DOI: 10.1068/d393t.
- ANDERSON, B. Affect and biopower. Towards a politics of life. **Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers**, 37 (1), pp. 28–43, 2012. DOI: 10.1111/J.1475-5661.2011.00441.X.
- ANDERSON, B. **Encountering Affect. Capacities, Apparatuses, Conditions**. Farnham: Ashgate, 2014.
- ANDERSON, B & HARRISON, P (Eds). **Taking-Place. Non-Representational Theories and Geography**. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010.
- ARAUJO, FGBd. ‘Identidade’ e ‘território’ enquanto simulacros discursivos. In: ARAUJO, FGBd & HAESBAERT R (Eds). **Identidades e Territórios. Questões e Olhares Contemporâneos**. Rio de Janeiro: Access, 2007. Pp. 13–32.
- ARAUJO, FGBd & HAESBAERT, R (Eds). **Identidades e Territórios. Questões e Olhares Contemporâneos**. Rio de Janeiro: Access, 2007.
- BACHELARD, G. **The Poetics of Space**. Boston: Beacon Press, 1994.
- BANNISTER, J & FYFE, N. Introduction. Fear and the City. **Urban Studies**, 38 (5-6), pp. 807–813, 2001. DOI. 10.1080/00420980123505.
- BAPTISTA, LA. Combates urbanos. A cidade como território de criação. In GUARESCHI, N (Ed.). **Estratégias de invenção do presente. a psicologia social no contemporâneo**. Rio de Janeiro: Centro Edelstein de Pesquisas Sociais, 2008. Pp. 172-177.
- BATISTA, VM. **O medo na cidade do Rio de Janeiro. Dois tempos de uma história**. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Revan, 2003.
- BONDI, L; DAVIDSON, J & SMITH, M. Introduction. Geography’s ‘emotional turn’. In: DAVIDSON J, BONDI L & SMITH M (Eds). **Emotional Geographies**. Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2005. Pp. 1–17.
- BRINKEMA, E. **The Forms of the Affects**. Durham: Duke University Press, 2014.
- BROWN, S & STENNER, P. Being affected. Spinoza and the psychology of emotion. **International Journal of Group Tensions**, 30 (1), pp. 81-105, 2001.
- CALDEIRA, TPdR. **City of Walls. Crime, Segregation, and Citizenship in São Paulo**. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 2000.
- CLOUGH, PT. The Affective Turn. Political Economy, Biomedicine and Bodies. **Theory, Culture & Society**, 25 (1), pp. 1–22, 2008. DOI. 10.1177/0263276407085156.
- CONNOLLY, WE. **Neuropolitics. Thinking, Culture, Speed**. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.

- CRESSWELL, T. **On the Move. Mobility in the Modern Western World.** New York, NY: Routledge, 2006.
- DELEUZE, G. **Foucault.** London: Athlone Press, 1988.
- DELEUZE, G. **Spinoza. Practical Philosophy.** San Francisco: City Lights Books, 1988a.
- DELEUZE, G. **Expressionism in Philosophy. Spinoza.** New York: Zone Books, 1990.
- DELEUZE, G & GUATTARI, F. **What is Philosophy?** New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.
- DELEUZE, G & GUATTARI, F. **A Thousand Plateaus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia.** London. Continuum, 2004.
- DOWLING, E. Affect. In: FARRIS, S., SKEGGS, B & TOSCANO, A (Eds.). **Handbook of Marxism.** London: Sage, *forthcoming*.
- EL-TAYEB, F. **European Others. Queering Ethnicity in Postnational Europe.** Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2011.
- ENGLAND, MR & SIMON, S. Scary cities. Urban geographies of fear, difference and belonging. **Social & Cultural Geography**, 11 (3), pp. 201–207, 2010. DOI. 10.1080/14649361003650722.
- FARIA, SdC. Família. In: VAINFAS, R (Ed.). **Dicionário do Brasil Colonial (1500-1808).** Rio de Janeiro: Objetiva, 2001. Pp. 216-218.
- FANGHANEL, A. The trouble with safety. Fear of crime, pollution and subjectification in public space. **Theoretical Criminology**, 20 (1), pp. 57–74, 2016. DOI: 10.1177/1362480615582097.
- FORTUNA, C. (Micro)territorialidades. Metáfora dissidente do social. **TerraPlural**, 6 (2), pp. 199–214, 2012. DOI. 10.5212/TerraPlural.v.6i2.0001.
- GAMMERL, B; HUTTA, JS & SCHEER, M. Feeling differently. Approaches and their politics. **Emotion, Space and Society**, 25, pp. 87–94, 2017. DOI. 10.1016/j.emospa.2017.07.007.
- GANDY, M. Urban atmospheres. **Cultural geographies**, 24 (3), pp. 353–374, 2017. DOI. 10.1177/1474474017712995.
- GOODWIN, J; JASPER JM & POLLETTA F (Eds). **Passionate Politics. Emotions and Social Movements.** Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009.
- GOULD, DB. **Moving Politics. Emotion and Act Up's Fight against AIDS.** Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009.
- GREGG, M & SEIGSWORTH, GJ (Eds). **The Affect Theory Reader.** Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press, 2010.
- HAESBAERT, R. **O Mito da Desterritorialização. Do "Fim dos Territórios" à Multiterritorialidade.** Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 2004.
- HAESBAERT, R. Identidades territoriais. Entre a multiterritorialidade e a reclusão territorial (Ou. Do hibridismo cultural à essencialização das identidades). In: ARAUJO, FGBd & HAESBAERT R (Eds). **Identidades e Territórios. Questões e Olhares Contemporâneos.** Rio de Janeiro: Access, 2007. Pp. 33–56.
- HAESBAERT, R A global sense of place and multi-territoriality. Notes for dialogue from a 'peripheral' point of view. In: FEATHERSTONE D & PAINTER J (Eds). **Spatial politics. Essays for Doreen Massey.** Malden, Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013. Pp. 146–157.
- HARDT, M & NEGRI, A. **Commonwealth.** Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2011.
- HUTTA, JS. Geographies of Geborgenheit. Beyond feelings of safety and the fear of crime. **Environment and Planning D. Society and Space**, 27 (2), pp. 251–273, 2009. DOI. 10.1068/d3308.
- HUTTA, JS. The affective life of semiotics. **Geographica Helvetica**, 70 (4), pp. 295–309, 2015. DOI. 10.5194/gh-70-295-2015.
- HUTTA, JS. From sovereignty to technologies of dependency. Rethinking the power relations supporting violence in Brazil. **Political Geography**, 69, pp. 65–76, 2019. DOI. 10.1016/j.polgeo.2018.11.008.
- HUTTA, JS. Affective territorialities in Brazil's current political conjuncture. A three-part essay. *Environment + Space*, 2019. Available at: <https://societyandspace.org/2019/04/11/affective-territorialities-in-brazils-current-political-conjuncture-i-political-affects/>.

- KOSKELA, H. 'Bold walk and breakings'. Women's spatial confidence versus fear of violence. **Gender, Place & Culture**, 4 (3), pp. 301–320, 1997. DOI. 10.1080/09663699725369.
- LEYS, R. The turn to affect. A critique. **Critical Inquiry**, 37, pp. 434–472, 2011.
- LIM, J. Immanent politics. thinking race and ethnicity through affect and machinism. **Environment and Planning A**, 42, pp. 2393–409, 2010.
- LORIMER, H. Cultural geography. Worldly shapes, differently arranged. **Progress in Human Geography**, 31 (1), pp. 89–100, 2007. DOI. 10.1177/0309132507073540.
- MAZZARELLA, W. Affect. What is it good for? In: DUBE, S (Ed.). **Enchantments of Modernity. Empire, Nation, Globalization**. London: Routledge, 2009. Pp. 291–309.
- MCCORMACK, DP. **Refrains for Moving Bodies. Experience and Experiment in Affective Spaces**. Durham: Duke University Press, 2013.
- MUSCARÀ, L. Heurística de Jean Gottmann. Um dispositivo psicossomático. In: SAQUET, MA & SPOSITO, ES (Eds). **Territórios e Territorialidades. Teorias, Processos e Conflitos**. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2009. Pp. 37–56.
- NAY, YE. The atmosphere of trans* politics in the Global North and West. **Transgender Studies Quarterly**, 6 (1), pp. 64–79, 2019. DOI: 10.1215/23289252-7253496.
- PAIN, RH. Social geographies of women's fear of crime. **Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers**, 22 (2), pp. 231–244, 1997.
- PAIN, R. & SMITH, SJ. Fear, critical geopolitics and everyday life. In: PAIN, R. & SMITH, SJ (Eds). **Fear. Critical Geopolitics and Everyday Life**. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008. Pp. 1-24.
- PASSOS E, KASTRUP V & ESCÓSSIA Ld (Eds). **Pistas do Método da Cartografia. Pesquisa-intervenção e Produção de Subjetividade**. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2009.
- PUAR, JK. **Terrorist Assemblages. Homonationalism in Queer Times**. Durham: Duke University Press, 2007.
- PUAR, JK. 'I would rather be a cyborg than a goddess'. Intersectionality, assemblage, and affective politics. *Transversal*, 2011. Available at: <http://eipcp.net/transversal/0811/puar/en/print>.
- ROMERO, MLd & ZAMORA, MH. Pesquisando cidade e subjetividade. Corpos e errâncias de um flâneur-cartógrafo. **Psicologia em Estudo**, 21 (3), pp. 451–461, 2016. DOI. 10.4025/psicolestud.v21i3.29787.
- ROSE, G. **Feminism and Geography. The limits of Geographical Knowledge**. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993.
- SAQUET, MA. Por uma abordagem territorial. In: SAQUET MA & SPOSITO ES (Eds). **Territórios e Territorialidades. Teorias, Processos e Conflitos**. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2009. Pp. 73–94.
- SAQUET, MA & SPOSITO, ES. Apresentação In: SAQUET MA & SPOSITO ES (Eds). **Territórios e Territorialidades. Teorias, Processos e Conflitos**. São Paulo: Expressão Popular: 2009. Pp. 11-15.
- SEIGWORTH, GJ & GREGG, M. An inventory of shimmers. In: GREGG M & SEIGWORTH GJ (Eds). **The Affect Theory Reader**. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press, 2010. Pp. 1–28.
- SHARP, J. Geography and gender. what belongs to feminist geography? Emotion, power and change. **Progress in Human Geography**, 33 (1), pp. 74–80, 2009. DOI. 10.1177/0309132508090440.
- SHIRLOW, P & PAIN, R. The geographies and politics of fear. **Capital and Class**, 80 (Summer), pp. 15-26, 2003.
- SOUZA, MLd. **Fobópole. O medo generalizado e a militarização da questão urbana**. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 2008.
- SOUZA, MLd. Território' da divergência (e da confusão). Em torno das imprecisas fronteiras de um conceito fundamental. In: SAQUET, MA & SPOSITO ES (Eds). **Territórios e Territorialidades. Teorias, Processos e Conflitos**. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2009. Pp. 57–72.

- SPELMAN, E. Anger and Insubordination. In: Garry A. & Pearsall, M. (Eds). **Women, Knowledge, and Reality. Explorations in Feminist Philosophy**. Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1989. Pp. 263-273.
- SPOSITO, MEB & GÓES, EM **Espaços fechados e cidades. Insegurança urbana e fragmentação socioespacial**. São Paulo: UNESP, 2013.
- THRIFT, N. Intensities of feeling. **Geografiska Annaler**, 86 B (1), pp. 57–78, 2004.
- TUAN, Y-F. **Topophilia. a study of environmental perception, attitudes, and values**. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974.
- TUAN, Y-F. **Landscapes of Fear**. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1979.
- VALENTINE, G. The geography of women's fear. **Area**, 21 (4), pp. 385–390, 1989.
- WETHERELL, M. **Affect and Emotion. A New Social Science Understanding**. Los Angeles, London: Sage, 2012.
- ZIBECHI, R. **Territories in Resistance. A Cartography of Latin American Social Movements**. Oakland: AK Press, 2012.

¹ Where the original references and sources cited are in Portuguese language, translations are mine.

² Considering the implications for film studies, BRINKEMA (2014) has argued for instance, that one can 'read for affect' in movies by investigating how affects are intensified through spatial arrangements, illumination, story, sound and cutting techniques – without conducting any studies of audience perception or documenting one's own emotional experiences.

³ These words and verses are taken from Marcello Taurino's poem *O Aconchego*, published and discussed in HUTTA (2015).

Sobre o autor – Informações prestadas pelo autor

Jan Simon Hutta

Doutor em Geografia na Universidade Aberta, com o tema o envolvimento do movimento LGBT (Lésbicas, Gays, Bi, Trans) na democratização da política de segurança no Brasil, examinando o surgimento de novas formas de cidadania. Examina a "geografia do respeito" no contexto das experiências que os migrantes transgêneros fazem com o regime de fronteiras europeias. Professor assistente na Universidade de Bayreuth, trabalhando no Grupo de Pesquisa em Geografia Cultural. Vem trabalhando nas áreas de política sexual e transgênero, governamentalidade urbana, migração e relações de subjetividade e espaço. Ele recebeu seu PhD da Open University (Milton Keynes, Reino Unido). Sua pesquisa atual aborda formações de poder, influência e cidadania no Brasil, bem como subjetividades dançantes no contexto colonial. Ele é editor fundador da revista de acesso aberto em língua alemã sobre pesquisa urbana crítica 'sub \ urban - Zeitschrift für kritische Stadtforschung'.

Como citar esse artigo

HUTTA, Jan Soimon. Affective territories: cartography of aconchego as cartography of power. In: **Revista Geografia em Atos (GeoAtos online)** - Afetos e emoções: abordagens teórico-metodológicas na análise do Espaço Geográfico - v. 05, n. 12, p.8-36, jul, 2019. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.35416/geoatos.v5i12.6581>

Recebido em: 2019-06-25

Aceito em: 2019-07-05