



Geir Harald Samuelson
haptic drawing

What the precision-algorithm (Næss) *does* is to transpose. It constitutes the epistemic aspect of transposition (itself defined as an [aesthetico-epistemic operator](#)). It features the occasional responsivity between events, whereby the mechanism of the event is transmitted to another event.

The success of such transmission rests on a particular kind of training, which is here is tied up with—and derives from—fieldwork. Learning how to use a knife to carve a finger out of a stick occurs at particular time and place, with its own materiality, with which the work becomes tangled.

Learning how to carve a finger from a stick (U), and knowing the field/site (T) in which this happens are tangled. The memory of the action (U) is local (T). It becomes tied to the place. If the decision to return (V) to the place (T) is made, the actions and harvest from them can multiply, and then *transpose*.



ancient rock-carvings inside a
boulder (Fontainebleau)
photo: Geir Harald Samuelson

The interesting thing about looking at climbing—as archaeology—as a kind of field-research, in the present context, is that it is hands on. Other field-work disciplines, within what we broadly understand as natural history, deal with practical matters, evidently, but not involving intimately the hands.

Climbing, as archaeology, requires a sensitive and dexterous routine which is not *a priori* linked to making. Whenever it involves making it still is tethered to understanding aspects of the field that are not accessible through the routine. In which aspects is knowledge tied to the field itself.

That is, a knowledge which cannot be reasoned in any abstract way, or conveyed by symbolic representation: how do we connect this form of knowing—which is common in artistic reception (maybe a condition)—and what we understand as field-research? It is non-mimetic yet indigenous...

Since it is non-symbolic it relates to the transposition of the event itself, or the transposition of one event into another event; in a way that is characteristic of systems, or alternatively reveals the presence and operation—i.e., the action—of occasional cause. Mechanisms at work.

If we abandon the idea of empirical systems, and limit ourselves to acknowledge the existence of processes with system-like features, then we cannot consider the system as a property. It is a feature, not a property. Then the alternative is to expand our notion of action to the field. It acts.

Similar to how an art-work, artefact or thing reveals itself as we interact with it. The field, then, is not only an instance where connections runs deep. It produces connections. The infinite potential of lies dormant shift into active affordances as humans traverse the field, interact with it, and leaves a trail.

But how is it stirred? Is it disturbed in a destructive—non-environmental—sense? Can it, alternatively, somehow be redeemed? For latter option to be realised it would have to be allowed to (somehow) speak for itself. What is the descriptor of this happening, and not the opposite? What is mediation?

Or, what does mediation do? What are categories of mediation that go in radically different directions (destruction vs. redemption)? How do we categorise mediations to enable ourselves to discern between them? Intuitively, creativity driven to the edges is in many ways similar to crime.

Would creativity within the [normal](#) constitute an alternative? What would the ramifications of categorising creativity within the *normal*, rather than categorising creativity as exceptional (wether singular as in art, or an excrescence as in crime)? The normal category is operated by *mechanism* ([Weber](#)).

The ratio of exchange between the passing and the enduring—which defines an event—can be considered a 'vectorial sum'. Which means that it can be produced in a variety of ways, which means that it can also be displaced, and transposed. Transposition and precisation is one and same.