



The dynamics of linking and fragmenting that alternate between joining and dividing us as we convening in video-conferences, have something that resonates with actors in ANT (actor-network theory). That is, when *hybrids* enter the interaction between participants, and are somehow integrated.

However, under the liminal conditions of video-conferencing—the between space of private and public spheres in digital interface—the *inscription* of actors (such as the present flyer series) is unstable, because of passing use; and their *translation* is sideways rather than goal-oriented. Crab-wise.

In this sense, hybrids are *visitors* and will be experienced as *sightings*. They are 3rd party singularities that stand to witness that open sets—as language and culture—are wholes (as such, they may be at the foundation of cogency and logic). Hence the question of whether/how they may be contained.



This flyer folds with #01. Participating in the 2021 ARW has been like riding a comet. Probably because this activity has been flanked by the production of this flyer-series. Their appearance is structurally similar to a *sighting* (cf, HEX exhibits #01-06): their presence has not been summoned. A visitation.

Werner Herzog's still recent film (2020) [Fireball](#)—a movie on meteorites and stardust—shows how visitation and sightings is not tied to alien life forms, but can be conveyed by objects: featuring the sensational microphotographs of stardust, in a variety of material shapes that appear “*artistic*”.

Moreover, they provide a huge variety of quasicrystal samples that appear with properties that are between the organic and inanimate. Like viruses. The question is whether such transient forms are unique to cosmic matter or have their parallel e.g. in the point G. Simmel made on the [stranger](#).

A person whose categorisation in social terms is neither alien nor familiar. And—interestingly—solicits a kind of confidence on topics that would not be disclosed among intimates/familiars. For this reason, field-working anthropologists has been interpreted as fitting into this precise category.

But it is not only true of anthropologists. In the [SALTWATER](#) Istanbul Biennale in 2015, [Bracha Ettinger](#)—painter, diary-keeper, psychoanalyst, and feminist—coined the term *wit(h)nessing* in an experimental text emulating the queries of painting, in which feeling has a status of evidence.

Her perspective might be helpful in featuring the deal from the vantage point of the visitor (not limited to the people experiencing the visitation). Hence we have covered the subjective, objective and the affective aspects of *visitation*. The whole structural gamut of what is here called a *sighting*.

There are two issues, raised here, in this regard: **1)** the attributive impact of *wit(h)nesses*—visitations/sightings—to prompt open sets as wholes [i.e. singular events producing holism]; **2)** what is the relation between the phenomena discussed here and what Bruno Latour calls agents/*actors*?

To what extent should the concept of ‘actor’ in ANT be restricted to *wit(h)nesses*, which—as we have seen—cover the full range of living to inert matter, on a scale that includes a range of intermediary forms? Actually, this is a question which is not so easy to answer. Are actors by nature *singular*?

In Bruno Latour's ANT this depends on which book you open. His focus on how actors come about through inscription into networks (by use), and how these inscriptions are *translated* into goal-directions would appear to relate directly to singularity. Societies-natures formed from the actors' hybridity.

This is the [We have never been modern](#) strand. Purification and hybridity develop alongside with the dual work of inscription and translation. However, in more rote applications of ANT (e.g., derived from *science in action*) applies to all artefacts even before they are inscribed and translated.