



tesseract offers a dynamic model of superposition: as the tesseract moves it is turned inside out (reversible content/ container). It made up of 32 vertices and 22 sides.

The statement ‘a wardrobe *cannot* be adjusted to a cabinet, it can only be *redeemed*’ is based on the idea that the two—the *wardrobe* and the *cabinet*—are metaphysically *off kilter*: while the *wardrobe defines* the *cabinet theorises*. They therefore could compare to *applied vs. pure* mathematics.

A story: a mathematical genius was interviewed by a science journalist, who asked him “what is the difference between pure and applied mathematics?” —his answer: “there is no difference, in fact they have *nothing* in common whatsoever.” If they were *different* they would have that in common.

But what is *nothing*, in this statement? Is it **0** (zero) or the empty set \emptyset ? From the point of view of the *wardrobe*, which is the realm of *action*, it may be **0**. While from the point of view of the *cabinet*—the precinct of *judgement*—it may be \emptyset . We are hoping that they will be *reconciled* by specific *push*.



We are assuming that matter is *ephemeral*, but of course it is not. It appears that way because we are ephemeral. Our grasp of the *infinite*—that is, everything that is *not* us, save our thought and extension—is *theoretical*: it passes through the *finite*. It is hatched, sustained and developed *here*.

The finite features the *theory*—Gr. *theoria* the journey—we are the *theoros*. The travellers: journey(wo)men. We are, as one says, *passing through*. Which means that there is *nothing* eternal about theory. It is *not* a proxy for a divine word. That is, the *finite* is there to *comprehend* the *infinite*.

This is a *different* task than the one that has kept us busy in modernity, from the Renaissance onwards. The finite offers us the possibility to be *specific* in what we find. It also allows us to seek *precision* in compositions we derive from that. And also to seek *precision* in our assumptions (or, *doxa*).

From this vantage point, *art* is the *first vehicle of theoretical knowledge*. Which is to take knowledge of *substance*—which is *unique*—and define a human realm in *relation* to it; *between* the one *and* the multiple. Design is the *science* of this realm: humanity's storehouse of *journeys* with the infinite.

For instance, the wardrobe belongs to the human realm: it is the case in point of an *interstitial* space between the one and the multiple. While the cabinet is a *theory* on how *substance* can hold an infinity of *attributes*. The same item does two things: it *defines* a realm and *theorises* beyond it.

A *computer* with its *files* is a *wardrobe*, in this sense. But it is also a *cabinet* in the sense that it prompts us to theorise the *world* (which is *one*) and *everything* that is in it (the *multiple*). If we say that the history of humanity *coincides* with that of the wardrobe/cabinet our *thinking* is the same.

Only the *knowledge* has *changed*. Let us consider another example: *if* the top image on flyer #02, in this series, is a *wardrobe* for the *tetra-cluster*, then the bottom image, of the same flyer, is a *cabinet*: though unified, the tetra-cluster, can hold different metaphysical *situations*. The full range of *un/real*.

From this point on, I will *no longer* speak of Spinoza's philosophy, but only of Spinoza's *geometry* when referring to his Ethics (or, *Ethica*). As a storehouse of *common notions* (sic)—that are carefully numbered and categorised—it is a *wardrobe*. But it also a *cabinet*: theorising G-d and nature.

The wardrobe defines a realm which is *neither* one *nor* multiple. The cabinet theorises the infinite which is *both* one *and* multiple. In the Hebrew tradition, the *arch*, the *tabernacle* and the *menorah* feature furnitures that combine the two. One containing the human realm, the other turned away.

That is turned away, in the sense of being turned unto itself, *off* the human realm and *forbidden*. Their joinery is defined by *redemption*: indicated in the arrangements for Yom Kippur—the day of *atonement*—when *lots* were placed on two goats: one for *sacrifice* the other for the *wilderness* ([Azazel](#)).