



If we are looking for a *correspondence* between things *said* and *done*—even as they are intended and prized—it is typically *emergent*: that is, it is revealed *before* it can be appropriated. It doesn't matter whether it is planned and expected. It still has to be *intercepted* (X) for it to be *identified*, as it *happens*.

Under the conditions of confinement this year the conditions of interception were changed. Not only were the 'production facilities' *moved* between home and KHIO, but the relation *between* teaching, production *and* reception changed. The students did *not* do less work than previously (perhaps *more*).

Their *process of communicative interaction* was divided in two: **1)** the hit-and-impact of production forces; **2)** the interactive messaging on the video-platform used during classes. Alternating between the two, **3)** a *third* level of communication would define: *receiving* student-work and *moving* with it.



Last year (2020)—here on the Norwegian Skagerrak coast—I braced myself, gathered strength and clout, to engage ‘digital media’ in *communication*: knowing what was coming, in the following year, with video-conferencing and remote teaching. Simply casting an *active model* for communication.

This year (2021), the challenge is exactly the opposite: to engage with the world *with* and *from* the *experience* of communicating, under the terms of confinement, *acquired* the past year, and move *beyond* our circle. *Twice* beyond the social circle: last year, and then again this year. *Once more*.

I find it productive to consider Aby Warburg’s leaving the confinement of the private [Bellevue Asylum](#) (Kreuzlingen) after his unexpected healing. He first left his social circle to live through the inferno of his own madness. *Then* he *left* the circle of his (old ways) with *books* and established his library *anew*.

My concern here is the trail of how his *writing* accompanied him *into* the 3 years at the asylum, as he left his social circle. While he *left* his older erudition as he *partly* rejoined his circle: and continued his journey—now into the realm of books—in what is known as his [Mnemosyne](#) atlas.

My intuition is that we can understand this “flip-switch” motion—*turn off A* to *turn on B*—as a case in point of *communication*: mainly related to the implication of forces into a practice of *breaking* and *making*, also involving messages and journey: the [Meza-plateau](#), [Bellevue](#), the [Warburg library](#).

In this aspect, a *single* work of *reception* and *redemption* of [force](#) (which to the advent of Schopenhauer/Nietzsche, Freud, Jung and Binswanger had featured in *conversation*—not really at play—in mundane correspondence [restricted to the compound of journeys and messages]): [sublimation](#).

For instance, it is widely accepted that book can *both* educate *and* entertain, but the idea that books can *sustain* is a comparatively rarer assumption. That is, the role of books in different *struggles*: religious, political and psychological struggles. Or, even the struggle for survival of our “humanity”.

The question as to whether the sense of being sustained by an *communicative assemblage*—an actor attractor with disseminated agency (Latour)—occurs through [sublimation](#), is core to the exchange between Freud and Binswanger: a matter on which, it appears, that they agreed to disagree.

Presently, we will maintain this discussion as basically unresolved, and the outcomes—as of this time—multiple and indeterminate. What interests us is that though Warburg came back to his social circle, he remained *other*. His books had also changed face: they returned to his circle in *Mnemosyne*.

Does his history of healing reveal something about the forces are at play among *terrestrials* (Latour)? That is, the process of communicative interaction in which three determinations of communication are unmeshed in a single performance. Communication of: 1) force; 2) message; 3) movement.