



An artistic protocol can be to *transpose* the sum of a) *technical knowhow* and b) *design* unto a *stage*, where *resident principles* that only can be discovered as the staging is *performed*; and the two—knowhow and design—become a *vectorial* sum. Something that they are *not* when worked with each *apart*. Scenography, then, is the *agencement* that brings about this possibility.

While technical knowhow is pledged to *accuracy* in the *procedure*, and *precision* in the *sensing*, *evaluation* or *perception* of outcomes, design is vested in *testing-* and *goal-seeking* process. The latter is what moves knowhow from *technè* to *poïesis*: which is why *design*, in the words of [Giorgio Vasari](#), could be defined as *the animating principle in all creative processes*.

It is a *necessary* condition for art to emerge, but *not* a sufficient condition. Art arguable emerges as the ‘difference that makes a difference’ is *played out*. It is *not* implicit in its constituent elements: as here, *knowhow* and *design*. It is possible to play with the idea that *engaging* with the photogravure process is *performant* and *re-effects* an installation. But in *actual* practice it is neither.

Its potential is to feed and fire the development of a performance installation but since what is at stake here is the *public* premise that makes the show, they do not really belong to the artistic sphere. It has been claimed that [Marcel Duchamp](#) stated the white cube as a *recording-* and *replaying-*device. In that something is recorded in the exhibition space, and replayed by the visitors.

Of course, these categories—recording and replaying—have a broad range. A *dream* is a replay of something recorded. In the current practice of *mobile usership*, people are recording and replaying as *acts* of *staging* events in their life-world, as *present* events from which they can learn. That is, with this faculty that humans have for the virtual: we become citizens of Tertius Orbis.

Or, Tlön... or, Uqbar. If the step is decisive enough our brains can make this leap in an instant. When the veil becomes thin and the leap is almost not required, it veers unto the uncanny. These lessons from [VR](#) are things that artists have been working with for centuries. From an artistic point of view, there is no reason why things should not be uncanny. As long as it is *scenaric*.

That is, a situation intentionally *removed* from what *presently* can be planned or learned. It can be a futuring *vision*, a *spectre* of the past or simply *elsewhere*. But beyond the range of what we can plan, and for which there does *presently* exist *no* learning-path. An exhibit thus can be seen as a place where learning is staged: a *theatre* for past, future or elsewhere learning.

And so an addition to the repertoire of what can be learned, or *is* a material for learning: if only, anticipated and postponed (indefinitely). Or, taken on as a challenge as in the present series of leaflets. In this scope, the work of the artist is to find ways of transforming the past, future and elsewhere as *contemporaries*. The presence of things past, present and future (cf, [Augustine](#)).

In *Augustine's* mediaeval scope these were the criteria to partake of the city of G-d. In *Agamben's* critical discourse these are *tropes* of the [contemporary](#). In *Laruelle's* practice of radical immanent realism, artists are the protagonists of a *First Science* (one coming before science and philosophy). Which also was the broad scope of *Dieter Mersch* in his keynote to NARP in [2017](#).