



Superposition of two magnetic fields visualised by iron file

Another example of antipodal dislocation can be determined between *artistic* research and *scientific* research: doing research *through* (artistic) and doing research *on* (scientific). For the time being, there is *no* container at Oslo National Academic of the Arts (KHIO) to *hold* these definitions of research conjointly: the interfaces between them are weak/non-existing. Intermittently.

However, the antipodal *premise* makes it possible to visualise and materialise this sort of (non/)relationship. Example: in an ongoing work, presently done to prepare an account of the *diary master* and her husband the *diplomat*—the university voices/underscores the difficulty/impossibility to narrate something of value to knowledge when the author is closely related to the subjects.

At KHIO it is the opposite: as a *personal* errand is key to the artistic content and its value for research (in the sense that springs from art). What I am hoping is that knowing through *making*—the agenda reaped from Tim Ingold's initiative—it is possible to clear the path for an almost unlimited licence to research *with* (ranging *from* the most intimate *to* the remotest recesses).

This possibility finds support in Martin Buber's idea of *normalisation* in his essay on Hebrew humanism: being *with* the other, rather than being *as* the other. Doing research *with* subject matters invested with intimate entanglements, will hatch a process of de-identification from the subject matter, while remaining in proximity with it: *near* in an adjacent non-representational sense.

What we are in search and query of here is therefore the path and passage through a field flanked by *opposites* [seating arrangement in **Leaflet (1/7)**], and structured by *antipodes* [artistic vs. scientific research here]. Instead of assuming *identity* as the nature of human bonding and relationship, we are looking directly at the structure and dynamics of the *boundary* as such.

Because with subject matters that we study *remotely*, pose exactly the same problem: it is about establishing a *proximal* relationship. So, whether the relation to the subject matter is *intimate* or *remote*, the challenge is in *both* cases to establish a *proximal* mode of *access* and *presence*: a lightness of being and remaining in touch, *rather than* emulating, substituting and erasing.

How to gather ourselves, in active relationship to a subject of knowing, is a candidate outcome of doing research *with* (whether we connect intimately or remotely to the subject of knowing). In the proximal relationship we pass *through*—flanked by the intimate and the remote—to a sense of research that is accountable to a group of peers. Which is a criterion for “proper research”.

Then we are left free to move between the antipodes *artistic* research and *scientific* research. Here, a notion of *field research* is candidate denomination for the *path* and *passages* between the two. But *no longer* in the narrow sense of anthropological fieldwork. To be *flanked* by the *intimate* and the *remote* one may need access to both *geological* time and deep human *psycho-dynamics*.

These are *beyond* the scope of anthropology, but not of the time we are living in: in the *anthropocene*—when *things human* and the *history of the planet* have become entangled—the *range* of disciplinary approaches must be *according* to the *needs* of the subject matter. Our list of references—then—do *not* serve to delimit a discipline, but become a stratified indicator of *mattering matters*.