



Isak Wisløff—04 Wojak

As a designer, Isak Wisløff has been working with and for artists. One being, N.Y. based Tom Sachs. After his MA at KHiO, Isak moved overseas to work with him, and continue learning. This was his scheme after completing his formal education: to continue learning. In this framework, his statement on siding with the students acquires a greater scope. That of *lifelong learning*.

And, within schools and colleges, rethinking education: for instance, what <u>Stefano Harney</u> has been attempting in defining *study* within the framework of business school. Turning the page from a knowing life-form—*homo sapiens*—to a *learning* life-form. Turning the page on the human life-form: a material in performance and also how it materialises. Hence the focus on *rare earths*.

Landing the human life-form from its present *extraterrestrial* condition—looking globally from the vantage point of *satellites*—to land it. From the alamy-gloss of dot-com rights, appropriating visual ownership, to what artefacts articulate in human-environmental relationships. Giving space-adventure a terrestrial look and feel. The criticality of artistic research in these terms.

Criticality means inhabit and change. Inhabiting art-spaces as a vehicle of change in the art-field. Inhabiting perception to change perception. Cultivate the human talent to intercept environmental change. Inhabit the devil to allow for change. Walking up the trail of public and corporate agencies—whether pledged to security or finances—and turning to them with evidence/dialogue.

Adopting this strategy of <u>Forensic Architecture</u>—whom we know from their exhibits in Venice and recently in Louisiana—in developing a mesh of human learning with an architecture that makes forensic evidence appear, allowing for its interception, interacting with the agencies that should be concerned by the existence of such evidence and attempt at moving these organisations.

This is an invitation to work artistically with the powers that be—extending from governmental bodies or the corporate sector—making the results of artistic research convertible according to what the legal framework of universities and colleges, in Norway, is asking us to do: using our freedom to apply/generate artistic results interacting with both the public and private sectors.

With this approach and attitude, <u>investigative aesthetics</u>—whether applied to what we read (3/7) or how we use our computers—can have a framework in higher education: that art-schools can be harbingers of a very needed change. Articulating the vast array of collective activity of our life-form to deconstruct the present cultural hegemony: *midstream* of politics and business.

We will not do all that is needed. But there is something that is needed in all that we do. Which is to take awareness of *how* we conduct our operations and also monitory the *extent* of these. If we are sufficiently precise on both accounts we will hatch a readiness-potential to intercept manoeuvres that otherwise would be going on unawares: including those responsible for them.

Responsibility does not always correspond with an ability to respond. Making this ability fluid enough to learn and study on its own, therefore is a major task in our time. It defines a realm of initiative that we *legally* have, but might still not have acquired *legitimacy* (neither in the eyes of the powers that be nor always in the eyes of artists). Art schools are responsible to change this.

That is, as long as they *can*. Which is why all parties involved—students, teachers, workshops, administration and management—should initiate contacts and develop dialogues about this *task* and its *occasions* in the organisation of cultural *encounters* that take place at all these levels. If art schools take on this challenge, they will build & develop a *specific* profile.