L'histoire d'un autre *ready-made* fameux, baptisé *Air de Paris*, mérite d'être contée.

En juillet 1919, Marcel Duchamp, qui vit alors aux États-Unis, retourne pour quelques mois en France. Il y fréquente Dada et quelques-uns des futurs surréalistes. De cette période date en particulier l'outrage fait à la Joconde et d'autres trouvailles qui sortent de notre propos.

Sur le point de retourner en Amérique, probablement vers la fin de l'année 1919 ou au tout début 1920, Duchamp réfléchit au cadeau qu'il pourrait ramener à son ami et mécène Walter Arensberg. Comme l'artiste le confiera plus tard à Hans Richter, Arensberg était tellement riche et tellement comblé que la tâche se révéla ardue. Il fallait assurément quelque chose d'inattendu et d'original. « Aussi je lui ramenais une ampoule d'Air de Paris. [1] »

Philadelphia Museum of Art.

From *Revue d'histoire de la pharmacie* (AI-enhanced by upscale.media). Air de Paris: air from Paris, looks like from Paris. It was bought in Le Havre.

This new series of FOOTPRINTs and HANDOUTs have *two* extensions: one cartographic, the other grammatologic. The first appears immediate since maps extend from walking. However, if we extend walking to *montage*, our usage for *images* feed a cartographic *model*. We are then considering walks recorded and replayed. The grammatologic extension seems less obvious: but if we add the act of handing over to someone else, the scripts whereby we convey our words to a surface we have not only conveyed a record/replay of our words, but a prompt hand-to-hand.

FOOTPRINTs and HANDOUTs are therefore conjoint aspects of deconstruction, if *deconstruction* means a form of *revelation*. The etymology of *deconstruction* goes from Derrida to Nietzsche: the notion of *Abbau* (unbuilding). However, according to Didi-Huberman (2008), the readymade does respond to some of the same ideas, when we think of industrial products (as vials and type-writer covers) as *editions*. There is a slight—or, infrathin—variation within the series, that increases and becomes blatant as the product ages, goes out of use and falls apart. There are examples of this.

With the Condeep platforms developed in Norway for offshore oil-exploitation on the continental shelf, the edition counting 11 platforms are all different yet of the same *design* (called Condeep). As the oil-exploitation declines, the platforms have attracted industrial memory and the possibility that they may be protected as cultural heritage. This is partly due to the fact that removing them is

Single pillar construction of the Draugen platform (Condeep design).

technically challenging and very costly. It has also been considered that the Condeep platforms are early *settlements* unto the North Sea, where wind, sun and wave power can be explored and exploited, along with the development of aquaculture.

The early platforms were incomprehensible in size and scope. It was a great and risky leap unto the unknown. The ideas of settlements is recent. It happens in the wake of the assessment of the value of the oil-venture (economic and societal) and the awareness between the activity and its specific results (the development of expertise, safety and routine in the same period). As the technology of its gigantic individuals (somewhat rhetorically coined dinosaurs) is becoming *obsolete*, this North Sea agglomeration is transformed into an X-factor. It is cultural in the sense that it is *somehow* on the move and up for grabs.

The dual script of prompt and montage feature the *individual* "dinosaur" and *group* as a vectorial sum: the X-factor thereby becomes a vantage point for the push on the utility-frontier *and* the awareness of specific connections *conjointly*. In the case of the Condeep platforms, the frontier has moved from entrepreneurship to urbanism. Accordingly, the notion of nature is no longer

scenic but cultural. The location of this cultural turn within the oil-business itself, is what we mean by deconstruction. It is not a turn applied to the business from the outside, or externally.

If the presence of the early Condeep platforms in the scenic landscape of the construction-sites, on the Norwegian West-coast, were sculptural in their impact. They became tiny in comparison to the depths of the continental shelf explored and exploited, and in confrontation with sea and weather off shore. They became implicated in a world of global business figures and capital interests, while the technical knowhow was reaped and organised—under the aegis of an extended state involvement—as the Norwegians, at the same time, became international players.

The state made itself an instrument for a geo-political capitalisation of Norwegian entrepreneurship. If we are bent on determining the said cultural turn on this historical backdrop, it must also be understood as part of the reframing of the activity as the major Norwegian company—Statoil—changed its name to Equinor (intended to suggest a viable connection between two forms of equity, financial and environmental). This new bet on the synergy between between profit and sustainability, is in search of public credibility. Which Arne Johan Vetlesen denies them.

It is the old bet on 'doing well while doing good' which seems incurably to reverse the hierarchy: doing good while doing well (and, when the equation goes desperate, being reduced to doing well). As the Americans say: take what you can and see where the chips fall down. While not denigrating earnings, it is necessary to put good before earnings. The reverse simply does not hold. But rather than resorting and appealing to morals, deconstruction may found this alternative on more solid bases. Doing well while doing good as a method of revealing the system to itself.

Our greatest trouble, at present, may first and foremost be that we do not see what we are doing. And the possibility that we may, in fact, be driving blindly should be enough to take the alternative seriously. In other words: is doing well while doing good a candidate investigation into the workings of value creation (in the expanded environmental sense). That is, going about the work of revelation by moving our vantage point to *apposite* practices: such that are adjoined—rather than opposed—and peel off from current practices, hatching new repertoires by criticality.

The idea that new repertoires will hatch—past a critical threshold/mass—from *apposite* vantage points, is one that can be exemplified by the way the two-tiered model of practice and theory in art-education, can work in the context of cultural history. For instance, in the National Library archive (which is dedicated to cultural history primarily) it is clear that artists will give the archival contents a different kind of circulation; that is, apposite to academic circulation. Simply because material practice is part of their deal. With theoreticians from art-school a different layer is added.

Since they will be well versed in artistic methods they will differ, not in the use of artistic methods, but by their use for other than artistic purposes: for instance, by bringing about conversation with their academic counterparts in ways deemed inessential and uninteresting for artists. Not in an act of translation but a specific transaction. From the vantage point of the art-school the relation between practice and theory will no longer appear as opposed, but adjacent/apposite/alongside. While difference is brought to bear between art school theoreticians and academic researchers.

Often in surprising and positive ways. And peel/shoot off in what we want to do next. Reframed in

Off-point: what to do next after artistic, art-theoretic and academic aggregate has been compiled and configured archivally.

these terms—same, similar, different and off—the variety of professional interests/practices at game will have this in common: what emerges from their interaction, in the archive of the National Library, dedicated to cultural history, is they are all engaged in doing something. And doing in aspects that can be further detailed in values sought and details harvested (differently for each one of them). In a broader sense it is about how we make research a part of our culture of education (beyond pedagogy, which is theory development). Just as it is ludicrous to state that theory has no practice, So is the statement that only theorists theorise.

Essentially, it is the common notion of *doing* that may give a *counter-point* to undoing. Wether in society or nature: the cultural turn. Not common in the sense of the same, but in the sense of a *model*: a non-repetitive series, or requisite variety.