



Bjørn Blikstad—Special arrangement for conference with QUAD groups

Consider an actual space in which two time dimensions—initial time and final time—are actual. That is, linked to tasks that will result in *group-performance* similar to what has previously been conceived as QUADs. The QUAD, in this sense, establishes a link between *panel-readability* and *communicative ritual*.

By this we mean that the two time-dimensions are *performed*: 1) the *initial* time in which all the elements are performed as though it *for the first time*; 2) the *final* time in which the ritual performance elicits, or conjures, deep—and often hidden—memories. The *vectorial sum* between the two is a *ritual*.

The intercept that emerges within this vectorial sum, features as third time-category: which is the time of *mediation*. The ritual *performance* is such that the *aim* and *attitude* combine to hatch this *third* dimension: which is the *semiotic* dimension. The black spot is the *signature* of this dimension.

*



Peacock Cabinet



Peacock Cabinet (detail)



Taweret panel—inside



Taweret panel—obverse

Bjørn Blikstad furniture elements
Photo: Jørn Aagaard

If, indeed, it can be held that the present *discursive* hegemony—in art and science—favours *oligarchies* of taste and form, *before* research, a success at locating our query in a venture in which art and science are *effectively* joint, would not promise success in the short run. It would likely be rejected at first.

An example. A proposition is asserted—in argument and demonstration—that the standard conferencing arrangement, where the presenter speaks to a facing audience alongside a projection surface, is identical to the choir, chancel and presbytery reserved for the priests vs. the ship where the seats are.

That is, the relations of power and conditions of visibility are identical—save the exchange of the white dove for a projector—the setup for standard conferencing is one developed, over the centuries, for preaching and sermons, devised for *persuading*, rather than convincing, a captive/hostage audience.

What are the reactions we can hope for? Surprise and laughter maybe, *for as long as* the similarities between conferencing and preaching can be held to apply only *superficially*. But what if we managed to argue and demonstrate a deeper—perhaps even substantial—relation? We will meet more resistance.

When surprise is exchanged with *confusion*, resistance is unavoidable. Both experts and lay-wo/men alike will *blame*—maybe even “kill”—the messenger. They will ask: *who are you to confuse us like this?* they will ask, notwithstanding that it is the *fact* of connection between sacred/secular that is confusing.

We had left that behind. So, when Bjørn Blikstad draws up an arrangement planned for an artistic research conference, in which the *connection* between *church* and *conference* interiors become architecturally obvious, it also becomes obvious that the *sweet* architectural black-spot is in the *middle*.

It is where the projector is fixed to the ceiling. In Bjørn Blikstad's design laying out the spatial conference arrangement, for his artistic research, the sweet-spot is exactly in disseminated in the interstitial space between the black hole in the *Peacock* cabinet, and its enlarged instance in *Taweret*.

The content of these works make it exceedingly clear that the audience is located *between* two elements that call on 1) the eroticism of the *libido* [the *visceral*]; 2) the cosmic traction of the *metaphysical* [the *sidereal*]. These are two main *categories* in Didi-Huberman's reading of Aby Warburg's *panels*.

That is, the *readability of what was never written*, which is—in Didi-Huberman's scope—the readability of the *atlas*. It is also in this between-space that the *orthogonality*, between the *initial* and *final* time-dimensions, that the *black spot*—the sweet spot in Blikstad's work—can disseminate into small **QUADs**.

If use this as an opportunity to move beyond Edmund Leach's understanding of *ritual* as the *communicative aspect of all behaviour*, we can state that ritual has these two dimensions: **a)** the initial dimension of performance as though for the first time; **b)** the final dimension where it prompts deep memories.