

## In the *shadow* of materiality, memory and soul

—Accessing the rhythmic event between sensorial and technical detection

“Rhythm, all in all, marks an irregular continuity between different bodies (human, machine, or other), dimensions (virtual or actual), and domains (aesthetic, techno scientific, or philosophical).”

Eleni Ikoniadou. (2014)

### Propaedeutics

A

When referred to Eleni Ikoniadou’s book (2014) *The rhythmic event: art, media and the sonic*, the topic of our present gathering—‘tracing rhythm’—would seem to invite a fresh and direct approach; beyond aesthetic, techno-scientific and philosophical *confines*, and instead *tango* with the *tangle* between mark-making, tools and language. We are brought to query motions of different kinds: tracery, dexterity and articulation; as aspects of setting spaces and time in *motion*, in what we call *rhythm* (wise on the variety of performance needed to tease out the event).

Indeed, the event of rhythm *happening* orients us—in search and research—could be seen to occur a three levels: transposing, as it were, those already taken into consideration. By our daily movements in *confined* spaces we can learn something about *objects*. By the traffic of *open* locations and different crowds, we can learn something about *practice*. And from the *come-and-go* between these two modes we would pick up on a *third* way of moving—and motions—of a more *inferred* and projected kind: from irrational *paranoia* to a deep and secret knowledge of *matter*.

The aspects in which we pick up on the ‘movements of the world’—beyond our sensorial range—to build percepts reverberating *semiotic* and *technological* forms of *detection*. Not knowing whether what we are intercepting is the shadow of the *world*, or the world of the *shadow*. This intervention is intended to query whether we can progress on this subject matter, by investigating some ways of the *3<sup>rd</sup> mover*; fuelled by the come-and-go between *field-search* and *studio-work* as commonly practiced by artists, archaeologists, architects and anthropologists alike<sup>1</sup>.

B

It is with the shadow, as a friend or foe, that I intend to tease out some insights in my intervention today; working from a *lineup* that I have named *La Kahina* and from a *travelogue* from a journey to St. Erme in France. The lineup as a *studio-experiment*. The travelogue as *field-search*. The contrast between the two works, presented in preparation for the seminar, are typical for an anthropologist: featuring two *participatory* modes of learning—one in the field and the other in the studio. The *studio* is here used in the etymological sense of a place of study and experiment.

My studio-work features in the lineup—*La Kahina*—and the field-work in the travelogue from a journey and sojourn at St. Erme. *La Kahina* is a lineup in the sense that the elements on display behind a plexiglass-sheet are moveable, and that I have made in this way because *I am looking for something*: it is *not* a work finished and shown, but one that seeks to display a form of *investigation in progress*. Between storage and retrieval. It is not a play nor a show. But is more similar to the lineups in *detective* stories, or in *fashion*, where what we looking for is *in the detail*.

It is also there to *change*—changes in order, elements, connections and priorities. This is not the approach in the account from St. Erme. The difference between the *lineup* and the *journey* resides in different approaches to events. While the events of a lineup are *produced*, the events of a journey are *received*: here, they are *not* happening because they are important, they are *important* because they *happen*. Between these two lenses—reception and production—the movements transduced beyond the lineup and the journey, by the rhythmic event, in matters of life/death.

The relevance anticipated from art and archaeology lies in this possibility: that it is possible to commit oneself to the tracery of movements on the edge of life/death, and that the *forensic fiction* coming out of this exercise, can hatch some *facts* that partly belong to the domestic life of *studio-work* and the life in the big open —*fieldwork*. The plot of the present intervention is to explore this

<sup>1</sup> Ingold, Tim. (2013). *Making—Anthropology, archaeology, art and architecture*. Routledge.

possibility; and in its colour and shadow, let the faint light at the edge of life, transpire in the connected locations of the *proximal space*: larger than the body, smaller than the world.

In its application, it is hoped that the *proximal space*—and its extension unto a *middle zone*—will allow us to establish *experimentally*, based on *common* and *particular* cases, the diacritics needed to *distinguish* fiction from illusion: by insisting on the *forensic* scope of fiction (the *anthropogenic* framework affording an archaeological query of the present) and the role of experimental theory development in the *transition* from fiction to fact: **1)** the *fictionalisation of illusion* as a critical strategy; **2)** the *forensic approach* as an experimental theoretic strategy.

### La Kahina

In this lineup we are *not* investigating something as clearly defined—in legal terms—as a *crime*. Neither are we there to optimise the detail and concept of her *look*. We may be slightly more interested in *why* the photographer, in Brooklyn 1962, has used *this* location (doing his job) in more than one photograph. When working on the photogravure from the red-taped original, as the photo *at first* was little more than a item lugged around as part of a larger inventory of objects in my keep, I realised that there is nothing important about the location, save its *light*-conditions.

To *dock* a summary from a *video* on photogravure—created for pedagogical purposes by Prof. Jan Pettersson, who is an expert—unto the media of its expression in *print*, I wanted to see if I could fit the entire process in a text-description of *exactly one page*: to get a handle on it. When I sent it over to Jan he appreciated *this* leaflet front-page in particular. Since the leaflets are crafted according to a set protocol, this gave me a sense of the process as *though* I could do it. That is, an *hypothesis* docked into the *material technique* that I planned to include into my *repertoire*.

To the right you see the same elements as in the lineup, with the exception of the central element, which is covered with *gelatine* from the sensitised paper used in photogravure, after exposure and the series of alcohol baths, from which the motif appears through an *orange crust*, of the same hue and colour that you can see here. The consecutive process of etching w/*ferro-chloride* further extends the sense of *excavating* the photo, according to what one might call the phenomenology of the archaeological *dig*. The photo seems to surface from a deep/blind backside of the plate.

In sum, photogravure joins image- and object perception in which the image is examined from the vantage points of a *transfer process* that takes a total of 3 days. Which means that, to the *material process* is added the *work of time*. The hours spent in the *wet-* and *dry* phases of photogravure, attending the detail of the image, through a *vast* array of different techniques, as you can read from the left page, results in a *swarm* of small acts—all attentive—with changes in the *apparatus* that makes the relationship between the *body* and *object* go through a series of contrastive *shifts*.

In this process we can *intercept* levels of the photo in which *object perception* yields a *variety* of images—readings that are *not* photographic—ranging from the *touch*, *feel* and *smell* of her *suede* party-gloves, a surprising *weight* of the *mantella* she is wearing over her shoulders, the *cold* feel and *smell* of her glass with gin-tonic. What is her work of being *that* woman—the woman we can see in the photo in the moment of the take—through the series of non-same *contact*-metaphors; such that yield an investigative access which is *not only* embodied, but *also* residing in space.

As I wrote on the exhibit-sheet, what interests me here is a variation on Goethe's notion of the 'acts of light'—expanding from light conditions, chemical processes, physiological ones and also perception. The immersive approach he develops in his study of colour, in the didactical part his *Theory of colours* (1810). The *light conditions*, the physiologies *performing the light conditions* before and behind the camera, in Brooklyn 1962, the chemistry of the emulsion playing in the *shadows*, the perception of the photo *then* and *now*; what can be *prompted* by photogravure.

### The proximal space

We are in the body's *proximal space*. A spatiotemporal zone *between* the body and *not* the body, which can be defined as its action-, working- and living-space; but a space also *run* by physical

forces that are *other* than the body's and only *marginally* under our control: pending on our control of tools, skills and materials (or, the wider range of printed, worn and used items). It is in this context that a statement by dancer Otto Ramstad became a condensed intuitive lead unto the subject of the *shadow*: that *the back is the dark side of the body*. His search was site-specific<sup>2</sup>.

He was basically looking for the backside-story of his family's migration to the US. And *return* was to something that—up to that point—wasn't to be *had*, but what his family definitively had *left*: the life of *husmenn* (dependents or agricultural labourers, living in serfdom). The labours of being *that* family, living in *these* spots, and through *such* situations in Skjåk, upstream of Gudbrandsdalen. The dark side of the family memory, which for him has part and parcel of his motivation to *move on* (rather than back) to Norway from the present conditions in the US. The shadow of migration.

A *turn* to a memory (*by no means* a return). *Remembrance*: piecing together the body anew. An examination of what was left behind, in the wake of his decision—with his family—to make a new life in Norway. I am lingering a bit on this because it may important as a prerequisite for why/how we turn to *archaeology* in field-searches: what we can *find* is what people *have left*, or the *back-story*, the *reverse* side. The readable traces of labour of being who they were, their give and take with other people. The trail of people *who had each others' backs*, and the people *who didn't*.

Which means that we will also see the *meandering paths* of failures and betrayals, and not only a functionally *integrated society* (no matter what). The name and fame of some. The shame and blame of others. Hopes for life and disappointments. Which is the perspective applied here to the lineup. *La Kahina*: the tracery of the labours of being *that* women, living in *these* places, going through *such* life situations. And the challenge of bringing a *third party readability* to all this, in using photogravure as process allowing to move and shift into the place/position of the *witness*.

### A husband-and-wife team

**G** The 71 diaries kept by *La Kahina*—in a period of about 45 years—testifying to *herself*, taking on the task to *witness* the hours, days and years of her marriage to a diplomat named *K*. In 1954 they entered the kind of matrimony based on a classical model of a husband-and-wife *team*: having each other's backs—she at home and in private, him at work and in public. Enhanced by their *middle ground* of receptions, dinners, openings, performances and concerts. That is, cultural arenas as the teeming spaces where much of international diplomacy has been taking place.

Modern diplomacy from the Congress of Vienna in 1815 onwards, in the wake of the Norwegian Constitution adopted in 1814, and after independence in 1905. The particularity of this sort of life, as conveyed in *La Kahina's* diaries, is that the home is *not* simply a private dwelling, but one with a myriad of tasks—and a pervasive function—linked to *official* occasions. In sum, it is *not* fully private. Hence the work of being *that* woman, in *these* situations and places, defines a *proximal zone* that is productive and performant in hatching culturally organised encounters, *internationally*.

This life-project, resonates with what Eleni Ikoniadou (p.55) evokes from a work by Anne Niemetz and Andrew Pellin: “As the project description reads, ‘*L’espace du milieu* explores the reflexive emanations of the middle zone... The middle (or centre or interval) operates multiple changes with what surrounds it. ... The work is experiential, inflecting the vibrational activity of middle spaces, which include and exceed humans.’” The physics of contact-metaphors that are marginally under control—or, beyond control—within the perimeter of such *space-times* is what concerns us here.

Accordingly, beyond the triviality of the relationship—in which the mutual dependency of *having each other's backs* in areas *beyond* their individual reach, also can be fraught with suspicion and betrayal—which is a fact of life that we all know, with stories that we know from a broad variety of fiction and documentary, the relevance of the kind of partnership that existed between *La Kahina* and *K*, to our present errand of unfolding adventures with the shadow in their *proximal* space, lies in staging the events of a *middle zone* extending from *within* and *beyond* the domestic unit.

---

<sup>2</sup> Otto Ramstad did his MA at the Dpt. of dance (2019) with a project called *Lineage*. The dance was part of an immersive lecture, during which he presented his quest and query in Skjåk on the Ramstad trail. A performed query during which an investigation of documents, methods and findings were stage and trailed in one of KHIO's BlackBoxes.

Their journeys started 1960 with Paris and went on to: New York, Oslo, Geneva, Oslo, Brussels, Paris, Washington D.C., Baghdad-Paris-Oslo-Paris and Athens. Their final sojourn abroad was in The Hague. The *singularity* of each new place of residence became the *common* denominator in a life of *adaptation*. The *particularity* of this life—owing to the salience of hosting—emerged through the *millions* of small operations, surfacing over the years, in the [worksmanship of risk](#) inherent in *official tasks*, *cultural occasions*, and arenas of *encounter*: the dynamics of *agenda-making*.

### Norwegian off-shore activity

**H** A career developed alongside the development of Norwegian *off-shore* activity, international trade-politics and European integration. *K*'s carrier as an *ambassador* started in Baghdad 1981, and ended in The Hague 1999. Eighteen years. The task of being on *field-service* in different locations and *making a home* in different places, could be the full job description of the husband-and-wife team. And so too the *service-relationship* between *residence* and *field*. Just as the domestic unit *not* being entirely private, the public presence of a diplomat is *not* entirely public.

Because the official arenas in the festive culture of inter/national diplomacy are *salient*, *ongoing* and *enduring*, they constitute a domain of permanent concerns of how to *run* a diplomatic residence, and are linked up with *writings* with a different category of *protocol* than the diary—the life and process of foreign-service *documents* in and out of archives: *up* and *down* in the pile of the documents of a civil servant's in-tray, in and out of the perimeter of political decision-making, *in-and-out* of news-media in modern democracies. The twists of policy-*agendas* in power-relations.

So, what we see in this slide is **1)** the *diary* collection to the left and **2)** the collection of foreign service *documents* to the right; **3)** the type of hallmark residencies in the *corps diplomatique* at the centre: this one in *Avenue Henri Martin* near the OECD in Paris, where *K* was working at several occasions, in different roles. The lineup of oil-field exploration and exploitation over the years (1971-2010) which is at the *middle-out* core of the husband-and-wife team's career across the mentioned locations of their residencies abroad. A story lacking depth without *La Kahina*'s diaries.

The 1980s are the centrepiece of the account on *La Kahina* and *K*—in a stretch of their career as a *domestic unit on journey* from Baghdad via Oslo to Paris—following a good slice of Norwegian energy politics abroad, culminating with the *Troll deal* with France: not on account of its size nor importance, but as a *pilot* for the perceived importance of *cultural exchange* in international politics, which was formative for *K*'s ideas of Norway's place in Europe. The OECD documents he left behind are consistent with Bruno Latour's perception of a turn in the oil industry in the 1980s.

**I** This is in the book *Down to earth—politics in the new climatic regime* (2018): the title in French was *Where to land?* It is extended by the title of the book that came in 2021, before his recent departure, *After lockdown*. In this case, the French title was *Where am I?* This was a philosophical fable inspired by Kafka's *Metamorphosis* relating how the world had changed with the pandemic. Here I am mainly interested in the *domestic* framework of life and work, during more than two years, how it altered our worldview, our way of being and acting in the world *seen from home*.

**J** Looking at such processes from **1)** the premise of *domesticity* and **2)** the vantage point of *public service* is obviously quite different. *Cultural arenas* were previously sites for the task of grooming policy-*agendas*. Today, they may be means to keep up with *ourselves* as we listen to the world. So we may be challenged to imagine the encounters that hatch when *the two* are under a *single person's* keep. As when Goethe *fled* from his public duties in Weimar, *for 2 years*, to embark on his Italian journey. And later the place in the middle-zone of his Weimar-*studio*, for investigations.

**K** Goethe's *field-work* and *studio-work* as *one* cogenerative process. The *internal* relation between the *journey to Italy*, that took place in 1786-88, the *theory of colour* that came out in 1810, and the *publication* of the Italian journey in 1816 (& 1817—a tribute to its popularity at the time). So, in *between* the journey *and* the publication of the *travelogue*, the years spent on *perambulation* with Schiller and colour-experiments conducted in his Weimar-*studio*. So, if we look at the gross relation between *field work* (Italy), *studio work* (colours) and *outcomes*, the relation is *complex*.

I am using the word ‘outcome’ because it includes publication but can also cover a *broader range of findings*. For instance, featuring in Goethe’s *rock-collection* that he kept in his studio. These are not simply rocks collected in nature and inserted into his *studio*-drawers, but that have—as the name indicates—been studied for their *common* and *particular* traits: that is, for their singular and innumerable observational contributions to the understanding of geological processes. What we see are *not* simply pieces of rock, but pieces of *nature* revealed in action<sup>3</sup>: *natura naturans*.

From the present vantage-point, the notion that what we call findings are insights at a *mature* stage—drawing *conjointly* on field- and studio-work—yields: **a)** an understanding that what we hold as *fact* is hatched *from* fiction [a class of *mature contents*]; and that **b)** what *separates* fact from fiction comes from *making* experimental productions from experiences recorded/noted in field-records [which essentially means that studio-experiments do *not* produce primary data, but develop *theory*]. Theory yields the *threshold* needed to allow fact to hatch from fiction.

This is a bold assertion. If difficult to prove we should—at least—establish strong indications of it. We may find a way around this if we accept that a *major* difference, preceding the *diacritics* separating fact *from* fiction, is the the difference *between* fact and illusion. An *Illusion* is a world unto itself and contains its own reality. While fiction is *adjacent* to fact in a relation of *contingency* where fiction always can be *marked* by facts. It doesn’t matter how imaginative fiction is, in this regard: what determines its definition as fiction is that it is *open* to the real, and is marked by it.

### The 3<sup>rd</sup> mover

“According to Deleuze (2004b), philosophy draws the concept of intensities from physics to point to ‘pure ontological differences’ that are themselves virtual but may give rise to actual entities.”

Ikonidou, Eleni. *The rhythmic event*. (2014, p. 37).

The logic relating to *fiction* and *fact*—with the Goethean notions of poetry and truth—the lines of query, drawn up and phrased at the bottom, left address the issue: **1) what have we here?** [a *fictional* query and impetus]; **2) where does it go?** [its *virtual* load]; **3) how far come in terms of what has already been achieved?** [the hatching of *fact*]. We move from the *singular*—or, the common—to the *particular*, which is born of the arduous task of looking and observing, under the immersive conditions of the *field*- and *-studio*. Back and forth *between* the two: hatching theory.

Here, what we have termed the 3<sup>rd</sup> mover appears as the *vectorial sum* of field- and studio-work. The diagram on the slide does *not* constitute a symbol, since the parts *do not* fit: they are *not* congruent (a characteristic of the symbol). They are incongruent up to the point where they are *solved* creatively. It diagram therefore features what Gilbert Simondon (2005) calls the synolon: referring to Greek—*how the whole came out*, with elements that are *not* predetermined, predestined and promised to one another. It holds information. More like an artistic result.

Which is how—in some way—the physical world is *partner* to fiction. We must never forget that the physical world, though explained by science, is not a scientist. Fiction is the backdrop on which theory can develop in due time. As it, time and time again, has been in science fiction, for instance. But it is with fiction—as with Goethe’s Faust—that it will be faced with a *choice*: between immortality and perdition, vs. mortality and redemption. We can use this language since we know that Goethe was concerned with these questions as a matter of fact: poetry and truth.

However, the *failure* at coming up with an integral narrative is the *success* of the theory that fact comes of fiction: since there is no common time-frame within which an account may take shape, *we don’t know what the facts are*. And that is precisely the point. But *then* we may ask if *rhythm*—as elaborated by Eleni Ikonidou, and our topic at this seminar—might allow us to hatch a new kind of *account*. If the *shadow* by definition is *that of which* the story *cannot* be told—at least not in the current sense of narrative—then it may be tailed and trailed by the *rhythmic event*.

<sup>3</sup> See, for reference: [Memory-atlas & the redrawing of the terrestrial](#), Seminar series §112, Dept. of media and conservation, national library, November 3<sup>rd</sup> 2021.

Hence the re/markable nature of fiction is eventually what allows theory to develop, and facts to hatch: they typically emerge—with the work of time—by *alternating* between our movements in the *field*, and *studio*-activities. And that this does *not* call for interpretation but rather aspects of experimental staging that we know from physics as *entanglement*, *superposition* and *intra-action*<sup>4</sup>. We can see these as *the tropes of the proximal space*: different modes alternating between field- and studio-work in the *middle zone*. I will now give four different examples of these.

### Tvergastein, Johannesburg, Fontainebleau & Paris

**N** The predicates used in the *examples* are referred to Arne Næss nomenclature for explaining the notions and practices of ecosophy. *Ecosophy T* refers to Tvergastein: the name of the site where he built is cabin at foot of the Hallingskarvet massif. **T<sub>1</sub>** determines *the cabin as a transportation, construction and maintenance process*. While **T<sub>2</sub>** determines *the decision and practice of living and working in the cabin as much as possible*. It should be added that the cabin includes a *library* and local *substances* collected from Arne Næss experiments. Næss and Goethe: both Spinozists.

Here, **T<sub>0</sub>** determines the dimensions of Tvergastein based on *findings*: the place *itself* as a finding—linked to his walks to and from the site, and experimental activities *on site*—that grew over the 14 continuous years that he lived there, as a *vectorial sum* between **T<sub>1</sub>** and **T<sub>2</sub>**. Based on Spinoza's idea that a substantial insight is *specific*. Perhaps Tvergastein could be seen in sculptural terms as a performance-installation of Spinoza's *Ethica*: i.e. an alternative geometry/cartography of the world we live in, based on a *change in our life-ways*. An idea & practice of *balanced give & take*.

**O** But, perhaps more frequently than not, the give & take is *not* balanced: the apartheid-regime in South Africa is a case in point. Yet, the lives of the people there are *entangled*. The slide shows a drawing by Kentridge of his movements within the confines his *atelier*. While at the centre-right an encounter with *other lives*, with which his own are not automatically on par. His work is *full* of such encounters. Our errand *cannot* presently be to pass judgement on whether his initiative with the Centre for the Less Good Idea is balanced, but on how it might make the problem *appear*.

**P** It opens for what Arne Næss called a *precisation*: reaching for *clarity on the terms on which a problem is set*. A different trope features in Geir Harald Samuelsen's work with boulder-climbing and study of ancient rock carvings in the *field* (the Fontainebleau forest) and his *studio*-work with *haptic drawings* (in his atelier). The reason I conceive the relation between his *field*- and *studio*-work in terms of *superposition*, is that the *combined* work draws attention to how his field- and studio-work considered *each apart*, can be seen as a sum *without* altering the nature of each.

**Q** The haptic drawing *can* be seen as a *sum* resulting from field- and studio-work. The study of the rock carvings can enter a *sum* with climbing. Or, they can be considered *each apart*. If we look at Dragoş Gheorghiu's performance-documentary appearing alongside Geir Harald Samuelsen's work in the volume *Palimpsest* (publication from Materiality Memory and Soul, 2021), it shifts to yet another trope: that of *intra-action*. The whole point being a *shift* between the *body* and the *rock carvings*—the subject and object—through the the operations and shifts in his *apparatus*.

In this work, the proximity between the studio- and fieldwork is *immediate* and juxtaposed, the difference and articulation between them is subtle. This cohabitation is even *embodied* in the articulation between the *left* and *right* sides of the artist's *performance*. As such it may express shame and blame on our contemporary notions. The point being to provoke/inspire a shift in the *ratio* between *body* and *matter*—*subject* and *object*—in such terms where the *balance* of give and take, at this level, also can be *clarified*: that is, the terms in which the problem is set.

**R** Then I am returning to the husband-wife-team, where Dragoş Gheorghiu's di/vision and connect between *left* and *right*, is transposed in a di/vision and connection between *wo/man*. Beyond having each other's back—and in this sense connected—they are differently involved: while *K* is moving with the world, *La Kahina* is a witness. His availability to his interlocutors (at the centre

<sup>4</sup> As the literature indicates (from Stéphane Lupasco and Gilbert Simondon, to François Laruelle and Karen Barad), the findings of sub-particle physics are precisely that: the theories are developed from a secondary level of observable fact.

with Walter Mundale): her standing a few steps off, in the proximal space, but rather as a hostess and witness. *K* working for the terms on which Norwegian oil- & gas-trade achieved clarity.

**S** Which is why, at this point, I take a step back and ask what my errand might be in my attempts at humanising *research*, and my refusal to draw a portrait of the researcher as someone essentially apart from people in general. Someone who, like Goethe, is ready to flee his duties in order to feed his curiosity and cultivate his taste. And so venture to take the consequences of living in an era of [investigative aesthetics](#), as everyone's concern. In my doctoral fieldwork, to journey from place to place, getting to know a field of practice through variety. After that, the *studio-journey*.

In bringing the journey together in the latent years of studio-work, the *redeeming* factor—that released this material from my keep—was the process of making the *book*, designing the *volume*, working with typography, image and visual grammar of the spreads up to print and distribution. The hands-on knowledge of the cogs of creating value for a type of content *beyond* contemporary readability: life on the cultural *margins* of war, and having been in the *proximal* zone of killing. Being marked by the violence, not only to people but to the earth, *not* committed but *witnessed*.

Of course, the question is whether it is possible to carry out a forensic *scoping* of something with a large and ongoing *footprint* as the oil-& gas-industry which is *true* to reality while also being *communicable*. Indeed, how to gauge an industrial activity *reaching across* the massive scale of oil-rigs, the geological time applying to its finding and extraction, along with the increasing pace of *spot*-markets, *future*-markets and explosive production of oil-*derivates* from the beginning of the Norwegian adventure in 1971 through the yuppy-1980s, into the post-industrial era?

The hallmark of the post-industrial era is likely the change of atmosphere around the extraction of *primary resources* generally: moving from *optimism* for the future and stability of economic growth, to covert pessimism, socially and environmentally shameful operations, dependency on primary resources and chasing ever shorter time-windows for making trade-benefits. The projective talents and compulsion of human beings gone wild. It challenges *telling*. But the chances of *succeeding* at accounting, may be greater in the proximal space/[middle zone](#).

This is not a place to pass judgement on developments—in which we have each our different share of responsibility—but rather an occasion to ask a question: if the copy of Neri Oxman's design of [Kerb's cycle](#) of *creativity* has succeeded in drawing up a fictional framework for what can be expected of art and *design*, in relation to *science* and *engineering*, with *economy* and *philosophy* powering the core, how do we *tango with this tangle* if at its core it is an *illusion*? That is, that our systems commit violence against reality, in a rush to make the most of what is left.

**T** Bruno Latour is a lot harsher—almost harassing and jeering—in passing judgement over this tendency. Which is a frenzy of digging, drilling and excavating to which we cannot remain indifferent to, when our scope is *archaeological*. The sense that *we have no time*, up against the archeological *ethos*: that time is *all* we have got. Digging up the planet at an accelerating pace for purposes of an extremely narrow scope. *Not* because we should but because we *can*. Instead of accusing the spread of ubiquitous human banditry, to linger on the structure of the problem.

### Terrestrial violence

The challenge is similar to one a situation played out in a quarry near Larvik, where *larvikite* is extracted: mainly for *kitchen-tops*. The contrast between the geological story of the earth's tectonic shields—according to which the present location of Larvik was 30° North (about the latitude of the Mediterranean Sea)—and the catalogue displaying different quality of kitchen-tops [on site](#), the present technology extracting at about 8% efficiency, is rather similar; it challenges our current narrative templates of relating in story two developments *across* gaping time-scales.

So, my discussion of the lineup is concluded with this kind of *incongruence*, of which there are an *endless* number of examples, and attempt to see if it is possible—in Goethe's spirit—to discover some *particularity* that may hatch a bigger picture. Which is basically a new cartography based on the kind of passage which Bruno Latour outlined in his book *Down to earth* (2018): the passage from modern *globalisation* to a disenchanting *terrestrial* grounding, which is closer to the world as it is. It is a bold attempt to redesign the world, which of course only exists in outline/theory.

U For instance, a bigger picture can be hatched by following the trail of how the “Crystal Palace” of internet-connections we have access to through our screen-ware, is dependent on the *mining* of rare earths across the globe: we find the same *discrepancy* between the time of the *mined materials* and the pace of their *use* by humans, as between oil and its derivatives, the Larvikite mineral and its domestic appliance. But here the prevalence of the extraction or the appliance depends on *which side* of the post-industrial barrier you are: grossly the North/South barrier<sup>5</sup>.

Precarity will change this. For now, the appliances are *not* docked to the material reality that permits them: as affordances they therefore are structurally *disconnected* and cannot be told according to their *terrestrial* preconditions. And they are likely to stay that way so long as we conceive them as being *beyond us*. The discovery that they *traverse us*, is a game-changer. Terrestrial preconditions are constantly reverberating *through* us because they are terrestrial. Which means that we can start almost anywhere and make substantially linked findings.

Alienation from the earth and other people is a major challenge: this is the corollary to Latour’s insistence that climate change and the explosion of inequalities, are not two separate things but fundamentally the same. Which is an invitation to turn the page. Is there something in our *adventures with the shadow*, up to this point, that can help us turn *that* page? My work with the materials left by *La Kahina* and *K* can be seen as an act of disposal: the deposition of a private archive at the National Library. An attempt that will be clarified with a round-up from *StErme*.

### The journey to *StErme*

“This handling of the notion of rhythm plants the seeds for the development of a speculative aesthetic theory that has the power to explain and put into practice some of the most basic concepts of science and philosophy—such as time, perception event. Perhaps this is also the impetus for their [Nietzsche, Langer and Deleuze] attraction to the concept, addressing a frustration deriving from grand claims of scientists and philosophers that they are able to explain the world whereas art merely beautifies it.”

Ikoniadou, Eleni. (2014, p. 17).

V The journey to *StErme* was to attend a gathering with professional staff and students of dance and choreography with 8 schools from a variety of European countries. The purpose was twofold: **1)** relocate ourselves for MA-students at KHiO to present written reflective works to a professional staff of 2, specialised in this area, inside an institution called PAF: Performing Arts Forum, within the structure that was previously a Catholic girls’-school; **2)** the subsequent gathering of schools with MA-programs in DaCo do discuss topics and prospects of the growing *precariat* in this field.

Outwardly, the movement of this crowd to PAF—a place where it has *foothold*—makes sense of both purposes. Working from the *floor* is where this milieu catches its grounds, whether the aim is to work on theory, or to *crowdsource* on working-conditions and develop *slim* possibilities. In the expanded field, theory development can partake of both. On the one hand, the *floor* is the crossroads of text-narratives and image-reels that *compete* for embodied attention. On the other hand, the organisational and political talents of performance-people comes from the *floor up*<sup>6</sup>.

To organise these tensions I had—on beforehand—introduced a board of the kind used by naturalists of yore, but painted on two sides: one side with black slate-colour blackboard paint, the other side with white glossy oil-paint that can be used as a white-board. I *docked* this artefact into the situation with the MA-students at KHiO, by suggesting that the black side of the board was a piece of BlackBox *floor*, and that the white side of the board was a piece of WhiteCube *wall*. Thus the possibility to work from chalked floor-samples and experimental wall-displays.

Hence these *two* ways in which a *surface can be had*—rather than simply assuming them—yields a modelling device that can be *docked* to a reflective apparatus that includes *movement*, *text* and *image*: which is also what I essentially have involved in this intervention. But one in which the text

<sup>5</sup> Cf, [Jan Peter Hamer’s PhD project](#) (Art Academy), and [Isak Wisløffs artistic research project](#) (Design), in KHiODA.

<sup>6</sup> Personal communication Yaniv Cohen in preparation for the PAF gathering in *StErme*..



and image elements are *held* by body-movement in a way that goes *beyond* the dialectics of *field* and *studio* considered thus far. Dance and choreography therefore feature the *experimental reflective apparatus* of a 3<sup>rd</sup> mover: *interceptions* from sensorial/technical modes of detection.

The lingo of the 3<sup>rd</sup> mover here becomes clear: moving to a place where it is possible to join and juxtapose what is picked up by the *technology* of stage-equipment and by the *body-senses*, is *intercepted* by the movement of the dancer. What can be *picked up* from this from some-one *not* dancing—e.g. the audience—is part of the quest and query of a choreographer. That is, in this very sense, the movement not *in* time and space, but movement *of* time and space. In this sense, DaCo features a variety of interventions *in* and interruptions of “normal” time and space.

An example from the PAF-gathering. A young Iranian woman had just returned from Tehran where she had participated in a demonstration against the obligation for wearing a *hijab* in public, had been witness to a fellow demonstrator being killed by the “moral police”. She chose to share this in one of the *self-organised groups* during the inter-school phase at PAF. Since some of us had a baggage of *similar* experiences, we chose to side with her, in facing the dilemma of murder in our proximal space: that of contamination and shame from an act we have *not* ourselves committed.

Also that the way *in* and *out* of such situations are *differently* grounded: we cannot stand on a cursed ground. When we were ending our communal meal in the evening, the young lady stood up on a chair, asked us to intone a song that the women chanted during the demonstration in Tehran. She asked us to follow her *singing*, in a procession from the dining hall to the kitchens where we prepared the meals. There was little or no psychological care in these interactions. It was about co-presence to rage/regrets that were larger than our narrow egos: politeness and respect.

The *tear* and *force* of the emotional energies at place were considerable, however. Which is the point in case of the third mover as a sequel to Aristotle's treatise *on the soul*: the soul being the 1<sup>st</sup> mover (the “form of forms”), the hit-and-impact of *causes* being the 2<sup>nd</sup> mover, and the 3<sup>rd</sup> mover what articulates and connects *within* and *beyond* the *proximal* space. Featuring the possibility of what Bracha Ettinger (2015) has called *wit(h)nessing*. Being *with* though not claiming being *as*, because one is—at the same time—a *witness*. The unlikely union between the intimate/remote.

My way *out* of the experience at PAF and my way *into* it therefore were quite different. *The way in*: the receptive mode in which things do not happen because they are important, but important because they happen. *The way out*: transposing the experience according to a protocol that makes experience culturally available in technical and sensorial aspects that are at *odds* with one another, even incongruent, but now in a mode where we are traversed by this incongruence. What came up in my mind was a misunderstanding of a movie title I came across many years back.

It was a title by the Georgian movie-maker Tengiz Abuladze that was [banned in 1984](#) and then shown in Cannes, 1987: the title was conveyed to me by a fluent English speaker with a knack for adding occasionally a Norwegian pronunciation to his drawl: so when he said *Anger* with that Norwegian accent, I thought he was speaking English. Actually, the title of the Georgian movie was *Repentance*. Which, translated into Norwegian, is *Anger*. The movie trailed the story of violence in a relation between an *operetta* style dictator-like mayor, and an *iconic* artist/researcher.

In all his apparel the dictator was clearly *made up*, while the artist was conveyed in the language of *revelation*: hence the contrast between *made up* and *revealed*. This triggered some memories from a lecture on East European icons at Marc Augé and Françoise Héritier's seminar *donné à voir & faire entendre* i Paris, 1990. Here the East European icon was discussed in terms of the Greek etymology of *eikon*: what is *given to view*... the artists marking this sort of work without a direct signature, but writing “through the hands of X” indicating that it was revealed (rather than made).

That is, according to a protocol of *sensorial* detection. However, a *technical* protocol exists for certain icons: the icons called *keramion* and *mandylion*—the *keramion* is an icon transferred to a *ceramic* plate, while the *mandylion* is conceptually a *shroud*. The shroud of Torino, for instance, features the imprint of a corpse (held to be Jesus). The relation between the two was explained by a technical-miraculous procedure: the *mandylion-shroud*, by contact with the ceramic plate, makes the icon miraculously appear. A *photographic desire* before the existence of photography.

On our way to <sup>St</sup>Erme we stopped and changed of trains in Laon. Wrapping up the story of the icons—as revealed through the senses and their technical procedure—I was therefore surprised to find that one such icon is kept in display in [Laon](#)'s Notre Dame cathedral. It was said to have been given in felty to Geoffroi de Charny in 1390 by the Serbian royal court of the Nemanjić dynasty. From Aby Warburg we know that images travel differently through space and time than textual narrative/treatise. And if conjoined our categories will change, and along this our understanding.

What is at cause, however, are the tropes of connection we have looked at from the example of 3 *artistic productions*: Kentridge, Samuelsen and Gheorghiu. But now directly linked to the ways of the 3<sup>rd</sup> mover. How fiction can be *marked* by reality, and how *theorising* can hatch *fact* on the backdrop of fiction. It is more *materialist dialectics* and than *dialectical materialism*. That is how the forensic framework—as an experimental protocol—opens for walking adventurously with the shadow, where illusion, escape and violence will follow in the wake of pristine yearnings.

## Disposal

X Perhaps this was imminent in Freud's fear that Jung's engagement with archetypes of the collective unconscious could be flooded by the *black tide of occultism*. We are not here to settle this score. By trailing the shadow's tail—in this intervention—I have given priority to Goethe's ideas of darkness partaking of colours: as the acts of light. The wing-screws in the lineup *La Kahina* relate to this. The pigments are based on a colour pick from the gems in the Biblical High Priest's Breastplate of Judgement<sup>7</sup>. The idea being that a gem is a *lens* and a *mineral* conjointly.

A *lens*, because it is *translucent*. A *mineral* because it can be crushed and used in *pigment*. As a lens it causes refraction in an *instant*. As a pigment it is opaque and as *old* as the bones of the earth. If we accept that the flash of a moment and the eons of time come together in a gem, we may also accept it as a *contact metaphor* between the *intimacy* of the senses and the *remoteness* of geological time, which happens to cross and fertilise in the middle zone, or proximal space—where the first and second mover are held by a third—as a way from *artefiction* to *artefact*.

Here I am thinking of the transition from our luminous screen-ware as a worthy candidate to exemplify *artefiction*, in our time, which can pave the way to the progress in establishing it as an artefact: the compound of the translucent screen-media, and the *rare earths* from which it is currently made. An example of the travail from fiction, through theorising to fact, in an honest attempt to level with reality. It is a step off from the pristine illusion of cyberspace, to a terrestrial space-time in the sense of the 3 tropes of *quantum theory*, as the playground of the 3<sup>rd</sup> mover.

Y Less in an attempt to tease out the secrets of quantum computing to *already* existing purposes, but instead attempting to *repurpose* the digital uses, by docking them to the 3 tropes. What is assumed here—as a working hypothesis—is a quantum mechanics over the level of sub-particle physics *unfolding* and *enfolding* (David Boom) it in biological physics, as heralded by Simondon, is currently mainly possible in what we understand as *artistic practice*. Because it will not be *contained*, yet it calls for our understanding in the connective paths of proximal space.

Z That is, acts of *surrender*—rather than conquest—as we set our goals; of psychoanalysis taken out of the therapeutic *closet*, as a cogenerative partner of *character development*, and the development of life-ways that are compatible with life on earth, now and in the future. Taking the leap *within* to connect from *afar* is something we can do as humans. The 3<sup>rd</sup> mover is the potential human respondent to the rhythmic event. The disposal of the materials from *La Kahina* and *K* at the National Library engages a process of this kind. *This is what I want to share...*

\*

<sup>7</sup> Hebr. Hoshen Mishpat. Pentateuch. Exodus 28:15. The Kestenbaum Edition Tikkun: The Torah Reader's Compendium.

## References

\*

- Aristotle. (1987/350 b.c.e.). *De anima*. Penguin.
- Augé, Marc & Héritier, Françoise. (1990). *Donner à voir et faire entendre* [seminar]. Paris. École des hautes études en sciences sociales/Maison des sciences de l'homme.
- Attias, Jean-Christophe. (Dir. 2012). *Les Sépharades et l'Europe—De Maïmonide à Spinoza*. Alberto Benveniste. Presses de l'université de Paris Sorbonne.
- Abuladze, Tengiz. (Dir. 1987/1984). *ճԹԾԵԾԵԾԵԾ/Repentance* [movie]. Cannon film.
- Barad, Karen. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway—Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Duke university press.
- Barth, Theodor. (2022). La Kahina [Lineup]. *Tracing rhythm* [PKU project Materiality, Memory and Soul]. Bergen. KMD/UiB.
- Barth, Theodor. (2022). [Memory-atlas and the redrawing of the terrestrial](#) [seminar lecture]. Snø og isdekte alper 1820-21. Del III: Kunst og vitenskap. Nasjonalbiblioteket.
- Boom, David. (2002). *Wholeness and the implicate order*. Routledge.
- Cohen-Lacassagne, Julien. (2022). *Les berbères juifs—L'émergence du monothéisme en Afrique du Nord*. La fabrique.
- Demos, T.J. (2017). *Against the anthropocene: visual culture and environment today*. Lukas and Sternberg.
- Didi-Huberman, Georges. (2011). *Atlas ou le gai savoir inquiet* (Eng. Atlas or the anxious gay science). L'œil de l'histoire 3. Minuit.
- Ettinger, Bracha. (2015). Carriance, copoiesis and the subreal. *SALTWATER*. 14th Istanbul biennale.
- Fuller, Matthew & Weizman, Eyal. (2021). *Investigative aesthetics: conflicts and commons in the politics of truth*. Verso.
- Goethe, Johann von. (1970/1810). *Theory of colours*. MIT press.
- Goethe, Johann von. (1989). *Sämtliche Werke, X*. Deutscher Klassiker Verlag.
- Goethe, Johann von. (2013/1811). *Poetry and truth* [autobiography]. Cambridge university press.
- Goethe, Johann von. (2014). *Faust: A Tragedy* [Parts One and Two, Fully Revised]. Yale university press.
- Ikoniadou, Eleni. (2014). *The rhythmic event—Art, media and the sonic*. MIT press.
- Ingold, Tim. (2013). *Making—Anthropology, archaeology, art, architecture*. Routledge.
- Jorn, Asger. (2012). *Les sauvageries de l'âme*. Les atômes de l'âme.
- Jung, C.G. (1989). *Memories, dreams and reflections*. Vintage.
- Kentridge, William. (2016). *No it is*. Walther König.
- Laruelle, François. (2017). *Principles of non-philosophy*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Latour, Bruno. (2018/2017). *Down to earth: politics in the new climatic regime*. Polity.
- Lupasco, Stéphane. (1951). *Le principe d'antagonisme et la logique de l'énergie. Prolégomènes à une science de la contradiction*, [Eng. the principle of antagonism and the logic of energy. Prolegomenon to a science of contradiction]. Hermann & Co.
- Næss, Arne. (1999). *Det frie mennesket—En innføring i Spinozas filosofi*. Kagge.
- Ramstad, Otto. (2019). *Lineage*. Dance performance. [KHiODA](#).
- Samuelsen, Geir Harald. (Ed. 2022). [The palimpsest](#). KMD/UiB.
- Simondon, Gilbert. (2005). *L'individuation à la lumière des notions de forme et d'information* [Eng. Individuation in Light of Notions of Form and Information]. Editions Jérôme Millon.
- Sloterdijk, Peter. (1983). Critique of cynical reason.
- Snowman, Daniel. (2010). *The gilded stage: a social history of the opera*. Atlantic books.
- Spinoza, Baruch. (1677). *Ethica—Ordine geometrico demonstrata*. Public domain book.
- Warburg, Aby. (2020). *Der Bilderatlas Mnemosyne*. Hatje Cantz verlag.