

K har skogskart, så vi drar til nye steder hver gang. Denne gangen gikk vi en 8-kantet rute i ca. 2 timer. En del av den blir kaldt Bois de Silence - store mørke trær uten en bevegelse på bladene, ingen fugler og bare 1 menneske m. hund møtte. Tror jeg ville syntes det var litt mist å gå alene der. Etterpå lotte vi etter en gammel sømersk aqueduct men den kunne vi bare gjette!

From La Kahina's diary from 1985, an excursion to the Fontainebleau forest, as she thought she was moving to Charlotte Andersen's vei 13: a work of living.

In the life-form of the diplomatic residence—as a form of residency—the distinction between the *quotidian* and the *mundane*, is more significant than between the private and the public. The mundane will reside in an array different locations. The home is but one of these. The quotidian has a similar distribution. It is not confined to the home, but extends to a variety of arenas on which daily business is conducted: a visit to the baker/butcher is not mundane, a visit to the hairdresser might be. The type of errand, the extent of conversations and the subjects covered.

Therefore the distinction between private/public is simply not native to the way a diplomat lives and dwells: the difference between the mundane and quotidian is a perambulatory border, one that is *never* fixed, but continuously negotiated with others. One that is named, that counts, is subject to characteristics and evaluated continuously. Either over dinner, in letters, a diary and so on. In other words, there is a track record of the quotidian/mundane that is continuously ongoing. It is therefore better to think of it as a *différance*: a differences that generates/begets differences.

Or, if you will, an active model screening for events, intercepting and framing them: it alternates between being marked by event, and attracting them. At this point, it is impossible to tell where exactly the diplomatic form of residency—the form of life of the travelling family—belongs in the classical hierarchy of the class-system. Since at very core of this vocation is to devote oneself to *social mobility*: one concerned with the screening, interception and framing of information. Diplomats cannot be pledged to maintain their status in the country they come from and work for.

They depend on achieving a minimum of social mobility on local terms. Though they are loyal to their home-country, their relation to it—in terms of cultural values—can become quite

complicated. Social relations to other people in the trade are only exceptionally intimate, but stable across time and place. The “radar” on which they pick up on events that mark them, or attracted by them, is *paper*. Different qualities of it. That is, in the time of the career and life-span of the husband and wife team: the diplomat K. and his wife La Kahina, in their 12-residency journey/sojourn.

The letters from K were typed by a secretary—who, by name is one who keeps secrets—while the letters from La Kahina were handwritten. There were no type-writers at home. The computer was K's first first-hand experience with the QWERTY board. Which means that the domestic paper-trail was constituted by documents brought home by K. and La Kahina's profuse hand-written production:



Another [paper trail](#): receipts from acquired electronics and dress.

letters, to be sure, but also her diaries, the legacy I am working with. Her manoeuvres at the quotidian/mundane frontier reverberates with [Camilla Collett's](#), from her 1863-64 journey.

But much more of it, since La Kahina was not an author and kept to her diaries. K was aware that the handwritten diaries were the paper trail of the household. Not only in the aftermath, as they aged, but in real time: there are oblique references in the diaries to messages from him, asking her —with a point of irony— to redact his performances a bit. Generally, however, the diaries are beyond his reach: they appear to be activity that K appreciates, but they essentially belong to La Kahina's affairs. And these affairs, keeping them in order, were her part of her job at his side.

By processing them on my iPad their importance and value changes. They also change in the wake of having done some work on the transcripts from Camilla Collett's letters, that Marius Wulfsberg sent to me. The parallels between the care and toil at the quotidian/mundane frontier was evident to me. And although the parallels to the life of diplomats and the Grand Tour of yore also seems obvious, the fact of it reflected in Camilla Collett's correspondence resulted in cultural transfiguration of the diaries: it brought the menial aspect of them on the map of cultural history.

Or, it *makes it*, in contemporary terms, *compute*. Which is what interests me at this time. What happens with crossed-out garbles when noted as  $\leftarrow\rightarrow$ . It is like making a point of something that was never intended as one: "this is illegible, so I cross over it to make sure that it isn't (or, no ulterior attempt at reading is invited)". It is similar to the *point d'ironie* or the irony-stop? There is a confusion between what it *counts* for and how it is *named*. Is it used to indicate that there is irony —count this as irony— or does it stop irony? Is this ambiguity ironic? Should that be indicated?

Is there an end to irony once it has been marked (in other words can there be a stop?): ????... The irony stop was invented by the French author Alcanter de Brahm at the end of the XIX<sup>th</sup> century. The notation for the crossed out garble  $\leftarrow\rightarrow$  is similar to the irony-stop in the sense that it does not only note the unreadability of the garble, but the fact that the author whose handwriting we contemplate has deemed it unreadable. It is like erasing the garble by marking it. And the transcription makes a point of it: *the removal from presentation, is what becomes represented*.

This is what Badiou calls the *point of excess*. The ledger between presentation and representation tips in the direction of the latter. Like the *point d'ironie* the *point d'excès* contains its own denial. Like crossing out a garble says: this should not be read. So, it is a spot where we cross from *epistemology* (a content that can be known) to *ontology* (a being that is questionable). *One whose*

*being is questionable as a result of something that s/he has expressed*: falling off the grid of a good reputation, is the most threatening that can happen to a diplomat. In other words: rumour. Or, in our time: the arresting works of the meme.



The coolness of a meme arguably comes from its not only being a digital garble, but that it also is crossed out as it can be changed/obliterated at any time/moment.

When someone is in the business of actionable knowledge or operable understandings—of which the diplomat is a case in point—reputation is decisive, of course. Which is also why attacking that reputation is a vulnerable point (*point de vulnérabilité*). So, the attack and its denial (the signature or alt-right harassment) is what we may be better advised at looking for in memes, rather than their visual display. Or, the visuals are but a small part of the meme. The premise of *denial* is as cause. Vulnerability constitutes the signaethics of the meme and its math.

Camilla Collett's correspondence is weary of the dangers of rumour. La Kahina also in her musings over K's career. Perhaps one could say that the shadow of diplomacy is rumour, and the meme it's vehicle: with the fundamental premise of rumour being that it doesn't/hasn't happened. It is neither named not counted: so it is not, but exists. In Badiou, the mode of existence—like in

mathematics—is the *multiple*. Hence the possibility that codes as  $\leftarrow\rightarrow$  and  $\S$  is the math of memes. Writing is not the last word. I suggest that we want to query is the assumption that writing is the end of the line. Memes arguably contend this as crossed-out garbles that are indigenous to the internet, just as the marks discussed here operate between paper-trail and screen.