



Nataliia Korotkova and Nina Tsy/bolskaia write in their <u>VIS exposition</u>: "Our body scale reflects our environmental perception; humans are aware of what is behind their heads as well as what is in front. Koffka once stated 'What is it that lies between the 'in front' and the 'behind'? – 'Just that phenomenal object we call the Ego' (Koffka, K. 1935. *Principles of Gestalt Psychology*. New York: Harcourt, Brace). A bit further down they infer: "What, then, lies between the 'up' and 'down'? Perhaps the phenomenal object we call The Memory." What then of the above image (**Fig.1**)?

It is an *intermediate* angle: in this angle, **a)** 'in front' and 'behind' [Ego] is *preserved* along with **b)** 'up' and 'down' [Memory]. What I will venture to discuss here is the impact of assuming that this angle is the angle of *signification*. In **Fig. 1** the viewpoint is not a satellite—the angle is less than 90°—and could be a GoPro shot from a kite/hang-glider. In terms of the Ego (Koffka) and Memory (Korotkova, Tsy/bolskaia) an "exchange" is taking place: the Ego and Memory have to give something to one another for *signification* to occur. A joint perspective of materialist mathematics.

Suppose that to every *operation* (here, the moving rock [Ego]) is associated a *distribution* (here, a track where the rock has been [Memory]). Then consider that at some angles the operation and distribution will achieve an unstable equilibrium; while, at other angles, they will simply fall apart. Which means that at some angles a *mapping* will occur. So, if we have a group **G** of *rocks* and a group **H** of tracks, there will a smaller group at which a mapping occurs. Let us call *f* the function that maps the rocks unto the tracks, then the mentioned group prefiguring mapping is *ker(f)*.

That is, the *kernel* of *f*. It results from a the kind of calibration that precedes a mapping. A sign, in this understanding, features a turn at which the give/take between Ego and Memory, opens up the field for questioning (that would not otherwise concern). Obviously questions are asked in verbal



**Fig. 2**—In this diagram we are exploring the relation—in variable proportion—between  $T_0$ ,  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ . If the relation between rock and track has a operational scope ( $T_1$ ) and a distributive scope ( $T_1$ ), then in they come together in relation ( $T_2$ ) where significance may be queried of meaning. Outside of this the rock w/track can be a sign with no meaning.

language. However, the explication of the *sign* in terms of *group algebra*, is not established by passing through language. But has to do with the relation between human being, apparatus and certain critical adjustments: *signs* are, in this sense, emergent and material. The time of the rocks. The time of their tracks. What comes out of the photo in **Fig. 1** is not only that there are rocks and trails, but also patterns.

A pattern is an emergent structural property, resulting—in the above case—from a certain angle in combination with a certain altitude. Further up or down, we know that the pattern will disappear. And within an even narrower interval, the pattern will disconnect from the operational and distributive functions: here, the rocks and the tracks. When the pattern gains too much

## (handout)

autonomy our perspective becomes structuralist. When the pattern stops being a structural form generated from a process, it also takes off from the materialist approach we take on here.

So, there is the problem of loosing pattern on the one side, and the problem of loosing generative process on the the other side. One way of escaping this is that there is *no* such thing as structure —except in pure mathematics—and there is only *hetero-structure*. That s, structure which is constitutively linked to something *else* which is not structure: *the generative process where operational and distributive functions combine to form a pattern* (in this sense a pattern is always a heterostructure). Then it is possible to study the preservation and loss of structure mathematically.

If we move *from* rock *to* cave, then we are back to Korotkova & Tsy/bolskaia's exposition. Here the elementary problematic of angle and distance that have been considered up to this point, is no longer elementary; but complex and multiple. This is exactly what their scan of the Kvithellehula: it is the multiplication of the problematic of angle and distance determining *ker(f)* above. What kind of track can be expected to be left by a cave (instead of a rock)? The multi-directional scanning of the cave from which the video is made, reverberates the multidirectional scanning afforded by *text*.

As when we read the text materials in the exposition: the *letters included* into the architecture of the exposition, as correspondence, makes this connection. Can we see the *cave* and the *correspondence* in a similar relation, as the *rock* and the *tracks*? Yes, probably: if the approach to the humans engaged with this—Nataliia, Nina and people like me—is immersive, in the sense of being willing to inhabit the cave (under different weather conditions) and having the sense that a cave, even if hollow, is precisely *not* empty: having acted as the occasional shelter for people.

Moreover, this sense of the cave is replicated in the body-text—in larger portions than the correspondence—where the historical references are never narrated in detail, but rather endowed with a readiness for reception: the historical references, likeness, language and performance is, in the same way as the cave, a hollow. A hollow that is filled and emptied by readers, whom in this way are not materialising the content permanently. But instead contributing with new layers (of which the cave is already swarming). Homomorphism is the mathematics of how forms travel.

Let us round up by returning to the transactions between Ego and Memory: if the Ego grows beyond proportion, Memory suffers. Likewise, steeping ourselves into the deepest recesses of Memory can affect/remove our ability to act. So, in different situations, we balance off the two of these in different shares/ratios. Within the affordance of the balance—once struck—we can move/ act and observe/learn at the same time. This is by no means trivial and general: it happens from time to time, occasionally and with lower/higher frequency according to work and talent.

It is made possible because the spectre of what is left out—depending on the bargain—will define *exformation*: if you will, the equivalent of a hollow in an informational sense (Kenya Hara). The proportion, share or *ratio* of information *and* exformation is what will occasionally strike *significa-tion* (like striking gold). In this sense, value comes *before* meaning, rather than being derived from



Fig. 3—Photo. Here there is no pattern, there is only a rock and a trail. Only stone and track. Stone migration in Jezero crater. We can intercept this as a sign—in the relation between operative and distributive functions—but it does not have to mean anything. With the pattern we can begin to ask about its meaning. The math can be good for that.

meaning: or, it is what comes *beneath* meaning (as the other of meaning, which thereby belongs to heterostructure). If we abandon ourselves to what comes before meaning, that will become a wellspring of *meaning*. To be taken lightly.

Imbuing meaning with a sense of gravity, is missing the point. We often assume that if the relation between a rock and a track is a sign, it says something about linguistic meaning. But, as we have seen, this is not necessarily so. *Linguistic* meanings can be in a *heterostructural* relation to *signs*: that is, in the sense that language is founded in signs, but cannot take off from signs without loosing something essential. But language can be used to wake up signs.