



Lodging the moon in a course following the contours of the rooftop (Rosenhof movie)—or, any other horizon—as a subject of desire. A desire which is at once optic (relative to the camera) and semiotic (relating to references to Surrealism), as is the grinding of granite foundation on its base. The learning theatre works in the production/reception of this desire.

A common understanding is that *if* the ‘work of reception’ is successful it will—by the mere fact of its success—override the work of production, dictate its terms and determine where it should go as it moves onwards: whether it is work in progress, or the maker is moving on to a new work. Today, I discussed this with Farhad Kalantary who claimed that *Rosenhof* would be his last film—after a moment of hesitation... “of this kind”. So, it has something final about it. The time-travel in the cinematographic expression found its explanation today: the animation was made from photos.

It had taken him 5 years to make the film: it started in 2019 and ended this year (in 2024). Maybe scheduled for a premiere in May. The background for his opting for working from stills was the following. When he wanted to work in the Rosenhof school during the pandemic, he was at first debarred. When he got access in 2021, the school was empty but floors, walls and staircases were tagged with security directions for Covid. Since it was not a movie about the Covid, these materials would have to be removed frame by frame. Thereby it became simpler to work with photographs.

The backdrop for his project was the full history of the institution since the building was completed and it opened in 1917, was used for a year (or so) to accommodate immigrants, then it became the largest integral school (primary, middle and real school [Norwegian system]) till WWII, when the building was taken over by the SS (with air-artillery mounted on the roof), and again incorporated the language school for foreigners. Rosenhof features a multi-layered history of domestic populations, education, occupation and finally the Norwegian courses. Rosenhof is now “on the couch”.

So, it really was a school building that was in for analysis (in a psychoanalytic sense). As with all such analyses, the movie is marked by the work of time: it is the visual outcome of 5 years of work. With the slow and time-consuming work that Kalantary put into photoshoots at the location, working with them in [Photoshop](#), then in [Motion](#) (animation program) and finally in [Final Cut Pro](#). It that was not it, he returned to the site, shot new photos and so on. All this I was ignorant of when I wrote back to him from the preview.

Private Project
Enter Password

Rosenhof
Share: [f](#) [t](#) [p](#) [e](#) [m](#)

Overview Credits Specifications

Rosenhof, HD video, Color, Sound, 13:40 min, 2024
Rosenhof is a short animation film exploring the emotional conditions of a historical building in Oslo.
Taking the building on a journey of self-reflection the film is loosely based on the history of the building and its changing occupants. Rosenhof avoids the use of any text and narration, and does not attempt to tell the hi-story of the building. It rather tries to reveal what the building might have sensed, felt and experienced.
(Due to the low resolution of this PREVIEW file you might notice some image distortions and pixelations. They do not appear on the screening copy.)

Project Links
[Website](#)

Director Biography - Farhad Kalantary

Farhad Kalantary (Tabriz, 1962) is a visual artist working with film, video, sound and installations. He studied at San Francisco Art Institute (MFA, 1996) and San Francisco State University (BA, 1992). He lives and works in Nesodden, Norway.

How It Works Browse Festivals Testimonials Help Contact
Terms Privacy Logos

The objective of the exercise—on his part—was to see if something would emerge that he had not seen, thought about or worked with himself: in the sense that I would pick up on the dead angles of the work, and accidentally pick up on his blind spots, for him to consider in his final touch on the movie. None of this happened however, because he was mainly concerned with visual and aural qualities that I could not detect on my system. I would have needed a larger screen and better audio to do that. But it seems that I verbalised some things he had thought about.

Seeing exchanges such as this one in terms of a *transaction* could be interesting in the sense that it also could serve to clarify the question: how to take

matters further/onwards once the work of reception has been delivered? It seems to me that, foreshadowing a talk about the movie that we might have at the premiere, that what I intended an analytic approach could be used by the film-maker for di-dactic purposes of relating the reception and referring to it as context. While from the vantage point of the reception didactical input—when he gave more historical background—is its analytic interest.

In the case of this specific reception, the many facets of the life of the building from 1917 onwards, contributed in adding depth to the Surrealism-reference in the reception: WWI, domestic immigrants, school, WWII, SS headquarters, language course for foreigners. When truth is put on the table/shared it has intrinsic finality to it, causing other queries—and their attached notions—to end: that is they have an impact on the subject. This crossover I understand as the didactic interpolation which may have been what Kalantary expected. However, it was the analytic interpolation hitting in.

My Surrealism reference—referred to *the path of historical necessity breaking its path through the human unconscious and the language of dream-work, to manifest itself in the form of coincidence* (Breton)—was “true because I feel it.” Having that knowledge, feeling acquires the status of *interception* and feeling is accepted as *proof*. Coincidence (or, I would say *contingency*) is where desire and history meet. This was formulated as a pitch to a survey that Breton conducted together with Eluard in the *Minotaure* magazine, seeking to reconcile Marx and Freud on this particular point.

Reading through the responses that they received in return, the contents revealed the cultural/psychological ruins of French society and values from before WWI. The respondents were basically asked to relate events that, in aspects, appeared to them as having happened by design or accident. The Freud and Marx loop (above)—which is characterised by its being extremely economical—was *not* really the matter of discussion, but it served the purpose of establishing a restricted space for the reader of the survey, affording an *analytical* reception of the responses.

The definition of the *learning theatre*—as an optical device and a semiotic laboratory—is to offer a launch-pad for *both* interpolations: both didactic *and* analytic. The nature of transactions including *scale* is that if the outcomes are didactic in the learning theatre, then they are analytic in the expanded field around the learning theatre. And if it they are analytic in the learning theatre, they are didactic in the expended field. Which is to say that there are aspects of what we call transactions that are *intraactive*: affecting the embodied subject-object ratio through the vehicle of instrumentation. Which is at the basis for our definition of the *affect*: between subject and object there is the affect.

An example of a didactic to analytic transaction—*not* prone to serve the di-vision between artist and scientist—is when I worked on modelling a walkabout with a group of research librarians from the National Library of Norway (NLN) at KHIO. Here, my approach was clearly didactic (below, left) when I lined up a trajectory through the building—prompting a dialogue between the 2 professional staffs through the intermedium of the workshops—with the help of a narrative logic based on *materiality* (and to some extent inspired by the Bauhaus iris). A narrative in record and replay.

I am wondering whether the professional staff with a basis in artistic education, will retort with an analytic interpolation, the success of which depends

EARTH (α)	1. ceramics
FIRE (β)	2. metal
WOOD (γ)	3. model & prototype
PAPER (δ)	4. print
CHANGE (ε)	5. academy of fine arts
MOVE (ζ)	6. dance
ACT (η)	7. theatre
SING (θ)	8. opera
DESIGN (ι)	9. design

on whether it is surprising and generating opportunities for strategic collaboration, in the professional encounter with the staff from the NLN. If so, I will have something further to discuss with Farhad Kalantary and Rosenhof. Because there is the question of the art-work being *structurally* homeless in a way resembling the homelessness of Lacan's *cabinet*: since they both operate within the fundamental premise of working within an enclosure—e.g. the 5 years Kalantary has been working on the film—while at working with public matter (*res publica*).

The learning theatre comes about, in this regard, from the joinery of the cabinet and the public space: though it takes place, it is *not* locked to the site by blood and

soil. The learning theatre is therefore akin to [Hakim Bey's TAZ](#) (temporary autonomous zone).