



Box 1—A congregation of pigeons on the power-lines above track 1 of Lillestrøm station. It is said that pigeons orient themselves in flocks by [flying in circles](#). It makes one wonder what the lineup above is, in contrast. Is it resting pose? Or, does the lineup feature a way of identifying a location. If the latter, linear expressions need not be banal. We readily assume that a lineup metes out distance. But if it serves to identify a location—in communicative terms—it is far from trivial. On the contrary, it is testimonial: a witness action.

Truth is up to a point: no matter how short the delay, truth is always in *hindsight*. The verbal tense of truth, is therefore *future anterior*. When told, truth approaches it obviation like Zeno's paradox: its completion is a receding horizon, and there will always be a [remainder](#). In this sense, truth is without exception theoretical—or, *semiotic*: it will always be possible to doubt it. On the other hand, truth is always beckoned from somewhere beyond ourselves: and the readiness to respond to its calling, the readiness to proceed and take action based on this call, indicates conscience/intent.

Impact—what truth produces (Lacan)—is ever in progress: it is what we understanding as the physical/actual world. Whether it is our digestion (personal), the horizon (perennial), or our gestures (proximal). It always exceeds truth, moving us beyond our present imagination, without for that reason being excessive. The impact anticipates on truth by covering the remainder even before it exists. Whether truth and impact will ever meet each other's mark, therefore remains an *open question*. Or, rather, it is opened *by* the question in a growing, developing, explanatory relation.

That is, what essentially defines *anaptúxis*. Truth emerges from the cracks of the impact, as William Kentridge's [less good idea](#): it engages us in a pursuit where we never catch up. But make our peace with the situation, and accept that truth and impact can be maintained *superposed*, by virtue of the capacity we have at maintaining truth and impact in a relation of [double exposure](#). A kind of *double ontology* maintained by focussing two fragments of being unto a single point, keeping them focused, while reaping from the entanglements at the edges, within/beyond the merger.



Box 2—Above: dodecahedron in a Bifloral cut, superposed to a shop-sign of a [book store](#): note that the light the creature needs to read is placed on the bookworm's tail.

Here, truth and impact *never* become one thing. But inasmuch as we keep them superposed—which can be achieved through training—the track record will feature a tangle moving through changes of connectivity across the proximal (achieved by superposing the personal and the perennial), and will manifest a change in the subject/object relationship (with the work of time). The relationship between truth and impact is a linear function maintained by a willed effort: $f(\text{truth} + \text{impact}) = f(\text{truth}) + f(\text{impact})$. In other words, it communicates affectively: in flight-lines.

This means that the unity between $f(\text{truth} + \text{impact})$ which *I maintain* can be assessed as $f(\text{truth}) + f(\text{impact})$ by *someone else*: but then randomly either as $f(\text{truth})$ or as $f(\text{impact})$. This is the principle of superposition—a *homomorphism*—applied in *quantum physics*: which

is a *homeomorphism* (topology; the properties are deformed, but preserved). The one is anthropological (it can be sustained) other is physical (the unity is not sustained but intercepted alternately as the one or the other). The relation between *will* and *effort* is of the same kind as between truth and impact. $f(\text{will} + \text{effort}) = f(\text{will}) + f(\text{effort})$: the Bifloral cut in the topological version.

Here it is *either* the will *or* the effort which is intercepted when will-and-effort are joint by someone else, but they can be maintained in theory (Fredrik Barth 1966, p. 15): define this challenge: «Human behaviour is 'explained' if we show (a) the utility of its consequences in terms of values held by the actor, and (b) the awareness on the part of the actor of the connection between an act and its specific results» These aspects cannot be observed conjointly, but their unity can be maintained in theory (again by will and effort combined). An understanding of action in context.

In this scope, the quantum void is a transposition of free will into the realm of sub-particle physics. The centre anticipated and postponed by the act of superposition—perhaps as the essence of performance—is activated only on assumption that truth-and-impact/will-and-effort feature a whole, and therefore are defined by a centre. By becoming lodged in the *quantum void*, the centre obviates number of discoverable but unpredictable affordances, that exist by virtue of being *ascribed* to pure existence. The quantum field *is not*, but in an active tense responding to *being*.

But the point of reflecting about truth-and-impact in terms of an energy-audit becomes more obvious as we move to will-and-effort. The energy-aspect becomes obvious when we take e.g. *trauma* into consideration. The energy aspect was addressed by Freud, in his following & aftermath, in a number of different ways. However, if define trauma as truth-and-impact in a *frozen*—and *numbed*—relationship, as the result of [shock-and-awe](#) (and in response to it). That is, an attempt at gaining control through the maintenance of truth-impact in a frozen, and numbed, relationship.

By frozen I mean passive and active at the same time: posing conjointly as un/important, defining pseudo-explanations—without placing too much stock in them. Adding to this, traumas are on repeat. So, a trauma does not have to be caused by major harm. It can simply emerge from leaving the fluidity of the dynamic truth-impact relationship, for a wannabe frozen, static and passive one. What is to the credit of the psychoanalytic tradition is that it has show the psychodynamic profile of trauma: it is not static, frozen nor passive. But it initiates, it never completes.

Which is why it is in the nature of the trauma to be ongoing (or, in progress). And that its relation to truth is adjourned: it is fixed/frozen in anticipation and postponement of an updated and flexible superposition. However, if trauma is linked to an energy-exchange, it is an indication of that *there is*



Box 3—Two gargoyles of the Cathedral of our Lady in Freiburg in Breisgau (Germ.). In this handout they are not considered as individuals but as a pair. If G = gargoyle then $f(G_1 + G_2) = f(G_1) + f(G_2)$. While the face of the mooning G_1 is uncovered, the reading G_2 's face is covered. Naïveté and nature, counterposed to culture and cunning. That is, S_1 and S_2 .

indeed such an exchange. If we consider that this exchange is of a *communicative* nature—*both* in the sense of truth *and* impact—then we may take into consideration that in any work that communicates effectively, we will take stock of the fact that the *last hand* we put on the work, is the *first* to be spotted by someone else. Not now and then. Always!

Which means that we become engaged in games—and simulations—in which what appears to us in the *sequence* truth-impact, always has a corollary *consequence* of impact-truth. Also will and effort: it also writes effort-will. They thereby tangle with one another in a metamorphic relation between body and object. We clear that as aspects of *form* in sculptural ornamentation. But it also distinguishes the communicative *material*. The topsyturvy gesture does *not* communicate a specific content, but the *intent* and *act* of communicating as such: the signifiers S_1 and S_2 .