

Thesis
stef meul

2012-2013

dirty art department

00m00 (Jerszy about
communism)

"the only thing to do is to interpret the life through the self.
while it is not about the self."

can't remember that name he mentioned yesterday.

Appearance during moving, something Bourges.

Seems to be the name of a cathedral in France dedicated to St-Stephen

00m00 (stef)

"So, yeah. Let's figure this out ey. yes,

I think for me, the most interesting question. Well lets say the question now is like:

Although there is the individual, like capital one or capital I, and there is the thing which is shared by everyone, like capital C or the community or the communal. So, how can: 1) like in a relation of love, where the one identifies with the other and there is a mix taking place of the identity of that capital I through the perception of the other. 2) An identification with the beliefs about the other or the beliefs that the other has about the capital I. How can they share this fluid identification, this fluid feeling of connection, of support and challenging, without feeling that need to possess themselves or anything?

That is the question now."

03m06

condition conditionné - deleuze -

artaud - depth-surface - carrol in
w o n d e r l a n d - p a v l o v -
behaviorism - left right -right left -
semiocapitalism - bifo berardi -
power - sm - social environment -
nature nurture - love anger fear -
c a l m - h a p p y - a n g r y - s a d - 8 -
chronos likes banana's .

intercutting with word magic quotes

The salon with the patroness as a place to make the man bark in a detailed fashion.
The stammtish as a place to get wasted and commit to multiple social suicide.
The tertulia w

Time to write

INTRO

In the first place I would like to address you, the reader; or rather we, being the ones that have read this previous and following text. The main question for us could then be asked: if we are free to make a living, how to value the next thing that appears to be done? In other words: in which way does the potential for personal authority validate the capacity of meaningful embodiment in a continuous singular life cycle? When a single answer would be given, a next proposition could most likely appear in the form a single digit word with a singular literal appearance, instantaneously brainwashing itself into sanity. Since proven to have failed in this attempt, there might be some significance in continuing this deviatory attempt.

What is meant with: 'How does culture realize its legitimate capacity?' In respect to the three chapters : 1) Ten things to do before you die - Neotopia at our window. 2) Analysis of the experimental economy of effort. 3) Script for the transformation of Time is Money into the implementation of Time is Art.

Starting, with a proposal called 'Ten things to do before you die - Neotopia at our window' in which we will come to denote certain topics derived from 'The Logic of Sense' by Gilles Deleuze. These topics are in this case to be mainly gathered around a few of the series of what I'll refer to as 'time, dimension and operation'. Simultaneously, a few works are to be addressed in respect of their psycho choreographic potential.

Subsequently, we will enter in the more applied form of the proposition called 'Analysis of the Experimental Economy of Effort', phonetically referred to as 'EEOE'. In this analysis, analysis is conducted in an objective-subjective-subjective-objective manner; referred to as 'OSSO'. For some ideas of a reference like: 'breaking the mirror in the instant of glueing the broken pieces seamlessly together, whatever. Just being in some literal aktionistic zen state kind of way, if known what is meant with that.' Most of the 'EEOE' will consist out of derived text and scrambled material, mainly authorized by the author. The intersection here will take place with an argumentation on the organizational aspects of the proposition. A method will be loosely addressed called 'cooperative cultural conception' although not in respect of formalized or historic post- or predecessors. In reference to other references: "The coming Boogie Woogie", "The Shario For Mario", and the behavioral sciences are also to be applied in the 'OSSO' argumentation.

To conclude the proposition a script is formulated. Within the measurable, an implementation of the concept 'Time is Money' (TIM) is transformed into an implementation of the concept 'Time is Art' (TIA). In other words: 'Tim belongs to Tia because without her he will become no more.' The script structures itself into a constellation of potentiality. The cultural activities derived from the script operate on: 1) the full transformation of the experience of time, 2) within a choreographed instantaneous, although indefinite implementation of form. 3) with disregard to negotiation on the relation of the real with the spectacular.

Finally, as a coda to the proposal, I have included a transcript of a lecture series that has taken place at PAF with Marten Spangberg during a french norwegian magical summer of the year 2012.

ABOUT

Performance Art : *"Meant that it was live, and it was art, not theater. Performance Art also meant that it was art that could not be bought, sold or traded as a commodity."*

The individual - being a source of action in most relevant economic transfers - defines it's abilities to execute voluntary any type of movement, in order to achieve it's desired outcome.

Performance Art - Art History 101 Basics;
Available from <http://arthistory.about.com/cs/arthistory10one/a/performance.htm>;
Accessed 30 May 2012.

Magic : *"Genius is another word for magic, and the whole point of magic is that it is inexplicable." Margot Fonteyn. "Magic is believing in yourself. If you can do that, you can make anything happen." Johan Wolfgang von Goethe. "Many secrets of art and nature are thought by the unlearned to be magical" Sir Francis Bacon.*

This medium allows the writer to convey its reasonable message - alongside its irrational cause - with the ultimate aim to evoke comprehension whilst reading.

Finest Quotes;
Available from http://www.finestquotes.com/select_quote-category-Magic-page-0.htm;
Accessed 30 May 2012.

Can we think of, and state adequately and incisively, what we mean by universe? For universe is, inferentially, the biggest system. If we could start with universe, we would automatically avoid leaving out any strategically critical variables. We find no record as yet of man having successfully defined the universe-scientifically and comprehensively-to include the nonsimultaneous and only partially overlapping, micro-macro, always and everywhere transforming, physical and metaphysical, omni-complementary but nonidentical events.

Fuller, Buckminster. "Operating manual for Spaceship Earth". Buckminster Fuller Institute.
Available from <http://www.bfi.org/about-bucky/resources/books/operating-manual-spaceship-earth>
Accessed 18 April 2012.

CHAPTER 1 : TEN THINGS TO DO BEFORE YOU DIE - NEOTOPIA AT OUR WINDOW

Either ethics makes no sense at all, or this is what it means and has nothing else to say: not to be unworthy of what happens to us.

...

Bousquet goes on to say: "Become the man of your misfortunes; learn to embody their perfection and brilliance." Nothing more can be said, and no more has ever been said: to become worthy of what happens to us, and thus to will and release the event, to become the offspring of one's own events, and thereby to be reborn, to have one more birth, and to break with one's carnal birth - to become the offspring of one's events and not of one's actions, for the action is itself produced by the offspring of the event.

Logic of Sense, Twenty-first series of the event, page 149-150; Gilles Deleuze

TIME

The experience of time has had several historical interpretations which go beyond the scope of the proposition. The interest in time here focuses on the experience, not on the interpretation of time. Within a division of time in Chronos and Aion and the imperceptible instant of the clinamen, we are still not at all close to an experience of time, merely a description of it. To write about time is to propose a certain timing, with a certitude of transformation by the reader, in any way also not intended in the proposition.

At the same time, the reading of time relates the reader to an endless complexity of points of reference, supposedly from where to measure the time continuum from. As a part of departure within this propositions timing, we will depart from this time: the time you are in. Meaning, the time: in which we happen to have been in. Meaning, the time: in which we happen to have happen to have been in. Etcetera.

This sense of timing, or rather nonsense, timing of timing to reveal itself as unsustainable to a human consciousness. A challenge to even the most intelligent and persistent human being would result in a failure the moment it falls asleep or dies, since the next human could then only carry on counting, or restart and count longer-shorter or faster-slower than the previous. The relativity of time should not be stressed in this regard, since the interest in the experience of time reveals a more certain timing. In regard to the Aion and its singular succession of points along a straight line in future and past, never present: the experience of time, often regulates itself towards habitual patterns within a relative variation of conditioned durational form. This experience of time in its habitual timing should not be confused with the chronology of time and its relational forms of cause-effect, problem-solution, etc. It only proposes an individual sense of timing and refrains from generalizations towards collective interpretations of time. In this sense the experience of time is not Chronos devouring the individual pre- and post-maturely, it merely calls for an authority within the individual towards the constitution of its own timing along the singular points of the Aion.

Just as the present measures the temporal realization of the event - that is, its incarnation in the depth of acting bodies and its incorporation in a state of affairs - the event in turn, in its impassibility and impenetrability, has no present. It rather retreats and advances in two

directions at once, being the perpetual object of a double question: What is going to happen? What has just happened? The agonizing aspect of the pure event is that it is always and at the same time something which has just happened and something about to happen; never something which is happening. The x, with respect to which one feels that it just happened, is the object of the "novella"; and the x which is always about to happen, is the object of the "tale" ("conte"). The pure event is both tale and novella, never an actuality. It is in this sense that events are signs.

Logic of Sense, Tenth series of the ideal game, page 63; Gilles Deleuze

These effects are not bodies, but, properly speaking, "incorporeal" entities. ...

They are not things or facts, but events. We cannot say that they exist, but rather that they subsist or inhere. ...

They are not substantives or adjectives, but verbs. They are neither agents nor patients, but results of actions and passions. They are "impassive" entities - impassive results. They are not living presents, but infinitives: the unlimited Aion, the becoming which divides itself infinitely in past and future and always elude the present. Thus time must be grasped twice, in two complementary though mutually exclusive fashions. First, it must be grasped entirely as the living present in bodies which act and are acted upon. Second, it must be grasped entirely as an entity infinitely divisible into past and future, and into the incorporeal effects which result from bodies, their actions and their passions. Only the present exists in time and gathers together or absorbs the past and future. But only the past and future inhere in time and divide each present infinitely. These are not three successive dimensions, but two simultaneous readings of time.

Logic of Sense, Second series of paradoxes of surface effects, page 5; Gilles Deleuze

1) Having at least once seven orgasms within one night and day.

Having the experience has an unforeseeable affect on the sense of time. It becomes clear that the age people give themselves, poorly reflects any sense of experience of time developed within that period of time. The main condition we give to time in order to let it structure our behaviors, is what we believe to be work. Labour time and Leisure time division of the modern age has ended a while ago, since the digital online time has gained full-time presence. In the current age given, the time given to work serves more to organize social behavior than that it serves productional needs. Would there be something called unemployment if the time to work would be available for money to be made from? And who would ever have the time to pay for this work?

The consequences of the argumentation of the experience of time and all its possible values are here inscribed within the personal timing of the individual. The question is in that sense not 'how are we to organize our time to do things that we can't do by ourselves', but rather 'while doing this, also doing what we ourselves are doing'?

And on second thought, perhaps he did leave one great idea behind him. It is charmingly illustrated in this anecdote from the autobiography of his son, Robert Dale Owen. "When the child screams from temper, my dear Caroline," said his father (Robert Owen), "set him in the middle of the nursery floor and be sure you don't take him up until he stops crying." "But my dear, he'll go on crying by the hour." "Then let him cry." "It might hurt his little lungs, and perhaps throw him into spasms." "I think not. At all events, it will hurt him more if he

grows into an ungovernable boy. Man is the creature of circumstances."

"Man is the creature of circumstances," and who makes the circumstances but man himself? The world is not inevitably good or bad but to the extent that we make it so. In that thought Owen left behind him a philosophy of hope more powerful than all his fanciful notions about spades and plows or money or Villages of Cooperation.

The wordly philosophers; page 116; Robert Heilbroner

Their critique of mass culture is quite complex and was based on the belief that culture had become a form of domination. For them, the industry was selling a package of ideas and beliefs. People no longer had to think since "the product prescribes every reaction by signals." It is characterized by a pervasive manipulation of the consumer, whose intellectual capacity is continually underestimated. There is simply a profusion of sameness and repetition by using sets of interchangeable details, sweeping away all particularity and flattening out anything distinct. The reification of the art world causes its autonomous parts to lose both their qualitative distinctiveness and their immanent intrinsic properties.

Adorno, World of art and what is at stake; Moya K Mason

The new book came out in 1904. Factual or not, it was even more coruscating and still more curious than his first. For the point of view that it advocated seemed to fly in the face of common sense itself. Every economist from the days of Adam Smith had made of the capitalist the driving figure in the economic tableau; whether for better or worse, he was generally assumed to be the central generator of economic progress. But with Veblen all this was turned topsy-turvy. The businessman was still the central figure, but no longer the motor force. Now he was portrayed as the saboteur of the system!

Needless to say, it was a strange perspective on society that could produce so disconcerting a view. Veblen did not begin, as Ricardo or Marx or the Victorians, with the clash of human interests; he began at a stage below, in the nonhuman substratum of technology. What fascinated him was the machine. He saw society as dominated by the machine, caught up in its standardization, timed to its regular cycle of performance, geared to its insistence on accuracy and precision. More than that, he envisaged the economic process itself as being basically mechanical in character. Economics meant production, and production meant the machinelike meshing of society as it turned out goods. Such a social machine would need tenders, of course - technicians and engineers to make whatever adjustments were necessary to ensure the most efficient cooperation of the parts. But from an overall view, society could best be pictured as a gigantic but purely matter-of-fact mechanism, a highly specialized, highly coordinated human clockwork.

But where would the businessman fit into such a scheme? For the businessman was interested in making money, whereas the machine and its engineer masters knew no end except making goods. If the machine functioned well and fitted together smoothly, where would be a place for a man whose only aim was profit?

Ideally, there would be none. The machine was not concerned with values and profits; it ground out goods. Hence the businessman would have no function to perform - unless he turned engineer. But as a member of the leisure class he was not interested in engineering; he wanted to accumulate. And this was something the machine was not set up to do at all. So the businessman achieved his end, not by working within the framework of the social machine, but by conspiring against it! His function was not to help make goods, but to cause breakdowns in the regular flow of output so that values would fluctuate and he could capitalize on the confusion to reap a profit. And so, on top of the machinelike dependability of the actual

production apparatus in the world, the businessman built a superstructure of credit, loans, and make-believe capitalizations. Below, society turned over in its mechanical routine; above, the structure of finance swayed and shifted. And as the financial counterpart to the real world teetered, opportunities for profit constantly appeared, disappeared, and reappeared. But the price of this profit seeking was high; it was the constant disturbing, undoing, even conscious misdirecting of the efforts of society to provision itself.

The wordly philosophers; page 235; Robert Heilbroner

At start, to abandon the familiar sense of time result often in less or more psychological destabilizations. The first thing that mostly happens when loosing track of time, is a loss of self. As if within the new time experience, the name has been lost. This often leads to a great deal of panic and a swift restoration of previous systems of time. The experience then resides in the memory, where it has both no time at all, and all the time of the world to resurrect itself almost instantly. Since this experience of the loss of time is only experienced consciously by a mystified minority of people - often people with great difficulty to adapt to commonly accepted norms regarding time - the understanding of it remains under a regard of psychiatric suspicion.

Similarly, every dream has the potential to experience time within larger borders of the awaken conceptual constrains of identity. The intention of an own system of timing within each individual addresses a form of self released from the historical backgrounds of history wherein times are considered privately or commonly owned. The nameless experiences a sense of timing greater than itself, although this greater sense of timing is unilaterally the pre-individual experience of the nameless. The self thus becomes the main producer and consumer of its own timing without respect to other time values. And the nameless self experiences a greater sense of time beyond itself, uniquely and obliquely produced by the self.

All these reversals as they appear in infinite identity have one consequence: the contesting of Alice's personal identity and the loss of her name. ...

For personal uncertainty is not a doubt foreign to what is happening, but rather an objective structure of the event itself, insofar as it moves in two directions at once, and insofar as it fragments the subject following this double direction. Paradox is initially that which destroys good sense as the only direction, but it is also that which destroys common sense as the assignation of fixed identities.

Logic of Sense, First series of paradoxes of pure becoming, page 3; Gilles Deleuze

I propose that we begin by recognizing, as Beaudrillard (1983:26-7) says of Watergate, that the Milli Vanilli "scandal" was not a 'real' scandal at all but rather a 'scandal effect' used by agencies of power and capital to "regenerate a reality principle in distress." Power requires for its working a matrix of significant oppositions and "capital, which is immoral and unscrupulous, can only function behind a moral superstructure" (ibid.:27). Simulation threatens the structures on which power and capital depend by implying that moral, political, and other distinctions are no longer meaningful: the Right is the Left; the Mediatized is the Live. " When it is threatened today by simulation (the threat of vanishing in the play of signs), power risks the real, risks crisis (ibid.:44). Beaudrillard (ibid.:12-13) also points out that: When the real is no longer what it used to be, nostalgia assumes its full meaning. There is a proliferation of myths of origin and signs of reality; of second-hand truth, objectivity and authenticity. There is an escalation of the true, of the lived experience... And there is a panic stricken reproduction of the real and the referential.

Live performance in a mediatized culture; page 109; Philip Auslander

2) Looking at something disgusting until the reflex to vomit accustoms into perverse fascination.

V

\$

€

^

— —

i

o

The small heredity is the heredity of instincts, in the sense that the conditions or kinds of life led by the ancestors or parents may take root in the descendant - sometimes several generations later - and act in her as nature. A healthy foundation, for example, is rediscovered; alcoholic degradation is passed from one body to the other; or instinct-object syntheses are transmitted at the same time that lifestyles are reconstituted. Whatever leaps it may undertake, this heredity of instincts transmits something well-determined. It "reproduces" whatever it transmits; it is a heredity of the Same. But this is not at all the case with the other heredity - the heredity of the crack - for, as we have seen, the crack transmits nothing other than itself. It is not tied to a certain instinct, to an internal, organic determination, or to an external event that could fix an object. It transcends life-styles; it therefore runs its course in a continuous, 'imperceptible', and 'silent' way, forming the complete unity of the Rougon-Macquart. The crack transmits only the crack. That which it transmits does not allow itself to be determined, being necessarily vague and diffuse. Transmitting only itself, it does not reproduce that which it transmits. It does not reproduce the "same." It reproduces nothing, being content to advance in silence and to follow the lines of least resistance. As the perpetual heredity of the Other, it always takes an oblique line, being ready to change directions and to alter its canvas.

Logic of Sense, Phantasm and modern literature, page 324-325; Gilles Deleuze

But now comes the Schumpeterian contradiction: capitalism may be an 'economic' success, but it is not a 'sociological' success. This is because, as we have already seen, the economic base of capitalism creates its ideological superstructure - rational rather than romantic, critical rather than heroic, designed for men in lounge suits, not armor. In the end it is this capitalist frame of mind, this capitalist 'mentality', that brings down the system:

Capitalism creates a critical frame of mind which, after having destroyed the moral authority of so many other institutions, in the end turn against its own; the bourgeois finds to his amazement that the rationalist attitude does not stop at the credentials of kings and popes but goes on to attack private property and the whole scheme of bourgeois values.

And so the great entrepreneurial adventure comes to an end, not because the working class has risen up or because the system has finally been unable to master a worsening succession of crises, but simply because the atmosphere has changed. Personality and force of character count for less; bureaucratic management for more. Innovation itself becomes institutionalized and reduced to routine. The bourgeois family, the great transmission belt of capitalist values, becomes infected with the disease of rationalism. The bourgeois family loses faith in itself. Thus, while things are going well at the surface, "there is a tendency toward another civilization that slowly works deep down below."

The wordly philosophers; page 302-303; Robert Heilbroner

"This, that all work is now pleasurable; either because of the hope of gain in honor and wealth with which the work is done, which causes pleasurable excitement, even when the actual work is not pleasant; or else because it has grown into a pleasurable habit, as in the case with what you may call mechanical work, and lastly (and most of our work is of this kind) because there is conscious sensuous pleasure in the work itself; it is done that is, by artists."

...

"But to answer my question, as to how you gained this happiness." "briefly", said he, "by the absence of artificial coercion, and the freedom for every man to do what he can do best, joined to the knowledge of what productions of labour we really wanted. I must admit that this knowledge we reached slowly and painfully."

News from Nowhere; page 69-70; William Morris

One other matter is related to the vigesimal mathematics that the Mayan used to express the science of time. Vigesimal mathematics - count by 20 as distinct from decimal, or count by 10 - express a higher order or reality, because its progression follows an exponential binary curve. This curve is based on doubling the base numbers 1,2,4,8,16,etc., and increasing their power by 20, hence 1,20,400,8000,160000,etc. Rather than the static linear advance of the decimal system by powers of 10 - 1, 10, 100, 1000, 10000, 100000 and 1000000, the seventh order of 10 - the seventh order of the vigesimal code creates a ratio of 64 to 1: 1, 20, 400, 8000, 160000, 3200000, 64000000. This is more than just a quantitative difference. ...

The vigesimal counts with their exponentially advancing binary progressions have more in common with biology and the intrinsic harmony of nature and art than with the money system that is based on the decimal. The 20-count and its scientific base, the Law of Time, establish a mathematical foundation for mental perceptions that are of a higher-dimensional order, one characterized by syntropy - energetic increase in ever greater harmonies. A fundamental equation of the Law of Time states: $T(E) = \text{Art}$, energy factored by time = art. All of nature is a fundamental harmony, where evolving consciousness attains its purpose through increase of art and the perception that reality is aesthetic; hence the premise of the Law of Time: Time is art.

Manifesto for the Noosphere; page 58-59; José Arguelles

DIMENSION

When Kierkegaard's hero demands "the possible, the possible or I shall suffocate," when James longs for the "oxygen of possibility," they are only invoking the a priori Other. We have tried to show in this sense how the Other conditions the entire perceptual field, the application to this field of the categories of the perceived object and the dimensions of the perceiving subject, and finally, the distribution of concrete Others in each field. In fact, perceptual laws affecting the constitution of objects (form-background, etc.), the temporal determination of the subject, and the successive development of worlds, seemed to us to depend on the possible as the structure-Other. Even desire, whether it be desire for the object or desire for Others, depends on this structure. I desire an object only as expressed by the Other in the mode of the possible; I desire in the Other only the possible worlds the Other expresses. The other appears as that which organizes Elements into Earth, and earth into bodies, bodies into objects, and which regulates and measures object, perception, and desire all at once.

What is the sense of the "Robinson" fiction ? What is a Robinsonade? A world without Others. Tournier assumes that Robinson, through much suffering, discovers and conquers a great Health, to the extent that things end up being organized in a manner quite different than their organization in the presence of Others. They liberate an image without resemblance, or their own double which is normally repressed. This double in turn liberates pure elements which are ordinarily held prisoner. The world is not disturbed by the absence of the Other; on the contrary, it is the glorious double of the world which is found to be hidden by its presence. This is Robinson's discovery: the discovery of the surface, of the elemental beyond, of the "otherwise-Other" (de l'Autre qu'autrui).

Logic of Sense, phantasm and modern literature, page 318-319; Gilles Deleuze

Paradox appears as the dismissal of depth, a display of events at the surface, and a deployment of language along this limit. Humor is the art of the surface, which is opposed to the old irony, the art of depths and heights.

...

One could say that the old depth having been spread out became width. The becoming unlimited is maintained entirely within this inverted width. "Depth" is no longer a compliment. Only animals are deep, and they are not the noblest for that; the noblest are the flat animals. Events are like crystals, they become and grow only out of the edges, or on the edge. This is, indeed, the first secret of the stammerer or of the left handed person: no longer to sink, but to slide the whole length in such a way that the old depth no longer exists at all, having been reduced to the opposite side of the surface. By sliding, one passes to the other side, since the other side is nothing but the opposite direction. If there is nothing to see behind the curtain, it is because everything is visible, or rather all possible science is along the length of the curtain. It suffices to follow it far enough, precisely enough, and superficially enough, in order to reverse sides and to make the right side become the left or vice versa.

Logic of Sense, Second series of paradoxes of surface effects, page 9; Gilles Deleuze

From denotation to manifestation, then to signification, but also from signification to manifestation and to denotation, we are carried along a circle, which is the circle of the proposition. Whether we ought to be content with these three dimensions of the proposition, or whether we should add a fourth - which would be sense - is an economic or strategic question.

...

Thus the condition of truth would be defined no longer as the form of conceptual possibility, but rather as ideational material or "stratum", that is to say, no longer as signification, but rather as sense.

...

Sense is both the expressible or the expressed of the proposition, and the attribute of the state of affairs.

...

It is exactly the boundary between propositions and things. It is aliquid at once Extra-Being and inherence, that is, the minimum of being which befits inferences. It is in this sense that it is an "event": on the condition that the event is not confused with its spatio-temporal realization in a state of affairs. We will not ask therefore what is the sense of the event: the event is sense itself.

Logic of Sense, Third series of the proposition, page 16 - 22; Gilles Deleuze

As there is a certain wish within the writer to draw connections between uncertain matters of interest, there is a similar urge to withdraw from certain conclusions to be made. The unwritten process becomes a simple attempt to posit itself in a relative field between other relative statements as reference. What is written is, in respect to literary form, a mediocracy with no definite ground that would be able to determine its consistency. Mainly nonsense. Within the dimension taking place as a result of textual signs, there is a blind spot appearing amidst propagated language and mystifications. From a relative viewpoint of empiricism, this could appear as a failure of articulation. From the viewpoint of no viewpoints, this attempts no more than nothing. Whether a written form has any power outside of its own dimension, remains a debate within its linguistic limitation. The dimension which precede 'this' word, are in a manner of speaking: alike the human that figured out the 'hu' in 'man' and then started to sing 'lulaby'.

Anything goes, from the non-referential point of view, although there is also nothing proven about the correctness, or useless aspects of the proposition.

According to the esoteric standpoint, music is the beginning and end of the universe. All actions and movements made in the visible and invisible world are musical. That is: they are made up of vibrations pertaining to a certain plane of existence. Music is called sangita in Sanskrit, signifying three subjects: singing, playing and dancing. These three are combined in every action. For instance, in the action of speech there is the voice signifying singing, the pronunciation of words signifying playing, and the movements of the body as well as the expression of the face signifying dancing.

The Mysticism of Sound and Music; page 9; Hazrat Inayat Khan

The empty debate on the spectacle - that is, on the activities of the world's owners - is thus organized by the spectacle itself: everything is said about the extensive means at its disposal, to ensure that nothing is said about their extensive deployment. Rather than talk of the spectacle, people often prefer to use the term 'media.' And by this they mean to describe a mere instrument, a kind of public service which with impartial 'professionalism' would facilitate the

new wealth of mass communication through mass media a form of communication which has at last attained a unilateral purity, whereby decisions already taken are presented for passive admiration. For what is communicated are orders; and with perfect harmony, those who give them are also those who tell us what they think of them.

Spectacular power, which is so fundamentally unitary, so concentrated by the very weight of things, and entirely despotic in spirit, frequently rails at the appearance in its realm of a spectacular politics, a spectacular justice, a spectacular medicine and all the other similarly surprising examples of 'media excess.' Thus the spectacle would be merely the excesses of the media, whose nature, unquestionably good since it facilitates communication, is sometimes driven to extremes.

Comments on the Society of the Spectacle; page 5; Guy Debord

With the advent of the 12:60 frequency, the different art wholes characterizing planetary civilization through the first twelve baktuns of the cycle of history came "under attack." During the thirteenth baktun, the art wholes of both the evolved literate as well as the primary preliterate cultures are being disintegrated. In their place is the rise of secular socially disassociated art with the individual artist pursuing his/her own individualistic destiny, each one attempting to imprint his/her own style, seeking acclaim and fortune thereby. This competitive ethos breeds eccentricity and degeneration, redeemed by the almost superhuman effort of a few individual geniuses scattered across the landscape of increasingly industrialized time - from Mozart, Beethoven, and Van Gogh to John Lennon, Andy Warhol, and Jimi Hendrix. In the end the gritty urban styles of punk rock, hip hop, and graffiti dominate the global industrial art whole with an often-jarring effect meant to punctuate the boredom of everyday consciousness.

And yet in the phase preceding the Noosphere one finds in the practice of all the contemporary arts a heightened consciousness, as dissonant as it may sometimes be, that exhibits an awareness of the great thought ocean of the universe, the ocean of the pre-eminent power of the always existing Supermind. The most genuinely inspired artist is one who, realizing this cosmic power, instinctively proceeds to act as if he/she is creating the universe anew. Such acts or gestures of universal creation are mythic enactments of the primordial pattern of reality. By "mythic" we mean (in this context) without any preceding thought, art emerging as a configuration of primal power. This is the basis of originality.

However, in the Noosphere, as long as all beings attain to cosmic consciousness, all beings are artists, and therefore all beings are cosmic channels. This is not so different from the pre-noospheric era of the mobile phone, which functions as every person's channel. But the mobile phone channel is a closed system limited to the extent of the power and scope of one's ego. The artist/beings who attain cosmic consciousness transcend egoic limitations and commune directly with different orders of galactic being and intelligence, informing their modes and forms of expression with a universal appeal.

Manifesto for the Noosphere; page 160-161; José Arguelles

All publicity works upon anxiety. The sum of everything is money, to get money is to overcome anxiety. Alternatively the anxiety on which publicity plays is the fear that having nothing you will be nothing.

Money is life. Not in the sense that without money you starve. Not in the sense that capital gives one class power over the entire lives of another class. But in the sense that money is the token of, and the key to, every human capacity. The power to spend money is the power to live. According to the legend of publicity, those who lack the power to spend money become literally

faceless. Those who have the power become lovable.

Ways of seeing; page 137; John Berger

If a child were led to make judgments concerning the interpretative quality of the various Batmans or Cinderellas he or she had seen - such as : "I liked the Cinderella at Eurodisney better" or "This guy did Batman better when we were last at Six Flags" - then the performances would have been dismal failures precisely because they, like Tamara, are instances where live performance aspires to the condition of mass art. These instances also suggest how live performance may participate in the economy of repetition, not just by being recorded and replicated, but through the mass production of the live event itself.

I return now to Benjamin's observation on what he called "contemporary perception" and its hunger for reproductions. "To pry an object from its shell," he writes, "to destroy its aura, is the mark of a perception whose 'sense of the universal quality of all things' has increased to such a degree that it extracts it even from a unique object by means of reproduction" (Benjamin 1986 (1936):32). I have tried to suggest here that this is exactly the state in which live performance now finds itself: its traditional status as auratic and unique has been wrested from it by an ever-accelerating incursion of reproduction into the live event. ...

This situation represents the historical triumph of mechanical (and electronic) reproduction (what I am calling mediatization) that Benjamin implies: aura, authenticity, and cult value have been definitively routed, even in live performance, the site that once seemed the last refuge of the auratic.

Live performance in a mediatized culture; page 54-55; Philip Auslander

Seeing is believing

Historically, one consequence of the reification of music in recordings is the century-old separation of the musical experience from live performance, and, particularly, the aural experience of music from its visual experience. The critical impact of the gramophone when it became widely available in the 1890s was "a vital shift in the experience of listening to music: the replacement of an audio-visual event with a primarily audio one, sound without vision" and it is from this original point that the culture of popular music, and its emphasis on the aural aspects of music performance, has evolved (Laing 1991:7-8). Nevertheless, sound recording certainly did not render the visual aspects of music irrelevant; indeed, listening to recordings may always be a visual as well as an aural experience. Evan Eisenberg distinguishes the experience of monophonic and stereophonic recordings by saying that: "Stereo... arrays the musicians before you in an empty space... The introduction of stereo... changed the phenomenology of the phonograph by adding a spatial, and hence visual aspect" (Eisenberg 1987:64-5, my emphasis). Eisenberg's point is an important one:

when sound is divorced from sight by virtue of technological mediation, the aural experience nevertheless evokes a visual one: "every mode of record listening leaves us with a need for something, if not someone, to see and touch." (ibid.:65)

Live performance in a mediatized culture; page 85; Philip Auslander

Doubtless, the present situation is highly discouraging. We have watched the war machine grow stronger and stronger, as in a science fiction story; we have seen it assign as its objective a peace still more terrifying than fascist death; we have seen it maintain or instigate the most terrible of local wars as parts of itself; we have seen it set its sights on a new type of enemy, no longer another State, or even another regime, but the "unspecified enemy"; we have seen it put

its counter guerrilla elements into place, so that it can be caught by surprise once, but not twice. Yet the very conditions that make the State or World war machine possible, in other words, constant capital (resources and equipment) and human variable capital, continually recreate unexpected possibilities for counterattack, unforeseen initiatives determining revolutionary, popular, minority, mutant machines. The definition of the Unspecified Enemy testifies to this: "multiform, maneuvering and omnipresent... of the moral, political, subversive or economic order, etc.," the unassignable material Saboteur or human Deserter assuming the most diverse forms."

A thousand plateaus, page 422; Felix Guattari & Gilles Deleuze

We do not seek to demean any artist but to question how one work of art could be valued at millions and another to be virtually of no value at all? This is not the purpose or reason for art in the cosmo-biological perspective. Our whole sense of art and its purpose must be overhauled. It is not just some sideline activity that is of questionable economic purpose, but the very essence of our being and nature in the cosmic scheme of things. It is how nature works out her design in conscious and super-conscious structures of meaning.

If in the Noosphere we are going from "time is money" to "time is art," what does it mean?

We have to imagine that the structural basis of the entire planetary social order is reorganized so that the highest priority is given to artistic expression - not just individual expression but to collective artistic expression well. Art is not merely an activity practiced during leisure time, as in today's economic context; on the contrary, it is the very essence of all human activity including economic. This means that the human is no longer a passive consumer of packaged entertainment but an active participant in the whole co-creative process of being alive in the universe. This shift in the fundamental existential role of the human in the natural order is accompanied by a heightened activity of the psychic being, of the expansion of paranormal powers hitherto only dimly perceived or even unknown.

This appraisal of the role of art and the very nature of human existence is not just a result of the devaluation of money or of monetary value altogether, but of a whole shift in perception and our understanding of the nature of consciousness. Art, artistic value, and aesthetics in general play a formative and purposeful role in cosmic evolution, which is really the evolution of consciousness and the attainment of ever more spiritualized states of being. In this evolution, art is the vehicle or medium for consciousness realization.

Manifesto for the Noosphere; page 156-157; José Argüelles

"It is true that in the nineteenth century, when there was so little art and so much talk about it, there was a theory that art and imaginative literature ought to deal with contemporary life; but they never did so; for, if there was any pretense of it, the author always took care (as Clara hinted just now) to disguise, or exaggerate, or idealize, and in some way or another make it strange; so that, for all the verisimilitude there was, he might just as well have dealt with the times of the Pharaohs."

News from Nowhere; page 77; William Morris

Under the traditional schema, live performance authenticated the records, and (usually lip-synched) performance on television was deemed intrinsically inauthentic and, therefore, simply irrelevant to that process. Now, the music video has usurped live performance's authenticating function. The function of live performance under this new arrangement is to authenticate the video by showing that the same images and events occur in the video can be reproduced onstage, thus making the video the standard for what is "real" in this performative realm.

Live performance in a mediatized culture; page 105; Philip Auslander

OPERATION

Business:

The only business is show business.

In societies where contemporary conditions of production dominate, all of life presents itself as an immense accumulation of spectacles. Just as early industrial capitalism moved the focus of existence from being to having, post-industrial culture has moved that focus from having to appearing. Everything that was directly lived has not only moved away into representation, representation has turned to become the formation of imaginary as such.

Within contemporary capitalism the company does not exist outside the producers or consumers who express it. Its world, its subjectivity, its reality merges with the relationships and enterprises that workers and consumers have with each other. Thus, the company seeks to construct a correspondence, an interlacing, a chasm between the consumer and worker and the world, i.e. the company. The expression therein, that is, the creation and realization of the sensible (desires, beliefs, intelligence), precedes economic production. The economic war currently played out on a planetary scale is for many reasons an aesthetic war.

The Coming Boogie-Woogie; page 33; Mychoreography.org

Any society whatsoever has all of its rules at once - juridical, religious, political, economic; laws governing love and labor, kinship and marriage, servitude and freedom, life and death. But the conquest of nature, without which it would no longer be a society, is achieved progressively, from one source of energy to another, from one object to another. This is why law weighs with all its might, even before its object is known, and without ever its object becoming exactly known. It is this disequilibrium that makes revolutions possible. It is not at all the case that revolutions are determined by technological progress. Rather, they are made possible by this gap between the two series, which solicits realignments of the economic and political totality in relation to the parts of the technical progress. There are therefore two errors which in truth are one and the same: the error of reformism or technocracy, which aspires to promote or impose partial arrangements of social relations according to the rhythm technical achievements; and the error of totalitarianism, which aspires to constitute a totalization of the signifiable and the known, according to the rhythm of the social totality existing at a given moment. The technocrat is the natural friend of the dictator - computers and dictatorship; but the revolutionary lives in the gap which separates technical progress from social totality, and inscribes there his dream of permanent revolution. This dream, therefore, is itself action, reality, and an effective menace to all established order; it renders possible what it dreams about.

Logic of Sense, Eight series of structure, page 49; Gilles Deleuze

It becomes a combined contradiction of asceticism and decadence.

It is like two sides of a mirror, only what is one side has no resemblance to what is on the other ("... all the rest was as different as possible"). To pass to the other side of the mirror is to pass from the relation of denotation to the relation of expression - without pausing at the

intermediaries, namely, at manifestation and signification. It is to reach a region where language no longer has any relation to that which it denotes, but only to that which it expresses, that is, to sense. This is the final displacement of the duality: it has now moved inside the proposition.

Logic of Sense, Fourth series of dualities, page 24; Gilles Deleuze

We must say that the paradoxal entity is never where we look for it , and conversely that we may never find it where it is. As Lacan says, it fails to observe its place (elle manque à sa place). It also fails to observe its own identity, resemblance, equilibrium, and origin. We will not say, therefore, of the two series it animates, that the one is originary and the other derived in relation to one another. They can also be successive in relation to one another. But they are strictly simultaneous in relation to the entity by means of which they communicate. They are simultaneous without ever being equal, since the entity has two sides, one of which is always absent from the other. It behooves it, therefore, to be in excess in the one series which it constitutes as signifying, and lacking in the other which it constitutes as signified: split apart, incomplete by nature or in relation to itself. Its excess always refers to its own lack, and conversely, its own lack always refers to its excess. But even these determinations are still relative. For that which is in excess in one case is nothing but an extremely mobile empty place; and that which is lacking in another case is a rapidly moving object, an occupant without a place, always supernumerary and displaced.

Logic of Sense, Sixth series on serialization, page 41; Gilles Deleuze

Mass production:

"No premier, no business" is the guiding idea of this method. Its logic follows the statement, "more premiers, more business". It is a weapon of mass production that believes in the growing quality coming from practice. It can also be said that it follows the logic, practice makes perfect.

The mass production tool is often used in safe environments where the outcome can be explained and justified in front of a small, interested and colleague based audiences. It is not yet really accepted as a method for "real shows" like opening the Impulstanz festival.

Yet many artists are tempted by its benefits.

- It is useful to get rid of procrastination and preciousness. (This effect might only be visible in the particular context where the mass production takes place, yet it gives a well needed rest to the self obsessed artists)

- It effectively reveals tendencies, weaknesses, strengths, problems, areas of failure and areas of success in a nicely statistical way, where the amount becomes the trustworthy factor.

It can be seen as a counter movement to research based non-transparent processes, where months of work lead to no products, no shows, no sharing, no books, no fragrances, but only a bigger understanding of "whatever" for the people involved.

The method is very closely related to the idea of time as a way of framing rather than of time as an obstacle. How often have we not thought, "If I had a little longer this show would have been better, perhaps the best show I have ever done". Possibly a disillusion.

Different ways to put this method into practice:

REDAKTIONEN

You start at 8:30, deadline at 19, half an hour before show time. You need enough material to fill a show lasting the entire evening. If there is nothing, fill it with nonsense, if there is too much material, cut.

The process must go on for a number of weeks to reach optimal results, but a thing cannot be

in twice. This does not exclude the possibility to work on the same topic, subject or idea more than once. The time frame can also change, you can do a show every second day, or twice a day. But the important thing is the repetition and evenly paced interval.

HALF TIME, DOUBLE TEMPO

Decide how long your show is supposed to be, for example full evening, one hour. Create a one hour show in one hour, create a one hour show in half an hour, or create an hour show in two hours. Create a six hour show in half an hour. Or, however you want.

The ways of mass production are plenty and finding your own is legitimate. But the state of mind is important. The performance is and has to be the product of what we do. But it is not what we are. It is simply a snapshot of a omen, like an instagram, sometimes we look good and sometimes it makes us ugly. We know it is only small reflections of a little piece of who we are. The more we produce the better we will know ourselves.

The Coming Boogie-Woogie; page 124-125; Mychoreography.org

It is necessary to understand that the two series are marked, one by excess, the other by lack, and that the two determinations are interchanged without ever reaching equilibrium. What is in excess in the signifying series is literally an empty square and an always displaced place without an occupant. What is lacking in the signified series is a supernumerary object and non situated given - an unknown, an occupant without a place, or something always displaced. These are two sides of the same thing - two uneven sides - by means of which the series communicate without losing their difference.

Logic of Sense, Eight series of structure, page 50; Gilles Deleuze

- 3) Rather than trying to talk about something precious that needs to be expressed, more saying whatever so, in a way of keeping track of what becomes apparent anyway.

The arbitrariness of arbitrary power is therefore not a result of some intrinsic character which would distinguish it for example from modern bio-power, that is, from means that always have an end or some institutional context or particular legitimation (from means that receive their "reason" or legitimation from a particular institution and its task) but from its arbitrary relation to these. This is how the concept of arbitrary power opens the nexus between the floating currency (the floating signifier) and the generic human capacities (intellect, perception, linguistic-relational abilities) as means of production, that is, the nexus between the era when the faith in the sign (or in any external reason directing action) is lost and the production of wealth in modalities that cannot be thought or understood by the concepts of modern economy.

It is precisely this loss of faith that distinguishes arbitrary power from despotic power and the over coding of meaning characteristic to it.

In the Postscript to the Societies of Control Gilles Deleuze says that the changed conception of "money" perhaps best explains the transformation from disciplinary societies to those of control: whereas discipline was always related to molded currencies having gold as a numerical standard, control is based on floating exchange rates, modulations, organizations of the movement of currencies. In short, it tries to follow or imitate movements and exchanges as such, paying no attention to their specific contents.

This is to say that the new formless form of power as a non-state, non-institutional form of intervention, is the logical "form" of power within an economy whose foundation has collapsed (organization without meaning). Knowledge economy is the continuance of capitalism without a foundation, and arbitrary power is its logical form of organization.

Organization without ends

But how can arbitrary power then function and manage without any legal or institutional task or justification?

In the 'Stato di eccezione' Agamben does not get much further than posing this question.

Instead the idea of the production of commonplaces (ethics) opens the door also to understanding such "operating in some other way" than as a means to an end. Let me therefore return shortly to the relation between a self-evidence and pure power.

When we accept a commonplace, a self-evidence, we accept it "as such". We accept it as a repetition of something already known and already said. A self-evidence does not add anything new to a discussion. This is to say, more precisely, that when we accept a self-evidence we accept the person who says it, not because of what he or she says but because of what he or she is: we accept the person as such. This power to get through as such or get through a "message" without any content, a message which does not refer to anything outside itself, defines 'authority'. A contentless message is a pure command, you cannot discuss it, you can only accept it, you can only follow and obey it. It does not say or tell anything outside itself, it only commands and demands acceptance as such. Self-evidence has thus a structure of a pure command where the means detaches itself from the ends and which is thus only in relation to its own medially. This means that it works "in some other way" than as means to an end. Pure command is like a bare manifestation in which the word detaches itself from the thing or act and annuls the idea of the referentiality of language. It breaks the nexus between ends (or reasons, particular tasks, meanings) and means and therefore does not accomplish or say anything outside of itself but only appears and functions. Because of the break it 'cannot' say anything or do anything outside itself but only appear and function.

Just like a bare language is that which is not an instrument for communication, but communicates itself as such (communicatively as such), so arbitrary power or pure power is a pure command which does not refer to anything outside itself (not in relation to means without an end, but only in relation to its own mediality) and can only be followed, it organizes and controls action and thinking by establishing conditions of action and thinking that can only be followed.

But if the functioning of arbitrary power is not based on reasons or on transmitting meanings and information contents, on what is it based? What is organizing without a common cause or interaction without meanings?

There were information ends, where meaningful action and meaningful reasons end, there begins imitation. Imitation is interaction beyond meanings and beyond particular common causes. It is interaction and communication without any particular reason, or interaction and communication in a deficit of information (or where there is too much information).

Or as the empirical studies on investment behavior have shown: what is important in the functioning of collective opinion or "market psychology" is not so much that what is communicated (the information content), but the way in which that what is regarded as a wise investment decision by 'others' is communicated (the communication 'in itself').

Imitation is not about communicating some particular information or about meaningful interaction but about communication and interaction without them. ...

We can for the first time look into eye our being as potential beings without any particular task or function or surrounding, as beings that can do anything and from which anything can be expected. The flexibility of humans, their capacity to live in almost every imaginable environment, to bask in any conceivable ambiance, is an active and not passive faculty. The human being creates its own ambiance and its own problems. It is an animal that is able to change its fate. Arbitrary power over life of the mind organizes and subordinates the species-

being of human beings (ability to create meanings with a reason, ability to create something new) which is without any function and always open to change to the particular and already structured tasks and aims of a particular historical period.

The time of arbitrary power means a redivision or a re-appropriation which is directed at the general characteristics of the human species, at those general properties which make human beings 'humans'. If we want some grounds for politics, it is in the participation in the fight for the direction of this transformation. What is at stake is not just this or that historical fact, or this or that injustice, but the element of change as such. In this fight we have no other resources to turn to except ourselves, that is, this ability to do anything characterizing us. This experience of the bare "I can" does not refer to any particular ability or faculty but to our nature as such. It is the maybe most severe and cruel experience possible: the experience of potentiality. At the moment of the experience of potentiality when we experience at the same time the abundance of our possibilities and the trivialness of all reasons, we can paradoxically only rely on ourselves. When we don't have anything, we can rely on everything.

Everything Under Heaven Is Total Chaos; page 299-301

Two different figures correspond to these two powers. 'First figure': the paradoxical element is at once word and thing. In other words, both the blank word denoting it and the esoteric word denoting the blank word have the function to express the thing. It is a word that denotes exactly what it expresses and expresses what it denotes. It expresses its denotatum and designates its own sense. It says something, but at the same time it says the sense of what it says: it says its own sense. It is therefore completely abnormal. We know that the normal law governing all names endowed with sense is precisely that their sense may be denoted only by another name ($n_1 \rightarrow n_2 \rightarrow n_3 \dots$). The name of saying its own sense can only be nonsense (N_n). Nonsense is of a piece with the word "nonsense," and the word "nonsense" is of a piece with words which have no sense, that is, with the conventional words that we use to denote it. 'Second figure': the portmanteau word is itself the principle of an alternative the two terms of which it forms (frumious = fuming-and-furious or furious-and-fuming). Each virtual part of such a word denotes the sense of the other or expresses the other part which in turn denotes it. Under the same form, the entire word says its own sense and is, for this reason, nonsense. Indeed, the second normal law governing names endowed with sense is that their sense can not determine an alternative into which they themselves enter. Nonsense thus has two sides, one corresponding to the regressive synthesis, the other to the disjunctive synthesis.

Likewise, nonsense does not have any particular sense, but is opposed to the absence of sense rather than to sense that it produces in excess - without ever maintaining with its product the simple relation of exclusion to which some people would like to reduce them. Nonsense is that which has no sense, and that which, as such and as it enacts the donation of sense, is opposed to the absence of sense. This is what we must understand by "nonsense."

It is thus pleasing that there resounds today the news that sense is never a principle or an origin, but that it is produced. It is not something to discover, to restore, and to re-employ; it is something to produce by a new machinery. It belongs to no height or depth, but rather to a surface effect, being inseparable from the surface which is its proper dimension. It is not that sense lacks depth or height, but rather that height and depth lack surface, that they lack sense, or have it only by virtue of an "effect" which presupposes sense.

It suffices that we dissipate ourselves a little, that we be able to be at the surface, that we stretch our skin like a drum, in order that the "great politics" begin. An empty square for neither man nor God; singularities which are neither general nor individual, neither personal

nor universal. All of this is traversed by circulations, echoes, and events which produce more sense, more freedom, and more strength than man has ever dreamed of, or God ever conceived. Today's task is to make the empty square circulate and to make pre-individual and non personal singularities speak - in short, to produce sense.

Logic of Sense, Eleventh series of nonsense, page 67 - 73; Gilles Deleuze

No doubt for a seer it is not necessary to read the thought from the visible form of a person, because he cannot be a seer if he is not open to reflection. Every thought is reflected in him, which makes things even clearer. Besides that, he need not see the picture of the thought on its visible form in order to know it; the atmosphere tells him. The thought itself calls out: 'I am this thought!', whatever it may be, for thought has a language, a voice, thought has breath and has life.

What is imagination?

Imagination is uncontrolled thought.

Is it good to have a strong imagination?

It is good to be strong oneself. If one has strength, then imagination is strong, and thought is strong, and one is strong oneself. Furthermore, a strong imagination means a strength going out from oneself, reaching out without control. Therefore strong imagination is not always promising. It is strength of thought which is desirable. For what is thought? Thought is a self-directed and controlled imagination.

...

One could ask: 'If a person is in prison, is his mind in prison too, or can it reach beyond, can it go out of prison? Certainly it can. It is the body of the man that is in prison. His mind can reach everywhere. Perhaps a thought produced in the mind-world is made captive by its object or motive, by its source, or by its application in a sphere, within a horizon where it is working out its destiny. Nevertheless it is a thought, it is capable of reaching every part of the universe in a moment's time.

How should undesirable thoughts be destroyed? Must this always be done by the person who created them?

Yes, it is the creator of the thought who must destroy it, and it is not in every person's power to do it. Yet the mind which has reached mastery, which can create as it wishes, this same mind can destroy.

Would you explain further what role the brain plays in thinking?

The brain may be likened to a photographic plate. The thought falls upon the brain just as a reflection falls upon the photographic plate - both one's thought and the thought of another. Then there is another process, and that is that the thought is developed like the photographic plate. What is it developed with? Is there some solution in which the photographic plate is to be put? Yes, and that is the intelligence. Through one's own intelligence it is developed and made clearer.

Has one element superiority over another? For instance, is a thought colored by fire superior to a thought colored by another element?

There is no superiority of one element over another. The superiority of a thought is according to the outlook of the mind. For instance, one person standing on the ground sees the horizon just before him; this is one outlook. Another person stands on the top of a tower and from there he

looks at the wide horizon; his outlook is different. It is according to the outlook that the thought is superior or inferior. Besides, no one can take a thought, any thought-picture before himself and say: 'This is an inferior thought', or: 'This is a superior thought'. Thought is not an earthly coin which can be inferior or superior. What makes it inferior or superior is the motive behind it.

The Mysticism of Sound and Music; page 208-209; Hazrat Inayat Khan

4) Becoming a combined contradiction of asceticism and decadence.

"CapitAl K, chrislam"

The paradoxes of signification are essentially that of the 'abnormal set' (which is included as a member or which includes members of different types) and that of the rebel 'element' (which forms part of a set whose existence it presupposes and belongs to two sub-sets which it determines). The paradoxes of sense are essentially that of the subdivision ad infinitum (always past-future and never present), and that of the nomadic distribution (distributing in an open space instead of distributing a closed space). They always have the characteristic of going in both directions at once, and of rendering identification impossible, as they emphasize sometimes the first, sometimes the second, of these effects. This is the case with Alice's double adventure - the becoming-mad and the lost name.

Paradox is opposed to 'doxa', in both aspect of 'doxa', namely, good sense and common sense. Now, good sense is said of one direction only: it is the unique sense and expresses the demand of an order according to which it is necessary to choose one direction and to hold onto it. This direction is easily determined as that which goes from the most differentiated to the least differentiated, from things to the primordial fire. The arrow of time gets its direction, since the most differentiated necessarily appears as past, insofar as it defines the origin of an individual system, whereas the least differentiated appears as future and end.

Good sense is essentially distributive, "one the one hand and on the other hand" is its formula.

The essence of good sense is to give itself a singularity, 'in order' to stretch it out over the whole line of ordinary and regular points which depend on it, but which also avert and dilute it. Good sense is altogether combusive and digestive. It is agricultural, inseparable from the agrarian problem, the establishment of enclosures, and the dealing of middle classes the parts of which are supposed to balance and to regulate one another. The steam engine and the livestock, but also properties and classes, are the living sources of good sense, not only as facts which spring up in a particular period, but as eternal archetypes. This is not a mere metaphor; it ties together all the senses of the terms "properties" and "classes." The systematic characteristic of good sense are thus the following: it affirms a single direction; it determines this direction to go from the most to the least differentiated, from the singular to the regular, and from the remarkable to the ordinary; it orients the arrow of time from past to future, according to this determination; it assigns to the present a directing role in this orientation; it renders possible thereby the function of prevision; and it selects the sedentary type of distribution in which all of the preceding characteristics are brought together.

Good sense plays a capital role in the determination of signification, but plays no role in the donation of sense. This is because good sense always comes second, and because the sedentary distribution which it enacts presupposes another distribution, just as the problem of enclosure presupposes first a free, opened, and unlimited space - the side of a hill or a knoll. Is it then

enough to say that the paradox follows a direction other than that of good sense, and that it goes from the least to the most differentiated, through a whim that might only be a mental diversion?

The power of the paradox therefore is not all in following the other direction, but rather in showing that sense always takes both sense at once, or follows two directions at the same time. The opposite of good sense is not the other direction, for this direction is only a recreation for the mind, its amusing initiative. But the paradox as passion reveals that one cannot separate two directions, that a unique sense cannot be established - neither a unique sense for serious thought and work, nor an inverse sense for recreations and minor games.

"Which way, which way?" asks Alice. The question has no answer, since it is the characteristic of sense not to have any direction or "good sense." Rather sense goes to both directions at once, in the infinitely subdivided and elongated past-future.

Logic of Sense, Twelfth series of the paradox, page 75 - 77; Gilles Deleuze

The mystery of sound is mysticism; the harmony of life is religion. The knowledge of vibration is metaphysics, and the analysis of atoms science; their harmonious grouping is art. The rhythm of form is poetry, and the rhythm of sound is music. This shows that music is the art of arts, and the science of all sciences, and it contains the fountain of all knowledge within itself.

Music is called a divine or celestial art, not only because it is in itself a universal religion, but because of its fineness in comparison with all other arts and sciences. Every sacred scripture, holy picture or spoken word produces the impression of its identity upon the mirror of the soul, but music stands before the soul without producing any impression of this objective world in either name or form, thus preparing the soul to realize the infinite.

The Mysticism of Sound and Music; page 167; Hazrat Inayat Khan

A kind of dancing mystic rhythms in harmony with poetry, seeing sound and music through the 'body' itself.

After vocal and instrumental music comes the motional music of the dance. Motion is the nature of vibration. Every motion contains within itself a thought and a feeling. This art is innate in man. An infants first pleasure in life is to amuse itself with the movement of hands and feet.

...

Tune and rhythm tend to produce an inclination for dance. To sum up, dancing may be said to be a graceful expression of thought and feeling without uttering a word. It may be used also to impress the soul by movement, by producing an ideal picture before it. When beauty of movement is taken as the presentment of the divine ideal, then the dance becomes sacred. In tenderness of heart the tone turn into a half-tone, and with the breaking of the heart the tone breaks into microtones. The more tender the heart becomes, the fuller the tone becomes; the harder the heart grows, the more dead it sounds.

The Mysticism of Sound and Music; page 165-166 Hazrat Inayat Khan

The secret of composition lies in sustaining the tone as solidly and as long as possible through all its different degrees. A break destroys its grace, power and magnetism, just as the breath

holds life and has all grace power and magnetism. ...

Although all art is an improvisation on nature, yet it is only genuine when it keeps close to nature. ...

When the soul desires to express itself in voice, it first causes an activity in the mind, and the mind, by means of thought, projects finer vibrations in the mental plane. These in due course develop and run as breath through the regions of the abdomen, lungs, mouth, throat, and nasal organs, causing air to vibrate all through, until they manifest on the surface as voice. The voice therefore naturally expresses the attitude of the mind: whether true or false, sincere or insincere. The voice has all the magnetism which an instrument lacks, for voice is nature's ideal instrument upon which all other instruments of the world are modeled.

The Mysticism of Sound and Music; page 163-164; Hazrat Inayat Khan

5) Writing what has been said, speaking of what has been written, doing what can't be sufficiently described in symbolic form.

The body is language because it is essentially "flexion." In reflection, the corporeal flexion seems to be divided, split in two, opposed to itself and reflected in itself; it appears finally for itself, liberated from everything that ordinarily conceals it. ...

But if the body is flexion, so too is language. An entire reflection of words, or a reflection in words, is necessary for the flexional character of language to appear, finally liberated of everything that covers it up and conceals it. ...

A flexion that would be opposed to itself and reflected on itself in words. If language 'imitates' bodies, it is not through onomatopoeia, but through flexion. And if bodies imitates imitate language, it is not through organs, but through flexion. ...

One theme runs through the entire work of Klossowski: the opposition between exchange and true repetition. For exchange implies only resemblance, even if the resemblance is extreme. Exactness is its criterion, along with the equivalence of exchanged products. This is the false repetition which causes our illness. True repetition, on the other hand, appears as a singular behavior that we display in relation to that which cannot be exchanged, replaced, or substituted - like a poem that is repeated on the condition that no word may be changed. It is no longer a matter of an equivalence between similar things, it is not even a matter of identity of the Same. True repetition addresses something singular, unchangeable, and different, without "identity." Instead of exchanging the similar and identifying the Same, 'it authenticates the different.

Logic of Sense, Twelfth series of the paradox, page 286 - 287; Gilles Deleuze

Collective activity:

Back in the days, on ancient dance floors, people danced in couples. Man and woman together, coupled up dancing in patterns. Then, disco happened to us, couples split up and dance floors became a group activity. At first, there were specific movements, sometimes patterns, and formations in the room. But with time, also these patterns vaporized, and by the days that techno hit the floors, dancing was complete chaos. Free from compositional bounds, free to loose herself in her own trance, the dancer can dance how she wants. Sometimes she teams up with others, but these temporary bounds are unbound whenever she wants to. She

doesn't have to wait for someone to ask her to dance or couple up with a person of opposite sex. This dance floor is one aspect of an individualized world, where you mind your own business and fulfill your personal desires. It is a dance floor where attachments are shifting, flexibility admired and alliances form and reform. Yet, the dance floor demands a group. They all come to do the same activity in a shared time and space. The parameters of this activity are very defined, and you go there to do exactly this. As the group acts together, they form conventions that tie the group closer together and set the style of which dancing is done. All this happens within the frame of collective activity. You can dance independent of others, but it's impossible to do it alone. There must be shared sweat, someone to bump into, and a floor of swaying, bouncing, shaking people to throw yourself into. The individualized dance is a collective activity, forming groups held together through the creation of conventions.

The Coming Boogie-Woogie; page 46; Mychoreography.org

6) Something being something, while being seeing something being something seeing:
Something being something.

With its highly ambiguous relationship to subjectivity, consciousness, and life itself, we may hence consider the zombie a paradigm of immaterial labor. Both the zombie and immaterial labor celebrate logistics and a colonization of the the brain and the nervous system. The living dead roam the world and have a genetic relationship with restlessness: they are "pure motoric instinct," as it is expressed in Romero's Dawn of the Dead; or they represent a danger "as long as they got a working thinker and some mobility," as one zombie hunter puts it in the novel World War Z by Max Brooks. The latter, counterintuitive reference to the zombie's intellectual capacity may be brought to bear on the terms "intellectual labor" and "cognitive capitalism," used to denote brain-dead - and highly regulated - industries such as advertising and mass media. Or, the "working thinker" in the zombie's dead flesh is an indication of the Marxist truth that matter thinks. As Lenin asked: what does the car know - of its own relations of production? In the same way, the zombie may prompt the question: what does the zombie's rotting flesh know - of the soul? As Spinoza said: what the body can do, that is its soul. And the zombies can do quite a lot.

In Philip Kaufman's 1978 film Invasion of the Body Snatchers, a space plant that duplicates people and brings them back as empty versions of themselves spreads its fibers across the Earth as if it were the World Wide Web. The body-snatched don't just mindlessly roam the cities in search of flesh and brains, but have occupied the networks of communication and start a planetary operation to circulate bodies, as if proponents of the great transformation from industrialism to immaterial labor, in which production is eclipsed and taken over by a regime of mediation and reproduction. This is our logistical universe, in which things on the move are valorized, and in which more than ever before the exchange of information itself determines communicative form. The nature of what is exchanged recedes in favor of the significance of distribution and dissemination. Exigencies of social adaptation, by now familiar to us, also appear in Invasion. Somebody who has clearly been body snatched thus tells the main character played by Donald Sutherland, to not be afraid of "new concepts": imperatives to socialize and to reinvent oneself, shot through with all the accompanying tropes of self-cannibalization (self-management, self-valuation, self-regulation, self-consume, and so forth). Thus the body snatchers are a caricature of ideal being, incarnating mobility without nervousness.

Everything Under Heaven Is Total Chaos; page 148

7 - 9) Action, Realization, Transformation

Art:

Use art as an excuse to do something you anyways would like to do.

The Coming Boogie-Woogie; page 13; Mychoreography.org

Cooperative organizing:

A way of doing it yourself together. Some arguments for cooperative organizing:

- *You are not alone starting and running your own company.*
- *You can share costs, space and administration.*
- *You don't need to work on the same things in order to organize together.*
- *You can assemble a collection of skills and interests so that you all don't have to know everything or do stuff you don't like.*
- *You can have rotating leadership, different areas of responsibility, transparent hierarchy or whatever is suitable.*
- *You build dependencies and responsibilities which can challenge the dominating competition logic between artists.*
- *You can set up cooperatives in different countries where you work in order to access different funding structures, and use the different networks of the members.*
- *You can set up the structure in a way that puts you in the place of the employer or the employee, depending on the members' different need for social security, example parental leave.*
- *You can choose an organizational form in which you can make profit, that can be reinvested in the coop or in coming projects.*
- *You can coordinate employments and projects, incomes and costs in ways where different economies support each other.*

The Coming Boogie-Woogie; page 55; Mychoreography.org

Decision making in a group:

- *One person decides for everyone else.*
- *One person commissions other people to decide.*
- *Voting based - Range voting lets each member score one or more of the available options. The option with the highest average is chosen.*
- *Voting based - Plurality, where the largest block in a group decides, even if it falls short of a majority.*
- *Voting based - Majority requires support from more than 50% of the members of the group. This method almost always makes a group of "losers".*
- *Consensus decision-making tries to avoid "winners" and "losers". Consensus requires that a majority approve a given course of action, but that the minority agree to go along with the course of action. In other words, if the minority opposes the course of action, consensus requires the course of action to be modified to remove objectionable features.*
- *A constantly changing structure of who can decide what and when. The structure is predefined or defined by necessity for each decision or not defined at all.*
- *All decisions are taken informally, depending on the speed of decision processes and relations to external factors or powers.*
- *All decisions are taken informally, depending on internal factors or powers.*
- *A smaller group of persons, minority of the whole group, team up in order make their opinion on the decision is the only one that has more than one follower. This can be done through the smaller group explicitly teaming up, or through silent consensus within the smaller group.*

- Chance operations. You throw a dice.

The Coming Boogie-Woogie; page 58; Mychoreography.org

In a more general way, it was Guattari's intent to reshape the whole of science and technology based on an "aesthetic paradigm". "My intention consists in conveying the human sciences and the social sciences from scientific paradigms to ethical-aesthetic paradigms", he explains. An intent that is akin to a form of scientific skepticism. For him, theories and concepts merely have the value of 'models of subjectivization', inter alia, and no certainty is irrevocable. The primary criterion of scientificity, as stated by Popper, is falsifiability, is it not? According to Guattari, the aesthetic paradigm is called upon to contaminate every chord of discourse, and inoculate the venom of creative uncertainty and outrageous invention in every field of knowledge. Denial of claimed scientific "neutrality": "what will henceforth be on the agenda is the clearance of 'futuristic' and 'constructivist' fields of virtuality". Portrait of the psychoanalyst as an artist: "just as an artist borrows from his precursors and his contemporaries the features that suit him, so I invite those who read me to freely accept and reject my concepts".

Relational Aesthetics; page 96; Nicolas Bourriaud

I could not help being struck with the foolishness of that institution which treated me as if I were mere flesh and blood and bones, to be locked up. I wondered that it should have concluded at length that this was the best use it could put me to, and had never thought to avail itself of my services in some way. I saw that, if there was a wall of stone between me and my townsmen, there was a still more difficult one to climb or break through, before they could get to be as free as I was. I did not for a moment feel confined, and the walls seemed a great waste of stone and mortar. I felt as if I alone of all my townsmen had paid my tax. They plainly did not know how to treat me, but behaved like persons who are underbred. In every threat and in every compliment there was a blunder; for they thought that my chief desire was to stand the other side of that stone wall. I could not but smile to see how industriously they locked the door on my meditations, which followed them out again without let or hinderance, and 'they' were really all that was dangerous. As they could not reach me, they had resolved to punish my body; just as boys, if they cannot come at some person against who they have a spite, will abuse his dog. I saw that the State was halfwitted, that it was timid as a lone woman with her silver spoons, and that it did not know its friends from its foes, and I lost all my remaining respect for it, and pitied it.

Thus the State never intentionally confronts a man's sense, intellectual or moral, but only his body, his senses. It is not armed with superior wit or honesty, but with superior physical strength. I was not born to be forced. I will breathe after my own fashion. Let us see who is the strongest. What force has a multitude? They only can force me who obey a higher law than I. They force me to become like themselves. I do not hear of 'men being forced' to live this way or that by masses of men. What sort of life were that to live? When I meet a government which says to me, "Your money or your life," why should I be in a haste to give it my money? It may be in a great strait, and not know what to do: I cannot help that. It must help itself; do as I do. It is not worth the while to snivel about it. I am not responsible for the successful working of the machinery of society. I am not the son of the engineer. I perceive that, when an acorn and a chestnut fall side by side, the one does not remain inert to make way for the other, but both obey their own laws, and spring and grow and flourish the best they can, till one, perchance, overshadows and destroys the other. If a plant cannot live according to its nature, it dies; and so a man.

Civil Disobedience; page 12; Henry David Thoreau

10) Shape-shift

The abyss:

"Battle not with monsters, lest ye become a monster, and if you gaze into the abyss, the abyss gazes also into you."

(Friedrich Nietzsche)

The Coming Boogie-Woogie; page 226; Mychoreography.org

A semiotic regime is repressive when one, and only one, signified is ascribed to each signifier. Whoever fails to interpret the signs of power in the right way, doesn't wave at the flag or respect their superiors, and breaks the law, is in trouble. However, the semiotic regime we find ourselves in as inhabitants of the semiocapitalist universe is characterized by an excess of speed of the signifiers and stimulates a sort of interpretative hyperkinesis. The typical over-inclusion of schizophrenic interpretation becomes the predominant mode of navigation in the proliferating universe of video-electronic media.

In a chapter entitled 'Toward a theory of schizophrenia,' Bateson defined schizophrenic interpretation thus:

The schizophrenic shows weakness in three fields of the communicative function: a) a difficulty in ascribing the correct mode of communication to messages coming from other people; b) a difficulty in ascribing the correct mode of communication to verbal and non verbal messages; and c) a difficulty in ascribing the right mode of communication to her own thought, sensation and perception (1972: 240).

In the video-electronic info-sphere we all inhabit the conditions that describe schizophrenic communication. Exposed to an overloading of signifying impulses, the human receiver is unable to process the meaning of statements and stimuli in sequence and faces the difficulties listed by Bateson. A further peculiar character of the schizophrenic Bateson mentions is that she does not know how to distinguish metaphor from literary expression.

The peculiarity of the schizophrenic is not that she uses metaphors, but that she uses them without identifying them (1972: 248).

Precarious Rhapsody, Semiocapitalism and the pathologies of post-alpha generation; Semiotics of schizophrenia; page 113;
Franco Bifo Berardi

From that point on, I just followed the Octopress documentation to get up and running. I did, however, run into an annoying issue. Octopress command-line commands often use square brackets, such as: 1\$ rake new_post["My new post's title"] Run it in zsh, though, and you get: 12 \$ rake new_post["My new post's title"] zsh: no matches found: new_post[My new post's title]

The problem is that square brackets are a glob operator in zsh. This blog post pointed me in the right direction. The "solution" is to escape the square bracket characters. 1\$ rake new_post\[
["My new post's title"]\]

Alternately, zsh users can disable zsh's GLOB option. From the Octopress Github issue on this problem, though, it sounds like some tweaks will be added to Octopress to address the issue.

Rap Brendon. "Economy of Effort". Copyright 2011.

CHAPTER 2 : ANALYSIS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL ECONOMY OF EFFORT

Conducted in objective-subjective-subjective-objective manner; also called 'OSSO'.

For some ideas of a reference like: "breaking the mirror in the instant of glueing the broken pieces seamlessly together, whatever. Being just in some literal aktionistic zen state kind of way, known what is meant with that."

ALL PREVIOUS AND FOLLOWING TEXT HAS BEEN HAND-TYPED ON AN AZERTY KEYBOARD

why?

COPY & KNOW (sense of subjective authentication and expression of available information)

READ & REMEMBER (sense of attentive affection and activation of behavioral imagination)

OBJECT X = text

SUBJECT Y = reader

TIME-SPACE W Z = situation

At the end of an age it is worth while to reflect and situate ourselves in order to proceed towards any imaginable version of a potential future.

The history of the twentieth century is the history of the conflict and alliances of three figures. The sage is the heir of human labor, the bearer of the intelligence accumulated by the infinite succession of acts of labor and the infinite series of acts of the refusal of labor. The refusal of labor induces the evolutive motion of intelligence. Intelligence is the refusal of work, actualized into a socially useful form. Because of intelligence it becomes possible to substitute human labor with machines. Because of the refusal of work, science is pushed forward, developed, put into practice. From the outset, modern science has been aware of its function in this respect.

Knowledge multiplies the human capacity to produce useful things and the spaces of freedom for all human beings, by reducing the necessary labor time to produce whatever society needs. This means that to know is to have power. The merchant and the warrior want to turn knowledge into an instrument of power. And to this end they have to subdue the sage. But this does not occur easily, because knowledge does not tolerate domination. Thus, the warrior and the merchant resort to traps and deceit, to submit the power of thinking to the power of money and violence.

Precarious Rhapsody, Semiocapitalism and the pathologies of post-alpha generation; The Merchant, The Warrior and The Sage; page 58 - 59; Franco Bifo Berardi

Refusal of work does not mean so much the obvious fact that workers do not like to be

exploited, but something more. It means that capitalist restructuring, technological change, and the general transformation of social institutions are produced by the daily action of withdrawal from exploitation, of the rejection of the obligation to produce surplus value and to increase the value of capital by reducing the value of life. I do not like the term 'Operaismo', because of the implicit reduction to a narrow social reference (the workers, 'operai' in Italian), and I would prefer to use the word 'compositionism'. The concept of social composition, or 'class composition' (widely used by the group of thinkers we are talking about), has much more to do with chemistry than with the history of society.

Autonomy is the independence of social time from the temporality of capitalism.

This is the meaning of the expression refusal of work. It means quite simply: I don't want to go to work because I prefer to sleep. But this laziness is the source of intelligence, of technology, of progress. Autonomy is the self-regulation of the social body in its independence and in its interaction with the disciplinary norm.

Precarious Rhapsody, Semicapitalism and the pathologies of post-alpha generation; What is the meaning of autonomy today; page 77; Franco Bifo Berardi

The division of time is reducible to a relative minimum instant of singular operations. In other words: to count time by action, not in duration. To generate other sense in the multiplicity of actions taking place, and to intend to reflect upon past related future actions in respect of their organization, and even larger behavioral cycles beyond the individual, the situation can be significant towards a choreographic sense of action within realtime-space. Thus one hour time in this case has a dynamic uncountability depending on the operations brought into action during that period of countable time.

The division of time into actions is an intend to authorize the individual to complete or revise their operations during any form of activity.

The duration of any activity can be measured by other means of time, although the efficiency can not be based on any clock based assumptions of countability. In this time of networked societies, it has become apparent that global atomic clocks allowed for the labor time to synchronize into forms of continuous online Time presents.

During the century of communist revolutions, the Marxist-Leninist tradition disregarded and relegated to the background the notion of the General Intellect, even though in the post-industrial productive transformation it emerged as a central productive force. At the end of the century, thanks to digital technologies and the creation of the global telematic network, the general social process is redefined by the General Intellect and the Leninist conception of the party definitively abandons the stage. Even the Gramscian notion of the organic intellectual loses coherence since it is based on the adherence of intellectuals to an ideology, while what counts now is the formation of a new social concatenation, which we can call the cognitariat, representing the social subjectivity of the General Intellect.

Precarious Rhapsody, Semicapitalism and the pathologies of post-alpha generation; From the organic intellectual to the General Intellect; page 67; Franco Bifo Berardi

Relational aesthetics and constructed situations

The Situationist "constructed" situation concept is intended to replace artistic representation by the experimental realization of artistic energy in everyday settings. ...

The Situationist theory overlooks the fact that if the spectacle deals first and foremost with

forms of human relations (it is "a social relationship between people, with imagery as the go-between"), it can only be analyzed and fought through the production of new types of relationships between people. ...

It is possible to imagine "constructed situations" for private use, and even intentionally barring others. The idea of "situation" extends the unity of time, place and action, in a theatre that does not necessarily involve a relationship with the Other. Artistic practice is always a relationship with the other, at the same time as it represents a relationship with the world. The 'constructed situation' does not necessarily correspond to a 'relational world', formulated on the basis of a figure of exchange.

Is it by coincidence that Debord divides the time of the spectacles into two, between the "exchangeable time" of work ("endless accumulation of equivalent intervals") and the "consumable time" of holidays, which imitates natural cycles while at the same time being a spectacle "to a more intense degree"? The idea of "exchangeable time" turns out, here, to be purely negative: the negative element is not the exchange per se, which is a factor of life and sociability. What Debord identifies, possibly wrongly, with the inter-human exchange are 'the capitalist forms of exchange'.

These forms of exchange stem from the "meeting" between the accumulation of capital (the employer) and the available work force (the employee-worker), in the form of a contract.

They do not represent exchange in absolute terms, but an historical form of production (capitalism). Work time is thus less an "exchangeable time" in the fullest sense, than a 'buyable' time in the form of a salary or wage-package. The work that forms a "relational world", and a social interstice, updates Situationism and reconciles it, as far as possible, with the art world.

Relational Aesthetics; page 84-85; Nicolas Bourriaud

At the end of this time present, wherein the individual is biologically bounded to other forms of activity than continuous labor, the value related to time has necessarily shifted towards value inherent in time, and previously time related.

To act has a duration relative to its countability in numerical form, no matter how precise. Quality or other values are therefore related to the manner any operation is brought into action, relative to its numerical expression in time.

The manner any action affects itself, can be related directly to the altered perception of the 'durationalities' between operation, action, perception.

In more practical terms: the intend to bring operation into action 'to do what is desired' is valued from the individual perception 'exactly, kind of, not at all' during the attachment to the intend. The shift of value, that occurs to notions of time for actions to take place within a commonly accepted norm, becomes an incremental disorder within any human based time system, except for full time automated online systems.

Instead of inventing more jobs for unemployed humans to give meaning to work, in respect of competing with automated full-time (24/7) labour forms, the main value to any human activity would be considered on the individual perception of the operation brought into action.

<https://soundcloud.com/sicksentz/02-sicksentz-aint-different>

In other words: when all necessities regarding modern human needs are fulfilled through automation, the question becomes "now you have all the time and money, how would you want to be doing and what would you want happening to you?"

Info-machines have taken the place of the mother, changing the process of language learning. Certainly the first video-electronic generation did enjoy the mother's bodily presence much less than in the past times. The bodily and affective contact was a factor of singularization of language, and it is lost. Emotion and word tend to divert in these conditions. Desire becomes a dimension which is more and more separated from verbalization, from conscious processing of information. Emotions without words tend to feed psychopathology and violence. Acting without verbal communication is closed to aggression. Words without emotion feed a sociality which is poorer and poorer, reduced to the logic of giving and receiving.

The verbal processing of information and of emotion that is connected to information is compressed in ever accelerated times, and is giving way to a disturbance of emotionality and verbalization. Aphasia can be interpreted as a consequence of the growing distance between info-stimulation and the time needed for the elaboration of info-stimuli. We may see an effect of this acceleration also in the phenomenon of dyslexia? that is especially affecting cognitive workers, those who are exposed to the rhythm of electronic communication. To read a text from the beginning to the end seems to be an impossible task for managers.

Desire dwells in conjunction, and is killed by connection. Connection means a relationship between formatted segments; making desingularized bodies compatible. Conjunction means singular, unrepeatable communication between round bodies. Connection means integration of smooth bodies in a space which is no space and in a time which is no time.

Conjunction is the meeting and fusion of round and irregular shapes that are continuously weaseling their way about with no precision, repetition or perfection. Connection is the punctual and repeatable interaction of algorithmic functions, straight lines and points that overlap perfectly, and plug in or out according to discrete modes of interaction that render the different parts compatible to a pre-established standard. The shift from conjunction to connection as the predominant mode of interaction of conscious organisms is a consequence of the gradual digitalization of signs and the increasing mediatization of relations.

Conjunction is a process of 'becoming other.' In contrast, in connection, each element remains distinct and interacts only functionally. Singularities change when they conjoin – they become something other than what they were before their conjunction. The combination of asignifying signs gives rise to the emergence of meaning which previously did not exist.

Connected bodies are subjected to a kind of progressive inability to feel pleasure, and forced to choose the way of simulating pleasure: the shift from touch to vision, from hairy bodies to smooth connectable bodies. The control on the body does not come from outside. The control is built inside, in the very relationship between self-perception and identity.

When the info-sphere becomes hyper-speedy, hyper-thick, and the impulses are proliferating beyond any limit, we become less and less able to elaborate in a conscious way on the emotional impulses reaching our skin, our sensitivity, our brain. Consciousness is detached from sensitivity, and subjugated by the connective machine.

Autistic behavior can be described as the effect of the inability to feel the other's emotionality, and to project in the other's body pleasure and pain that we feel in our body. Lack of empathy seems to be an endemic effect of the growing time of the exposure of the mind to the accelerated virtual info-sphere.

I'm not reclaiming any authenticity for the erotic self; I'm not fantasizing about the golden age

of sexual happiness. I'm just interested in finding the signs of a pathology in the current proliferation of pornography: namely a pathology of emotionality. This pathology, which is latent in every kind of pornographic product, is highlighted by the mediatization, and especially by the net proliferation of porn. Since image and emotion are separated, the pornographic act (of vision) does not produce the emotional effect we are expecting. So we repeat the act (of vision).

Too few words, too little time to talk. Too little time to feel. Porn is an exercise in emotional automation and uniformity of the emotional time of response. Don't miss the implication between permanent electrocution, the shortening of linguistic attentive elaboration and atrophy of emotional response. Pornography is just the visible surface of this neuro short circuit.

Precarious Rhapsody, Semiocapitalism and the pathologies of post-alpha generation; The obsession with the (vanishing) body; page 100 - 103; Franco Bifo Berardi

The mass of men serve the State thus, not as men mainly, but as machines, with their bodies. They are the standing army, and the militia, jailers, constables, posse comitatus, &c. In most cases there is no free exercise whatever of the judgment or of the moral sense; but they put themselves on a level with wood and earth and stones; and wooden men can perhaps be manufactured that will serve purpose as well. Such command no more respect than men of straw, or a lump of dirt. They have the same sort of worth only as horses and dogs. Yet such as these even are commonly esteemed good citizens. Others, as most legislators, politicians, lawyers, ministers, and office-holders, serve the State chiefly with their heads; and, as they rarely make any moral distinctions, they are as likely to serve the devil, without intending it, as God. A very few, as heroes, patriots, martyrs, reformers in the great sense, and 'men', serve the State with their consciences also, and so necessarily resist it for the most part; and they are commonly treated by it as enemies. A wise man will only be useful as a man, and will not submit to be "clay," and "stop a hole to keep the wind away," but leave that office to his dust at least:

*"I am too high-born to be propertied,
To be a secondary at control,
Or useful serving-man and instrument
To any sovereign state throughout the world."*

He who gives himself entirely to his fellow-man appears to them useless and selfish; but he who gives himself partially to them is pronounced a benefactor and philanthropist. How does it become a man to behave toward this American government to-day? I answer that he cannot without disgrace be associated with it. I cannot for an instant recognize that political organization as 'my' government which is the 'slave's' government also.

Civil Disobedience; page 3; Henry David Thoreau

So what? I have no answer. All we can do is what we are actually doing already: the self-organization of cognitive work is the only way to go beyond the psychopathic present. I don't believe that the world can be governed by reason. The utopia of Enlightenment has failed. But I think that the dissemination of self-organized knowledge can create a social framework containing infinite autonomous and self-reliant worlds.

The process of creating the network is so complex that it cannot be governed by human reason. The global mind is too complex to be known and mastered by subsegmental localized minds. We cannot know, we cannot control, we cannot govern the entire force of the global mind. But we can master the singular process of producing a singular world of sociality. This is autonomy today.

Precarious Rhapsody, Semiocapitalism and the pathologies of post-alpha generation; Fractal time and social pathology;
page 84 - 85; Franco Bifo Berardi

Today's artists appears as an operator of signs, modeling production structures so as to provide significant doubles. An entrepreneur/politician/director. The most common denominator shared by all artists is that they show something. The act of showing suffices to define the artist, be it a representation or a designation.

Co-existence criterion

All works of art produce a model of sociability, which transposes reality of might be conveyed in it. So, there is a question we are entitled to ask in front of any aesthetic production: "Does this work permit me to enter into dialogue? Could I exist, and how, in the space it defines?" A form is more or less democratic. May I simply remind you, for the record, that the forms produced by the art of totalitarian regimes are peremptory and closed in on themselves (particularly through their stress on symmetry). Otherwise put, they do not give the viewer a chance to complement them.

Relational Aesthetics; page 108-109; Nicolas Bourriaud

0.0 production plan (zero point zero)

to be continued

wednesday 12 to 18 = 6 hours / operation
thursday 14 to 20 = 6 hours / organization
friday 18 to 02 = 8 hours / event
saturday 16 to 21 = 5 hours / publication

25 working hours / week

1 euro / minute

720 euro / week

2880 euro / month

50% tax & investments / 50% artist coöperative members

60minutes times 25 hours (1440) times four weeks (5760)

For what kind of things you would pay 1 euro per minute for?

...

Sexy service, massage, a limousine drive, some kind of a performance, or spectacular act.

Someone to listen to you talking shit to them, or try games with them or something.

A good legal advisor, or someone you can trust and has the capacities to get you what you want.

Complete relaxation, or just for inspiration, other information. Maybe just some sweet and loving care, a heart at ends of its despair, or some soup could do.

do 00:01 13-12-2012

Precarious is person who is able to know nothing about one's own future and therefore is hung by the present and praises God to be rescued from the earthly hell (the term precarity derives from praying). We speak of precarious labor when labor is subordinated to a form of flexible and unregulated exploitation, subjected to daily fluctuations of the labor market, and forced to endure the blackmail of a discontinuous salary. The precarious worker is not formally employed, and still his existence is not at all free, the waged relationship is discontinuous and occasional, and still the dependence is continuous and full of anxiety.

Precarious Rhapsody, Semiocapitalism and the pathologies of post-alpha generation; Precarity; page 150; Franco Bifo Berardi

few things to help:

Have your place where you can invite people into.
Live love, no less.
Only do the work that really matters to you.
Don't argue, do.
Work beyond words
And get rid of drugs.

The conscious-feeling organism is enveloped in a flux of signs that are not simply the bearers of information, but also factors of perceptive stimulation and excitation. In the past, artistic experience was founded on the sensorial centrality of catharsis. The work of art created a wave of involvement and excitement that rushed forward towards a climax, a cathartic state of agitation comparable to orgasmic release. In its classical, as well as romantic and modern conceptions, beauty was identifiable with the moment of completion, an overcoming of the tension implicit in the relationship between the feeling organism and the world: catharsis, harmony, sublime detachment. Reaching harmony is an event that can be compared to orgasmic release following the excitement of contact between bodies. Muscle tension relaxes in the fullness of pleasure. In the happy perception of one's own body and the surrounding environment what is at play is an essential question of rhythm, time and lived temporalities. But if, into the circle of excitement, we introduce an inorganic element such as electronics and impose an acceleration of stimuli and a contraction of psychophysical reaction times, something ends up changing in the organism and its forms of erotic reaction. Orgasm is replaced by a series of excitations without release. Orgasm is no longer the prelude to any accomplishment. Inconclusive excitation takes the place of orgasmic release.

In the post-urban dimension of the cyberspatial sprawl, contact seems to become impossible, replaced by precipitous forms of experience that overlap with commercialization and violence. Slow emotion is rare and improbable. And the very slowness of emotion is transformed little by little into a commodity, an artificial condition that can be exchanged for money.

Time is scarce – time can be exchanged for money. Time, an indispensable dimension of pleasure, is cut into fragments that can no longer be enjoyed. Excitation without release replaces pleasure.

Precarious Rhapsody, Semiocapitalism and the pathologies of post-alpha generation; Cybertime, eroticism and desensitization; page 92 - 93; Franco Bifo Berardi

In our post-industrial societies, the most pressing thing is no longer the emancipation of individuals, but the freeing-up of inter-human communications, the dimensional emancipation of existence.

A certain suspicion creeps in with regard to mediative tools, and transitional objects in general. And thus, by extension, to the work of art regarded as a medium whereby an individual expresses his/her vision of the world in front of an audience. Relations between artists and what they produce thus tend towards the feedback zone. For some years now, there has been an upsurge of convivial, user-friendly artistic projects, festive, collective and participatory, exploring the varied potential in the relationship to the other. The public is being taken into account more and more.

this "sole appearance of a distance"

It is in this sense that we can talk of a community effect in contemporary art. It does not involve those corporate phenomena which too often act as a disguise for the most die-hard forms of conservatism (in this day and age, feminism, anti-racism and environmentalism all operate too frequently as lobbies playing the power game by enabling it never to have to call itself into question in a structural way). Contemporary art thus introduces a radical shift in relation to modern art, inasmuch as it does not turn its back on the aura of the work of art, but rather moves its origin and effect. This was the thrust, some time back, of that masterpiece produced by the group General Idea, Towards an audience vocabulary (1977), which skipped the whole art object phase and spoke directly to the audience, offering it patterns of associations. But the audience concept must not be mythicized - the idea of a unified "mass" has more to do with a Fascist aesthetic than with these momentary experiences, where everyone has to hang on to his/her identity. It is a matter of predefined cording and restricted to a contract, and not a matter of a social binding hardening around totems of identity. The aura of contemporary art is a free association.

Relational Aesthetics; page 61; Nicolas Bourriaud

In the absence, then, of a satisfactory and comprehensive definition, we run the risk of defining fascism as every- thing that disgusts us, and of identifying fascism, simply, as the party of imbecility and violence: as the party of evil. And this, naturally, doesn't work, it doesn't define anything. The problem is that to which we are referring by using this word fascism which is imprecise and historically far too dated, is an extremely vast field of forms of life, behaviors, ideologies and prejudices that have, in the last analysis, a single element in common: the obsession with definition. The obsession to define is, in the last analysis, the characteristic common to the field of phenomena that we define as fascism. This is why this object is so difficult to define.

The pressure that seems to fundamentally guide those behaviors which fall within the ambit of fascism is the pressure to recognize ourselves as identical, identifiable, and therefore belonging to a community (of language, faith, race) based upon origin. Only origin bears witness to belonging, and as we know, origin is an illusion, a legend, an attribute that is more or less shared, but unfounded. Ethnic identity does not exist any more than linguistic identity. While each of us comes from a history of crossbreeding and contaminations that can neither be attested nor authenticated, there are illusions of ethnic belonging; while each of us speaks our own dialect that can never be fundamentally translatable by another speaker, there are illusions of linguistic comprehension. Living together is premised on these. The more the field of ethnic identifiability, of comprehensibility, of origin, are perturbed, the more acute becomes the need to identify, to the point of obsession.

Precarious Rhapsody, Semicapitalism and the pathologies of post-alpha generation; Fascism and identification; page 96;

As Walter Benjamin writes: 'all efforts to render politics aesthetic culminate in one thing: war.' The becoming aesthetic of life is one aspect of this mobilization of social energies. The aestheticization of war is functional to the subjugation of everyday life to the rule of history. War forces the global masses to partake in the process of self-realization of the Hegelian Spirit, or, perhaps more realistically, to become part of capitalist global accumulation. Captured in the dynamics of war, everyday life is ready to be subjected to the unlimited rule of the commodity.

From this standpoint, there is no difference between fascism, communism and democracy: art functions as the element of aestheticization and mobilization of everyday life. Total mobilization is terror, and terror is the ideal condition for a full realization of the capitalist plan to mobilize psychic energy.

Precarious Rhapsody, Semiocapitalism and the pathologies of post-alpha generation; Activism; page 128; Franco Bifo Berardi

Cooperative workspace and artist residence

- Modules with 3 to 15 members per cultural producer cooperative.
The members cover for all the workspace expenses.
The workspace provides artwork & gathers a travel budget.
- Partnered investment in energy plus living
The workspace connects to similar venues,
and becomes itself member of an investment fund for energy plus living.
- Local publishing and internet broadcasting
The members publish artwork on an irregular basis, in a regular manner.
The events are preferable broadcasted, or available soon after.
- International trilateral events
The workspace connects to similar venues in multiple geographic areas and
synchronizes its ongoing calendar of international multi-appearance.
- Workshop exchange venues
Among the members in all the venues of the cultural producer cooperatives, the
exchange amongst venues is encouraged to host and guest all members internationally.
- One on one profit and expense
All profit is divided in 50% net salary and 50% taxes and coöperative investments.
All expenses are related to the members according to their individual contributions.

Another example is intelligence. The intelligence cannot know itself unless it has something intelligible to hold; then the intelligence realizes itself. A person with a poetic gift who is born a poet, never realizes himself to be a poet till he has put his idea on paper, and his verse has struck a chord in his own heart. When he is able to appreciate his poetry, then is the time that he thinks: 'I am a poet'. Till then there was a gift of poetry in him, but he did not know it.

The eyes do not become more powerful by looking in the mirror. Only the eyes know what they are like when they see their reflection. The pleasure is in realizing one's merits, one's gifts, what one possesses. It is in realizing that the merit lies. No doubt it would be great pity if the eyes thought: 'We are as dead as the mirror', or if in looking in the mirror they thought: 'We do not exist except in the mirror'. So the false self is the greatest limitation.

The Mysticism of Sound and Music; page 230; Hazrat Inayat Khan

If, as Serge Daney writes, "all form is a face looking at us", what does a form become when it is plunged into the dimension of dialogue? What is a form when it is essentially relational?

Form is most often defined as an outline contrasting with a content. But modernist esthetics talks about "formal beauty" by referring to a sort of (con)fusion between style and content, and an inventive compatibility of the former with the latter. We judge a work through its plastic or visual form. The most common criticism to do with new artistic practices consists, moreover, in denying them any "formal effectiveness", or in singling out their shortcomings in the "formal resolution". In observing contemporary artistic practices, we ought to talk of "formations" rather than "forms". Unlike an object that is closed in on itself by the intervention of a style and a signature, present day art shows that form only exists in the encounter and in the dynamic relationship enjoyed by an artistic proposition with other formations, artistic or otherwise. There are no forms in nature, in the wild state, as it is our gaze that creates these, by cutting them out in the depth of the visible. Forms are developed, one from another.

When the aesthetic discussion evolves, the status of form evolves along with it, and through it.

In the novels of Polish writer Witold Gombrowicz, we see how each individual generates his own form through his behavior, his way of coming across, and the way he addresses others. This form comes about in the borderline area where the individual struggles with the Other, so as to subject him to what he deems to be his "being". So, for Gombrowicz, our "form" is merely a relational property, linking us with those who reify us by the way they see us, to borrow a Sartrean terminology. When the individual thinks he is casting an objective eye upon himself, he is, in the final analysis, contemplating nothing other than the result of perpetual transactions with the subjectivity of others.

The artistic form, for some, side-steps this inevitability, for it is publicized by a 'work'.

Through it, the artist embarks upon a dialogue. The artistic practice thus resides in the invention of relations between consciousness. Each particular artwork is a proposal to live in a shared world, and the work of every artist is a bundle of relations with the world, giving rise to other relations, and so on and so forth, ad infinitum.

The face, Lévinas asserts, is "what orders me to serve another", "what forbids me to kill". Any "inter-subjective relation" proceeds by way of the form of the face, which symbolizes the responsibility we have towards others: "the bond with others is only made as responsibility", he writes, but don't ethics have a horizon other than this humanism which reduces inter-subjectivity to a kind of inter-servility?

He maintains that form, in an image, is nothing other than the representation of desire. Producing a form is to invent possible encounters; receiving a form is to create the conditions for an exchange, the way you return a service in a game of tennis.

...form is the representative of desire in the image. It is the horizon based on which the image may have a meaning, by pointing to a desired world, which the beholder thus becomes capable of discussing, and based on which his own desire can rebound.

Tzvetan Todorov has shown how the essence of sociability is the need for acknowledgement, much more than competition and violence. When an artist shows us something, he uses a transitive ethic which places his word between the "look-at-me" and the "look at that". Daney's most recent writings lament the end of this "Show/See" pairing, which represented the essence of a democracy of the image in favor of another pairing, this one TV-related and authoritarian. "Promote/receive", marking the advent of the "Visual". In Daney's thinking, "all form is a face looking at me", because it is summoning me to dialogue with it.

Form is a dynamic that is included both, or turn by turn, in time and space. Form can only come about from a meeting between two levels of reality. For homogeneity does not produce images: it produces the visual, otherwise put, "looped information".

Relational Aesthetics; page 21-24; Nicolas Bourriaud

Visibility:

To bypass ideas of audience expectations and questions about the affect of a performance on the audience, here is a list of the things and ideas that audience can see and understand about how the process of work was, resulting in a specific performance:

- Length of the time of the process.*
- Budget.*
- Relations between the people performing, especially if the choreographer performs.*
- Method of work: Improvisation, Practice based, One action that repeats, Memorized sequences of movements.*
- Relation to a tradition of dance as an aesthetic choice: Idealistic (Ballet), Emotional and expressive (Mary Wigman), Humanistic and expressive (Pina Bausch), Strong/decisive and sexual (Ohad Naharin), Quotidian (Yvonne Rainer), Relating to a discourse (Xavier Le Roy).*
- Relation with the audience or how the audience is positioned in relation to the performance.*
- Relation of the artist to the community, who the people are that come to see the performance.*

The Coming Boogie-Woogie; page 247; Mychoreography.org

Again, we have more information, less meaning; more information, less pleasure. Sensibility is within time. Sensuality is in slowness, and the space of information is too vast and fast to elaborate upon it intensively, deeply. At the point of intersection between electronic cyberspace and organic cybertime is found the fundamental crux of the present mutation. The great majority of humanity is subjected to the invasion of the video-electronic flux, and suffers the superimposition of digital code over the codes of recognition and of identification of reality that permeate organic cultures.

Precarious Rhapsody, Semiocapitalism and the pathologies of post-alpha generation; The cognitariat against capitalist cybertime; page 72 - 73; Franco Bifo Berardi

Assignments:

-Dance solo minimum 45 minutes, strictly on "phrase". Phrase understood as material. No light design or original music. Set and costume should fit in a plastic bag. The piece should be danced by the choreographer. The relation to the material should be articulated and justified.

- 15 minute power point presentation, prepared during one week, in front of a jury pitching a proposal for a performance to be realized during one week utilizing the competitors as actors, performers, workers etc. Budget: 1000€.

- 7 people, 7 weeks, 7 pieces, using only each other. The pieces should utilize minimum three performers of which one can be the choreographer, minimum 48 minutes duration. No light design or original music. Set and costume should fit in a plastic bag. All seven performances should be performed the same day/evening.

- Solo choreography, minimum 30 minutes and not danced by the choreographer, that is a study for a full-night group piece. The solo should be an autonomous work, with no light design or original music. Set and costume should fit in a plastic bag. The choreographer should present a proposition/concept for the group piece, including a title, set-design, costume and music. The group piece is not to be realized, but the title of the group piece is also the title for an exhibition, that should be realized in all parts except the realization in the exhibition space, i.e. proposition, artists, pieces, program text, hanging, pedagogical profile etc.

- Group choreography for a classical theatre dispositif, minimum 48 minutes, with at least three professional performers. No light design or original music. Set and costume should fit in a plastic bag. Budget: equal to two weeks full-time employment for 4 performers.

The Coming Boogie-Woogie; page 18-19; Mychoreography.org

What is sound? Is sound outside, or is it something within? The outside sound only becomes audible because the sound within is continued, and the day when the sound within is shut off, this body is not capable of hearing the outside sound.

Man, living today the life of externality, has become so accustomed to the outside life that he hardly thinks of just sitting alone. When he is alone he busies himself with a newspaper or something else, always working with the life which is outside, always occupied with the life outside himself. In this way man loses attachment to the life which is within. So his life becomes superficial, and the result is nothing but disappointment. There is nothing in this world in the form of sound, visible or audible, which is so attractive as the sound within; for all that the senses touch and all that is intelligible to the mind of man has its limitation. It has its limitation in time and effect; it makes no effect beyond that.

The Mysticism of Sound and Music; page 253; Hazrat Inayat Khan

The idea of innocence faces two ways. By refusing to enter a conspiracy, one remains innocent of that conspiracy. But to remain innocent may also be to remain ignorant. The issue is not in between innocence and knowledge (or between the natural and the cultural) but between a total approach to art which attempts to relate it to every aspect of experience and the esoteric approach of a few specialized experts who are the clerks of the nostalgia of a ruling class in decline. (In decline, not before the proletariat, but before the new power of the corporation and the state.) The real question is : to whom does the meaning of the art of the past properly belong? To those who can apply it to their own lives, or to a cultural hierarchy of relic specialists?

Ways of seeing; page 25; John Berger

The current trend, which will continue for the foreseeable future, is for highly capitalized cultural producers to envision "projects" that can be realized in many different forms (as films, television programs, dvd's, live performances, sound recordings, toys, collectibles, etc.) rather than individual cultural objects. Even if changing circumstances necessitate shifts of emphasis,

none of the particular manifestations of the project need be profitable as long as the project as a whole is.

Live performance in a mediatized culture; page 30; Philip Auslander

To Veblen, businessmen were essentially predators, however much they or their apologists might drape their activities in the elaborate rationale of supply and demand or marginal utility. Later, in an essay on "The Captain of Industry," Veblen described the businessman as he really saw him; the following passage explains what is meant by the phrase "watchful waiting," which had been used to describe the entrepreneurial function:

Doubtless this form of words, "watchful waiting" will have been employed in the first place to describe the frame of mind of a toad who has reached years of discretion and has found his appointed place along some frequented run where many flies and spiders pass and repass on their way to complete that destiny to which it has pleased an all-seeing and merciful Providence to call them; but by an easy turn of speech it has also been found suitable to describe that mature order of captains of industry who are governed by sound business principles. There is a certain bland sufficiency spread across the face of a toad so circumstanced, while his comely bulk gives assurance of a pyramidal stability of principles.

The wordly philosophers; page 239; Robert Heilbroner

The loss of competitive spur to exertion had not, indeed, done anything to interfere with the necessary production of the community, but how if it should make men dull by giving them too much time for thought or idle musing? But, after all, this dull thundercloud only threatened us, and then passed over. Probably, from what I have told you before, you will have a guess at the remedy for such a disaster; remembering always the many of the things which used to be produced - slave-wares for the poor and mere wealth-wasting wares for the rich - ceased to be made. That remedy was, in short, the production of what used to be called art, but which has no name amongst us now, because it has become a necessary part of the labour of every man who produces."

News from Nowhere; page 98; William Morris

This sound Hu is the beginning and end of all sounds, be they from man, bird, beast, or thing. A minute study will prove this fact, which can be realized by listening to the sound of the steam engine or of a mill, while the echo of bells or gongs gives a typical illustration of the sound Hu. The Supreme Being has been called by various names in different languages, but the mystics have known him as Hu, the natural name, not man-made, the only name of the nameless which all nature constantly proclaims. ...

The mystery of Hu is revealed to the Sufi who journeys through the path of initiation. The more a Sufi listens to sawt-e-sarmad, the sound of the abstract, the more his consciousness becomes free from all the limitations of life.

The soul floats above the physical and mental plane without any special effort on man's part, which shows its calm and peaceful state; a dreamy look comes into his eyes and his countenance becomes radiant; he experiences the unearthly joy and rapture of wayad or ecstasy. When ecstasy overwhelms him he is neither conscious of the physical existence nor of the mental. This is the heavenly wine to which all Sufi poets refer, which is totally unlike the momentary intoxications of this mortal plane.

The Mysticism of Sound and Music; page 172; Hazrat Inayat Khan

Sex:

Sex, like dance, is something you can do alone or with others and which has to do with the body. Like dance, it gives rise to a variety of sensations while you do it, and can result in everything from joy and ecstasy to boredom or embarrassment, or sorrow, or physical harm, and even death. Like dance, people pay money to see other people perform it, and like dance, there is a vast number of styles and variations, interpretations and opinions related to it. Like dance, sex can be addictive, and equally, if not performed for an extended period of time, the desire to do it may diminish and in some cases disappear completely. Like dance, sex both leaves and gives rise to traces in our bodies and the way we move or interpret objects and the movement of objects, which makes it more or less a constant present in our daily life. However, sex is not dance and dance is not sex, unless it is a kind of sex-dance.

The Coming Boogie-Woogie; page 195; Mychoreography.org

In Finnish, there is a specific word which maybe best combines both senses of the emerging power: miellivalta. It reads literally mind-power or sense-power - the meaning of the word mieli is etymologically in the German words der Sinn (sense), das Gemüt (mind), die Launen (mood), die Lust (desire), der Verstand (reason, understanding), die Ansicht (view, opinion), die Absicht (intent, mind), die Erinnerung (memory); and valta means power (in the sense of Macht, pouvoir, potestas) - but first meaning is a use of power that is not based on 'reason' (or on law, rules, objective facts), that is a power that is mindless and senseless or arbitrary. Mielivalta is arbitrary power over life of the mind.

Everything Under Heaven Is Total Chaos; page 302;

What is it we can do that only we can do?

This can, for example, be used in order to:

- Give backward reason to why things happened like they did.
- Create a feeling of necessity, a feeling of being indispensable, "I am needed and without me it would be something else, or this would not be possible."
- Think about a capacity of a group in a positive manner.
- Produce extreme specificity.
- Bypass other ways of reasoning or justifying why one does things.
- To create a circular argument where everything is OK since anything one does can not be something one can not do, and any other group would never do exactly the same.
- Push things as far as possible and a bit more.
- To make one feel totally unnecessary, "Without me someone else would be here instead and this rule would apply anyway, and it would just be something else, equally specific and good."

The Coming Boogie-Woogie; page 256; Mychoreography.org

These "evil thoughts" can be collected into three groups:

- *lustful appetite (Gluttony, Fornication, and Avarice)*
- *irascibility (Wrath)*
- *intellect (Vainglory, Sorrow, Pride, and Discouragement)*

Seven deadly sins; wikipedia.org

CHAPTER 3 : SCRIPT FOR THE TRANSFORMATION OF TIME IS MONEY INTO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TIME IS ART

'Tim belongs to Tia because without her he will become no more.'

The script structures itself into constellations of potentiality.

Within the following text there is the form of an alternating monologue by TIM and TIA. The monologue is alternated for the simultaneous readability of multiple actors. In this way they can see what the other is up to, and to what part of their monologue it might appeal to continue on. This alternating form should not be confused with an intend to create dialog or using dialectics in a negotiable or political manner. Although the form of expression might vary according to the role chosen, and especially by whom, the intend of the following text is rather an affirmative formulation in respect to its communicability within a broad range of the living art.

1610

> TIA

Ashes to trashes, dust to rust.
Your teeth, my love
Will be your last must.
Raindrops and roses,
Nail polish or narcosis,
And lately, dear you
Let me near.

> TIM

Now do your daily chores. And while you are at it, keep counting at your own pace, to infinity. And when you lost the count, you may start all over again.

> TIA

I thought of you and you said no more
More of you I couldn't stand
you left me all on your demand.
Since ever we entered along the train
you can't dream no more without refrain
to senselessness, non sense nor plain.
Leave me here, leave no trace, let all
your memories go to waste.
Dream to me, all it takes, no more

for the given, since all it breaks.
Life the forgiven, breath or breasts
and nested in the living.

> TIM

My dear, my love, my giving. I like you as much as the sincerity within my eye. There is so much I can do for you, just tell me what. You are my reason for being, I know this is as real as the ground I stand on. Prove me wrong and call me a liar, I'll always know what I believe in since the day I crawled here on earth. I have you in my heart, forever.

> TIA

You lived in a daydream, never gone, never at rest.
Least you produced some kind of excess.
You're dream is over: numbers, words,
I and anything else. All vanished
with thanks to all your best.
Now is gone, and all left
is this day, a dream and
if it's ok, some sex.

> TIM

I wish I could tell you, but you're never gone.
Not for a minute somewhere lost into unknown
territories of violence and lust, not even a joke
about some dead men or false trust.

> TIA

Create me the sky and you will die a death not longer than regret.
Give me your tears and they will feed your griefs, don't bother why?
Lend me your body and I'll return you your mind.
After it you'd wonder if it's still dark outside.
Or maybe, just let me watch you sleeping.

The cultural activities derived from the script operate on:

- 1) the full transformation of the experience of time,

2) within a choreographed instantaneous, although indefinite implementation of form.

- *regular regularities*

This sequence structures itself upon a fixed interval between a fixed operation.

For example: getting up by a programmed device, having to go do the same thing.

- *regular irregularities*

This sequence structures itself upon a fixed interval between a random operation.

For example: doing all together, whatever you feel like.

- *irregular irregularities*

This sequence structures itself upon a random interval, between a random operation.

For example: only reacting upon, what has been done to you.

- *irregular regularities*

This sequence structures itself upon a random interval, between a fixed operation.

For example: doing something or going somewhere, when you feel like.

3) with disregard to negotiation on the relation of the real with the spectacular.

This sequence structures itself upon a "law of conduct" between the 'one' and the 'all'.

The execution of actions upon this pseudo-philosophical series of affirmations has an intend to supply free associative effects between its subjected actors and states of affaires.

SHARIO FOR MARIO

THE BOOK OF ALL LAW

0001#

One must be completely convinced of any proposal, project, statement, concept, attitude, etcetera; and fully embrace it into all future development that obviously made any past insights obsolete.

0002#

One must contain the instant ability to switch the light on or off at any given moment in time.

0003#

One must never gain subsistence on behalf of borrowed time.

0004#

All must die naked as have been born.

0005#

One must remain a moving target whilst breathing.

0006#

All need to disagree and remain alone.

0007#

One only needs to engineer its consumption.

0008#

Eternity is by definition non existent and consequently rules both all and one.

0009#

Resources are accessed by all means on a strict basis of ones actual necessities.

0010#

All growth is equated on ones deployment.

0011#

All matter is destined to oblivion while no matter will ever resist.

0012#

One word can never be taken into account.

0013#

All potential fortune is ones single desire and therein one wants to be only one.

0014#

All one considers needs to be undertaken before ones accidental abandonment.

0015#

One may spell out any word to make it available for all.

0016#

Zero is one of its favorite names. Sully can be given equally.

0017#

One must feed, drink, travel, learn and dream luxuriously.

0018#

All must resist mindless repetition and devote all attention to nothing in particular.

0019#

Here and now remain unknown to neither all nor one.

0020#

Boredom is ones only economic incentive, trade its loss, and profit its last resort.

0021#

Ones weapons are all to be made tools for ones prolongation with all other ones.

0022#

All violence is considered as ones failed attempted suicide.

0023#

All ten o'clock rituals imply the invocation of ones imaginable fear; succeeded by the feeding of ones soul food to no reason at all.

0024#

Idolatry is ones preferable way of identification; whilst all identity consistently resides in a flaming pool of oil like substance.

0025#

The other ones are to be considered as the only foundation of all intelligible manifestation of nothing at all.

0026#

All scriptures and languages, although contradictory in definition, are without exclusion to be adopted into The Book Of All Law; in particular all existing maritime, (inter)national and corporate law.

0027#

The copyrights of The Book Of All Law are under the authority of Eternity. (ref.0008#)

0028#

One is considered an animal to all; whilst all remain alien to anyone.

0029#

All form of sound and music perceivable and imperceptible to one are considered to be ones most valuable means of communication.

0030#

One must count its age by the entropy of its container.

0031#

All never give a shit about ones problems.

0032#

All gender issues and household specialities are to be resolved through ones preferred codes of conduct. (ref.0024#)

0033#

Any degradation or promotion can be easily obtained by obliteration of both zenith and nadir.

0034#

when one finds oneself at crossroads, one must look out for traffic before returning on ones steps.

0035#

One resides in solitude or loneliness, unless one succeeds in one others fortunate experience.

(ref 0006# & 0013#)

0036#

One tends to be the exponent of the achievement of all.

0037#

Ones perceptible surroundings must be cultivated towards ones basic needs, and towards all eternal subsistence.

(ref 0017# & 0032#)

0038#

Temporary value is to be defined in terms of :

- total light (a.k.a. 13 crystal clear)
- twelve scale intensities of light (open to interpretation, although always numbered from 1 to 12. ex. misty 5, red 8)
- total absence of light (a.k.a. 00 dark shit)

0039#

Any speculation on a definite relation between all nor one could be described as : a sound memorable mind in a neurotic_peptide conditioned body of breath word, flesh, feeling, movement, distraction and thought.

0040#

Resistance is futile. All will be assimilated.

0041#

Hypnosis and any benevolent - with a voluntary consent of the other one - trance inducing practices are to be used to propagate the global implementation of The Book Of All Law.

0042#

Wireless Fidelity is to be obtained in ones artificial events for the behavioral imitation of all imaginable synchronometric processing.

0043#

Art and all ones calling oneself artist are to learn from divers natural surroundings before pursuing to communicate artful undertakings.

0044#

Any one in violation of any article within the Book Of All Law are to be forgiven for Life, and forgotten for Eternity.

0045#

All tendencies of malignant behavior towards any external authority are to be celebrated and rewarded with overwhelming comprehension.

0046#

One must always be available to rephrase ones previous statements. (ref 0001# & 0015#)

0047#

Aesthetic and ethic are to be sublimated into asymmetric synonymous harmony.

0048#

The human condition is to be defined as ones fluctuating ascent towards ultra human consignment.

0049#

All education should be undertaken on ones student question basis and always formulate a minimum of three potential undertakings, with regard to all possible answers given in response to the question. (ref 0030#)

0050#

One must let all trivialities be in order to sustain one others dependency.

0051#

Any area unknown to all can only be explored by one.

0052#

One must not decide with hunger nor thirst on other matters than the preparation and preferable taste of its next meal or beverage. (ref 0017#)

0053#

One and all previous ones need only to encounter similar eventualities for uniting any difference of spontaneity, dimension and experience. (ref 0028#)

0054#

All forms of commerce, exchange and trade are considered completely free of tax or credit practices. (ref.0020# & 0038#)

0055#

All forms of matter, product or service have received the exact same rights as any one in particular. (ref.0011#)

0056#

consumption is based on a practice of adequate production. (ref.0007# & 0010#)

0057#

ones final destination is imagined by ones state or ability for assumption and discernment within a perpetual manifestation of all formless matter.

0058#

ones time always belongs to all common present sense.

0059#

all is ones ether synonymous to all one can produce.

0060#

one its language has a potential purpose to be comprehensible to one and immediately heard by all. (ref 0051#)

0061#

a common sense from the viewpoints of all results in a dissociation with the common wealth from the viewpoint of one.

0062#

twelve counts to a rhythm of choice is all duration given to ones consistent deliberation in anticipation of any decisive matter to be undertaken subsequently.

0063#

the complexity of all symmetry is as real as ones natural ability to produce a straight line.

0064# to 0109#

ones memory can never obtain all information at once, although all manifestation can be refrained within eternity. (ref 0057#)

0110#

one ability is considered a temporal suspension from gravity.

SHARIO FOR MARIO;

THE BOOK OF ALL LAW

dirty art work
2012

The 0110# prophecies of The Book Of All Law are unveiled by Eternity upon the fingertips of brother Mario 99 times The Great within a few moons following the passing of the canine mentor. The initial notations within The Shario For Mario are to be submerged within the practices of Norwegian and Venusian Magic. The Book Of All Law serves ultimately to be implemented as the singular total global law in a succession to the united nations governing bodies.

CODA

- fragment transcript "Norwegian Magic" at PAF with Marten Spangberg

August 2012, Reims France

to give a lecture series

because the lectures we did then where

the lecturers were invited to do 5 hours for 3 days long and in the beginning they were very much afraid of doing this, they thought they would be out of text very quickly but it turned out that it lasted longer than 5 hours. the principle is that we listen unless we don't understand. it is a seminar not a discussion in principle. but Martin can set his own rules for this, ok?

You are very welcome, we are very pleased that you are here, we appreciate this very much.

Great! howdy. i m not gonna leave till sunday, so we can talk the whole night, the whole day, all other moments also. but i thought i would talk a little bit this afternoon. The three days are about norwegian magic, which is a rather unexplored intellectual territory. Basically, it was invented last christmas at PAF. more by accident than by any other reason. but there is still something that i would like to try to articulate. and todays session. somehow when i walked down the stairs i thought that todays session would be called, would be under the titling, 'the open is not clear' and to try to explain which is not very difficult but never the less time will take 3 hours, or 2 45 to explain what this possibly could be. we will hopefully not have a break, but on the other side everybody can go in and out as they like, have the mobile phones on, smoke, etc. smoke outside.

I forgot to say we opened a pirate pad.net.

If there are people that want to make notes collectively, go to :
piratepad.net/norwegianmagic

Ok, so...

Oh yes, but first, so hmm.

I never written any fiction in my life, but one morning a while ago i had this film scene, the opening scene of a film in my head, all of a sudden And i thought I could tell you the beginning of the film and then we could maybe continue to see what this film, how it will end or how it will continue. and it goes like this:

it's kind of a grey day, it's the northern part of the USA, so kind of probably upstate NY, somewhat differently north west virginia or kind of a fly over state, that is close to some kind of sub urban area. So, anyway we see a car coming into the picture, which is a still image, it is not , whatever, a fixed camera. we see a car coming in and on that side of the car so to say there is a landscape, probably with a little forest, probably with a little kind of fields, some cows, whatever, just to say that we are not anymore in the urban environment, but in the country of the US or in a small city.

So, and then out of the car, of course not yet, then we re coming to the car and the car comes into the image. if this would have been in the early eighties, this film right. then off course this car would have been a Jeep or a Cherokee or something with a V8 motor, in this film

which is a contemporary, it is obviously a Prius, so. we see now that this family, the car owner is an environmentally friendly person and so on. and in the car we see the dad behind the steering wheel it's in this film a kind of gender binary, so it's still a dad it should off course should have been a mother, but in this film it's also a sort of promoting certain stereotypes of women in order to become efficient enough, so it's a dad. And here is a somewhat 40 years old. hmm. not a small character but trained and we think that hmm, this is person that probably work at a university or could be a graphics designer with aspirations to be an architect, or it could also be that he is an academic person, somewhat between that territory in between micro biology with a specialization in oceanic life or something like this, so he is a researcher but not hard science, so he is not a physicist or chemistry, it is not math or outer space. It is a guy who takes care of his environment he is down to earth, he is not megalomaniac at all, right. So he researches. if he is an architect he is gonna build social houses, not hospitals or monuments or something like this. he is a modest kind of character and he drinks café latté with a special order of what the milk should be. extra skinny, you know, or what do you call sunny side up or something that you do when you drink cafe latté, i don't know what it is called exactly, he is a conscious kind of character. And he drives his Prius, so he is handsome, definitely. and although not over handsome, it's is definitely not a young Tom Hanks, definitely not. it 's more one of these contemporary characters, I don't know what they are called, but you know : actors.

Like for example the police man that helps batman, in a few years, in the new film. you know that kind of character. well dressed, behaving but not too rude right?

so, anyways and then 'click' there is the son and it says 'click' because the son takes off the belt. Off course, I mean this is a film about being good in society, so you also have the belt in the car. the son steps out and there is no fight in the sense of 'I don't want to school' or what , but it's there friendly they open the door and then kind of shoulder to shoulder they walk out towards the school building, which you now see them walking, so you see from the other point of view, sort of say. And there you see the school building which is a typically american high school, as I imagine: a place which is like a building that is kind of impersonal strongly, and yet it doesn't produce itself as a cathedral, it is not a university building but it is still strong. And it is not a really fresh building. So they walk there side by side, the son and the guy, and we know if this would have been, say 'breakfast club', which is another movie involved a father leaving a son at the school, and off course the car would drive away and it would be very lonely and so on, but here we have a conviviality between generations of father and son. So they walk into the school and the school is exactly how like we want an american school to be:

slightly abandoned, and the lockers are with bubbles or whatever that could be called a bit smashed a bit or all the students have been thrown banged against and so on, a school of speakers and so on... and a slight smell of rotting flesh and pigs, and of the same right. So anyways they walk there and you know, around the corner and around a... Next, every corner we expect some boogiemaniac, you know, or some guys with real long nails like something like this, or you know what these kind of that looks like, that looks like a, whatever, any, some kind of monster. But nothing of that happens, it is still gray turning corners, turning corners... Suddenly they come to the door. knock the door and the kind of head teacher, which is a lady. So the teacher that you feel is responsible for the son opens the door. She looks direct, just an itty bitty younger than the father. Very good looking, very proper, very good in all, and we understand that this is now the midterm meeting. Sort of to evaluate the son, how it is working in the school and so on and so on.

Next image: we sit in the office, and the head misses on one side, and the father and the son on the other side, and it is going super well. We can see that the son is doing magnificent in

the school and the father should be proud. And he is proud, and he is also, he knows it right? He knows totally that my son it is a good guy and he does his homework and you know, we also practiced together, shared knowledge and this kind of thing. So everything is working fine. A certain moment we realize that it's kind of time to put an end to it, or rap it up, or a little cadence and so on. So, this is announced by the father putting his hand on the son's shoulder and. Cut.. The head mistress or the lady there sort of leans forward in order to do a gesture to coming together in finalizing. And she says : yes mister something, yes mister, your son is, how can I say? "Such an imagination." And at that moment the hand on the shoulder of the son kind of clinches a bit like the grip is tightening, and we feel that all of a sudden there is darker energy into the room. Some kind of coldness has entered into the space. And the teacher she also feels that there is something spooky going on. So she kind of leans forward even more and says : "yes , I mean, so creative". And at this moment the grip tightens extremely and the father kind of goes out of the chair, and this is a little bit in slow motion, out of the chair from his side. And the son now there looks like completely surprised and taken with the pants down, something like this, very surprised, but still kind of frozen in his coma. The father comes up and sort of jumps over. How this works I don't know, he is very athletic. He was in the wrestling team when he was in the university. He jumps over the table and sort of manages to put his both hands kind of around the neck of the teacher. and they kind of fall over in together side, which is now this side right? And they fall over and they disappear up and down there and somehow we see maybe a little of the back of the father, but we understand that he is strangling the woman. And then we see the son in the eyes and he is completely devastated and we then suddenly see from his direction. And we see like out from the table, there we see the foot of the teacher like the last kind of, if you know what I mean Meg Stuart kind of movement. Some small shaking, until she goes limp. And then the little day began and we see the son who is kind of totally devastated again and we see the father probably looking like this. He comes up and he looks a little bit to the camera to make it more obvious. He looks and he points to the dead, now dead, previously quiet good looking, school teacher, and says : "Nobody, nobody calls my son creative." And then it cuts. and then it's a question how it goes on. and so, and so.

Please, which apparently doesn't have much of a... What do you say? A punchline for you. And the question is now if it's a mere bad storyteller or the poem is or if the punchline is totally kaput. or if we need to rehearse a little bit.

So I thought there would obviously, this film is all about that it doesn't need to go on right? Because we know what is going to happen next, that is: they take off in their Prius to the next little city and the next semester and a new head mistress is being strangled or now stabbed to death with a pen sharpener or whatever it could be. And it goes on and on and on. And somehow they would never get caught, obviously. Obviously, to all other serial killers right? Exactly, because the son and the father indeed is creative. So, or maybe the other way around. And obviously, they will be caught because they are only creative.

So I thought about this story and the next time, as a thought now, about what does it mean today in 2012 to be creative? And why would somebody call, why would somebody not want his or her son or daughter to be understood to be creative? And the proposal here is that of course if we think about the last 20 years what has happened that since basically 1986, what has happened is that the notion of creativity has invaded the society at large. So in every job, in every situation, in every daily activity : what we are supposed to be is creative. We're always around creativity and we're always supposed to come up with the creative solution. On the other side if the teacher says 'your son is so creative' it will also mean that he is measurable and already installed. he is already that which he is supposed to be. he is using the bold feel and the laws in a productive manner, yet never abusing anything, yet never going over anything,

always being in the measurable, in the territory of the productive or in other words inside good will.

16 minutes

So if your son indeed is creative or, and we really should speak about imagination later, but if your son is accused for being, or if your son is just creative, in other words it means that he is totally mediocre. So how do we get out of this script and how do we understand, how did we think about a departure point out of creativity? Which must be through creativity somehow, because we cannot preliminarily cancel creativity in favor of something else. The open will always be proposed by initial openness and then we will see how this initial openness can somehow formulate itself. But this story basically happened as an introduction.

So now to the real thing. Which should always be postponed, obviously. But it is great that the story was so enlivening and we were first very happy and now we are complete downed or something. But of course we should also prove that at PAF we are everything but creative, right? This is not a place for creativity, it is exactly what you leave when you come into that port there, is that you leave your creativity behind, in favor of something else. If creativity is what you strive for, you can also go to Essen, dance residencies, or schools in Amsterdam or stuff like this. So maybe this Norwegian Magic is also a matter of speaking about why it is important to go to PAF and not somewhere else. On the other side off course Norwegian Magic is also very much of a form of responsibility one can also say. But Norwegian Magic came out somewhere 2009, Jan and me shared the project called first 'Oedipus my Foot' and then later it was kind of re-baptised to 'The Agora' and there was a project, a theatre, a project that initially was about making a couple of, or making one theatre piece, then started to be more of a field or some kind of a shared territory, and there was fundamentally, the proposal as far I know and Jan probably can tell you other versions over lunch or dinner but we are not going to inquire about what he thinks about it know, because then it is going to be very lengthy and tedious and so on, but he is very good in anecdotal dinner talks. I definitely support and promote that you take your opportunities and have him not have lunch with me or Perrine or some other veterans of PAF.

So, anyway there we were, 'Agora' and you know that is the greek term for the public space. So the square is the agora and the agora has a history which we will also come to soon. But in this project the proposal was, ok so we should also tell you what 'Oedipus Rex' was the story that we supposedly were to make some sense from. Which was off course not about interpreting the play and doing or best. But it was rather to think about or deconstruct in a way and then put together in a Deleu, ah, maybe like this: rather to think about Oedipus Rex as a Deleuzian concept. Which we can also explain what it means later on, but there are a lot of things which I have to explain later, also very promising. Maybe I could expand to 5 hours already today. But I will be blurred after 3 hours I become a bit warm in the mouth, which is a good sign, But I don't know if I will manage for more than 3 hours a day. Which of course I will. I am just saying this to make you feel like yeah see, hopefully he does it and I have support from you and so on.

So anyway, we were supposed to stage Oedipus Rex. So then what is Oedipus Rex about? Exactly. As you know the story goes like this: Oedipus is born, the king and the queen have the child and there is a curse that the child will kill the father and sleep with the mother. So they ask the shepherd to take the son to a river and drown the kid or give it to the eagles or whatever stuff. But the shepherd is such a softhearted person with a big nose, probably. Kind of a dutch big nose. And so, this soft hearted guy. And this is exactly, this is not by accident,

right? So instead of giving the kid to the eagles, he gives the kid, this child, to a childless couple in a village far away. But of course as we know a curse is a curse and it will happen. So after a while when Oedipus the son grows up, he goes then to talk to an oracle or whatever, and then the oracle says, this is your situation. And then he gets pissed off with the parents that they didn't told him the real story and so now Oedipus goes away from his city and at a certain crossroad, off course a crossroad. also then those greek authors where full of cliches and platitude, and at the crossroad he meets a group of soldiers. And the first of the soldiers walks, somebody, the boss somehow. And the boss tells Oedipus to go out of the way, we are the warriors of Thebe. And Oedipus says: I am Oedipus, I don't step out of the way of anybody. and he kills the guy, the boss, and takes off. And then he comes to a city and there he has to answer a question, because the city is now cursed by a disease. So he has to answer a questions from the sphinx who guard the city. And the thing from the sphinx was stolen by Adobe later on, to cover the real thing. But of course the question was: what walks on four legs in the morning, two at lunch time, and when the sun goes down, walks on three legs. And all we know what it is, and he answers the question correctemundo. And he comes into Thebe and since now the king happens to be dead, so the guy who answers the riddle gets the opportunity to take over the queen. Oedipus he is installed as the king and obviously has intercourse on a regular basis with the mother. Obviously he killed the father at the crossroad, he comes into the city, he has to inherit the mother and has an incestuous relationship with. And they like it, because they get two more daughters and sons, right? Antigone and the others. So, it works fine.

Then, everything is fine, but towards the end of the drama it appears that something is kaput here. And it has to do with the need to find out who killed the king? They sort this out in different ways that i can't exactly remember. But in any case at a certain moment it becomes clear to Oedipus: Oh my fucking god, it was me who killed the guy. the king was the guy at the crossroads and it was me fucking my mother and in other words the whole curse comes together. Clytemnestra kills herself and Oedipus is standing there in the stand on the outdoors and he is devastated and in order to, as a self punishment. Or we should see maybe something else. he sticks out his eyes, blinds himself and takes Antigone by the hand and they go into the world. So he goes blind into the world. And then, story is done.

Of course it's been, obviously there is no reason to do another Oedipus Rex. It is basically really a bad idea, because it has been played far too many times by really clever people introducing and so on. But we didn't have a choice because it was a commission. So what is it that? Our thinking was: where is the interest in Oedipus' action? From our point of view it is not about the sex with the mother. it is not about the pedrocital act which is the killing of the father. The is fine enough,. But the interesting moment is when he sticks out his eyes and what happens there. So, it has to do with agora, because as we know in the greek drama's are almost always talking about historical events. they don't speak about the present. especially not the tragedies. the comedies are kind of different, kind of stand up comedy commenting on the day, but the tragedies are the historical ones. they speak about the time different than the time which they were played. So how was the organization of greece at the time of Oedipus? During this time the country, there wasn't a nation, but a territory where the Spartans and the Thebens and whatever they were called hanged out and had their different places. Has everyone seen that wonderful movie with Brad Pitt called 'Troy'? Excellent example, brilliant movie. Totally underrated. So, Troy, Especially the beginning with Anthony Hopkins as Aristotle. Fabulous, and not. Maybe. He is a good butler but not very good as Aristotle. So, how it was is like this: that each of these of these households. Each of these, how can i say this? So, Troy was ran by one guy, or rather like this. The territory is dark. It is forests everywhere and the forest is dark. In certain places there are, what was called at the

time Oikos. So households, and each household is a closed entity ran by a sovereign. So, a guy who might be called Alexander or something, doesn't matter. But the man who was the sovereign of the Oikos, he was somewhere in between human and god. He had this opportunity of running the business in whatever way he wanted. There was this at the time, the Oikos was the place of no negotiation. He makes all the decisions. Everything is his. But it is only until the wall. Within the Oikos that is his domain, out side there is the dark forest. At the time each Oikos had there own sovereign. And obviously it became very difficult for these guys to come together and have a talk. Obviously, you're a sovereign, you're a sovereign, that becomes one too many in this group, right? The classic is the example when they re supposed to. One of the Oikos bosses' daughter is called Helena and she is about to get married. The problem is now, the father cannot just say to the Oikos owner 'you can have her'. Because then I have produced a liaison with the other Oikos and this might be problematic for you. So, in order not to produce a problem the father decides : the princes will have to compete. In competition it is fair play. it is your pre station that it comes down. And then we know the proposal is then: the two Oikos owners that want to have the other daughter will have a competition, they should build a labyrinth. Which is of course not an accident. They have two years to build to build two labyrinths. One year each. At the same time.

So, after one year the big king, the father brings everybody together and says: lets party and look at the labyrinths. Fantastic no problem. Everybody comes together and after a while the party goes the guys are really great so they are thinking for a while. Maybe we can have holy marriage, or open relationship, it's also a good thing in greece. both of the guys. But the father says, competition is competition so they go to the one, the first prince takes them over there. they walk and walk and finally they come to an incredible structure. the olympic station is like a kindergarden in comparison with this structure. it is fucking huge, so couple. not even delouse would smile in front of it. So it's like really terrifying and impressive. some parts are gold plated and there are planks that clap in the window, so it is also a beautiful complex. And the king is like. Jesus fucking christ, this is so amazing. So, yeah looks good, no problem. He is almost to say: ok you can have her. but competition is competition and so lets also see the other guy. The other prince his structure, labyrinth. So they walk through the city, the other side, out through the suburbs, and the little sub burs, even the leftovers, and the little car part over there, the Wall Mart they leave behind, and they come out, and all of a sudden the prince says: here it is. and they are standing in front of an endless desert. So, they are standing there in front of an endless desert. And we know of course what happens. I'm getting more and more ready. French intellectuals. So anyway, they stand in front of the desert and we know what happens. After a bit of consideration, the father the Oikos guy says to the desert guy: she is yours. What can I say: this beats the shit out of everything.

Obviously, right? Because in the other labyrinth maybe we don't know where we are, but we know we are in front of the next corner, or we are just after the corner we took to the left. But in the endless desert, we only know that we are lost and we can never know where we are, right? We know that we are always here, but that here is everywhere all of the time. The difference between the two labyrinths is that in the complex structure, the PAF like organization. which is many rules and many angles and so on. we might not know where we all are, but we always know that we are in PAF. We are never lost. And in the other side, we always already know where we are but we are always lost. Because we are always only here since and we have nothing to orientate ourselves in respect of. So every place is exactly identical. And in this space, every place has differentiation.

This was how was the organization when was happening in greece at the time of Oedipus. So Oedipus leaves his city and goes into the dark forest, outside the Oikos. When he leaves in the beginning, he left it and he is in a forest. At a crossroad he then kills the father, goes towards

Thebe and he can enter into a new Oikos. Now as a guest, right? So in other words, when he takes over the mother, he becomes the king of this Oikos, meaning he becomes somebody who doesn't negotiate. He becomes at this moment half god and half warrior. He is sovereign, right? And we can then again see, in this Oikos they are friends territory sort of say. Outside the Oikos there is the forest. The forest is known as Gnomos, so, the darker territory. If there is sovereignty within the walls. outside the walls there is no law whatsoever. outside in the dark forest, there if he kills or not the father. It doesn't matter. He cannot be accused, he cannot be prosecuted for this, exactly because there is no law. Outside the Oikos, no law. Inside the Oikos, only law of the king. And in the first, the dark forest, obviously no light, right? If we think about it in that respect, the city has light, the city has law, the city is like PAF. Outside the city, outside the Oikos, no light, no orientation, everything is exactly however it is a forest, it is a desert, right? Every place in the forest is the same. There is no differentiation between this and that place. Of course we are speaking this abstract, of course there is a little, somebody maybe made fire there two weeks ago, whatever. but on an abstract basis it is always, it is an excessive dynamism. So, but the problem point here is that if this is the situation, Oikos-Gnomos-Oikos, law-no law- lot of law- sovereignty, no negotiation, there is also no such thing we know as politics. Politics doesn't happen. Politics is defined by modes of different however endless amount of negotiation. In this situation, no negotiation. The sovereign can take and offer life without any complication. I am the law, no worries. On the other side, of course what the king wan only fear is to be killed, right? He is the law but the moment he gets killed, if you kill the king you cannot be prosecuted, because the king is the law.

So, Calvino his last book is called 'The sense of the tiger' or something stupid. It is a story about, 5 short stories about the senses, and he doesn't manage to write the fifth one because he died, but anyways the one he writes about the hearing, is about the king on a throne and he talks about the job of the king becomes to be an endless listener, because he can only be overcome, he can only be dethroned. He will always wait for is when the murmur of the population grows and someone will kill him. So he has to survey his throne. If you kill the king you cannot be prosecuted, but you will be the new king, and take over the law in any way you want. you can change the law, you can change the rule ship in whatever respect you want. On the other side in the Gnomos, no law whatsoever. In other words, whilst Oedipus sleeps with the mother, decides in a very good manner for the city. At a certain moment he realizes or he wants to figure out who killed the king, or the population wants to know this. And he goes so far to say, I want to know and Terezias the shepherd says: take it easy, you don't want to know. Yes i want to know Yes i want to know Yes i want to know. And at a certain moment you have to realize: it was me who did it. They thought the enemy that kills the king, but in Oedipus it is the king that suicides. So he undoes the warrior ship. Now it is not a battle. The warrior gives up his position as sovereign. Metaphorical he does this by sticking out his eyes. Even before this he does it by saying: Yes i want to know Yes i want to know. Whereas priorly, as a warrior, he is the knowledge, he is the law, he is the sovereign, so he is also the knowledge. In this moment he is no longer happy with 'because i say so. In Oedipus, he wants to know, he insists on the knowledge. And then he has to realize, it's me, then sticks out his eyes and goes out of the door. And of course now. What he does is: he steps down from the position from non negotiation. He steps down from the position from being a sovereign in favor of what? In favor of politics, right?

42 minutes

I step down from sovereignty and I pick out my eyes, the warrior god has eyes that is always

true and is always sees the it. He sticks out, he steps down, sticks out his eyes and is of course then one of us, right? He walks like a normal person or as an everyday person into the world as we all are blind. The way that we are blinded of course we can use these things in the plot, but we cannot, what it means to be blindness, is the necessitation or the necessity for negotiation. Oedipus previous to that day, what's the guy in Troy? Alexander, right? Brad Pitt plays Alexander. All these kings they always sought perfectly fucking brilliant, Achilles yeah, They always saw everything clear as water. And they could not not, right? Because then they would not be the law. They had to see everything clear as water and what Oedipus does is to say: "I'm just a guy." Sticks out his eye and in this moment something happens. And then this that the space, the ground that he stands on is no longer his, and is not longer his, right? Before it is only his: I am the sovereign, the land is mine, the people are mine, your fucking emotions are mine, even what you don't know that you know is mine, but now I step down out of my sovereign position and I become one of us. Mainly the sand that he stands on is from being his to being public. It becomes the public. The moment of the dethroning of the self-dethroning of Oedipus is in an open space that then becomes the public. Which is the space that belongs to the, the space that doesn't, and yet doesn't belong to, but is the peoples. The important is that it doesn't belong to us. It is very important to negotiate this that the public doesn't belong to us, but we have access to it. Unlimited access to it. And of course this also means that the moment that he steps down into the public, this moment becomes, opens the possibility of politics. If there is not the public space there can also be no politics. Then we need to have a space of negotiation. And moreover we need to have a space which is not already owned, but is a space where negotiation can be and emerge. Where modes of negotiation can be developed, somehow. So, in other words, what we were interested in this miss en scene we did, was to understand: how can we stage Oedipus as a way of kind of reclaiming public space, or reclaiming publicness. Instead of telling the story, rather making with some sense that sort of forces the audience or the spectators out into the public, into the negotiated, into this insecure territory.

What is the function of his daughter? When he sticks out his eyes, what does his daughter do?

Me neither, but she was probably good company. A magician needs an assistant. I didn't mean to be arrogant at all. On the other side what it also does is to say: he needs an accomplice, he needs missing eyes. But she doesn't have them either, metaphorically. She is a kid right? So she would be the innocent, or the naive that he needs to have her eyes in order to go into the world, and she needs his knowledge for the travel to go on. In that respect it also talks then about poor nice, when obviously what happens more over, there is more to it. What happens her is that in Oedipus it is the drama where not only the public space is open, nor only politics, but there is one more thing that happens here, and that is individual subjectivity. So, the individual, the birth of the individual it is this very moment. There were people and persons before, but the subject had a radical different formation. Or I wasn't around but we can assume that must have been different exactly because there was only one mister and he decided everything. And therefore the subject was much more instead of each person having a subject, the subject was the city. So, if we look, if we also see, and this is were the function of the sphinx comes in. The sphinx was there, the curse was on the city. So, the curse was on the whole city, it was not you who was sick or it wasn't you who got sick and then contaminated the whole city, it was the city who was cursed. So there was a subjectivity of the community. And if we think about earlier and the hero Oedipus is differently organized in this one and it is not that he manages only to get rid of the curse of the city, it is not that he takes upon himself the curse of the city; like in other heroes. But what he does, he takes it

on himself. He takes, the blame is all me. He takes it on his subjectivity, the war between Thebe and Sparta. It doesn't matter who the warriors are. It doesn't matter. The two cities was at war. And now it becomes Oedipus that have to take it on himself. The one that decided also has to live the punishment. In that case he is the one that have to live the punishment, and this is the moment where personal sin becomes guilt, becomes hmm, and so on. And he becomes negotiated and in that respect he has to have his daughter with him. As this is the subjectivity production, right? If I am not fooled as I was before, is it because I was decided everything by the warrior, everything was decided for me and now posed Oedipus in this relationship that it happens, right? I conform, I confirm you and you confirm me. I don't have access to my entirety. We can also say that in the pre-public or pre-political Greece, there was only consciousness and unconsciousness, sort of in the Oikos, consciousness, in the Gnomos, only unconscious. And now with the political subject this comes together and they have only partial access to each other to maintain our blindness. So if we can, I hadn't expected to talk about this but it is probably is a background on Norwegian Magic. Anyway since within three days i have to postpone a little bit of the. So

If certainty is something that you have can it be also used or that you take?

Now well this we cannot say. This sovereignty is something that is contingent and not probabilistic. So if you took it or not doesn't matter, because you re sovereign. Either you have it, either it is or it isn't. It isn't a bit.

This uncertainty, as wanting to make another between certainty and creativity?

No. Of course not. Because of what happens now is also with the political subject is that is the creative subject. And not a sovereign subject which is above or beyond creativity. The sovereign.

And not between certainty and creativity, so in search of his certainty?

That is irrelevant because in the case of Oedipus the law, the tradition say. The guy who answers the riddle will have the mother. And then Oedipus goes out in the world, then the brother of the father takes over the city. It doesn't matter. It is irrelevant if you take it or if you have it. You are sovereign. End of story.

We can also see two kinds of sovereignty. There is the one on top and there is the one on the very most bottom. Also in endowments or organization of, when Helmer wrote this book Homo Saccharin the 1998 or something 90's which became a kind of bestseller. It is a blue cover. And it is not very thick, so it's ok it's sympathetic. He talks and talk, I hadn't really read it, but don't tell anyone. More or less what it says is that. Indeed he explores this notion what sovereignty implies and what becomes to say that the king has sovereignty, he decides everything all the time. Inside the Oikos he is sovereign, end of story. On the other side. In the Gnomos, in the dark forest, every individual. Every entity has sovereignty, right? Because there is nothing connecting them, so you have full sovereignty when you are in the Gnomos. Complete sovereignty, so it means if someone comes and slaps you, you can't go to the law and say: this is mean. Not even to me. No complains, no tryings, no nothing. So in contemporary writers Agamben addresses it. These are 'sans papier' people, right? People that are immigrants, that live amongst us but have no access to society. But in the Oikos-Gnomos situation it was somehow easy going because you could always knock on the door, right? You could always go to the Oikos and ask to go in. As long as you were not sick or something like

this you were allowed to enter with some kind of tax or not. In the cities we have now the question is how do we get out of sovereignty. If you don't have an address you can't have a job. If you don't have a job you can't have an address. If you don't have this you can't take a loan, so therefore you can't buy a house. If you don't have an address you can't have a salary so you can't have a house. So how do we do with this, right. What Agamben says, today sovereignty has witnessed with the liberal subject of the self from 1750 there sovereign is not anymore the one upstairs, but the sovereign is the one downstairs. And this new model of sovereign is something that is excluded of society and at the same time of course has excessive potentiality.

So, the sovereign was reigning his sand?

Yes, it is his sand, of course, and then he steps down.

And the one that are brutes, the sovereign of the outdoor?

No, it is his forest. The one in the forest it is his forest. For every entity out there, it is his forest.

He is an outlaw.

No he is outside of outlaw. There is no structure to be outlaw from. Lets do this in an example. Deleuze talks about two mode of escape. Prison break and clean break.

Prison Break is what we see in American movies. So what they do is forever and ever they look over their shoulder. Prison break means the rest of your life you look over your shoulder. The only lucky day of the rest of your life is when Calahan or whatever the Sherif comes to say, you're welcome back. Now I can look in front of me, onto the bars, but at least in front of me. The prison break wants to get back.

The other break is the clean break. I break out in a way that no one ever notices. I manufacture myself to look exactly like hime. He is a guard. I swop clothes with him and then I get the cash and fire myself and go to the Bahamas. The problem is that he only can look in front of himself, because the past will sooner or later catch up. What will happen when he looks in front of himself is that he sees nothing. Because he cannot make a relationship. HE cannot have a past. He must not have a past because that is the moment that he will be caught up right? The clean break means that you not only break from the prison, but you break with everything so you become the virtual. You become sovereign.

The prison break wants back. He is on an excursion into the deep forest and he wants back. And the clean break he ends up so much in the forest that there is no way to go back.

If this is somehow understandable. Meaning that there is, we have to instead of going from prison break to what would be clean break movie? This one, a brilliant movie, Pierce Brosnan and then some Italian or spanish talking. A spanish lady, hmm, who is not Penelope Cruz, but someone else. google somebody. Anne Dewit. Sort of tango. Can someone do a IMVU with Pierce Brosnan and yeah it is a tiny girl. So the film goes like this: they make super perfect thieves. The one that they are hanging on a building in Cambodia? No, not that one. But Pierce Brosnan makes amazing films, right? Is it called what? Quoi? No, Entrapment is with Sean Connery. It was not youtube because imdb. It is not very famous this movie. So in that movie. It is maybe from 97, which age? 2002 maybe? It's kind of his post-Bond period. No, that's also a weird movie but not that one. Beyond the Sunset. After The Sunset, exactly. So indeed what happens there, they do the, Selma and Pierce, they do a fabass heist. They steal

something very important and then they take off to the Bahamas somewhere. And then of course then what happens is, they are enormously bored. And they eat lobster every day and every day umbrella drinks, for ever and ever and ever. So in order to entertain themselves and each other, because all the people that they lunch with or have lobster dinner with, they have bermuda shorts and are overweighted and talk about alabama and shit like this, which is great fun in the beginning, but not in the long run. So they pickpocket their lunch and dinner guest, and they shouldn't do that. So exactly their clean break makes them absolutely and endlessly bored. So the film that we have to look into is then. It's the third movie, which we maybe should make then, but I have an idea. Road to Perdition. That is the good movie. And nobody saw that one apparently. It's with Tom Hanks and the sidekick is a black guy, a slightly older black guy, right? It is in the prison, they produce an autonomous system. Instead of making a breaking out or breaking clean, they produce an internal break. And of course this must be punished at a certain moment. This autonomous entity must be repressed. Otherwise it is not prison anymore, right? They should look at this new movie with Mel Gibson called Catch the Gringo, or Lool the gringo, it came out two months ago. Mel Gibson goes to prison in New Mexico. There is only a door and in the prison there is no laws, but it is formulating its own society. It sound terrible with Mel Gibson in a mexican prison, but it is quite. What was it called? O Z . This is not very incrementally is, it closes down and it is actually, the problem, the issuing was that there was no way in hell to keep up the prison. It became so corrupted, so oversized, etcetera, that the only way to deal with it was to basically close the door. The only thing that is, is this containment, right? In there of course children start to happen, they start schools, drug trafficking was internal and son on. It is quite an interesting film to look at in this respect of what is this break in between. Which of course is not called a break then. Road to Perdition is to turn the law upside down and make it our own and produce an autonomous organization and so on. Anyway this was between little parentheses.

But, nevertheless to come back to when we are in the black forest. When we are outside of the Oikos, we are in a black forest. I was thinking right, so. In the dark forest. The dark forest has a god. I mean the Greek they don't have one god, they have bunches of them, right. The god of the dark forest, obviously which one? Pan, right? So, Pan plays his flute in the dark forest. What happens when we are in the dark forest and we hear Pan play, what happens to us? We panic. So panic is what we feel in the dark forest. Endless an eternal panic. Exactly, because every direction is equally every direction. If we move far or short, doesn't matter. The dark forest you can meet super whimsical people. Everybody is lost all of the time. So, that was that.

What we wanted to do with our miss en scene in agora, was: can we learn the audience into this space that we call the public. Which is the space where theatre once started sort of say, all right? The greek drama has its tradition from traveling storytellers and then some idiotic wagon and slowly little by little it homogenized and organized itself and became a stage and had relation to rituals, and religious rituals , and sacrifices and what not. And the drama develops. The space of the drama is the same as the space of politics. So, we hear you see and say, and either we clap or protest, whatever, right? And my job as a dramatist and my job as a politician is basically to be convincing and make you say, ah yes. If we don't vote for these guys, look what will happen to us. Something in that direction, very simplified, right? So, theatre and politics has a shared starting point. But is it so that to the same extend that politics has lost its, but that could be called to the same extend that politics has lost its edge. Can we ask the question, is it the same thing with theatre. Has theatre lost its capacity for being a space for radical negotiation for the production of meaning for production. And not of, what is the case in our present predicament. Which would be, well: institutionalization

transparency interpretation, etcetera. Which we will come to, what has happened with theatre. Our opinion, our proposal is that theatre has lost its ability or its closeness or its involvement, or its engagement with the public or in publicness, in favor for support for something else. As much as politics has lost its relationship to politics. And would be sort of say that to think to redirect theatre again into a public would this also be to redirect or to claim, would this be to force our spectators to become political subject anew, or renew themselves as political subject. Since it is the space for negotiation, i can only be a political subject. But then maybe we need to detour this again to see what has happened with public space? Over a reason why. And this is great, because was not at all what i have made in my notes, look. I have several papers and I haven't even started so lets give a title, but not more than that.

So, this will take a long time so prepare for the worst. You know, so. Here comes the footnote is to say the reason for Norwegian Magic is in the agora project. And it is to realize that it failed and to initiate, can we think another kind of theatre, closest thing, or another kind of constellation of knowledge. Or is another constellation of knowledge necessary in order to re-enter a public as a public and not re-enter as a representation, nor as some kind of vanity, right? To come to this how, it was necessary to organize Norwegian Magic because of the agora and it is from a deep conviction in me that the public is of the utmost importance, although we of course remember this Rancière, has this little sentence. Everybody reads too much Rancière and I think there is only one pare that is necessary to read and that is a little thing that is on the internet called: ten thesis, ten sentences, maybe even, ten paragraphs on politics. Which is basically he goes over what makes politics in a sort of republican or kind of democratic sense. What is the conditions of politics? One thing that he says is: Of course we know that the dead of politics and the rebirth of politics is the one and the same. In other fords we can in order to go to the public. It can not be a public that we know. In order to rebirth politics it cannot be from some, 'lets blow some fire into communism again. That won't happen, once the game is played, it's played. So if we want the rebirth of politics, cannot be a rebirth, it must be a radical birth, as for the first time. Otherwise it is already inscribed and is always an opponent that has a weapon sort of say. The birth of politics, again, is a moment where there is no weapons to negotiate. It needs in other words: the birth of politics, the rebirth, the death, is already negotiated, right? The real new birth needs to be a non negotiated one, mainly it cannot be ancestral. It cannot be relational, it needs to be clear cut. Nor and in a certain way it has to be the good moment which is an evil one. The good evil moment of a clean break. Which we will come to later on. Which is exactly not a creativity break.

So, hmm. What was I supposed to talk about. Hmm. I have almost said that the title of the piece of todays and, ah yes. A public space, what has happened to the public space over the last so many years then? So, somebody told me the other day: you know i am so poor, i cannot afford to go to the gym. I thought that that was a brilliant sentence. What do you mean? You mean you can't do pushups in your room or in a park or something? You have to go to the gym to make your body better? So maybe there is something in there that is really really scary, right? To practice the body is already corporatized. I can only practice my body when I pay for it, when it is corporatized, and then I can measure the production that my body involves itself in. Otherwise when it is in some sort of public, then something else is taking place. But, I think we need to take this story from 1750. And which is not we will go year by year. But around 1750 is where, 1678 is when, almost sure, is when the stock market in Amsterdam is initiated. So the 18 century up until 1789 which is the French revolution I believe. These hundred years is the introduction of a new kind of governance. Pre 1750 is a governance that deals with sovereignty, new kinds of sovereignty then in the pre-political greece, but yet is one where Louis XIV has sovereignty and he can give and take life. The way

that this kind of governance deals is that if you do wrong, we will punish you. So the threat is the reason for you not to do wrong. And then there comes a new kind of governance around, which says: this is not very clever. It is very messy to cut the hands when someone just steals bicycles anyways, so what should we do when they steal something really bad. And so on, and by the way it is kind of interesting. In the times of sovereignty. So there are some examples for this, about this in Agamben. Somebody who inside the city say, a high up priest, kills somebody and was excommunicated, he was thrown out. And after he was thrown out there was a burial of him in the city. Since you are in the deep forest and not in the city, you don't exist and therefore you're dead and they had to bury you. So they had to put empty coffins in the ground in order to maintain the illusion, the phantasy sort of say, of a society of such a model. Cutting of peoples arms are not very good, and fear is not very building, right? If you are in fear and if you know that this is the punishment. At a certain moment we will gather together, we armless people, and fight against the king, or whoever, right? So, instead said the governance what we should do is: the government has to teach the citizens what is good for them, is good for the city, the nation. The governance teaches us that it is a bad idea to steal the bicycles, because if everybody does we will have a shortage of communication means or something. Whatever. We are taught what is good for and in Foucauldian terms we are taught, what is good for the maintenance of the species. This is our job: to know what is good for the survival of humans. And we should come back to this term survival, which is highly complicated. So, our job is to work for the maintenance of the species, since we know this is so, we can also say that: because of the maintenance of the species, it is how it has to be. Some people have to be poor, some people should be rich. Other use, it would be otherwise, because what we work for is the maintenance of the species.

1hour20minutes

A little bit of war is better for the species, if it is good for the species, it is good with war. What we work for is kind of a Darwinian situation of maintaining the human and if we now remember and we will come to this later on. 1750 lets say, who is the dark, no. Who is the? Not the dark, it is not a very dark guy. About 1750 there is also a philosopher that, the one that we talk about is Kant.

The critique of whatever knowledge is 1783. That is the bad moment, right? What he says is correlation. What Kant promotes, or how I understand, or whatever. What Kant does is to say: end of metaphysics, end of the big questions. I cannot answer the big, what we have mostly have been busy with were the big question: what is time, what is being, what are the other big questions. Kant says: I cannot answer these questions, because I can only answer these questions from a consciousness. The world is only configured vis a vis a consciousness. So, the questions that Kant answers is not: 'what is', in the big sense; in the sense of the sovereignty of the issue. What is being as sovereign, but it becomes what Kant introduces, what is being from the point of view of the consciousness, which is the humans. Not necessarily my mind, but a human consciousness. What happens also, what this, how I categorize Kant, what this means is that philosophy stops cutting the hand of people, and starts to learn to teach the citizens what is good for them. Mainly philosophy becomes a human endeavor and not something which is out there. Philosophy introduces itself to become somehow political theory; instead of being philosophy with a big 'P'. It is interesting to see here how politics change to become utterly human oriented. Now the human is the subject is a consciousness, that the consciousness about providing a world what is good for it, while previously if you did that, we cut your head off or something else, because the person was understood as an object. Now it is a consciousness and Kant helps out and introduces a

philosophy that becomes liberal. So, pre-modern governance, liberal governance, philosophy until Hobbs as a kind of transition and into Kant, here it becomes, philosophy becomes also a liberal endeavor. And is maybe only now, two hundred and how many years, that possibly we can see, or we need to see a way out of Kantian correlationism. Which we have done already for a few years with a number of philosophers and so on. I mean not neo-liberalism. I mean liberal in the sense of liberal governance as the whole range of capitalism. It is about building, it becomes basically from the governance of deaths to the governance of lives. And this I mean liberal governance. It is a matter of governance of lives and the maintenance of lives. Human life?

There is only human life. For liberal governance there is only the humans and the assistants which are animals and windows and so on. Not so much windows; but rats and sharks, they are also a system. And trees and seas and so on. What Kant of course introduces is also a strongly hierarchical organization for a very equivocal organization of big systems. So the world exists as vis a vis the human. Not as vis a vis the human and two dogs, or a truck and a couple of chairs.

Just between parentheses, totally from the thin air.

In Sweden two elections ago there was an issued, which is great and so on, but nevertheless there was issued of the feminist party. Which is already a mystical proposition. The feminist party, what the hell is now that? We can also have the happy party, and you know some other party. But the feminist party was initiated and in the beginning they were, of coarsen, for gay marriage. And then suddenly over night they changed and said they were against gay marriage, gay partnership: no way ever. Then a little bit of metabolic and arguments and conversations, and it ends up by them saying: first of all we are against gay marriage as we are against any kind of marriage. After all it is a ritual that consolidates people in a certain way behind the door with one name on the foo, so fuck that. But more over, why, first of all to be allowed to marry only one and why only humans? What if I want to marry a couple of chairs and the toast that I made this morning. That should also be possible, if we consider that there is no difference to your life and any other consciousness. It might not participate in the world in the same way, but we cannot differentiate 'what is its life' it is still a being in the world, so what is the problem? Should we now dismiss the possibility that there is a consciousness in a chair or a toast? And if so, where do we make the cut? Where is the consciousness not valuable anymore? Because we say, if we kill a toast or you kill a cat, in every days sense we have a very big difference, right? People do things with the cat, they have them in their bed and so on, which is totally discussing obviously, but they do. Then sometimes I have friends visiting me and they say: what does the toast do in your bed? And I love it, it's cosy and then I'm kind understood as crazy. So where is the cut between consciousnesses, and can we do a cut at all?

So, in any case: liberal governance, Kant, consciousness, highly hierarchical. And the next time around is of course Whitehead and then Deleuze, and of course Nietzsche, who opposes these kinds of qualities and organizations. Something happens to public space with the introduction of liberal governance which is that what we do in the public space, what we do in the agora, what we do in this town square, is what is good for the people, is what is good for the maintenance of us. As prior to liberal governance, and of course this what not over night and suddenly, but prior to liberal governance what govern people in the public sphere previously, was not what is good for people, but what is good for me here and now, and only here and now. So the messiness or the trouble with public space changed fundamentally in this period of time. From being a place where anything goes, whatever, is exactly whatever. It were all kinds of... Of course there was police to make sure that the public space would not degenerate completely, but there was still a space of very strong smoothness. Towards now a

liberal space which we kind of govern already. So from having a police there in the back previously, if we stole something we cut off the hand, in the liberal public space it becomes a self-governed possibility. So we become governors of public space already and somehow, sort of say, now we install public space into the republic, into governance that is already prescribing what goes on. So, in a sense, we can think that it is a kind of a paper works wise. So there is a moment that you have to have a permission to make a public or political demonstration in public space, which in a certain way is ridiculous, right? Prior to liberal governance public space was radically public. As far as my accounts are. It had a very different kind of publicness to it. So making this as a starting point and then bringing this into social democracy or welfare state post WWII, we can see how have we accommodated, or how have we developed what is our understanding of this public space. We understand it as a place of free play, but of course it wasn't, right? The space of free play, but only, almost, but not quiet. A semi-striated or a structurally weak, territorialized opportunity. And then comes a moment. So, I would argue that there is not such a strong transformation of public space from 1750 up until 1971, where something happens again. Which is the city, the nation governs the space and gives permission to us to do whatever. Which is good for, and we do what we already understood to be good for the population. And in 1971 something new happens and that is, however mystical the connection, this is, I think it's 18 of August or 18 of September in 1971, which is when Nixon took away the gold standard. In this moment, symbolically speaking, this is the moment when indexicality, so value, that kind of value evaporates. And of course it is already anticipated and it goes on afterwards, as we still think about that gold being there in some or other way, right? But at that moment Nixon says: not only human relationship is floating, but value is immensely floating, everything, everywhere, and it is only us that assign value to this floating. And here is also not so strange, it is also quite interesting to think that, in the story that Nixon tells about himself, his metaphors, no in his autobiography, alright? In the autobiography Nixon mentions the date where he started to negotiate, which is the same date of Woodstock. So Nixon comes out with the idea floating currency the same weekend of Woodstock, which is an image of, a symptom, towards an image of a de-territorialized, or a de-homogenized, or a de-nuclear-familiarized US. So, the hippies come to their consolidation and say: free ourselves, liberate ourselves, drug liberation, women liberation, educational liberation, all kinds of fucking liberations. The minute after liberation goes override, when they on the turbo charge of liberation, that is the moment that Nixon says: no more gold standard.

The gold of the Fort Knox goes away in 1971. (discussion on accuracy of the dates)

So, your google is bad and I also learned it in school so we can contest each other, but how I have read it is: Bretton Woods is the rethinking of the standards, but in 1971 they take it away. So if 1948 was the same time as the United Nations, so we can of course do these genealogies that are totally pathetic, it is waco and fucked up and still genealogies. And of course the autobiography of Nixon, I just made that up now. But 1971, I believe, is quite there. It is the last moment that the gold standard is talked about and is taken away. I think it is really smart of Nixon, not as smart as we think, or as I have thought, but it is smart in order for exactly provide the opposite of what it proposes. Which we will come to soon. What happens here is that in the moment of opening, is that out goes the indexicality, and in comes difference. Everything becomes negotiable vis a vis the difference; the difference in between: this and that, you and me, etcetera and etcetera; rather than what is negotiated from what is similar. Previously where there is an index we can accumulate and organize in the spectrum of similarities, now becomes about differences and its perspective of difference becomes the currency. You are closer than me than she is. This becomes the economical organization instead of something that had weight, or whatever. So, in Woodstock are the

hippies, in White House is the gold standard and continental philosophy is off course also the one, where I would say, late sixties is also where relativism or value is cut out of philosophy for the second time. If Kant cuts the relation to the big questions, now the cut is being again made by saying: the only thing we have is language and language is performative and therefore constructed as an ever floating currency. So towards 1970 floating is ubiquitous and we can maybe even say that this the moment when computer power starts to be, ... happy. When was Concorde launched? 1971.

I haven't really figured out this yet so I am making some circles of regurgitation here, but if floating is what happens, must not something happen with public space? Because of 1971, because of floating, there was the possibility to re-negotiate publicness, public space, and it was possible to re-negotiate the ownership of public space. This is the opener for a corporatization of public space. I will build that argument tomorrow, but I can't manage now. So, corporatization of public space. So I would say that for the last 40 years what has happened is basically that public space as we knew it, as we have a nostalgic idea, has vanished. Public space doesn't exist anymore. It is fully corporatized, either CCTV or surveillance camera's or by Mc Donalds outdoor services. For example, Mac Donalds doesn't only own from their walls to the outdoor services stops, they also own the license all the way to the street. So here you cannot circulate political pamphlets, here you cannot sell your home made cookies. Before you could sell your home made cookies all way into the trash over Mac Donalds but now they own all the way there. If you think now about all the events that we have on our public squares, Nike has street basket ball, or B boy events sponsored all over the place right? This can happen since the moment the B boy or Nike events can happen in public space, there is not an event for people with blind dogs, or an event that says why don't we have more communism now, etc. So the moment we can rent out to corporations our public space I think we have a big difficulty. On the other hand the story is quite simple. Basically a general idea from the last 25 years or so, that public space has disappeared, it looks like it's there, but it's not. Most of its space become semi public. Of course you can do whatever you want in a shopping mall, but it is exactly only whatever you want, right? Also cinema's have also become semi public nowadays. You pay your 8 euro's to go into the cineplex, but when you are there they only look at your ticket before you go up the escalator, sort of say, and then you can go into any of the rooms, and in the old cinema's you came in one way, and there was another door to exit. Now you often go out the same door you came in. So, obviously they don't make money from you going through, but from staying in. They want you in the foyer, there's where they make money from you. Here we can have drinks, eat nacho's, collective conversation and exchange, but these interactions are organized or financialized in a sense. So in this respect, on the other side, somebody told me: I am so poor I cannot go to the gym anymore. Another person said: I am so sick of this artistic research, what has happened to artistic freedom. What do you mean artistic freedom? You have been subsidized by the Swedish, Norwegian, Finnish, French, or the German government for an entire artistic career, so what you mean artistic freedom? Ah, you mean artistic freedom inscribed in the welfare state, well that freedom of art we have maybe lost, but you really think that was a freedom? So the public space that we now want to have back, that we want to reclaim, which is the Breton Wood Public Space, I'm kidding.

I mean live

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Auslander, Philip. *Liveness: Performance in a Mediatized Culture*. London and New York: Routledge, 1999.

Berardi, Franco Biffo. *Precarious Rhapsody: Semiocapitalism and the pathologies of the post-alpha generation*. London: Minor Compositions, 2009.

Distributed by Autonomedia, New York. Available from <http://www.scribd.com/doc/45814645/Precarious-Rhapsody-Semiocapitalism-and-the-pathologies-of-post-alpha-generation-by-Franco-Bifo-Berardi> . Accessed 20 May 2012.

Berger, John. *Ways of Seeing*. London: Penguin Modern Classics, 2008

Bourriaud, Nicolas. *Relational Esthetics*. Les presses du réel, 2002

Debord, Guy. *Comments on the Society of the Spectacle*. Paris, 1988. Translated by Malcolm Imrie. Available from <http://libcom.org/library/comments-society-spectacle> Accessed 13 March 2012

Deleuze Gilles. "*The Logic of Sense*". Available from http://en.bookfi.org/book/1172079?_ir=1 Accessed 7 September 2012

Esaak, Shelley. "*Performance Art - Art History 101 Basics*." 1960s-Present. Available from <http://arthistory.about.com/cs/arthistory101one/a/performance.htm> Accessed 12 May 2012

Future Art Base. "*The Aesthetic Dispositive of Semiocapitalism*" Available from <http://www.futureartbase.org/portfolio/aesthetic-dispositive-of-semiocapitalism/> Accessed 29 May 2012

Fuller, Buckminster. "*Operating manual for Spaceship Earth*". Buckminster Fuller Institute. Available from <http://www.bfi.org/about-bucky/resources/books/operating-manual-spaceship-earth> Accessed 18 April 2012.

Guattari & Deleuze. *A Thousand Plateaus*. Paris: Les Editions de minuit, 1980

Heilbroner, Robert. *The Worldly Philosophers: The Lives, Times, and Ideas of the Great Economic Thinkers*. 7th Edition. London: Penguin Books, 2000.

Khan, Hazrat Inayat. *The Mysticism of Sound and Music*. Boston & London: Shambala Dragon Editions, 1996.

Mason, Moya K. "*Adorno : World of Art and What is at Stake*". Available from <http://www.moyak.com/papers/adorno-modernist-art.html> Accessed 17 May 2012.

Morris, William. *News from Nowhere*. First Edition: Commenweal 1890. Wildside Press, 2007

Rap Brendon. "Economy of Effort". Copyright 2011.

Available from <http://economyofeffort.com/>

Accessed 12 May 2012.

"Seven Deadly Sins." Wikipedia Article. Available from <http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?oldid=485467640> Accessed 4 April 2012.

Thoreau, Henry David. *Civil Disobedience and Other Essays*. New York: Dover Publication Inc. 1993.

Wilson, Chris. "Neotopia". Rob Espinosa. Available from <http://www.graphicclassroom.org/2007/03/neotopia-volume-1.html> . Accessed 20 May 2012.

for more information : <http://sign6.org>