

Notes on My Overlap with Einar Thorsteinn

Originally published as 'Notes on My Overlap with Einar Thorsteinn', in Einar Thorsteinn and Olafur Eliasson, *To the Habitants of Space in General and the Spatial Inhabitants in Particular* (Berlin, 2002), pp. 134–35.

Over the last five years, the involvement of different people in the development of the projects I am working on has become a central aspect.

One of the most central persons in this has, since I first met him in 1996, been Einar Thorsteinn. His skills and understanding of my work are and have been extremely important for the creation of a large range of ideas.

The multiple fields in which Einar is, and has been, active have given him a sense of space that, in its various combinations, has proven extremely productive. His field of research and, consequently, some knowledge range from areas of mathematical dimensionality to multi-dimensionality of living beings, from 2D and 3D geometry to crystallography and quasicrystallography.

From gravity in relation to cosmic zero-point energy fields and then, as described by Global Scaling, to anti-gravity, and consequently to free energy mechanics. From modern medicine to alternative and Asian medicine. From architecture and sustainable housing to Sick Building Syndrome and the effects geomancy and microwave fields have on the biological and ecological integrity of buildings. From geodesic dome building, tensegrity and synergetics to tensile structures and ergonomic design. Toy and furniture design. Space-architecture and free fall urinal technology. And then from science history to modern frontier science development. From local and global politics and journalism to conspiracy theories. From cultural history and archaeology to alternative archaeology. And finally cosmology and, within it, particularly extraterrestrial intelligence both within and without terrestrial reach.

One fact that fascinates me in particular is that Einar has a gift; an ability to think spatially – and this – without his thoughts being based on the dominant Cartesian or Euclidian space-time conception.

By thinking spatially, I mean that he is able to construct a more complex dimensional shape in his thoughts alone with high precision – while discussing and developing it. This ability would not be so impressive in terms of the traditional ninety-degree boxes that have dominated spatial relations throughout our Western history. But when the spatial coordinates become more complex – involving spherical or crystalline forms, where all angles are different – this ability becomes something far more potent.

In a way, it is like playing blind chess (not having the board in front of you while playing) to construct complex spatial progressions and then reverse them horizontally or cover them with mirrors, thereby creating a kaleidoscopic equivalent of the same structure, and all this while communicating to normal earthlings like myself.

I am not trying to romanticise this nor saying that being momentarily out of the Cartesian reach is any closer to truthfulness than elsewhere – the point is that I have found great inspiration in using different spatial ideas to expose that the so-called Cartesian spatial culture is a construction – and not a source of higher (spatial) relations. This would promote an acceptance of hierarchy – and lead to power structures – resulting finally in exploitation and ignorance . . . taking things for granted the way they are.

Here I should also mention that any other model of thought (including my own) is a construction as well – I believe. So, finally, the very inspiring

discussions and projects I have had with Einar were never based on the idea of laying out a 'new' value system that proposes a better space to replace the currently dominant one. No, the aim has foremost been to use the spatial questions as a source of reflection on, or of, the already existing surroundings – and, as previously stated, to show that our surroundings (defined as broadly as possible – which in Einar's terminology is very broad) are not naturally given.

Behind this, of course, lies an ideology that, despite its romantic reminiscence, is very crucial to me. So my interest in revealing the so-called cultural constructions is fundamentally motivated by my value of transparency of our surroundings as a source of freedom. Freedom in how we orient ourselves and relate to ourselves.

(Here I should note that what I have discussed above is my opinion, and even though I write it in this book, it doesn't necessarily mean that Einar shares the same beliefs; in fact, I sometimes have reason to believe that Einar is in contact with someone/something who might suggest a different matter of space that inevitably cannot be submitted to my mentioned idea. On the contrary, at times, he seems to hold relevant information that proves my mentioned ideas to be wrong. But fundamentally, I consider the overlap of his and my beliefs to be significant enough to have a critical and creative discourse.)

Some Notes on Changes

First – I was not sure if I was confused, which I guess meant nothing other than I was confused indeed. But this confusion was not linear, or at least not recognisable, with its usual mix of surprise and doubt. Some confusions, I guess, are so familiar that you recognise them as 'typical' confusions, knowing approximately to what realm they are taking you. No – this particular feeling was different. Its way of organising itself, or, rather, the way it didn't organise itself, had left me wondering – not about the particular situation I was in or the structure of this confusion (which I anyway rarely or, to be honest, never think about). No, at this moment I was wondering about myself. It occurred to me that, though very subtly, something had just changed.

So, as I've said, I was a bit confused; I was thinking about this little shift which had struck me, and without any particular spectacle, it became obvious to me that the confusion was not due to any sudden changes in my surroundings. No, what I had just experienced was how I – myself – had changed.

We all change – as we know – more or less all the time. We get older and equally wise or ignorant. We expect to change, so to speak. We anticipate change and the whole idea of doing so is part of our culture – the concept of changing has long been cultivated, or, should I say, modernised to the more progressive term *developing*. Thus, the whole idea of developing is to a certain extent predetermined, or at least somewhat predictable – just like 'confusion', as mentioned earlier, can be familiar. The discrepancy field, or so-called buffer zone, between what we expect to get and what we actually get is a complex playground where most of our cultural history can be found and told. But what is more important, since this particular area, by definition, is always connected to our time, it inevitably holds a strong position as the central link between our

emotions and our surroundings. I can call this area, or time zone, *protension*. Using time as glue, our *protension* constructs experiences with our senses and surroundings as building blocks. It is somewhere around here, or rather 'there', that we are constructed as subjects – in a constantly changing progression.

Because of the overall dominance of rationality in modernism, mental bastards such as 'confusion' have been eliminated or reduced to existing only as subconscious guerrilla concepts, attacking only when the established, more acknowledged ideas, such as logic and expectation, crash and time/space are momentarily out of sync.

Back to changes. From down around our feelings – the best-kept construction we have – up to the sensation of our emotions being something given by so-called nature.

Throughout history you can observe how different models of seeing and relating to space – that is, man's relation to his surroundings – have replaced one another, parallel with social, ideological, technical, and other changes. Values of a given time will always determine the models and relations through which we choose to conduct our lives. If the values change, the relations change as well.

For the single person these models and relations can seem so natural that one can make the mistake of thinking that they are actual characteristics of our surroundings. Through a given time's system of values, we structure our surroundings in such a way that they appear meaningful and as an understandable entity.

However, at the same time, this specific relation also sets up a kind of limitation for what we perceive and understand from our surroundings because it excludes or suppresses any knowledge which clashes with its meaningful entity.

When I Met Einar

When I first met Einar Thorsteinn seven years ago in Iceland, I was working on a project and needed his advice. Soon after my initial meetings with Einar, my family and friends in Iceland started talking to him as well. First, this left me with some confusion – not that I was directly uneasy about it, but it just came with some surprise. My father, Elias, and my friend Gunnar both started spending time with Einar then. So after being slightly ashamed through my own petty-bourgeois jealousy – that 'my' Einar was seeing my friends without needing me to be involved – I was extremely thrilled to realise that I, in fact, was like a bird hit by two stones at the same time – (hence the above-mentioned confusion). One stone was that I saw my own social ignorance, and the other, that I had gained a great friend. The fact that Einar's virtue was spreading radiantly proved already in the early stage of our relationship what would later become a central issue: that all known (and unknown) physical structures, models, or relations exist as socialising potential.

The square root of the end