

Orts zeit

Basel 2014

Aufzeichnungen der Hochschule für Gestaltung und Kunst FHNW
Herausgegeben von Prof. Kirsten Merete Langkilde, Direktorin

Christoph Merian Verlag

- 7
Vorwort
Kirsten Merete Langkilde
- 15
Ein Campus für die Künste
Kirsten Merete Langkilde und David Wyss
im Gespräch mit Fritz Schumacher
- 33
Veränderung der Lebenswelten
Kirsten Merete Langkilde
im Gespräch mit Beat von Wartburg
- 51
**Die Moderne, die Gegenwart,
Kunst und Komplexität**
Kirsten Merete Langkilde
im Gespräch mit Bernd M. Scherer
- 69
Synprozess
Susanne Neubauer
- 89
**Sympathy and Synecdoche:
A Dozen Ways to Syn**
Raqs Media Collective
- 107
Parallelism 2
Liam Gillick

- 123
Synergien auf dem Campus
Sabine Himmelsbach, Claudia Mareis
- 143
The Art of Archiving Digital Media
Michael Renner
in conversation with Suresh Surenthiran
and Theodore Davis
- 157
**Critical Media – Signale verstehen,
gestalten und setzen**
Shintaro Miyazaki
- 173
**« Informare » – Bildmetaphern,
Ästhetik und Erkenntnis
Grundlagen eines Praxisprojekts
zur Umsetzung komplexer
Datenmengen**
Marion Fink
- 195
**Der « Dreisitz » – ein Aussen-
möblierungsprojekt für das
neue Campusgelände**
Susanne Neubauer
im Gespräch mit Werner Baumhaki
und Johannes Fuchs

- 217
Fokus « Arbeitsfläche »
Benjamin Adler
- 231
**Ausstellen und Sammeln
von Plakaten**
Michael Renner
im Gespräch mit Alexandra Schüssler
und Kurt Würmli
- 249
**Für Synergien und eine
gegenseitige Offenheit**
Christof Scheibert
im Gespräch mit Ines Goldbach
- 263
Musik – Pavillon – Lesestück
Claude Enderle
- 281
**« Grenzgang ». Vom Dreispitz
in den trinationalen Raum**
Beate Florenz, Markus Schwander
- 297
**Die wiedergefundene Zeit im
Pariser Palais de Tokyo**
Melanie Franke

- 311
**With Deepest Sympathy.
Paul Chan in Basel**
Nicolaj van der Meulen, Jörg Wiesel –
mit Marc Hörler
- 325
**« Das « Extra » ist kein
additives Mehr. »**
Katrin Kruse
im Gespräch mit Kathrin Grossenbacher
- 342
Autorinnen und Autoren
- 359
Bildnachweis
- 360
Impressum

Parallelism 2

Liam Gillick

Liam Gillicks Gastbeitrag ist eine Selbstreflexion auf seinen 2013 erschienenen Text *«Parallelism»*. In diesem macht der Künstler kontextuelle Beeinflussungen und *«Serien von Parallelen»* aus, in die ein Kunstwerk eingebettet ist. Sein Text beschreibt jedoch nicht nur die Produktionsbedingungen, die zu einem Kunstwerk führen und dieses sowohl beschränken als auch herausfordern, sondern auch eine Kunsthaftigkeit an sich (*«a state of the art»*). Diese ist auch durch institutionelle und instrumentelle Aspekte sowie Aspekte des Austauschs geprägt. In *«Parallelism 2»* wird der Vorgängertext Ausgangslage für einen Text auf zweiter Ebene, den der Künstler in den ersten Text einfügt. *«Synprozessual»*, im Sinne eines vereinbarten *«mutual agreements»* fügt Susanne Neubauer eine weitere Stimme ein, indem sie die zweite Ebene Gillicks als Ausgangspunkt und Inspirationsquelle nimmt und diese durch einen Kommentar in einen erweiterten Kontext überführt. Die daraus resultierenden Fussnoten nehmen zwar ihre *for-male Form*, nicht jedoch ihre traditionelle Funktion an, sondern dienen als *«parallel»* agierende Momente mit vergleichbarer, jedoch eigener Zielsetzung und Fragestellung. Das Projekt, das Anfang Juli 2014 realisiert wurde, nimmt auf diese Weise synprozessuale Vorgänge beim Wort und macht sie in ihrer gewählten Form konkret.

Parallelism 2¹⁾

Liam Gillick

Artworks that generate descriptive potential [where the descriptive potential remains in parallel to that which has been produced for exhibition or display or some other form of exchange²⁾] within current advanced art cannot be reduced or consolidated [the descriptive potential of the work cannot be absorbed within the work itself nor can the work itself carry all of the communication requirements of the descriptive potential of the work³⁾]. Descriptive potential means new forms or idea structures that can be used [use meaning that there is some descriptive potential circulating around the work itself – either research based, academically structured (researched)

1) “Parallelism 2” is a speculative working title. It merges two concepts (and two voices) elaborating on the idea that processes are embedded into “simultaneous realities” of “varied practices” (Gillick 2013: 208) and hence shape systems which could be described as “autopoietic”. The core moment of such a system is its quality of being subjective / individual as well as collective / social. The working title’s “2” is, besides indicating a certain reiteration, a reference to Helga Nowotny, Peter Scott and Michael Gibbon’s concept of knowledge production, “Mode 2”. It focuses on “how a discourse is being transcended” (Nowotny / Scott / Gibbons 2003: 180) – it makes the ground for further explorations which will undertake the difficult task to exemplify “synprocessual” exchanges on a qualitative basis. The question is: What is the qualitatively surplus as well as its underlying problem-

atics of the merging of individual thoughts to a creative output shaping the “third other”?

2) This observation is comparable to exhibitions such as Harald Szeemann’s “Bachelor Machines” (1975) which are potentially multilayered – using objects, works, “climates”, visualized images of imaginations – and “intentions” conceived as unfinished products, aiming at the “imaginative space” (Szeemann 1981: 142). It is about these forms of layers which are interlinked, which share the same concern, but are of a different genre.

3) As such, the work of art is the unfinished document of the producer’s intention and a place to frame the negation of mediation as well as its will to communicate – and to reproduce itself in serial forms or processual alterations.

or derived from reiteration or restaging⁴). While not necessarily didactic – descriptive structures tend towards producing a use value rather than recording a state or an abstraction alone [the descriptive potential can expand exponentially around the work remaining tied to a gravitational pull within the work. The descriptive potential and the work require each other⁵]. Such objects or structures with descriptive potential cannot be reduced or consolidated for they include elements of self-awareness in their deployment that recognize limitations and contextual influence [An encounter with the work brings awareness of descriptive potential around the work⁶]. The artworks are always incomplete but carry markers of their incompleteness [This state of incompleteness is not always immediately indicated but in some cases the title of the work or other textual material indicates a potential for extra-description⁷]. There are always exceptions when trying to apply classically reductive narratives to such artworks [The work itself demonstrates a lack which can only be provided by a parallel descriptive

4) Reiteration and restaging is key to synprocessual creative development and it is relevant that it is introduced into the text at this early stage. It touches the concept of translation which happens in an “area of tension” (Osborne / Buden 2008: n.p.) and where areas are “translated” from one to another. To elaborate on in the future are the individual / collective moments of anti-, trans-, and interdisciplinary (Osborne / Buden 2008: n.p.), and, finally, syndisciplinary impulses.

5) In a sense of work immanence, ontologically speaking. This concept however is polyfocal, at least bifocal, elaborating on the “tension” (fn. 4) between the object / thing and its surrounding structure, respectively narrative. This space of mutual interconnection is a zone with a shape that is imaginative – and therefore a matter of the brain – which requests further contextualization.

6) The potential description of the outer, “environmental” structure of a work of art, or a piece of design, is, as suggested, an area of interaction and above all production. It is interesting to see that production undergoes and surpasses limitations which are inherent in its outer structures. However, it is the quality of the structure (the finding of another language and therefore quality not its own) and not its limitation that influences the work’s potential. The question arises how known and / or unknown either limitation or structure should be in order to obtain full potential, a question which had been asked in a different context, however inspiringly, by Brian Uzzi (Uzzi 2005) and Ed Catmull (Catmull 2008).

7) Incompletion seems a productive state for the elaboration of an “other” area of communication as it – if declared by the work or its producer – supports associative thinking. This is what is meant by “extra-description”.

potential, so all attempts to analyse the work as a series of discrete gestures or self-contained references will be limited⁸). They [the works] cannot be simplified as they are reified at their origin, their deployment and their analysis [the reification exists in the development of the descriptive potential⁹] – they are concrete and have a self-conscious thingness built in from the outset. A thingness that is not limited to form but one that includes structure – both applied and anticipated [This sense of “thingness” means that the artwork itself is initially the aspect of the work that is presented and perceived, alongside an apparent lack¹⁰]. The decision to disperse something into the art context in this case does not produce a synthesis of ideas and forms but an endless series of strings that appear to cross and intersect [The work itself requires descriptive potential that is not prescriptive but allows a sequence or network of potentials to flow, and at the same time also taps into or feeds off further descriptive networks¹¹]. But such intersection is an illusion due to the effect of the institutional, instrumental

8) It is a non-defined realm that has the potentiality to call for or be in contrast to what is called “classical narratives”. The first question here is where the narrator’s position is, or, in Eduardo Viveiros de Castro’s terms, “quelle est l’anthropologie de ce peuple [in our context: of the object / work] – l’anthropologie que a ce peuple comme agent et non pas comme patient théorique” (Viveiros de Castro 2009: 52). It is the anthropologic perspectivism of the descriptive which enables the production’s potentiality.

9) Simplification and differentiation are processes of interaction within the greater process of reification. The work of art, as Niklas Luhmann suggests, establishes a proper reality which differs from the familiar reality. It constructs an imaginary or fictive reality and it is the symbolic use of language (as well as the religious sanctification of objects and events) that splits realities (Luhmann 1995: 229). In this splitting, lies the development of a descriptive potential.

10) On the anti-fetishism of things and objects as being linked in a “seamless web of things and human beings” see Hennion / Latour 1993. In another context: “If art is, in truth, art, it feels as if it is too concrete to be mere appearance, but not concrete enough to exist as mere reality. In other words, art is more *and* less than a thing. And it is this simultaneous expression of *more-ness* and *less-ness* that makes what is made art” (Chan 2009: n.p., emphasis in original).

11) Networks foster the development of interaction and unexpected encounters. Deleuze and Guattari’s “rhizome” is an apt concept of describing networks which are genuine (a “*map and not a tracing*”). “What distinguishes the map from the tracing is that it is entirely oriented toward an experimentation in contact with the real.” (Deleuze / Guattari 1987: Rhizome 12, emphasis in original). The real cannot be prescriptive, it is always “on site” and “on time”.

and exchange component of the art context [The institutional or “academic method” may limit or create unwittingly parodic or straightforward historically verifiable descriptive networks ¹²⁾]. When rotated and viewed from varied perspectives, the deployed ideas of art move through time as endlessly parallel lines with no possibility of cohesion or consolidation [While apparently tied to its specific work, the descriptive potential of the work may unhitch itself when viewed from a different context or from a different point in time only to reconnect with further networks operating in parallel to the initial ones ¹³⁾].

Further – the intention to produce an artwork that might – in whatever form – somehow carry a direct connection between the self-perceived ethical stance of the artist and the material, form or lack of care for form within the work itself merely creates more parallel strings within the extant endless parallelism of the art context in particular and in general [Any attempt to create connection to a descriptive potential that operates firmly and permanently in parallel to a specific work merely creates more open

12) For some time, the “academic method”, mainly the “classical” method of the *descriptio*, the *ekphrasis*, has been on the point of losing its ground in the field of today’s contemporaneity, even though the loss of thorough knowledge of how to describe works of art has led to many awfully misleading interpretations. Ruskin’s “innocence of the eye” is only one example of a non-denotative perception which was sought after in the mid-19th century (Ruskin 1856) and which comes to mind today as a possible concept, another is Proust’s account of the “potential descriptive”: “Mais j’y pouvais discerner que le charme de chacune consistait en une sorte de métamorphose des choses représentées, analogue à celle qu’en poésie on nomme métaphore, et que, si Dieu le Père avait créé les choses en les nommant, c’est en leur ôtant leur nom, ou en leur en donnant un autre, qu’Elstir

les créait. Les noms qui désignent les choses répondent toujours à une notion de l’intelligence, étrangère à nos impressions véritables, et qui nous force à éliminer d’elles tout ce qui ne se rapporte pas à cette notion” (Proust 1954: 835). It is the challenge to develop and concretize the category of the “other third” that evolves out of parallel and synprocessual overlapping.

13) The idea of parallel and timely interconnected descriptions and interpretation is what Terry Smith would call a marker of contemporaneity – and in its negative sense – modernity. Smith insists on the “presentness of multiple, often incompatible temporalities ... Everything about time these days – and therefore about place, subjectivity, and sociality – is at once intensely *here*, is slipping, or has become artificial.” (Smith 2009: 196, emphasis in original).

networks that produce ever more parallel strands ¹⁴⁾]. There is no way to draw a logical conclusion about the political, moral or ethical stance of the artist by attempting to resolve their rhetoric with that which appears to have been produced [No matter how precise the attempt, there will always be a parallel descriptive potential that remains unhitched from the work ¹⁵⁾]. There is no moment of completion in any work [This may be what makes it a contemporary artwork and not some other human construction ¹⁶⁾]. The point at which the artwork is released into a context within which it might be supposed to have some use value is not a terminal frontier – it is merely a moment when the endless parallelism of the state of art is exposed even more fully [The point of collection, of exhibition, or the work appearing in a text or being referred to at some point is not the “death” or the moment of the work’s limitation, it is merely the point where an institutional parallel is engaged that merely masks other parallels ¹⁷⁾]. The work at this moment becomes part of an unresolvable context and it too exemplifies its status

14) “Art, like things, must exist in material reality to be fully realized. But unlike things, art shapes matter – which gives substance to material reality – without ever dominating it” (Chan 2009: n.p.). The lack of domination and materialized openness of a work of art is what makes parallel narratives illimitable. The key aspect is that of temporality – what is materialized first sets the strategic guide rails.

15) Paul Chan for example describes this potentiality of art becoming art as follows: “For what it expresses most, beyond the intention of the maker, the essence of an idea, an experience or an existence, is the irreconcilability of what is and what it wants to be. Art is the expression of an embodiment that never fully expresses itself.” (Chan 2009: n.p.)

16) The issue of incompleteness of objects such as works of art, and commodities such as design objects or other “things” within a

cultural context marks a research gap. It is of permanent importance if an object is conceptually finished and / or is open for further development (as much artistic practice is). The framing device of serial production may be one interface where these questions could be analysed. This observation, however, also applies to synprocessual practices which are not dedicated to produce an object-like output, but other forms of knowledge production such as texts, diagrams and key concepts.

17) As such, this is a definition of contemporaneity that highlights the potential importance of an artwork within a certain temporal structure. It is not true that art is only asserted in its own time, but that “each particular work of art makes [a demand] on our time (that of the individual viewer)” (Smith 2012: 114–145). However, as is argued here, time structures are occasionally misinterpreted and / or pushed into the background by the work’s occupations by institutions.

as a product of unresolvable drives that cannot be consolidated [The very attempt to fix or stabilize the parallel capacity of the work accentuates the impossibility of the task¹⁸⁾].

The pressures of institutional, instrumental and exchange aspects as they circle the work become part of the commodity aspect of the work [Any attempt to find the symbiotic parallel aspect of the work and codify it within an exchange system merely contributes to the commodity aspect of the work. It is a historical inevitability that the commodity aspect of the work will always exceed any aspect of alienation or otherness expressed in the work¹⁹⁾]. There is no work that can exist capable of evading this fact nor one that can ever resist the breakdown into endless parallelism.

Collectivity and super-subjectivity attempt to gather these parallels and force them to congeal through competing desires [Collectivity and super-subjectivity work in different ways. Collectivity makes a virtue of the parallel and super-subjectivity is only parallel²⁰⁾]. Collectivity and subjectivity mask endless parallelism – they cannot replace or deny it [This masking procedure is made visible through a fetishisation of the parallel,

18) Contemporary practice is collective practice. The practice's limitations are of course manifold in the moment when collectivity and collective endeavour is regulated and institutionalized. Furthermore, collective work is creative work that is taking place in semi-accessible spaces of interaction. Cafés in institutional buildings are the best places to allow ideas to intermingle.

19) Technical rationalities such as deadlines, prescriptions of content, number of characters and pseudo-conceptual guidelines exert potential pressure on any kind of work, especially in cultural production. Silent negation – conducted in the aforementioned structure of

reification – is needed, not obeying rules nor an institutional picture which is solely drawn from the external.

20) Collectivity is twofold and hence a virtue as it disseminates responsibilities for the creative agents. It is both work immanent in the process of creation (artist's co-ops) and structure immanent (Bourriaud's idea of "relational aesthetics", monitoring "human contacts" (Bourriaud 1998: 8). Subjectivity itself, understood as "super-subjectivity" is a question of site and "autopoietic" self-differentiation. Subjectivity itself cannot be further enhanced, but it can allow itself to become more complex through the acquisition and the processing of knowledge and experiences.

either in the form of parallel as content or content as parallel²¹⁾. Collectivity brings the strings into clumps of over-cooked pasta [Endless parallels tangled up in each other²²⁾]. Super-subjectivity pulls the strings taught but leaves them surrounded by clumps, weaves and merely creates a temporary super-subjective tension (irony) [Parallel as a "way of life" or as an expression of exceptionalism²³⁾].

There is no conflict between simultaneous realities and parallelism – they are perspectival aspects of the same non-resolvable phenomena [Parallelism takes place because of simultaneous realities – not in opposition to them²⁴⁾]. Simultaneous realities are fixed points at any mo-

21) The world of aesthetics and art is undergoing a re-evaluation in terms of the increasing importance of geographical and, consequently, political positioning of the individual. Waves of (art) historical rewriting are observed in different parts of the world and from different perspectives. This process is going to effect the "social brain" which has, according to Franco "Bifo" Berardi, to shift the tendency inscribed in the "evolution of contents of knowledge, technology and social production, but this tendency is hindered by entangling forms [...]" (Berardi 2013: 31). However, self-awareness is increasing and entanglements and "parallels" are made more productive (even though fetishisation can happen).

22) Collectivity is a process of engagement and entanglement without a necessary incorporation to an object (in the context of the much-discussed reiteration above, this incongruity marks a promising start for further elaboration). In its potentially reiterated form it would result in a Gesamt(kunst)werk which is per se utopic and infused with undefined areas of "black holes", areas of unpredictable and unrealizable outcome – and its site of failure. It can be

compared to those mathematical models (see Samuelson 1948) which created the impression of being able to foresee economic development and growth. Young economists such as Tomáš Sedláček partly undo these clumps today (Sedláček / Orrell 2013).

23) Exceptionalism is the contemporary form of regression from the "world", a new form of the artist genius, often expressed in the so-called parallel spheres of medial transformation. Exceptionalism can be differentiated in the positioning of a person as being "online" or "offline", of nurturing a website or withdrawing from it. In this sense, we deal with a "way of life".

24) The temporal factor is crucial. It connects individuals and their computers through the worldwide network and supports smooth shifts and entanglements of individual thoughts which meet on one page of intellectual densification. The time delay in both directions extends the time frame in which a process occurs, on the other hand it is responsible for a more reflexive attitude which concretizes and densifies the output.

ment within this parallel schema [Simultaneous realities can be documented and mapped²⁵⁾]. Taking a slice at any angle – whether torqued or bent – through the parallel unresolvable strands of art will create this series of simultaneous realities but will not contradict the essential parallelism [Meaning that turning or torquing any recording or mapping of simultaneous realities will not erase parallelism, merely mean that it needs to be re-read²⁶⁾]. It will merely represent it in a different form. Yet this sense of there being simultaneous realities is especially helpful for the artist who wishes to understand the context at any given moment and therefore has a serious “use value” [Here thinking of Lawrence Weiner – who is against parallel realities. But I am not speaking of parallel realities²⁷⁾]. For

25) This is what is happening in each moment of this knowledge and artistic production.

26) Paul Ricœur writes in “The Hermeneutical Function of Distanciation” that “alienating distanciation is the attitude that makes the objectification which reigns in the human sciences possible; on the other hand, this distanciation that is the very condition which accounts for the scientific status of the sciences is at the same time a break that destroys the fundamental and primordial relation in the historical reality which we claim to construct as an object. Thus we reached the alternative suggested by the very title of Gadamer’s work, *Truth and Method*: either we have the methodological attitude and lose the ontological density of the reality under study or we have the attitude of truth and must give up the objectivity of the human sciences” (Ricœur 1973: 129). Here, the nature of practice and the theory of synprocess is as close as it can be. Theoretically speaking, the process of hermeneutically re-reading one’s own and other writings is a process of adoption and subjectivation

that is a process of cultural production with great potential – and a highly sensitive site of potential vulnerability, according to Brazilian cultural theorist Suely Rolnik: “One of the problems of the politics of subjectivation that artistic practices face has been the anesthesia of our vulnerability to the other – an anesthesia all the more devastating when the other is represented by the ruling cartography as hierarchically inferior, because of his or her economic, social or racial condition, or on any other basis. But vulnerability is the precondition for the other to cease being a simple object for the projection of pre-established images, in order to become a living presence, with whom we can construct the territories of our existence and the changing contours of our subjectivity” (Rolnik 2006: n.p.). This potential vulnerability is the risk of any collective interaction.

27) The use value of simultaneous realities is a surplus of understanding the context in which these realities take place in its synchrony. They are therefore physically and factually interlinked. “Parallel realities” are, on the

at any other moment before or after the establishment of the terms necessary to map simultaneous realities it is possible to create a new series of simultaneous realities [Simultaneous realities work in an established temporal frame and are therefore subject to a philosophical complex²⁸⁾]. Such apparent realities do not contradict parallelism nor exchange with them or replace them. The notion of simultaneous realities is just another way of regarding art within the flow of time [Simultaneous realities are a record of moments in time taking place at exactly the same time²⁹⁾]. Thinking harder about simultaneous realities than parallelism enables artists to have a more engaged relationship with the current context from any perspective but does not do away with the essential parallelism of varied practices [It is progressive in a political sense to assert simultaneous realities – but it doesn’t provide a way to understand the always exterior quality of the parallel³⁰⁾]. Thinking too much about parallelism restricts the ability of the artist to deploy their inevitably unresolvable praxis within a given context, while only focusing on simultaneous realities means that

contrary, not the issue of discussion in this paper as parallelism itself has no reality. Two parallels collide at a point of infinity in a projective space and are consequently realities that do not produce concretions. However, as frameworks they stake out conceptual *modi operandi*.

28) The identification and description of synchronous developments in art has been key to aesthetic and art historical discourse. Recently, the category of time has been expanded by time-space relationships and concepts of agency and transcultural networks. This is why the issue of modernity is today again a point of reference, not in terms of its ratification, but as a point of departure to consider history and contemporaneity as a map of formerly dismissed entanglements.

29) This reminds us of the use of language that “helps us to sort out recollections,” moments of time. This entire text is about “linguistic articulation”, and a process of “raising a topic”, as “etwas zur Sprache bringen”.

30) Varied practices are the ground on which collaborative work can happen. Even though it happens in the “outside” (as parallel practices, as “doing”), it influences internal processes as well (“thinking”). “Doing and thinking are complementary. Doing extends thinking in the tests, moves, and probes of experimental action, and reflection feeds on doing and its results. Each feeds the other, and reach set boundaries for the other” (Schön 1983: 280).

the artist removes themselves from the realisation that while appearing together their practice cannot be melded [Thinking too much about parallelism restricts the political potential of the work in terms of relative socio-political-economic consciousness at any given moment; however without it there is no possibility to take a critical position in relation to an analysis of history – past, present and future³¹].

The context is also a series of parallels as each view of the context is a slice through a constantly fluctuating set of parallels taken from an infinite number of apparently simultaneous realities [Context is not universal – so it depends which way you slice it³²]. The parallel aspect of the context is the result of it being unstable and impossible to verify – a number of parallel and necessarily conflicting simultaneous realities taking different slices from a flow of parallel strings [It might be possible to verify simultaneous realities³³]. Nothing conclusive can be understood from the position of the parallel in regard to simultaneous realities or vice versa. The parallel appears less “political” (activated, conscious, agitated) than a focus upon

31) Considering and foreseeing the reaction to any process from the outside is simultaneously incorporating this process into one's own decision. Unlike modernist aesthetics, this openness of art's boundaries gives – at its best – primacy to aesthetic experience as it establishes the interrelation of artwork, experience and “what is external to it” (Rebentisch 2013: 269).

32) The definition of a context oscillates between the “grand récit” (of modernity) and the peripheral “slice” (of contemporaneity) that mirrors our methodological freedom to decide where to slice the cake. “Here it becomes evident that the hallmark of the new type of researchers is not the eye for the ‘all-encompassing whole’ nor the eye for the ‘comprehensive context’ (which mediocrity has claimed for itself

but rather the capacity to be at home in marginal domains” (Benjamin 1933).

33) I like Donald Schön's description of the “reflection-in-action” process: “When somebody reflects-in-action, he becomes a researcher in the practice context. He is not dependent on the categories of established theory and technique, but constructs a new theory of the unique case. (...) He does not separate thinking from doing ... reflection-in-action can proceed, even in situations of uncertainty or uniqueness, because it is not bound by the dichotomies of Technical Rationality” (Schön 1983: 69). The various realities give us the opportunity to shift paradigms and in this sense, yes, simultaneous realities are more agitated.

simultaneous realities. However neither has an ethical advantage over the other. They are both systems of perspective [Perspective, point of view. What's your perspective? *What's Your Point of View?*³⁴]

34) Perspective is a key aspect of my work. It incorporates a self-referential and a political attitude, a constant consciousness of one's one particular and singular position in the world. It gives the impulse for one's own repositioning and it is a magnificent metaphor for being, looking and observing what is “out there”. Perspective is also the interface of the inner and the outer eye; as perception it clarifies the exuberance of the world and it asks for selection and reduction. The description of both systems – the parallel and the simultaneous – is an approach to introduce qualitative moments into theory and to describe

what is not easily put into words. It circumscribes not only different qualities of media which are thoroughly linked to each other, also in terms of their interdependent influences, but also put into practice (“reality”) which is metaphorically discussed. The way such an essay is produced is such a piece of reality and it shows, by close reading, that the clarification and concretion of a structure which is connected to a work of art or any other cultural practice produces other realities and what we called at the very beginning the “third other.”

Benjamin, Walter: Strenge Kunstwissenschaft: Zum ersten Bande der *Kunstwissenschaftlichen Forschungen*. In: *Literaturblatt der Frankfurter Zeitung*. 61:31, 30.07.1933, cited after Amor, Monica: On the Contingency of Modernity and The Persistence of Canons. In: Smith, Terry / Enwezor, Okwui / Condee, Nancy: *Antinomies of Art and Culture*. Modernity, Postmodernity, Contemporaneity. Durham 2009: 83–96, 83.

Berardi, Franco “Bifo”: The Mind's We: Morphogenesis and the Chaomic Spasm Social Recomposition, Technological Change and Neuroplasticity. In: de Boever, Arne / Neidich, Warren: *The Psychopathologies of Cognitive Capitalism: Part One*. Berlin 2013: 7–31.

Bourriaud, Nicolas: *Relational Aesthetics*. Dijon 1998.

Catmull, Ed: How Pixar Fosters Collective Creativity. In: *Harvard Business Review*, Sept. 2008: 1–11.

Chan, Paul: What Art Is and Where it Belongs. In: *e-flux Journal* # 10, November 2009, http://worker01.e-flux.com/pdf/article_95.pdf (05.07.2014).

Deleuze, Gilles / Guattari, Félix: *A Thousand Plateaus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis / London 1987.

Gillick, Liam: Parallelism. In: Schaffaff, Jörn / Schallenberg, Nina / Vogt, Tobias (ed.): *Kunst Begriffe der Gegenwart*. Von Allegorie bis Zip. Köln 2013: 207–209.

Hennion, Antoine / Latour, Bruno: *Objet d'art, objet de science*. Note sur les limites de l'anti-fétichisme. In: *Sociologie de l'art*, 6, 1993: 7–24.

Luhmann, Niklas: *Die Kunst der Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt am Main 1995.

Nowotny, Helga / Scott, Peter / Gibbons, Michael: Introduction. “Mode 2” Revisited: The New Production of Knowledge. In: *Minerva*, 41, 2003: 179–194.

Osborne, Peter / Buden, Boris: Translation – between Philosophy and Cultural Theory. 2008, <http://eipcc.net/transversal/0908/osborne-buden/en> (04.07.2014).

Proust, Marcel: *À la recherche du temps perdu*, tome I. Paris 1954, as cited in Imdahl, Max: *Kunstgeschichtliche Bemerkungen zur ästhetischen Erfahrung*. In: Imdahl, Max / Boehm, Gottfried (ed.): *Reflexion – Theorie – Methode, Gesammelte Schriften*, Bd. 3. Frankfurt am Main 1996: 282–302, 283.

Rebentisch, Juliane: Participation in Art: 10 Theses. In: Dumbadze, Alexander / Hudson, Suzanne: *Contemporary Art. 1989 to the Present*. Chichester 2013: 267–276.

Ricoeur, Paul: The Hermeneutical Function of Distanctation. In: *Philosophy Today*, 17, 2, Summer 1973: 129–141.

Rolnik, Suely: The Geopolitics of Pimping. 2006, <http://eipcc.net/transversal/1106/rolnik/en> (05.07.2014).

Ruskin, John: *The Elements of Drawing*. London 1855, as cited in Imdahl, Max: *Kunstgeschichtliche Bemerkungen zur ästhetischen Erfahrung*. In: Imdahl, Max / Boehm, Gottfried (ed.): *Reflexion – Theorie – Methode, Gesammelte Schriften*, Bd. 3. Frankfurt am Main 1996: 282–302, 282.

Samuelson, Paul Anthony: *Economics: An Introductory Analysis*. New York 1948.

Schön, Donald A.: *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. New York 1983.

Sedláček, Tomáš / Orrell, David: *Bescheidenheit – für eine neue Ökonomie*. Gespräch mit Roman Chlupatý. München 2013.

Smith, Terry: *What is Contemporary Art?* Chicago / London 2009.

Smith, Terry: *Thinking Contemporary Curating*. New York 2012.

Szeemann, Harald: *Junggesellenmaschinen*. In: Szeemann, Harald: *Museum der Obsessionen*. Berlin 1981: 137–149.

Uzzi, Brian: Collaboration and Creativity: The Small World Problem. In: *American Journal of Sociology*, 111, 2, September 2005: 447–504.

Viveiros de Castro, Eduardo: *Métaphysiques cannibales*. Lignes d'anthropologie post-structurale. Paris 2009.