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Abstract:
This essay shows the value of the exterior point of view. Inauthenticity, disorientation, justification and alienation will be shown as helpful for creating distance, leading away from material, subject and object. I aim to arrive at the person itself, where the meeting is the most direct. In this essay the reader will find different strategies in order to throw the spectator out of the medium, in which I use pseudo-subjects, banality and nonsense. In order to tackle this task I found references in works by Robert Filliou, Dan Graham, Pipilotti Rist and in interviews and writings by Martin Heidegger, Johan van der Keuken, Barbara Gronau and others. I am creating an image that pictures the space inside of a medium as a limitation, while the space exterior offers endless possibilities of expression.
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"The key to happiness, satisfaction, great success, and a wonderful feeling of personal power and effectiveness is for you to develop the habit of eating your frog first thing every day when you start work. Fortunately, this is a learnable skill that you can acquire through repetition."  

This concluding line by Brian Tracy presupposes that we search happiness, satisfaction and success by participating in „the game“ and being good at what is already there. This „being good at it“ is something that has less to do with our unique self but with something measurable in terms of numbers. My artistic practice does not exclude this approach, but it places importance on a perspective triggered by the opposite approach, an approach to not function in it, but to evolve out of it: the approach of hesitation.

**Whatever we talk about**

Motion and stasis always go hand in hand, but I see mainly the end product in motion and stasis as the tool to create that motion. Visiting for example a gallery the paintings say something to us in the timespan of watching them, as a comment on things we have seen before. If the visit of the gallery is successful it creates a development in us, it is like one sequence of the whole movie that is our life, that adds information to the sequences that we have lived before and it introduces the sequences that we will meet in our future. Motion happens on a level much closer to ourselves, explaining why my works of art are mainly time-based, or if not, why there focus lies in intervening in the level based on time. My focus on the level that is around material objects makes it on the other hand irrelevant what medium I use. The medium together with the subject, the object, has to be understood as an example in which anything could take it’s place. In fact I use strategically different mediums in order to ask the spectator to look beyond the qualities that only one medium can bring. Because works of art by the same artist exclude everything that is only in one of the works, when trying to understand the general point the artist is making. In my Installation *Two steps backwards* I am showing a comic strip of a person drawing and a video in which two persons, Vito and me, work on a problem when importing video footage (figure 1). The work presents the created free space when something is only an example. The video that Vito and me are work on, turns out to be a video about decorating cookies. The video within a video does not exist outside of the video we are watching, it is a fiction. Since it is a fiction the artistic statement is not included in that video. The fiction creates an extra big distance between myself and whatever I put into that frame within a frame, which is even more free than the frame of art. The same fiction within a fiction we have also within the comic strip.

---
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Goldsmith meets baker

The pattern that we have in *Two steps backwards* of telling the spectator that something I put in front of him has to be looked at as a tool, serving something else, recurs on all kinds of dimensions through my works. The medium carries an obvious superficial meaning inside of it, but I am more interested in the meaning that is exterior of it, or at least exterior from the subject or object inside of the medium. Taking the example of the medium of language: talking to a child that does not understand all the words, some people adopt the limited knowledge of the child, limiting their own way of speaking. Especially if there is no serious matter that has to be conveyed and if the talking is rather for the sake of meeting each other. By limiting his vocabulary and also putting on a particular tone of voice, the speaker does not see the subtext of his words that is, especially when talking to a child, stronger than what the words mean on their own. A sentence that is just sharing random happenings in the surrounding, might tell the child: “You are a little child, you don't understand much anyway.” Talking normal to the child might convey something into the contrary direction: “I take you seriously, I trust in you and I don't stereotype you.” Or might convey something else much more complex that exists in the large universe of meaning around the medium. My Video Goldsmith meets baker (figure 2) is dealing with surroundings that put a person into a role. It is a proposition for how different people could meet. I am representing the goldsmith, meeting the baker (in the video the baker is represented by a pizza delivery boy) by presenting him a piece of music that I made and letting him say something into an empty space in that music, I let him become part of my world and the piece of music. The idea is that, if I instead would start a conversation by talking about bread, I would make him into a stereotype and the conversation would be superficial. Talking about making inscriptions into rings, as a goldsmith might do (represented by sharing the piece of music with him), I start a much more sophisticated topic, because I know more about that profession, while the baker will relate his own work to my work, and see it from a new perspective. The objects in the center, bread and gold ring, become unimportant and similar to my different media that I use in *Two steps backwards*, what is left is something beyond differences, more essential.

When working on *Lasagna the movie* (figure 3) I interacted with different people in front of the camera. Art students, random people on the street and homeless people. I met them when I was in character, making them part of a fiction. I told them that the purpose of interacting with them on camera would have a commercial reason, using familiar realities for justifying the happening but in an absurd way. It was a balance I had to keep between disorientating and making that disorientation believable, getting the people to search for their place in my game. At some point I failed, when the person either felt made fun of, or what most of the time happened, they became too comfortable, starting to tell boring things coming from their backpack of pre-created thoughts and their fixed role that they have in life.

More conceptual but also dealing with the meeting between people that are strange for each other is the work *Fjöldasamvera*, which means multi-togetherness, a work which consists of only its title and the following slogan “öðruvisi samband/samskifti myndast” which I would translate with “different interaction
develops”. This work is inspired by the aesthetics of advertisement slogans like: Nike, just do it or Mountain Dew, dew you. Using business tactics I wanted to promote the importance of interacting with people that are of different ages, of different worlds etc., because it triggers an exchange of different perspectives, an alternative to fine art, letting the artistic exchange happen in daily life and everywhere. This work got a political turn, questioning our society that separates people by putting them into categories, so that everybody functions instead of developing as a human being. This political aspect is not represented in following works. What is still relevant for me, is the idea that the importance of something materialistic gets eliminated. In the example of Fjöldasamvera it is through the tactic of letting people have nothing in common, in order to meet on a layer that is more essential.

The blue frog with seven legs theory

"The experience is at its richest when meaning is at its lowest ebb. Perhaps it is just a case of communication vessels. The emptier the one, the fuller the other." ²

What van der Keuken refers to as meaning, I would refer to as subject or object. In my video Providing what we want (figure 4) the subject/object is a box. Interacting over that box I and the other person approach the box differently to what we would expect. For this video I invited one person into a room with cameras, presenting myself as a company called Happy Profile that is making profile pictures. A company for making the person, that I referred to as customer, naturally laugh, in order to make a good profile picture. Basically I used a form known from the business world to create a form that we know from the entertainment world. The setup of the performance created the expectation that I will serve jokes. But what I served were totally normal things that you would not expect as being considered funny. I repeated this performance eight times in front of a different one man audience. In the end I selected for the end product, the part where the person that participated in my performance, and becomes an actor in the video, does not laugh and where you also don't get conveyed that laughter is the thing that we are trying to achieve. The different things that I tell the person in the video and the person that sees the video create different realities, and the person that watches the video gets alienated and separated. When concluding what is said until now in this essay, we have the keywords, “differences”, “disorientation”, “alienation” describing the meeting that happens between people inside of my work. But more important as we see in the example of “Serving What We Want”, describing the meeting that I want to create between me and the spectator when he experiences my work. Other essential keywords: “against materiality”, “creation of reality”, describe the actual point of this chapter. The point that “difference”, “disorientation” and “alienation” are not effective on the basis of materiality, but only when they happen on the basis of the reality that is around materiality. If somebody shows me a blue frog with seven legs, the frog will be easy to conceive and I can continue my

² Nouel, Thierry, L'ENTRETIEN (avec Johan van der Keuken), Paris, novembre 1998
life without developing much in my perception. Instead if I see something ordinary, but with a set-up around it that is different to what I know, the ground I am standing on is falling apart and I need to redefine my position.

If strange happens under the name of strange it is not strange anymore

Entertainment encompasses realities that we can rely on and that never change: sports, series, shows, movies, etc. Consuming one of these categories we know what we get. For example the difference between criminal series is that the people and location are different and the difference between different CSI Miami episodes is that the killer was a different person. Entertainment allows us to unwind because there is a clear line between the reality that is in the medium and our own reality. In fact it is difficult to apply what is inside the medium to what is outside of it, because the stimulation entertainment is offering is very strong and very simple at the same time. It offers salt and sugar that might even make you lose specific fine senses that you need in order to appreciate the broadness of reality. The free space of art gets often used as an alternative to entertainment. Artists draw a line saying: “you people are there, in reality, next to all your stuff and rules with their constructed use and I invite you to come over here for a little time, just to have a look behind this line so that you can remind yourself how it is without all your stuff and rules with their constructed use, before you go back to your alienated reality where you can try to be sober for a while, not consuming any entertainment and not letting material things define you.” This definition of art is an anti reaction to science, creating space for truth by ignoring everything else instead of overcoming it. Serving this field we already have meditation and religion. “The one who eats from the tree of knowledge gets banned from the paradise.” Instead art should have the position which, “gegen die Gefahr jeder sich selbst absolut setzenden Wissenschaft oder Weltanschaung das Denken offen hält” 3. When creating an absolute fantasy it excludes reality, it does not show self-awareness. When using romantic, kitsch or idealism, they have to be looked at as a part of reality that we express in order to dissociate from it and our self. Art is a frame by itself and to not mistaken art as a reality that places itself just besides entertainment it has to frame the other realities. My recipe to create a work of art is to make an association that is inspired by reality and that looks familiar to what the spectator knows already but when entering it, or thinking more about it, does not make sense anymore. In Lasagna the movie I am continuing the role that I have in Providing what we want going on the streets to advertise Happy Profile by giving people food as it is common that advertisement comes with something enjoyable in order to bribe the potential customer. The familiar part justifies the happening and makes the person enter. When entered, the person gets confused or even insulted because giving a free whole meal to people on the street is only something one does to the unfortunate. When therefor going to homeless people in order to do the same, the confused reaction is triggered by giving them the advertisement. Relevant here is again less the graspable, as for example the

3 Thomas, Phillipp, Negativität und Orientierung, Würzburg, 2008, p.7
difference between homeless people and normal passengers but it is about the notion of losing your clear position in life and the life-intensity that comes from that notion. It is not about becoming aware of some matter but of yourself, triggered by the disorientating reality.

In Pipilotti Rists Ever is Overall (figure 5) we see the artist in slow motion, accompanied by music, walking down the sidewalk like a winner, smashing car-windows with a baseball-bat. Passing her, as accidental, there is a policewoman, saluting her, justifying the happening with a smile. This video is mainly a reality created, without a specific point in it to hold on to. The policewoman underlines the happening as a reality, an order that describes the context holding everything together. Rhythm, I categorize as a more abstract order, but with the same function in a medium. In my animation Alliance (figure 6) there is a woman talking in an unknown language. Because the spectator does not understand what she says he gets conveyed information not based on words and points that he can hold onto, forcing him to be more attentive to the other information in the video. Different indications remind you of different realities and through the whole video you are gathering information about the reality you are watching, but the whole time you are never fully orientated, because the information is sidestepping your expectations. First you think you are in a music video, then you think you are in something educative, then you are in an art-gallery where we see a spectator viewing a painting. In that gallery in the last moment, after a longer scene of a meeting between the painting and the spectator, when you thought there will not happen much more, some kind of a western shooting between the painting and the spectator happens, during the "credits" consisting of some back and forth bouncing text, drop in, the police arrives and arrest the spectator. The video ends with an handshake between the painting and the police, justifying the work of art. Now and then the video drags you in with its stimulating music and through the sense you make out of the story, until the alienating content and bad quality of the animation, throw you out again, telling the artist’s story when he made this animation. The development we go through when we watch „Alliance“ is less based on a story but on the realities we have in front of us. It is important that the strange realities the spectator encounters are not just categorizable as strange realities, explaining why I use familiar forms and aesthetics.

**Presence and acknowledgement of the situation**

"In the Netherlands we even had an advertising slogan: ‘If it is good, you forget that it’s a film.’

You see? For me, the opposite is important. You have to be very aware that it is a film." 4

So whatever the medium is, by not going further into it I want the spectator not to fall into the medium, not by putting nothing into the medium, but by making the content in the medium about what is happening around the medium. If the medium would be a text like the one you are reading right now, it would go into

---
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the direction of giving attention to your situation, the reader reading this text and me writing the text. Intervening the situation gives me infinite more material that I have to thematize in order to describe the situation. This creates a development that makes an avalanche out of a snowball. This also happens indirectly if I say something that adds to or even leads you into another direction of where you thought I would go after reading what I said before. In that way I react to your expectations and artist and spectator stay awake and conscious of each other and themselves.

In order to really touch the spectators orientations, I have to surprise him on a more general level than an object or a subject that I am talking about. I have to change the reality that he thinks he is entering. I started developing this strategy before even knowing what I was doing, when going in front of an audience, on some kind of a stage. The stage in frame of giving a talk on some school subject, or being in turn, to give a reflecting comment on the last class-trip. Already in elementary school, before using it artistically I enjoyed that situation and learned to know the value of creating a presence and recognition for the moment. To some degree I found it even more easy to have the attention of allot of people at the same time than the attention of just one person. When being in front of an audience there is a space created that I needed in order to express. In reality everything goes fast and you need to act in order to have attention. Me at that time reflective, and when trying to act, rather an unauthentic character did not score when “playing the game”. Performance is for me the purest medium. Pure in the sense that the medium is the most reduced on its idea. There is no material for the spectator except neutral media like gesture and language. Especially when looking into the spectator's eyes, all that separates me and the spectator is the concept that it is a medium; that what happens is in a frame/on a stage, not reality. The concept that, especially if it is materialized, protects the spectator, so that he can lean back, relaxed, without needing to act and being conscious of himself.

**Fantasy and reality combined**

This consciousness of looking at something as a medium is the first step in order to define something as a work of art. It makes the spectator attentive. At this point, we can also go into the direction of creating entertainment. Letting the spectator forget himself in the medium. Next step of creating an artwork is to make the spectator self-reflective. For doing that I go against the spectators safety. This is to some point a contradiction, because the space of having the spectator's attention is created by letting him give all responsibility away to the performer. What I do, as the performer, is to use that power over the moment, that the audience is giving me for shining the spotlights on the whole situation, including the audience. An example for that you have in the works of Dan Graham. In his performance *Mirror* (figure 7) he reflects little movements that he is doing in the same moment, he goes further, describing the movements in the room, and what the audience is doing. What he is doing here with a mirror and with words, he applies later
on his livestream video installations like *Present Continuous Past* (figure 8) where the spectator sees video recordings of himself visiting the exhibition.

Another artist that deals with a similar snowball effect, dealing with the situation that lies around the medium is Robert Filliou. Filliou's works have a presence like the one of a performer. With them he masters the craft of imagining our reactions to then again answer them and be ahead of our expectations. Works like the *Optimistic Box n°2* (figure 9) invite you to take you nowhere, then to eject you to make you be on your own again. The medium of that work is a box. “Long live Marriage” is the slogan on the front. The spectator is asked to answer that slogan by opening the box. The answer to that is a pornographic image that lies in the box. In search for answers the spectator reads the last indication that this work offers which is on the inside of the cap of the box. “of three” it says, which is a continuation of the slogan that was on the front of the box. Looking back at the image you see that the sexual act, of which you just see a close up zoomed on genitalia, contains three people.

**Creating the perception of a baby**

Both artists; Graham and Filliou take a step back out of the center going away from the subject/object. The difference between the two is that Graham redefines the reality that we are entering when we look at it, only one time. We go into *Present Continuous Past*, find out how it works, it mirrors us and by that we evaluate into the perspective of reflecting from the outside on us and the happening. This becomes, after grasping that with our understanding, a subject/object by itself. In that moment the work stops adding anything to our understanding, since although the work is continuing and there are things happening, the things happen very specifically, only in the frame of what we already know. We become grown ups inside of the work, because of things like how exactly the camera's mirror us, happens in a safe frame of our general orientation.

Filiou does not let you become a grown up when you view his work. Maybe you enter the work as a grown up. You see for example his sculpture *The Mona Lisa is on the Stairs*, (figure 10) consisting out of a cleaning-bucket, a swap and a note hanging from it. On your first look you enter the work as a grown up that categorizes the work as a usual Fluxus artwork where the point is that everything is art when calling it art. When reading the sign, “The Mona Lisa is on the stairs” we get disorientated by getting the opposing information to what we expected. The work of art is telling that it is not a work of art. We have to elevate out of the center, away from object/subject to see the work of art, that we came here to see. The disorientation destroys things that we already know, that we carry around and that prevent us from seeing what is in the presence. To create presence. The presence is created by not serving and at the same time keeping the space that is created by the viewers attention.
The point justifies the less concrete

A method of expanding this space and presence, that I applied later also on other media than live performances, works by having some point that I can hold on to, that justifies what is happening on the stage, besides the frame that is given to me, in which I have to act. For example the frame in which I have to speak about bacteria in a biology class. If it is an art performance it is simply the free space of art. In the presentation about bacteria the point would be all the knowledge that is expected from me. But in an ideal performance I would not just go for the point, but make a long transition with unexpected turns before I arrive at that point. I would for example start with talking about a superstar that is lately in the media, to then make a transition to the situation that we have in the room, to then slowly refer that on the biological facts that I have to offer. I have not done that with a small frame like a biology presentation, since that is very difficult. What I have done, talking now about a performance of mine (figure 11), I introduced myself as a magician. This allowed me to do lots of strange things with the audience, starting with giving them playing cards, inviting them to get into odd body positions, instructing them to stand on chairs, to hold hands plus the hectic music that I put on. In this situation it was a magic trick, which was the point that I was building up to, similar to the biology facts, in the presentation about bacteria. I had the justification for everything else that was happening. For me every media works like that, it has a point that you can grasp. A story, a person, a life-attitude, a message, an object, a subject. But around that point there is a form. A reality. We feel this reality, it makes us believe in the point, but if we believe we lose the consciousness of this form and by that also the consciousness of our self. My magician performance did not end with a magic trick. I stopped the music, and with that the performance abruptly. I took the point away, so that the form around the point became the point itself.

There is life around the medium and the product represents it

In performances that I made, as a side-effect, the space around me becomes often totally chaotic and flustered by bags and random stuff that I brought to the place as props. These have the same function as a detour when not going straight to the point but putting more value on the reality that I am creating around it. It promises something to happen that then does not happen, as if the performance did not finish. It is the detail around it that creates the imagination that there is more to it and that it is real. Not real in the sense, that you forget that it is a performance, but in the sense that it is not idealised and minimised like our imagination does, but complex and alive as reality. This created real reality might feel vastly to much, because it does not have space for you. And it might inspire you to take a day off to have a little bit time on your own.

The magician performance was just one of different acts of the bigger performance Looking into the sun makes me sneeze / behind the scenes (02.06.2015) (figure 12) In this performance I wanted to illustrate what happens when the preparation for something else becomes the product by itself. Or I wanted
in general to show how cause and effect justify each other and what happens if one of them becomes independent of the other. If we take the title, it would be looking into the sun, as a preparation to have a good sneeze, the behind the scenes of that sneeze, that would grow so much because of sophisticating that sneeze, till the sneeze becomes a minor matter than the looking into the sun. One key point in the performance is when I say that if we only have survival instinct and Darwinism to be the answer for everything we would not need to reflect much more, but since there is a percentage of people that live a successful life, a life of leaving their bed early every day, working hard and disciplined, being healthy, positioning themselves morally, being social, pairing up as a couple, with, in the end, the decision to not have children, inspires the big question, „why?“. The whole performance was thought as something that builds up to something bigger, that we don't have in the end. The ground structure was that I prepare the audience, by telling them allot of things, so that in the end, I could film myself and the audience, saying something unimportant, but having prepared the audience through what I have let them through before, so that the video would be a creation of a reality where we don't understand how it got created. That idea is an attempt to take what we have in Serving what we want further. Only that I saw the video, that would be the creation, created by preparing the spectator, in the other way around as a justification to do allot of the different things with the spectator to prepare him. Having that as the general image I had allot of space to fill this form of the whole with smaller versions of the same form where I play with cause and effect under the justification that I am preparing my audience.

Now this is what happened in the performance: Being in front of a blackboard I started with a similar setup as you have in school. I said that the effect that I wanted to achieve for myself, through this performance, was to learn French and I asked the audience to be my teacher. I followed with saying that, "in order to also give you, my spectators/teachers something in exchange, I have chosen an interesting topic for you which you will help me to learn French with.“ When learning a language it is not about what you say, so whatever you say becomes a tool for something higher that justifies whatever topic you chose. The next step was to create an overview on the blackboard. A drawing of the timespan of the performance. "First there is an introduction, then there is an overview, then there comes the first preparation, then the second preparation and then the making of the product. We are right now here, in the timespan of the overview.“ By making this overview I already started the French lesson and asked each participant what the names where for these chapters. The fact that I as the student had the authority in this moment, being on the blackboard and ruling the situation created an uncertain reality where the spectator is constantly working on figuring out my and his own role. For example saying „the second chapter is the overview, how do I say that in French?“ somebody answered, telling me the translation, whereupon I pointed my finger on him, like I knew the answer already and then writing that word on the blackboard. This reaction of mine suddenly made him feel like a student that proudly presents the answer. After the overview I got to the point to explain the image of one channel leading to the other channel, as an answer to the question „why“ and the deeper question that appears when one channel lives without an other channel, being justified by nothing but itself. Also going into the already named examples of sneezing, Darwinism and so on. During
that, I stopped slowly to translate things into French. The next step was to make theory praxis, with a so-called breathing exercise. In that exercise I invited the spectator to, on my signal, breath in as fast as they could, and then during making eye contact between each other and during slowly putting on a smile, to breath out with also making a sound at the same time. In this part I wanted to create a cause without an effect, by creating the motion of laughter without something funny, except maybe the motion of laughter by itself.

Following was the performance of the magician. I introduced it as if it did not matter what would happen next, since all that was important was, that the participants would experience something else to what the people later watching the video, would experience before the moment that I was planing to record. I started the magician chapter by saying that I had this hobby of being a magician and that this empty space that I had now, for doing anything, is a good opportunity to bring both these activities that I do in life finally together. After that performance I got to the actual filming. This whole performance is an example of me over complicating an idea so that there is not much space, in the end to let something happen in between me and the audience. Overcomplicating is a big part of my hesitative perspective. It means that I make a lot out of nothing and it goes into the other direction of functioning. When I plan a work like that I see a coherence in the whole. I see a broccoli and its recursion. But the result is often something that is too much, that loses the spectator at some point. After performing this performance I felt empty, because everything was too long, there was too much program making it difficult to be really in the presence and reacting to the audience so that I put much more out than what I got back. I said that keeping the attention of the spectator and at the same time not giving him anything to grasp is the best thing to create presence and life intensity. In other words, the motion needs its stasis. Otherwise I am boring people and I am also boring myself.

The work is what is between the spectator and the artist and it has to be in a good distance to the spectator but also in a good distance to the artist. Giving it a form is to get it away from oneself. This distance creates strength and creates development instead of personal emptiness. There is something that is your source of what you do and what you express. In a simplified look at the world, all we need, in life besides to survive is to share in order to overcome our loneliness. And the reason when we can't share and when we can't appreciate each other is because of misunderstandings that happen because of the complicated way of mediating perspectives. I also want to consider the opposite aspect that it is to some point great to keep our sources a secret. If we have a language barrier, I believe that it will deepen our source, because it isolates this source a bit and gives it space to develop better. If we reveal everything that we are thinking, we become too close to reality and we have difficulties creating a distance from the things that represent us in reality.
geheim gehaltene Informationen sowie menschlich unerforschte und unerforschbare Mysterien auf merkwürdige Weise zusammentreffen."

A distance to the thing that is in the middle, is also created when being in a character. To think about the meaning of being in character is for me a good way to think about art. Saying "everybody is an artist" would mean to me that everybody is an actor and would have a distance to oneself's actions. Art is something that lies around things and therefore, is dependent on life to have something to become aware of. To frame.

"The most essential, where film is at its most film-like or where Art is truly Art, is where nothing happens. Except Art cannot be purely Art because of the outside world. You must always prostitute yourself. No, 'prostitute' is not the right word. You have to humiliate yourself and be businesslike and have a big mouth and always interfere with everything. It's not prostitution but you have to express solidarity with the banality and the stress of everyday life. There are two opposing forces. But interestingly enough, they meet in a third point…"

1+2=3

This one-plus-two-makes-three-logic is how I explain the world that I am living in. It starts with my exterior point of view, that I had in high school, not being in the situation, but trying to become one with it - again. Until I give that attempt up and developed rather my own space, the space that I find on a stage. This was a simplification of my biography. The stage, a constructed un-construction. The contradiction where a high developed form of the second is creating space for the first. It also can be applied on the stasis that gives a form to the dynamic.

Joseph Vogel starts his book “Über Das Zaudern” which is a book about hesitation, with talking about Sigmund Freud's interpretation (figure 13) of Michelangelo's sculpture of Moses. Freud as an spectator found a big information gap between the indications that Michelangelo was delivering through the sculpture by itself and the information of the biblical story, the sculpture was representing.

"Entsprechend entziffert Freud im Moses des Michelangelo eine Zeilchenmenge, die sich an keinem Referenzsystem festbinden lässt: kein Ereignis, keine Tat, kein Inhalt, keine bestimmte

5 Gronau, Barbara, Lagaay Alice, Ökonomien der Zurückhaltung, Kulturelles Handeln zwischen Askese und Restriktion, transcript Verlag, Bielefeld, 2010, p262

6 Nouel, Thierry, L' ENTRETIEN (avec Johan van der Keuken), Paris, novembre 1998
There is no indication that gives Moses a clear role in the story, because his expression and gestures are contradicting each other. His right leg is drawn in, like he was about to jolt up, fitting with his angry facial expression, also fitting with the story, that Moses was angry about the indecent behavior of the people, but his arms showing a motion into the opposite back leaning motion. Freud drew an interpretation of this frozen image, by adding two sequences of what he imagined will fill the gap between the biblical story, and the motion of Michelangelo's Moses. Freud drew a first sequence of Moses, a Moses that is calm and satisfied, as a second sequence, a Moses that indignantly is about to jolt up, making Michelangelo's Moses, describing the third sequence, a Moses that, with his law and order, in form of the ten commandments under his arm, realizes that his reaction towards the people that don't act in the frame of his belief system, is not constructive for his belief system either. This puts him into a position where he has no position in the story anymore. He achieves a natural point of view that is exterior from the happening.

This notion is the same as what I want to achieve in my work, and that Robert Filliou is achieving in his works: “a discursive negativity that nevertheless enriches the Critiques even as it disturbs their logic. This generative negativity”⁸ “draws attention both to the instability of every form and to the contingency of all boundaries”⁹. Taking the contraposition of something I don’t like is at the same time a justification of the reality, in which the thing I am against, is in. A good example is Käthe Kollwitz.

"Her father, Karl Schmidt, embraced Karl Marx and The Communist Manifesto, and joined the German Social Democratic Worker’s Party (SPD), which he served with religious fervor.” “Her work” of art “was realistic and familiar, beloved by the German people. Many young men who joined the Nazi party had grown up with Kollwitz prints on their walls.... the Nazis appropriated posters she had made in the 1920s and reused them for their propaganda, deleting her name or replacing it with another. “Brot!” (“Bread!”), a poster she made in 1924 for the Central German Youth Day, was used by the Nazis to illustrate a poem against the Loyalists in Spain in 1936.”¹⁰

---

⁷ Vogl, Joseph, Über Das Zaudern, diaphanes, Zürich-Berlin, 2008, p. 20
⁸ Coole, Diana, negativity and politics, Dionysus and dialectics from Kant to poststructuralism, Routledge, 2000, London, p. 41
⁹ Coole, Diana, negativity and politics, Dionysus and dialectics from Kant to poststructuralism, Routledge, 2000, London, p. 231
Although her works were directly attacking the Nazi regiment, the Nazis did not find her works as dangerous regarding their own political ideas, as they found totally passive works like the ones by Paul Klee or Wassily Kandinsky. Passive in the sense of not participating in the political reality.

**Love, compassion, etc.**

In Martin Heidegger’s Book “Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes” he distinguish between three perspectives that we can bring to the world. The distinction of seeing something as a “Ding”, “Zeug” and “Kunstwerk”. The perspective of seeing something as a “Ding” is the pure perspective that an animal or a child has before questioning the world and needing sense and a higher meaning. “Das Ding selbst muß bei seinem Insichruhen belassen werden.”\(^{11}\) The second perspective where the “Ding” becomes “Zeug” is when we define it by its use. This is the perspective that we as humans bring to the table the most of our lives. The perspective of having values, order, culture, rules, religion and politics. We might have different ones, but we are all playing the game, “being businesslike” having an acting role with a clear position, like a character in a movie, with a will and a conflict. The third position, to look at things as a “Kunstwerk”, work of art, is a mixture of the first perspective and second perspective. It requires that you get a distance to your role in life, which makes you free and neutral again.

When telling what the most relevant things are in life, one would say things like: “love”, “compassion”, etc. But just like that these words don’t mean anything. The words need to be redefined so that the person saying them means them in a personal way. “Secret”, “overcomplicating”, “hesitation”, all these words are connected with this need of redefining. The need of being connected with what one is expressing. Therefor one has first to disconnect from the automatic use of words and expressions. Disconnecting is a reflection.

All together I see an image of a spiral reaching endlessly outside, because reflection never ends and so development of perception never ends. But by doing that, reflecting and disassociating, at one place we will always arrive. That is being with our self. Erich Fromm calls the third state, that Heidegger calls “work of art”, that we have to work our self up to, after eating the apple of wisdom and being not in paradise anymore, “love”. “But while recognizing their separateness they remain strangers, because they have not yet learned to love each other (as is also made very clear by the fact that Adam defends himself by blaming Eve, rather than by trying to defend her).”\(^{12}\)

---

\(^{11}\) Heidegger, Martin, *Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes*, Vittorio Klostermann, Frankfurt Am Main, 1977, p.18
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