Anneke Tonen
5740258

First reader: Marie Beauchamps
Second reader: Mireille Rosello

a most silent revolution if any
Thesis MA
Comparative Cultural Analysis
31 August 2018

Aan eventuele lezers,

Een doorlopende tekst. Die gevouwen – zie voor u een tekst aan een rol papier -, of met naden – zie voor u daadwerkelijk stof aan de meter - telkens een ander perspectief biedt. Naar gelang de volg-orde van de lezer.

A.T.

a most silent revolution if any

The argument would run like: knowledge; what is knowledge, what is it more etc... --> knowledge produces an Other. The Other.. what, when, how, etc... --> Space/home: space that possibly integrates both knowledge and the Other?

contents

Dear Reader,
before
I
begin:

voor u ligt a propositie. Een die iets bevraagt. Waar eerst nog geen passende research question bij was. De research question die er nu staat, is als dichts bijzijnd geformuleerd bij dat wat ik wil bevragen - als dat mogelijk is. Hoe kun je dat wat je wilt onderzoeken, al onderzoekende (en wellicht dan weer reflecterende) vatten in één vraag, die je vervolgens al onderzoekende moet beantwoorden aan de hand van objecten die u moeten helpen te begrijpen wat ik wil bevragen. Objecten die slechts pionnen zijn die zich onderweg aandienen, maar die ook weer verdwijnen omdat je onderweg bent, en deze dus ook weer achterlaat. Hier in deze propositie moeten ze blijven staan omdat ze u helpen. On verra.

I
would like to research the limits of the 'fact-based knowledge institutions', in order to open up spaces of understanding that traverse contemporary modes of exclusion, looking for a more profound concept of home.

While writing my master's thesis I came to the conclusion that, in order to be able to doorschrijven hieraan and to finish it I needed more space. Space in thinking and space in form. Op het moment dat ik schrijf over (het opdoen en waarderen van) kennis buiten de gebaande, geweten en gewaardeerde paden is het niet mogelijk dit in n vorm te passen die communiceert binnen die gebaande, geweten en gewaardeerde paden. I need a form die zich beyond deze paden beweegt, in order to be able to find ways to include meervoudige kennisvormen (zet dit op n andere plek) unknown or t opheffen van knowledge, ways of unthinking, and unthinkable people. What is unknown knowledge. Knowledge that we do not know. Knowledge that we do not approve of. Knowledge that we do not value (enough) What is unthinking. Getting rid of our ingebouwde ways of thinking. What are unthinkable people. People who are not being thought of. Inclusion (I will try to avoid this term as much as possible or find a new term). Hiervoor zoek ik naar een vormeloosheid van zowel kennis and the way how kennis is being transmitted, transferred, shared and communicated.
Het ontvormen van kennis. De vormeloosheid van een kennis die niet voor de hand liggend is, niet vanzelf sprekend is, niet vanuit of van zichzelf spreekt. Een kennis die binnen de universiteit niet als zodanig gewaardeerd of gezien wordt. Die kennis die tussen de woorden zit, buiten de lijntjes, buiten de tijd, but within our body, within ourselves. Een kennis die geperst wordt in een vorm die alle kennis eruit perst. Wat als er sprake kan zijn van een kennis, of meerdere kennissen (bestaat dit) binnen de universiteit die al bewegende tot een vermeerdering van kennis leiden. Kennis komt nu tot uiting in bepaalde vormen, in structuren, constructen. Veelal overdracht van docent naar student, toetsingsvormen ter check of de kennis zijn doel bereikt heeft, controlemechanismen die een doel op zichzelf zijn geworden. Is er ook een toetsingsvorm of de kennis de docent bereikt (heeft)? Vervolgens zijn er eind-toetsingsvormen: de scriptie (zowel bachelor als master). Deze hebben van oudsher n bepaalde vorm. N tamelijk restricted vorm met als doel universele (her)kenbaarheid (is dit zo), verwijzingseisen, ingeperkte tijd om er aan te werken. Wat als deze uitingsvorm n vormeloosheid in zich kan hebben die niet perse de geleerde stof controleert, checkt en kadert; n vormeloosheid die de ruimte opzoekt die leidt tot een meerkennis, tot een vermeerdering van de opgedane kennis. Die andere kennisperspectieven toestaat, exploreert, en verkent. Wat als de vormeloosheid van de toetsingsvorm leidt tot andere inzichten die een uit-zicht-loos-heid in zich hebben. Is dat niet de bedoeling van het (ver)delen, uitwisselen van kennis binnen de universiteit. Wat als de universiteit wederom verwordt tot een vrijplaats van kennis. In en uit.

Tussenstuk
'… het scheppen van zichzelf door zichzelf, het doen toenemen van de persoonlijkheid door een inspanning die veel haalt uit weinig, iets uit niets en onophoudelijk iets toevoegt aan wat er aan rijkdom in de wereld is'.
(Bergson 2016: 94)

Producing matter. Producing the unknowing, the unthinking, the undoing. Creating a spectrum of knowledge. To be able to include all forms (is it forms) of knowledge. Do I have to list all forms.
Can I list all forms. No. Since I do not know.
Stof, materie, woorden, taal, neerzetten, plaatsen, formuleren, blootleggen als in n puzzel. Als in n mogelijkheid. N nog te formeren 'plaats/plek', een wit vlak, waarop men de letters, de woorden in alle vrijelijkheid kan plaatsen, naar eigen inzicht, naar eigen mogelijkheden, naar gelang de eigen liefde, de eigen ambitie zich vormt of beter zich richt. Zoveel kanten, zoveel mogelijkheden, zoveel ruimte, zoveel liefde. Liefde, where did that come from? Als je denkt aan en in het spectrum van knowledge zit er ruimte in de beweging, in de verandering, in de omarming. Waarom omarming? Omdat je anders wellicht het geheel niet kan vatten. Een geheel dat niet te vatten is. So why bother. Why. Bother. Dit is de 'zucht' naar de toekomst, naar t handelen.

Tussenstuk 2
'… de ononderbroken schepping van niet te voorziene nieuwheid'. (Bergson 2016: 101)

Om de ononderbroken schepping van niet te voorziene nieuwheid ruimte te kunnen geven, is het nodig ons te ontdoen van scheidingen, namen. Geen namen, hoogstens initialen.

'Het recht van de heerser tot het geven van namen gaat zo ver dat men ook eens zo vrij zou moeten zijn de oorsprong van de taal zelf als een machtsuiting van de heersers te begrijpen: zij zeggen 'dat is dat en dat', ze verzegelen elk ding en elke gebeurtenis met een klank en nemen het daardoor als het ware in bezit' (Nietzsche 19).

Tussenstuk 3
We haasten ons om kennis te (ver)krijgen. We haasten. Curricula worden steeds sneller 'afgewerkt'. Waarom. Kennis wordt een lege huls, slechts informatie vindt haar weg. Ga lopen, wandelen. Haal de snelheid eruit. Wander around. Just wander. Just sit. Do nothing. Bore yourself to death. Haal de vorm uit je leven. Unstructure yourself. Vermeerder daarmee je kennis. Door diepere lagen aan te boren. Door te ontdenken. Door te ontdoen. De haast die er nu bestaat in de actie, in de handeling om immer sneller te moeten, lijkt onderdeel van een oppervlakkige misvatting.
T lijkt n handeling, maar t is een uitnodiging aan iedereen om vegetarisch te worden.

Concreet
In de uitvoering.

I produce matter. Ik produceer stof. Ik maak stof. Stof als in grondstof. Ik maak het onaffe. Ik maak geen eindproduct. Dus ready to share, ready to create different things, to create different ideas, to open up a space for thought. Space for joint thought. An empty space. An empty space ready to be filled. Een wit vlak. Papier. Stof. / embroider/print/imprint the text. On a sheet, on a white (piece of) cloth, on a white surface. Connect letters. Connect points. Draw. Write. Cut. Paste. Transform. Ontvormen. Opnieuw vormen. Begin bij nul. Telkens weer. N Sjabloon. Meerdere sjablonen. Tal van sjablonen. Leesrichtingen. Leesmogelijkheden. Hoe maak ik de connecties. Hoe verbind ik.

En laat de tijd zijn werk doen. Tijd vermeerdert kennis. Is dat zo? Maak tijd zichtbaar. Ontdoe je niet van de tijd.

Kind regards

knowledge

When there is nothing. Only a void. In (a) knowledge. In (an) existence. What do you do. You might get silent. The
silence is oorverdovend. It might last. Till you can't stand it anymore. And then. What do you do. You might start searching
for that what might be known. Searching for facts, searching for people, searching for the other, in order to get to know
things, to get to learn things and the other. In order to comprehend life. As such.

SO

**how
to begin**

**well
at
the beginning**

**with
what**

When I started with my thoughts about knowledge, already a long time ago, I was a kind of convinced that what I engaged, what I called 'the problem' (my problem), 'the conflict (since we are always looking for a conflict, looking for something we can solve)', was hidden in knowledge or was knowledge itself. We, human beings, develop(ed) epistemologies, theories, politics (of nature, of space, of ecology etcetera), which contained movements of thought, of knowledge, of truth if you wish. I learned to observe. I learned to listened. I learned that it might be us who are responsible, it might be (even) me who can take a step, it might be human who can change. On the one side it makes 'the problem' more complex because bigger, larger, enormous, huge, on the other side it became more simple since it is we, human (and nonhuman), who has to 'fix' it, do it, together. And that's possible. The politics of the possible. I like propositions. I do think that they can be compared to the list. The list with its affirmative feature(s). So a proposition, a list. Why not?

Along the way, during my research, I came across knowledge as tool to encounter the Other, and knowledge as a possibility for creating space. With the concept of space leading me to the most unknown space in society: home. Unknown in respect to statistics, the differences in which people relate to home, the difference in what people consider as (a) home. Which made (for me) the link to the homeless, the refugees, the fugitives, those with no papers, those with no home very obvious. Perhaps I go too fast but is it possible to consider a space like home as a space which integrates knowledge and the Other?

to proceed
Method. I'll use Genealogy as method to approach knowledge from various perspectives. Why. Since the aim of Genealogy is to generate an ontology of the present, to expose the familiar as an illness (Brown 109). Whereas according to Brown neutral (scientific) knowledge is exposed as a

massive exercise in power (106). As Raymond Geuss argues 'Genealogy' as practiced by Nietzsche is not intended to legitimize any present person, practice or institution (325), nor has it anything to do with resembling any contemporary mode of thinking. Nietzsche furthermore opposes 'the sentimental assumption' that all things we now value (for whatever reason) must have an origin. He radically rejects that assumption by pointing out that that unquestioned assumption 'tacitly guided much historiography and institutes both an obstacle to understanding and a symptom of debility' (Geuss 325). How do thoughts come into being. How do my thoughts come into being. How is one thoughts linked to the other. Next to that I use my 'own' method. In writing in English en Nederlands. Zoals mijn gedachten gaan, dwarrelen, grond vinden, en zich door-zetten. I'll enter the combined realm of knowledge, home and the other in a uncertain, unclear searching mode. Uncertain not in a young foolish way, but un-certain in the words I use, looking for new words, fragile and un-certain in connecting references and ways of thinking and thought. Looking into (every) possible direction(s). For now. Since directions are limited. Mijn zoekende ik kan zich voornamelijk uiten in het Nederlands - het Nederlands biedt me een ander soort helderheid - , of in een mengelmoes van Nederlands en Engels en mijn meer besliste, of op (wellicht) feiten gebaseerde gedachten prima in het Engels geformuleerd kunnen worden. Een soort buiten-binnen. Buiten de orde - vanuit mijn ogenschijnlijke wanorde - bewegen naar binnen. Van buiten - in mijn taal (is het taal) - kijken naar het binnen. Does that make sense?

I choose to begin with some thoughts on knowledge and will then proceed with Chaos to start from my own perspective on knowledge (which is most chaotic, using the Deleuze's rhizome as a guideline), to subsequently gather along the Other and Schwalbe's definition of livelihood further perspectives on the concept of home. Taking into account that 'thinking is the conceptual counterpart of the ability to enter modes of relation, to affect and being affected, sustaining qualitative shifts and creative tensions accordingly' (Braidotti 170), which Rosi Braidotti sees as one of the prerogatives of art, I'll use cases or performances from the arts to elaborate on three perspectives from which to approach the concept of knowledge. I will use the most recent long-term performance Building Conversation of Lotte van den Berg to stress on the importance to start in and from chaos. I will continue with theater collective Schwalbe's elaborate program on 'livelihood' to make it close, personal, subjective and down to earth (I will elaborate on this), and eventually will combine knowledge, the Other and livelihood within a short space in between in which I relate to the (hand) launderette as a possibility - to elaborate on the huge space in knowledge we have still to explore, and yet bring it back to the reality of a small space incorporating 'society' as such. I have put my conclusions, since I'll have to conclude, in some final epilogues.

some thoughts. on knowledge.

Where to begin when you want to speak, to think about knowledge, when you want to question the value of a specific kind of knowledge – aangenomen dat er verschillende soorten knowledge bestaan -, als je al weet dat het te groot is, dat je het moet inperken. Inperken zelfs voordat je begonnen bent. Wat wil ik schrijven, wat wil ik bevragen, waarom is dit belangrijk. Als ik kan bedenken dat er in mijn perceptie van knowledge het weten zit, het denken, het herinneren, de verbeelding, de ratio en de non-ratio, de ruimte, dan is het inderdaad too much. Maar alvorens in te perken, is het nodig eerst te elaborate and from that on to focus. In order to be able to get into the essence of the knowledge I would like to address, it appeared necessary to map my thoughts. To see where my thoughts are headed. As Deleuze describes in Rhizome about mapping of thoughts:… "it is a short-term memory, or anti memory. … the rhizome pertains to a map that must be produced, constructed, a map that is always detachable, connectable, reversible, modifiable, and has multiple entryways and exits and its own lines of flight" (22). Rhizome in al zijn letterlijkheid: - wortelstok of rizoom - een ondergrondse, meestal horizontaal lopende, al of niet opgezwollen stengel. Het begin en tegelijkertijd het einde van de wortelstok buigt vaak weer omhoog en vormt zo een nieuwe plant. Soms is het moeilijk te zien of het een wortelstok of een wortel is. Mapping opens a realm. Mapping thoughts. When I think of doing that, it immediately 'destroys' this thought. It then already becomes structure. Or something which I (like to) call structure. Order, linear thinking, 'het' op een rij zetten/denken. And then I am losing it. Thinking without a structure, without an order, without a coherent plan. Is that chaos? Can we call that chaos. Or is it a most constructive way to develop knowledge in a most literal sense (in alle letterlijkheid) without allowing for constant (regular, normal) connections. With regular, normal I mean the unconscious connections while not thinking. By not thinking them. Does that make sense? But yet knowing, mapping (not tracing) means nothing without acting to it. Then it remains theory, and with that volatile. This is how (politics of) nature is being constructed, by knowledge and how now (politics of) ecology can be constructed, by acting.

Als ik denk aan kennis dan denk ik niet per se aan feiten. Als ik denk aan kennis dan denk ik allereerst aan verbeelding, Deleuze en Guattari, aan nomadic thinking, aan Rhizome. Op het moment dat een gedachte, - stop wat is een gedachte. Een gedachte is een structuur from the past. David Bohm, quantum physicist, makes a distinction between 'thinking' and 'thought'. According to him 'thinking' implies the present tense – some activity going on which may include critical sensitivity to what can go wrong'. And he refers to some new ideas that may come up (60). 'Thought' is the past participle of that. So a thought is past thinking, a trace not a map (the map has to do with performance, whereas the tracing always involves an alleged "competence" (Deleuze & Guattari 12). A response acting on memory and more or less fixed or set. Not in motion. When we speak of a thought we do assume that we think that thought on that very moment, but it is an accumulation of earlier thinking and experiences. Does knowledge start with thinking? For me it does. Denken vraagt om stilte. Het is een ontdekkingsreis naar de stilte (Han 154). Stilte vraagt om ruimte. Is this physical space or mental space? Maybe both.

So. Again. What is knowledge? Foucault takes as a starting point: *'knowledge (connaissance) is produced in and by scientists who are acknowledged as authoritative in a certain period. This positive knowledge is embedded in a less explicit knowing (savoir)' (457). The formulation van Foucault's knowledge definition seems to contain a search for the 'truth'.* He talks about the production of knowledge by *scientists, authoritative* and perhaps it is in the word *positive*. Where and when does the knowing 'transfer' into 'savoir' (the French word seems untranslatable)? Is 'savoir' about the truth? Foucault about 'savoir': *'contains all the writing and speech that is acknowledged by people as the truth within a certain period. Savoir transcends rational knowledge, which focusses on the explication of the truth of her findings. Which findings are being considered as true, is determined by the episteme. Savoir is a broader concept than knowing (knowledge? – my question), since it concerns implicit formulations as well which do not meet scientific criteria' (460).* All the writing and speech. How about the 'savoir' then. Is there a 'savoir' beyond writing and speech? I think so. There is a savoir which is situated in the body, which is situated in the head, but which is beyond that what is said. And with that it constructs connections between not known, un-known elements. Wat maakt knowledge onvertaalbaar als kennis? Kennis is een te 'klein' begrip geworden om knowledge mee te vertalen. Knowledge heeft (voor mij) een grotere verbeeldingskracht. See how 'knowledge' is stated in Collins Cobuild English Language Dictionary: *'information and understanding about a subject which a person has in his or her mind or which is shared by all human beings'.* (How) is this last phrase even and ever possible? Is this called common knowledge then?

Daarnaast heeft hij (Foucault) het dus over het produceren van kennis – sprekend over produceren, stuiten we onder andere op Marx. According to Marx, the score of the modern virtuosis is the general intellect, the general intellect of society, abstract thought which has become a pillar of social production (Virno 63). With general intellect he refers to science, knowledge in general, the know-how on which social productivity relies by now (Virno 64). At the same time he makes a difference between general intellect versus public intellect (I'll proceed with this another time and another place).

Back. Hier komt nog geen denken aan te pas. Voor mij van enige importantie. Komt denken voort uit kennis? Of gaat het eraan vooraf. De denkende mens. We kunnen twee richtingen op: denken is er vanaf het begin – dus vanaf de geboorte – van het leven van een mens, of denken is/wordt aangeleerd. Wellicht bestaan ze beide; naast elkaar. Als het denken begint bij het begin, is er een wit canvas. Dat wordt ingevuld of je vult het zelf. Met open ogen kijk je de wereld in en neem je telkens tot je wat (je) op dat moment kan. Tot het overgenomen wordt door het geheel (? Ja wat is het geheel – dat is een opgenomen worden in een gezamenlijk denken alsof dat een waarheid bevat, of dat een waarheid is, en slechts van daaruit verder gedacht kan worden) en de invloeden van buitenaf op je in gaan werken. Raadgevingen, goede bedoelingen, meningen. Hall claims that there are many different and legitimate ways of thinking: we in the West value one of these ways above all others – the one we call 'logic', a linear system that has been with us since Socrates. Western man sees his system of logic as synonymous with the truth, as the only road to reality (Hall 9). Onder het mom van het voeden van het denken, van het alom gedachte idee dat dat een onderdeel is van het leven – dat voeden, wordt er kennis toegediend in de vorm van informatie/informeren. Voor Byung-Chul Han is informatie een verschijningsvorm van transparantie – in zoverre dat er geen negatieve kracht in schuilt (2010: 96). Informatie is een gepositiveerde, geoperationaliseerde taal. Yes. Hoe meer informatie er in de wereld komt, des te onoverzichtelijker hij wordt (2010: 97). Minder feitenkennis kan een meerwaarde opleveren (2010:55).

Dus het denken moet worden gevoed om kennis te doen toenemen. Om kennis te doen toenemen, moeten gedachten verbonden worden. Alleen informatie, feiten, brokken kennis heeft nog geen toegevoegde waarden. So. Connecting thoughts. In your own head. In multiple heads. Towards collective thought. Since it's an illusion that your own thoughts are enough. To understand. *In a Thousand Plateaus* Gilles Deleuze & Félix Guattari call a 'plateau' any multiplicity connected to other multiplicities by superficial underground stems in such a way as to form or extend a rhizome (23). When we are able om een plateau te ontwikkelen waarop gedachten de ruimte krijgen om te bestaan, waarop er een samen denken kan bestaan, is er de mogelijkheid tot de ontwikkeling van een collectieve gedachte (Bohm 15). Het lijkt erop /de vraag is of het cultureel bepaald is dat er nagenoeg weinig tot geen waarde wordt toegekend aan dat wat zich onder de uiterlijkheden, de oppervlakkige gedachte bevindt. 'It is a regrettable characteristic of the Western mind to relate expressions and actions to exterior or transcendent ends, instead of evaluating them on a plane of consistency on the basis of their intrinsic value' (Deleuze & Guattari 23). As they claim as well: we've lost it . They bring up Henri Miller saying: *'Grass is the only way out… The weed exists only to fill the waste spaces left by cultivated areas. It grows between, among other things. The lily is beautiful, the cabbage is provender, the poppy is maddening – but the weed is rank growth…: it points a moral'*(19).

How do we process the information we receive every day, the everyday increasing amount of information. We nemen information tot ons als kennis en ter kennis name. Informatie is in eerste instantie additief en cumulatief (Han 2010: 154). Informatie als een verzameling van afzonderlijke weetjes (feiten) is van geen toegevoegde waarde tot het weten. Informatie is nog geen 'kennis' als we deze verbanden niet leggen. Verbanden ontstaan door het verbinden van punten van het verleden (ervaring), via het heden (zijn), evt. naar de toekomst (mogelijkheid). Daarmee wordt elke connection subjective and of immediate value to a more collective knowledge(?). Kennis vormt zich door begrip, door vertelling, door doorvertelling waarmee gevolg getrokken kan worden. Gevolgtrekking. Kennis is een gevolgtrekking. Rituelen en ceremonies zijn vormen van gevolgtrekking; zij vertellen met beelden processen van kennis, van (inherent) weten. Deze hebben hun eigen tijd, hun eigen ritme en maat (Han 2015:73), belangrijk voor de ont-snelling. Versnelling treedt volgens Han op in een wereld waarin alles optelling is geworden. Gevolgtrekking kan snel dan plaatsvinden als er procestijd is, time to process, time om gevolg te trekken uit wat je waarneemt, en time just to process your thoughts, let them exist and subsequently process them to someone else, share, in order to make knowledge collective.

It's hard, probably for you as well, not to get confused by concepts or words like knowledge, savoir, information, thoughts. It seems all about connecting, about processing, about adding up, stapelen, landing, exchanging, needing the other to make it more. Does it always have to be more? Will it be okay as well to make it (something) less.

something else
Do hiding places for knowledge or maybe against knowledge exist? Can or do you have to flee from knowledge? Knowledge in itself is not something to flee from per se. With hiding places I mean spaces necessary to think, to gather, to collect knowledge. To stand still. To (re)consider. Spaces which do not seem to be there at this moment, or which are not easy to create for ourselves; on the one hand perhaps because we do not value creating such spaces any more, on the other hand a multitude of impulses, the hectic throughout society distracts us from silence, space. An open space. A white canvas. A place at rest. A place to rest. A space where you can draw pieces of your life. Where your thoughts can wander about. Some people might call this home. Can that be called home. Is home that near? I myself look for – actual/real hiding spaces throughout the city: the laundrette (at times no one is there), small apartments in distant neighbourhoods abroad, small banks throughout the city. Un-definable. Not clear what I'm looking for. I find. Does that mean that I do not have a home. That I have a house but not a home. I don't know. (I come back to that – will give it some thought). What I do know is that I am looking for the invisible in an effort to visualize that what was invisible till that time. Mainly to enlarge the not knowing. I call this the enlarging of the not knowing, since the visualizing of the invisible can't be known. Is that so? Rancière claimt dat onwetendheid geen inferieure kennis is, maar het tegendeel van kennis; kennis is geen verzameling van weetjes maar een positie (15). 'Kennen is precies het zich niet tevredenstellen met het zichtbare, meer nog, het is het ontkennen van het zichtbare als ontoereikend om daar het onzichtbare, het verborgen wezen van de dingen voor in de plaats te stellen' (46) zegt José Ortega Y Gasset. Ik weet (nog) niet of onwetendheid hetzelfde is als het niet-weten, of kennen hetzelfde is als kennis vergaren. Juist in dat niet-weten zit de kracht van het wonderbaarlijke. Misschien

noemen we dat verbeelding. Misschien. Via de verbeelding kom ik bij de kunsten. Kennis die verbeeld wordt in de kunsten. Kunst is in staat om (uit) te reiken naar kennisgebieden onder de oppervlakte. De kunst lijkt de ruimte te bieden om de tijd die we niet langer menen te hebben opnieuw te kunnen ervaren. Kunst geeft de mogelijkheid tot het blootleggen van het niet weten. Het niet weten mag ook niet geweten worden, want dan wordt het weten. Het is alsof de ondergrond aan de oppervlakte komt terwijl hij niet ophoudt ondergrond te zijn (Deleuze 56). Het is een proces, waarbij dan ook weer Deleuze en Guattari om de hoek komen kijken. Het is een ongoing mapping van het niet weten, dat maakt dat er ruimte ontstaat. So mapping is a sort of performance that produces rather than reproduces its object.

chaos

There is chaos, there is a circumstance, and that's all the foundation there is (Serres 1983:57).

Ik begin dit hoofdstuk vanuit chaos, in chaos met als main topic chaos omdat ik ervan uit ga dat er juist in chaos een zekere (wan)orde te vinden is. (Wan)orde die ik nodig heb for my (re)search for knowledge. Bij het zoeken van knowledge in een ordelijke omgeving zoals gegeven by certain scientists I get confused and (to be really honest) a little bit bored. In de ordentelijkheid raken gedachten en geweten zaken op een achtergrond. The way some scientists interpret the interpretation of the interpreted knowledge dazzles me, they seem to ignore matter as such. They look for arguments why de een deze bepaalde stelling zo onderbouwt in vergelijking tot de ander die tegen diezelfde stelling ageert. They seem to forget the matter, the content. So I do not mean the interpretation in the broadest sense: 'there are no facts, only interpretation', according to Nietzsche, but more like Susan Sontag indicates as a conscious act of the mind which illustrates a certain code, certain '*rules*' of interpretation (Sontag 5). With my emphasis on rules. Wat me hierbij duidelijk werd, is dat ik op zoek ben naar bij voorkeur on-geïnterpreteerde kennis. Die misschien zoals deze beschreven staat, of verkondigd wordt in eerste instantie geen sense maakt, maar die vanuit de ogenschijnlijke chaotische 'opstelling' zin(geving) krijgt door er een denkrichting aan te geven die eigen is, die deze kennis laat bestaan en verder laat ontwikkelen.

'De gewone ondoordachte neiging om exactheid als de eigenschap op te vatten die het waarheidsgehalte bepaalt, mist elke rechtvaardigheid en grondslag'
(Ortega Y Gasset 53).

I literally ran into chaos by the theory of David Bohm (1917-1992), a renowned quantum-physicist, in his book On Dialogue. Bohm's meaning of a dialogue derives from the Greek word *dialogos*. *Logos* means 'the word' or in our case we would think of the 'meaning of the word.' And *dia* means 'through'--it doesn't mean two" (1). Bohm points out that dialogue suggests a "stream of meaning" flowing among, through and between us. This makes it possible to create a flow of meaning in the entire group so that some new understanding will emerge. This in turn will create a "shared meaning" in the group that serves as the glue or cement that will hold the group (and society) together. The stream of meaning is being developed out of 'chaos', not by means of a subject, not by means of a theme, but by the participants of the conversation refraining themselves from reacting immediately. The stream of meaning comes to existence by not reacting, not talking, by having the conversation developed by itself. For Bohm chaos is being found in a hidden order. In a somewhat complex theory about there being two orders (not understood at that time) he explains the chaos within the orders (I am not sure). What I find remarkable about On Dialogue is the earthly method with which Bohm explains how to re-contact with the other(s) by a set of simple rules.

first performance

I started Reading On Dialogue when I got involved from scratch in a project of theater maker Lotte van den Berg: *Building Conversation*, which started in 2013. Als we dan kunnen spreken over n meer dan bovenmatige interesse in on-geinterpreteerde kennis is dit een goed voorbeeld. In that project a conversation is being treated as an artwork, a performance. Inspired by conversation techniques from all over the world those conversations are currently executed/performed - together with participants - in cities all over Europe. Doing so we explore, together with everyone who wants to join in, how we talk and how we could talk with each other. We focus mainly on the basic conditions of a conversation, like the space where the conversation takes place, the length of a conversation, the way we introduce or reflect upon the conversation, the chairs we sit on and the way we physically relate to each other in space. We play, you could say, with these so called preconditions. What happens when we put away the table, start moving, leave out the words, stand opposite each other or lay down together? And, how is the way we speak influencing the content we generate and the thoughts we create? The different conversations/performances we offer are executed/performed by the participants and guided by us. In an extensive and accurate introduction the form is being explained to the participants. Together with the group a few details are being decided upon and prepared. By doing so the form is completely given to the participants. The participants will develop the content by themselves. The knowledge of how is within the participants. They will have the knowledge as well as the responsibility. In a way is the how knowledge not per se acknowledged as intrinsic knowledge. Since the how influences the content, the content is being 'fueled' by every time different people. Having a different conversation every time, the process is the most important, not the outcome or any conclusion if any. So the outcome, even the process itself doesn't have to make any sense. Proceed

Encyclopedia: *a book. set of books, optical disc, mobile, device, or onlineinformational resource containing articles on various topics, usually inalphabetical arrangement, covering all branches of knowledge orless commonly, all aspects of one subject.* [1]

Along the way in searching for a werkelijke betekenis van chaos stuitte ik (niet geheel toevallig) op de chaostheorie. Interesting. Being described as 'natuurwetenschappelijke theorie die de nadruk legt op de rol van chaos in de werkelijkheid, waardoor deze veel moeilijker voorspelbaar is dan voorheen werd gedacht' is the description which attracted me most between all other descriptions, since this one gebruikt, zonder (te) diep in te gaan op de theory itself, chaos en orde (het verlangen te voorspellen is tegelijkertijd het verlangen het (on)voorspelbare te controleren) naast elkaar. En tegelijkertijd spreekt uit deze description de fluïditeit die alle theorieën mijns inziens zouden moeten bevatten: niets staat vast. De vraag is of je dan nog kunt spreken van een theorie as in 'a supposition or a system of ideas intended to explain something, especially one based on general principles independent of the thing to be explained'. [2] Allright. Ik dwaal af.

a circle of knowledge within chaos

One of the most opvallende kenmerken in de chaostheorie is dat er vele honderden jaren wordt gezocht naar patronen in de chaos om de chaos te kunnen verklaren. The chaos theory is ook daar om de dingen die on-(be)grijpbaar zijn, die zich in een tussenruimte bevinden te verklaren. Het onverklaarbare verklaren en daarin orde scheppen. Omdat we denken dat we het zo kunnen (be)grijpen. Wat als we de chaos, de wanorde laten bestaan. Wat als we, de mens, beter zijn dan we denken . Wat als we, of enkelen onder ons, beter in of vanuit chaos kunnen denken dan in orde. Een orde, een wanorde voor each human being. Een chaotische orde waarin voor every human being een eigen orde te vinden is. Ik denk dat iedereen een eigen orde heeft. Dat er niet één orde is. Of één wanorde. In deze eigen chaotische orde bevindt zich een eigen kenniscirkel. Weet niet waarom deze rond is, want ik heb niet het idee dat het vermogen aan knowledge dat zich daarin bevindt rond is, af is. Een kennisverzameling is wellicht beter. Een verzameling van kennispunten, die alle kunnen verbinden. Of niet.

dis-order, out of order

A S I D E

1   http://www.encyclo.nl/begrip/Chaostheorie
2   https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/theory.

To create order is to control. To regulate. Niets aan het toeval overlaten. What is the order of things? 'Orde is tegelijkertijd datgene wat in de dingen als innerlijke wet gegeven is en het verborgen network dat in zekere zin bepaalt hoe ze [de elementen] tegenover elkaar staan en dat alleen bestaat in het raster dat wordt gecreëerd door de blik, een gewaarwording of een taal; en alleen in de lege vlakken van dat schema manifesteert die orde zich als een onderliggende aanwezigheid die in stilte wacht op het moment dat ze wordt uitgedrukt (Foucault 14). Orde als een onderliggende aanwezigheid. In stilte liggen. Heimelijk. Wachtend. Proceed.

Wat als in de reguliere (normale) orde of door de reguliere (normale) orde we kennis missen . Omdat we dan niet kunnen beschikken over de kennisverzameling die zich in onze eigen chaotische orde bevindt; er zijn geen punten die we kunnen verbinden. Het mogelijk vermogen aan kennis wordt niet optimaal gebruikt. Misschien wordt deze wel misbruikt. Omdat er sprake is van een negatie (weet niet of dit het juiste woord is maar voor nu lijkt dit wel zo) van de aanwezige kennis. Van een ontkenning. Van een weglating. Dat er wordt gewezen op en naar de kennis zoals deze gebruikt wordt in de (normale) orde. Dat er sprake is van on-kunde. Terwijl de onkunde zit in het gebrek aan ruimte. Ruimte om vanuit de orde in de chaos te denken. Wie moet deze ruimte creëren? Wie is er in gebrek? Proceed.

ASIDE

I think I need chaos to be able to find knowledge in between. In between what. In between the things that are visible and those that are not.

chaos in a rational environment or chaos rationalized

Chaos wordt wel voorgesteld als een bodemloze leegte waar alles eindeloos 'valt'(ref.?); niet naar beneden, want er is geen enkele oriëntatie mogelijk, maar alle kanten op. Uit deze uitgestrekte malende wanorde ontstond orde (Wanneer? Waar? Hoe?). Interessant en wellicht belangrijk detail is dat chaos volgens sommige bronnen vrouwelijk is maar meestal als onzijdig wordt aangeduid. ⁴ Zou orde mannelijk zijn? Interessant: het blijkt zowel vrouwelijk als mannelijk. Welk een besluiteloosheid. Waarom heeft chaos een negatieve connotatie en orde een positieve? Als we de initiële betekenis van chaos als uitgangspunt nemen: een bodemloze leegte zie ik daar een enorme ruimte in. Een ruimte in zijn en een ruimte in denken. Die bodemloze leegte die niet naar beneden reikt, maar alle kanten op. Amazing. Wat een mogelijkheden. Chaos is often or maybe always being looked at rationally. As part of a rational reality. That is what problematizes chaos. The importance of chaos in reality, in society is being underestimated.

Even terug naar Foucault, om u daarna weer mee te nemen in de chaos van een gesprek. What he says is that the moment you translate your thinking (so yes a bit back to thinking as well) into language (18) you *share*. The moment you share your thoughts or your thinking it is possible to elaborate on that. So it is not about reproducing thoughts or your thinking but to build on thoughts/thinking in order to produce knowledge. That's what Bohm stresses as well. Proceed.

concerning language/words: mensen lezen (letterlijk en figuurlijk) woorden, maar vergeten of gaan voorbij aan de strek-king. Ze vergeten de betekenis om de woorden heen. De kennis die ligt of te vinden is in het veelal ongekende gebied tussen de woorden en omheen de woorden.

ASIDE

Language is een onlosmakelijk onderdeel/tool van een gesprek, maar niet het enige. It often seems easy to have a conversation, but it is less easy to have a satisfying conversation. Men vergeet maar al te vaak dat we bij een gesprek niet alleen iets zeggen maar dat het wordt gezegd door iemand (with her/his (cultural) background – with cultural in de breedste zin van het woord) to someone else. In order to have a satisfying conversation we need to know more about the different techniques.

Another good example to show that words, language is only part of a conversation, part of how one is able to relate to the other, is the conversation without words – also developed by Lotte van den Berg - which has a maximum of 15 participants. Those participants gather at a meeting point in a city center where they meet the guide. From that they walk to a place the conversation will be held. Most of the time for this conversation a small place is being used (like f.i. in Munich a bunker from World War II, or an atelier in Amsterdam). Before the conversation starts the guide will explain some rules like: the conversation is without words (off course), please use your eyes to communicate and do not mimic or use your hands, you are allowed to use one joker, that means at one moment during the conversation you can (silently) walk away, go out of the room, to the toilet or just go out, stay away as long as you like and come back (or not) to proceed, and some rules are set at that time, like the time the conversation will take is decided upon by the group itself. At last at the end of the introduction the guide will ask everyone separately if you agree to the time set and to the rules so that everyone is pretty conscious in participating in te conversation. Then the conversation starts. What is noticed at first is that you're completely not used to look someone in the eye and communicate that way for such a long time. Dus ontstaat er ongemak. Je kijkt weg. Je ogen gaan tranen. Je zoekt een andere partner, en vervolgens weer een andere and so on. Tot je iemand vindt, waarbij je blijft 'hangen', iemand met wie je een gesprek hebt. Zonder woorden. Maar met alle gevoel en woorden in je. Met wie je doorpraat, soms tot het einde, soms tot wanneer je durft. What knowledge is being used here? What is being practiced? How does this work. I'm still not sure. It's rather difficult to describe something without words by words. As similar with a work of art. How can you read such a conversation, such work. And it's not about reading alone, it's about the experience, the ability to communicate – without (the) words that are most of the time reason for confusion, misunderstanding, excommunication etc. It's perhaps strange but when this conversation is good – good in the sense of jawel, something happened between the two of you it feels like home. Home as in at ease, welcome, as in a place or situation to stay, comfortable, known. Yes I do think it feels known. We lack words for these kind of sensations, feelings, because when I came to think of it further it might feel as I am in love. That's the closest of words that I can think of. And no I am not in love.

Back to the words. You might ask why Building Conversation is being executed/performed (specifically) within the arts and a possible other question could be what the connection is with knowledge? You could ask that. And then you can get the following answer: Building Conversation is about staging the invisible, the unknown, the taken for granted. Building Conversation is not representing something, it is the exchange of words, the exchange of knowledge as you wish. It is the actual doing, performing, and not the representation. It's about agency. It's about taking responsibility. About exchanging. That what you know (or not know) with the Other. When you speak, attention will be paid to articulation, choice of words, focus is on speaking. When you don't speak, the focus is on the body, attitude, eyes, inconvenience, intensity, intimacy. With the spoken as well as the unspoken conversation the focus is on the listening, the focus is with the other, on what is there in the middle, on stage – staged. On that what is not, or does not become visible, if you don't look well (enough) or listen well enough, That what is said lays in the middle, not in you or in the other. It'll lead to an increase of the known, the knowable. And or better it takes time. It takes time to go beyond the knowable. Beyond that what you know of yourself and that what the other knows. It takes physical and clock time to endure. Or you can refrain from asking and just do it, experience it and take it with you, share it, make it shareable. It is about taking responsibility. In every conversation – and in every situation – one will have to take responsibility otherwise nothing will happen.

Wat moet duren. En waar wordt zelden tijd voor genomen. Het ongemak. Over wat we niet weten. Over wat er niet gebeurt. De niet-orde, het on-controleerbare. And further. Wat daarnaast opviel, wat opvalt, is dat zich een weten, a knowledge (savoir) openbaart die het liefst verborgen gehouden wordt. Een weten over de zelf, een weten over de ander, een weten dat zich manifesteert in de tussenruimte. Foucault noemt een tussenruimte: *'de opening die het proces van betekenisgeving in beweging houdt'* (Foucault 459). I like the in beweging houden, de nooit stilstaande, gefixeerde tussenruimte.

A possible room for thought, thinking, being. Space for an other being, the other, otherness. In chaos otherness can exist. Does this mean that otherness cannot exist in the opposite of chaos, namely order. Is order the opposite of chaos? Does order exclude otherness? Foucault spreekt het over het vermoeden dat er 'een ergere wanorde bestaat dan die van het *onverenigbare*, van het bijeenbrengen van dingen die niet bij elkaar passen';… die zijn daar 'neergelegd', 'geplaatst', 'gerangschikt' op plekken die onderling zo sterk verschillen dat het onmogelijk is om een

Ik vind dit gesprek het meest intiem en daarmee ook het meest 'te vrezen'. De kwetsbaarheid waarmee je je in zo'n groep manifesteert, is niet gekend. En onverwerpend.

ASIDE

ASIDE

Wat is physical time? Time that traverse though the body? How does time traverse through the body? By leaving out thoughts.

verblijfplaats voor ze te vinden , om *een gemeenschappelijke plaats* te definiëren die als algemene ondergrond zou kunnen dienen (Foucault 12). Vervang 'dingen' door 'de anderen'. What if chaos can be considered as a possible foundation, what if it can serve as a fertile ground for (a) multiplicity. A multiplicity in thinking, a multiplicity in time, a multiplicity in being the other, in being with others. More about this later in chapter about Otherness. Otherness in terms of (a) political order (Farrier 7).

the other

In my ongoing (re)search for expandable knowledge – meanwhile more and more related to other(ness) - I ran into the posthuman thinker Rosi Braidotti. For some time she critiques Humanities as a science and acknowledges the end of theory as a tool of power. As you already noticed I regularly try to undo myself of knowledge, looking for (new) ways to describe various perspectives of thought. If theory as such is being critiqued – theory as in knowledge, as in epistemologies which are directive and compelling then new thought can be developed. So while looking for a broader perspective on knowledge the end of theory (knowledge as you wish) as such came as a welcome intermission (right word?). An intermission which I can use to look at the other with what we know without being criticized by theory. If theory is being 'demolished', is there actually even an other (if we made up nature (according to Latour – will relate to that later), we might as well made up the other? Can we then speak of otherness? Is everything/everyone the same then? And isn't that even worse than being (the) other? But let not wander of: I was talking about the assumed end of theory. What (kind of space) do we need or do we have when we're in the realm of the not-knowing, when we're exercising ourselves in the un-knowing?

Perhaps you can imagine that for the other to be included it is necessary that there is space. And time. At this moment governments are looking for physical space, but in order to be able to create physical space it is necessary to ac-knowledge the need for another space. Why? Well with that I have especially spaces of understanding in mind. Understanding of other perspectives. Off course it is also and always a matter of perspective. Or maybe of figures. If it is said now that (only) 0,3 per cent of EU inhabitants are fugitives, what are we talking about. What's the problem. Research after research is done. Most of those researchers do that separated from each other. 'No, I am only mapping the anthropological issue regarding fugitives, I am not looking for the human rights part.' Fugitives. I was talking about the other. Is the other always a fugitive? No. The other is the other. The one opposite, next, below, above. The other is everyone but me. The other is a lot. When is the other a crowd, a multitude? What does it mean to be with more? What does that mean in terms of space. In terms of the other looking for (a) space. Transition. Looking for a place to be. Looking for a place to stay. Looking for a home. At any case for the time being. But what is home? What can be called home? Pramod K. Nayar, teacher at the Department of English at the University of Hyderabad, argues that 'home implies stability, security and freedom from fear' (89). So home can be everywhere and still at the same time nowhere. Nayar uses Ghosh's Hungry Tide to explore through the idea of home a knowing of the concept of the uncanny. Uncanny, as he relates the term to Freud in the human sense of house and home: 'is a perception of a space where the perceiver finds herself simultaneously 'at home' and 'not at home' (Nayar 3). The uncanny is the name of this experience of double perception of any space which is at once familiar and strange, safe and threatening, 'mine' and 'not mine'. Ghosh uses the term uncanny for those who feel dispossessed and those who 'lose their sense of home'. Is 'a sense of home' specifically human? Did we make up a (sense of) home?

When Nayar relates about the 'unhomely' sense of space - when it is not a matter of being out of space (being without a land or a history), he argues that the land itself (in this case the Sunderbans) is 'unhomely' by virtue of being inhospitable. The land is not able to be a home, to offer a home, from within, from within the self of the land. In the case of the Sunderbans this seems clear. Although it had to be found out by bodies being transferred, or bodies which transferred themselves to a (extensive) space which would not 'allow' them. Which is not hospitable. What if there is more land (in itself) that is not hospitable. What if we think that we, as human, can be hospitable or inhospitable, but that we do not have that capability or that power.

We think that what we have made, created, developed is also what we can master. But what if that is beyond our knowledge, beyond our power. What if the cities like we created them, are not hospitable in themselves. That they 'spit out' people, every time again, creating new landscapes for themselves.

Back to the other. I feel the need to write the other with a capital O. Like the Other is important. Well since I write myself also with a capital I, maybe that might equalize our position. All knowledge I gather or gathered past years comes from the Other. By meeting, listening, looking at the Other, the Other looking back, talking with the Other, sitting next to the Other. The knowledge in a Me is limited. It is there, but it has to expand. Slowly. So we definitely need the Other.

Thirding-as-Othering (il y a toujours l'Autre) There is always the Other, a third term that disrupts, disorders, and begins to reconstitute the conventional binary opposition into an-Other that comprehends but is more than the sum of two parts (Soja 31).

Is the Other human? Rosi Braidotti speaks about the human as a historical construct that became a social convention about 'human nature' (2013:26) – a normative convention which stands for normality, normalcy and normativity in the direction of a generalized standard. Normality excludes. Normality excludes the other. But what if there is no Other as is being claimed by Bruno Latour. Modernity stems from fictitious dichotomies according to Latour, he even speaks of 'our strange obsession with dichotomies'. Being modern is about separating epistemologies. Who 'invented' modernity? Who declared us modern? And why? The Moderns' victory cry: 'We Westerners are absolutely different from others!' separates not only epistemologies, but cultures as well. Is the estranged attitude towards the supposed 'other', the non-westerner, an invention of modernity? If that's the case than what happens when Latour acclaims that we have never been modern and we give that a follow up? Can we un-do the superiority of the West this easy? If we want to. 'We have never been modern' emphasizes that only through becoming aware of this insight what we can respond to and cope with the problems (that's a bit a pity: to problematize it) in our contemporary world. What is there to lose? A lot I think. People love to be superior, people love to be in control. They need to be in control. So what to do. So do what?

Latour argues that nature or reality is not a cause, but the product of scientific practice. What does this mean for knowledge, for theory, for epistemology? So to let go of nature, in sofar as nature is not a sphere of reality but the result of a political-scientific division, made by man, that subsequently separates the objective and the indisputable from the subjective and the disputable which short-circuits politics and paralyzes democracy.

Well. So what if there is no Other? What if the Other never existed? 'That means that we need to learn to think radically differently about ourselves'. Braidotti takes the posthuman predicament as an opportunity to empower the pursuit of alternative schemes of thought, knowledge and self-representation' (2013:12). By acknowledging the Other as the same, as the same as me/myself, I will develop new thoughts about myself. How does this work? It opens a hidden space within the Self which can be explored only in contact with the Other. The Other who is now the Self. We need to distinguish the other Other, otherwise we keep getting confused. The 'one next to us' is too long. For now I would like to talk of formerly the Other. See where it gets us. And then. How is this all (to be) connected with Latour's thoughts regarding we have never been modern. When we have never been modern who are we? Is that what Latour and Braidotti connect to when they develop separate from each other a new vocabulary about humans and nonhumans? If there is no Other we will and will have to develop other languages, other words, other texts, other attitudes, other ways of speaking about and towards ourselves as well as about and towards the one next to us (formerly the Other). How much time will it take to get adjusted to other-less-ness? Latour describes a Modern Constitution which obliges us to experience time as a revolution that always has to start over and over again (Latour 1996:70) But what if not. A complete (yes revolutionary) era would be there – has started long way back – or was there all the time, is there now and will never end.

things and infrastructures

Next to that Braidotti argues that the posthuman predicament has had its share of inhumane moments (2015: 9). In separating this notion from the human and nonhuman she however excludes an inseparable aspect of the human, of being human. Inhumanity is as human as can be. Considering that I do think it is important that we do not separate **a thing** anymore.

'In all languages of Europe, north and south alike, the word 'thing' whatever its form, has as its root or origin the word 'cause', taken from the realm of law, politics, or criticism generally speaking. As if objects themselves existed only according to the debates of an assembly or after a decision issued by a jury. Language wants the world to stem from language alone. At least this is what it says..' (Serres 1987: 111)

Thus in Latin the word for 'thing' is res, from which we get reality, the object of judicial procedure or the cause itself, so that, for the Ancients, the accused bore the name reus because the magistrates were suing him. As if the only human reality came from tribunals alone (Serres 1987: 307)
,
Here we shall see the miracle and find the solution to the ultimate enigma. The word 'cause' designates the root or origin of the word 'thing': causa, cosa, chose, or Ding.. The tribunal stages the very identity of cause and thing, of word and object, or the passage of one to the other by substitution. A thing emerges there. (Serres 1987: 294)

Since. By separating we are judging, neglecting, ignoring the matter. As if it is not ours. But it is. Ours. Like Latour argues that. Yes what. I do not get that completely (yet), but I'll get there eventually. Every time he is arguing about something he is un-doing it as well. Arguing about nature, abolishing nature. Arguing about modernity, we have never been modern. So no that's not the same as excluding inhumanity out of the notions human and nonhuman, but how can I avoid the term excluding (and maybe including as well) when I want to discuss this rupture of the whole.

Braidotti coins the posthuman as a new knowing subject which is a complex assemblage of human and non-human, planetary and cosmic, given and manufactured, and which requires major re-adjustments in our ways of thinking (2013: 159). So the posthuman as an object, a subject which contains everything. Well yes that requires definitely an other way of thinking; that requires a whole other vocabulary. Aren't they (Latour and Braidotti) thinking the same thing over and over again, from other perspectives, using other references, using other words (humans and nonhumans, subjectivity) and paradigms (posthuman, nonmodern). What does this mean regarding contemporary knowledge?

'Reason today has more in common with a cable television network than with Platonic ideas'. (Latour 1996: 109)

When I came across Latour starting questioning modernity, I started to think of other possible structures. No structure is also a structure. Nowadays everything is structured, ordered. In infrastructures, networks. As Brian Larkin, professor of Anthropology at Barnard College, Columbia University, US, argues when he relates about the ontology of infrastructure: 'infrastructures are matter that enable the movement of other matter. Their peculiar ontology lies in the facts that they are **things** and also the relation between **things**' (Larkin 329).

*'**Infrastructures** are material forms that allow for the possibility of exchange over space. They are the physical networks through which goods, ideas, waste, power, people, and finance are trafficked'. (Larkin 327)*

Following Larkin and proceeding on his thought: what if we think of things as agents (as is a common thought these days), how might people-thing/agent be a structure in themselves, how are they matter, how do they matter in a way that they enable the movement of other matter. Would it matter.

perhaps the part you just read is to dense, but sometimes it is necessary to put yourself though the dense in order to be able to get deeper into matter, if it was to dense please go back. And read it one more time. Or else. Proceed.
A S I D E

15

(a space like) home

Without a 'knowledge' of the lived space we are bound to understand a lot of what is actually socially space on a level of discourse, of language, on the level of mental space (Soja 57)

FEBRUARY 2017 - PROCEED

When knowledge is related to the Other, why would we leave the Other out. In what way are we able to invite them (them is quite problematic), to be with them (and again) in a way that they (they is problematic as well) can live with us, that we can live with them, to provide home for them – in one way or the other (and for the knowledge they bring 'to the table'). What kind of space do we need. I am looking for a space that is real. That is lived. Is that something that we can fit into a(n) (infra)structure. Can that be structured. Does that need to be structured. Can we only think in structures when it concerns the many. I'm not sure whether a lived space can be thought of in terms of the many. Because it seems so specific.

Real-and-imagined spaces: the 'real' coincides most with Lefebvre's perceived space and the 'imagined' with his conceived space. What Lefebvre described as lived space was 'typically seen as a simple combination or mixture of the 'real' and 'imagined' in varying doses'(Soja 10).

unknown spaces

While reading Gaston Bachelard's Poetics of space at the same time as Virginia Woolf's To the Lighthouse considering the notion of home as a space that cannot be mapped haunted me as a most striking notion of not knowing. At all. In the sense that there is no way of mapping home. No way of making home rational. No way to make it known. Interesting. Back to the mapping as a way to 'gain' knowledge. But what if there are things, places, spaces, people, that cannot be mapped. Does this mean that there might be an ample area of un-accessible knowledge. Ehm. Yes. So where to start (life) then. Since for most people home is the most important place ever. To start. To begin. Om vanuit te leven. Om naar terug te keren. Om het even niet te weten. Om vanuit naar buiten te gaan. Om naar binnen te kunnen. Om te schuilen. Home is a place where you can be yourself (not the other), home is a place where you are understood, where your language is spoken, where your body can be at rest.

So considering that the most unmapped, and therefore unknown space is home. That's almost unlike (Gaston) Bachelard says quoting William Goyen when diving deeper in the space of home: 'That people could come into the world in a place they could not at first even name and had never known before; and that out of a nameless and unknown place they could grow and move around in it until its name they knew and called with love, and call it home, and put roots there and love others there; so that whenever they left this place they would sing homesick songs about it and write poems of yearning for it, like a lover;…'. (78).

I 'read' partly (my) home in Woolf's *To the Lighthouse:*

… 'she took the heather mixture stocking, with its criss-cross of steel needles at the mouth of it, and measured it against James's leg. …
She looked up - … - and saw the room, saw the chairs, thought them fearfully shabby. …but then what was the point, she asked herself, of

ASIDE

what does this mean for the Other. What could this mean for the Other. The Other who is looking for a home. How would they be able to find (a) home if that is the most unknown space? How are governments able to provide for homes when it is not known what a home looks like. The feeling of being out of space, homeless, is a familiar one. It might work at several levels. On the level of knowledge. We might call it illiterate. On the level of home. We might call it homeless. On the level of other. We might call it migrant, refugee, or other (new) words, since it often changes how they are to be called. Like home they are not to be mapped.

16

buying good chairs to let them spoil up here all winter when the house,
with only one old woman to see it, positively dripped with wet.
Never mind: the rent was precisely twopence half-penny;
the children loved it; it did her husband good to be three thousand,
or if she must be accurate,
three hundred miles from his library and his lectures and his disciples;
and there was room for visitors.
Mats, camp beds, crazy ghosts of chairs and tables
whose London life of service was done –
they did well enough here; and a photograph or two, and books. …
And the result of it was, she sighed,
taking in the whole room from floor to ceiling
, as she held the stocking against James's leg,
that things got shabbier and got shabbier summer after summer.
The mat was fading; the wallpaper was flapping. …
But it was the doors that annoyed her; every door was left open.
She listened. The drawing-room door was open;
the hall door was open;
and certainly the window on the landing was open,
for that she had opened herself.
That windows should be open, and doors shut –
simple as it was, could none of that remember it?'(32)

Just an outline of what makes you and certainly me feel (perhaps) 'included' in a house, in a home. Or maybe not just. Perhaps the –more or less – complaining or brabbling about the increasingly decreasing beauty or better neatness of the premises. The joint reading of Bachelard and Woolf makes Bachelard commenting on Woolf or incorporating Woolf through me. As Bachelard relates that 'all really inhabited space bears the essence of the notion of home' (27). Or. 'Thus the house is not experienced from day to day only, on the thread of a narrative, or in the telling of our own story. Through dreams, the various dwelling-places in our lives co-penetrate and retain the treasures of former days. … We comfort ourselves by reliving memories of protection' (28). I get that. I get that and I have to think about it. I came (with slow pace) to think of a (first) line of a song: 'I am going to answer *protected'* (Aldous Harding). Protection. Protected. Memories of protection. Being protected in or by a house, by a home. For what. Against what. If I 'need' or get protected how does this work for others?

Ga ik via de kennis, via het niet-weten, via home richting the Other as a source for knowledge, as a source for home. Do I need a source. Do I need that source. Well. Het kantelt. Voortdurend. Als een on-vast-staand gegeven. On-vast-staand als in wiebelig, balancerend, omver duikelend, opstaand en ordenend. Home seems to exemplify a basis for (the I), the Other and knowledge, as a most common ground.

In order to reach that common ground I gave it some thought while writing, while reading, while wandering around in the city. *While writing* seeing the words unfolding under my hands as if my hands were able to think. Looking for some (new) thoughts on this. New because I am searching for connections. Between my hands and my thoughts. Between the doing and the thinking. *While reading* I came across a concept that Henri Lefebvre is using in his work, namely Third Space. Third Space as a limitless composition of life-worlds that are radically open, all-inclusive and move through various disciplines, that are never completely knowable, but at the same time function as beacons in a possible search for emancipatory change (yes it's a lot). Can a Third Space be considered as a home: the radically open, the all-inclusive, never completely knowable, sounds like the possible. Sounds like a save place, a place always or all the time in transition but save. Why save. Because of the never completely knowable:

you don't have to know, I don't have to know, it's all good. It's a place that is just there and if you're there you'll know it. So when you don't have to know it is save? You're save? Hmm. But. Well. To be able to start thinking in that direction it is at first necessary to think triallectically. Why. Because that refers to a spatial thinking within which Lefebvre puts three different kind of spaces: the *perceived* space (both medium and outcome of human activity, behaviour and experience); the *conceived* space (the spaces of scientists, planners, urbanists – all of whom identify what is lived and what is perceived with what is conceived) and the *lived* space which 'is alive: it speaks'. It has a recognizable centre: ego, bed, kitchen, church, cemetery. Contain all other real and imagined spaces simultaneously. *While wandering* around in the city I'm still looking for (new) places like home meanwhile looking for encountering, engaging with the other in order to probably find myself. I do need new ones since the old do not suffice any more all the time. So wandering is needed to see where the body can come at rest. Be save. Be at home.

For some reason I am most interested in space considered as (the) *lived* space. Perhaps you know by now. Lived space as a means to actually act, perform, to able to be to get things done in the end. Lived spaces in real life. Not only in the 'living area' but real life in working terms as well. For three years now I have been working with theatre collective Schwalbe. As from last year Schwalbe has been working on (creating or developing) space(s). They have been working on creating a lived space, a livelihood, in the sense that they create an environment, every time again, which is lived.

A definition of livelihood often used is: 'a livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living. A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stress and shocks and maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets both now and in the future, while not undermining the natural resource base' (Chambers & Conway, 1991). But I rather use: a livelihood as self-organized work in living economies, based on co- creation and co-production.

schwalbe

is more likely to apply to that last definition as well. The shared space that they are, and will be building will be in a continuous transformation through/by the participants. They're creating (in-stant) communities. They'll be literally building nests, homes, livelihoods. Inclusive environments. Who is not there does not change anything. That would imply that it is important to be there. Een aanwezigheid. A togetherness. A livelihood at that specific time. With the specific assets and the specific people that are there. And at the same time, what they do as well is everything else in between. Indescribable, actually, on their part:

they create warmth, ask questions without expecting answers, are inquisitive, are also curious, they deliberately give a nudge, they devote themselves to what happens 'around' a production, because that is the focus of their attention right now. they are looking in a different direction than they are accustomed to. they are looking at something that seems invisible. which is not what everything revolves around, but which must keep on going (itself). they are moving around what has to keep on going and bringing it to a halt. that might grate, sometimes. but actually, less than they thought.

How did they get there. As for them it's quite impossible to look too far ahead, to think of work, since they're creating their work actually 'on the floor'. Therefore – stimulated by a 4-year subsidy deadline - they have chosen to look at those four years ahead as a whole, as a time in which to turn everything that seems to be for granted into something that is not. They took a different approach. A block of four years offers another possibility regarding time: breathing space. They want to use it as such, not simply putting projects on a chronological line but in fact a-lineair: letting germs of ideas grow and keep growing throughout the four years, letting them roll like a snowball à la Bergson. To use, or better apply this time to enrich Schwalbe's work and zoom in on specific aspects of developing (a) work, including everything that happens around a work as a matter of course, and enter into a dialogue with all of the people connected with it, the expected and the unexpected. Approaching all these aspects (which can be considered autonomous but are now usually invisible parts of the process) as artistic work. By questioning or reconsidering the established value of things that are obvious, they think they can come closer to what they want to say.

Starting from their own strengths and ideas, their way of working, using the idea that organisation is content and content is organisation, considering the coming four years as an installation in which they place themselves in order to consider it from different perspectives.

The disordering of difference: Leaving the dis-order within the difference so that it is not possible to be claimed and (with that) 'colonized' by the hegemony (Soja).

further

So what are they – Schwalbe – doing and going to do. And how does that relate to knowledge. Perhaps 'as a matter of course' or 'not as a matter of course' are the key concepts in this. Knowledge is never a matter of course. To look in the unfamiliar. By looking at things from an other perspective. And off course there is space. It's definitely a matter of space. Developing or renewing a lived space. A space that has already been there for some time, but is not seen, not known as you wish. In a way it is too familiar, too close. As Henri Lefebvre indicates: 'the familiar is not necessarily the known'(Lefebvre 2008: 15) How to enter (a) (n) (un)- familiar (space).

Well. Starting with un-doing the initial order of things, enter the not knowing, or the not pretending to know, that's what Schwalbe does. To move beyond the space we are used to think in. Rehearsing the un-knowing. First on the floor and now on the organisation of their work as well. For that they took the performance 'out of the centre of our attention' (de-centred the work) and 'put a light' (in order to expose as well 'the work as the workers' to an audience) on everything and everyone who makes a performance/our work possible. The programmer, the bartender, the PR team, the technicians, the volunteers, the facilitating manager, the cleaners, the audience, the critics, the funding commissions etc. became their collaborators. The office, the backstage, the foyer, the hallway, the storage room became their working places. Work was something they found, they discovered, in between them and that particular venue. Work was a way to connect. Work was a way to nourish. In order to make it tangible they took a former performance, *Schwalbe is looking for crowds* [5]*,* and translated the content towards its organization. It placed itself as a small timeframe in a longer process, beginning with the first conversation with a programmer ending long after the last audience member left.
So how is the unknowing related to my search for knowledge. Is it an attempt to show – in in my ongoing search – that perhaps my current state of unknowing might be a position as well?

Back to Schwalbe. The projects they will do in the coming years and that they have already started last year will run through and tumble over each other, inspire, enrich, undermine and question each other. During the research, collaborations will arise or be continued. The research will lead to days of inspiration, floor work, presentations or parts of presentations, exhibitions, finished or unfinished productions, workshops, urban actions, public revelations, online presentations with a timeline: in short, a large variety of viewing possibilities and participative encounters. That's what they opt for. Since it's a plan to be executed. To be done. To be produced. Not only to be thought. The thought alone is not enough. The research, collaboration and connecting work might lead to the work, that which is finished. A finished piece of work gives the possibility of reflecting, mutating… after which they might end up in the realm of the unfinished again. What is the value of the unfinished. Of the work in progress. Work that is still developing. When is work finished. When it is performed for an audience? When it is set? Research is the basis of every Schwalbe production. So that's what we share. Research gives them the opportunity to momentarily stand on the top of a dune and see the direction that their initial inspiration can take them in, to try out a word in the breadth of it all, to get an idea of where the depth is that they want to investigate further during rehearsals. In every preparatory process, they take a theme or word and mentally go through each moment of the peeling off/ stripping down that they do with their performing bodies doing their show in front of the spectators. This process becomes visible during the research; they expose to an audience what has happened earlier, before it appears on stage, in the performance space. Is that what I do as well? Looking for a dune to stand on in order to be able to see more, to know more. Or. Am I not looking for knowledge but for a dune?

The work that follows develops and will develop like a pixel in time, a piece of glass in Bergson's rolling snowball. They have always worked this way, starting from not knowing. Not knowing turns into possibilities, into greater and enriched possibilities, into possible impossibilities, into filterings, into residue, into development of the residue, and becomes the work (in itself). The difference between the work they do now and what they did earlier is that this time they want to be open about what they're doing right from the start. Open toward a potential audience, potential performance space, potential co-producer, potential subsidiser. For a long while after graduating from mime school they felt forced to act as if they knew more than they did. It seemed as if they had to hide 'not knowing' to a certain extent, as if people needed a premature picture of the final product in order to have enough trust in the process leading up to it, enough trust in that particular product. 'Not knowing' is supposed to be hidden often.

space in between

Not (wanting) to know seems to be a lacuna in our society and in our thinking. Making a problem out of 'not knowing' means 'not knowing' has to be solved. *The space in between* is lacking. No inefficiency. Is allowed. They, Schwalbe, will be working this way in the coming years in order to follow their own desire on the one hand – necessary but might be looked at as coming with a sense of self-centeredheid, and on the other they will be using that desire to address a more general, socio-political problem. They want to do this through collaboration, exposing (infra)structures and entrenched ways of thinking they encounter along the way. They do not plan to lash out at a system. They're not going to protest. They are making a move and simply trying to deal with what comes their way. And imagining the leap instead of giving details about the results is exciting.

Is Henri Lefebvre relating to that specific *space in between* as well? His reworked trialectics of spatiality is more a transitional and desired state than an achieved one. Yet. Next to that it may look like that also Foucault (yes he is still in) hasn't written that much specifically on space (and therefore does not have a voice in this discours) it appeared that he wrote (at least) one text as basis of a lecture given in 1967: 'Des Espace Autres'. Although never officially approved (by the author) or published Foucault addresses space as something that was already there since Galileo (17th century) who replaced extension by localization, so it was for already a long time 'a horizon of our concerns, our theory, our systems.

I might add thoughts on how Lefebvre and Foucault are relating to space since I do think I need more common 'ground' for the spacial as I am entangling and relating my thoughts about knowledge towards the concept of home. Whereas Lefebvre and Foucault were making in their different yet similar conceptualizations of spatiality: 'that the assertion of an alternative envisioning of spatiality (as illustrated in the heterotopologies of Foucault, the trialectics and thirdings of Lefebvre) directly challenges (and is intended to challengingly deconstruct) all conventional modes of spatial thinking', bell hooks, in her most specific way explores new sites for struggle and for the construction of inclusive communities of resistance, recomposing real-and-imagined life in and from the margins, while incorporating and building upon the insights of Lefebvre and Foucault. All the spaces revealed are definitely "other than" the established ways of thinking spatially. Hoe te begrenzen. Hoe niet verder uit te weiden, niet verder in te gaan op meer gedachten over spaces (that difference makes). Those spaces are meant to detonate, to deconstruct, not to be put back in the (infra)structure we (used to) know. For me Schwalbe is looking for and perhaps creating 'spaces that difference makes'. Not in the way bell hooks refers to them, but in a way that they 'turn' spaces, they 'turn' perspectives, they 'turn' time. For Foucault (a) *Thirdspace* is meant to be 'a construction of this discursive triangle between power, knowledge and spatially effected a colonization of the life-world in which 'space' was given both metaphorical and material resonance. Space is fundamental in any exercise of power'. One of the main critiques of Lefebvre towards Foucault is what he saw as 'Foucault's failure to 'bridge the gap' between 'the theoretical (epistemological) realm and the practical one, between mental and social, between the space of the philosophers and the space of people who deal with material things' (Soja 146). This in clear contrast to bell hooks' attempt to move beyond the binary oppositions of race, gender and class in order to open up a Thirdspace from a position in the margins with which she creates possibilities for a new cultural politics of differences and identity. hooks argues that 'fundamental to this process of *decentering the oppressive other* and claiming our right to subjectivity, is the insistence that we must determine our legitimacy' (Soja 97). Who creates the identity of the ones in the margin?

It is necessary and ultimately powerful if that action is being performed *'in and for ourselves'.* So hooks chooses 'a space that is simultaneously central and marginal…, a difficult and risky place on the edge, filled with contradictions and ambiguities, with perils but also with new possibilities: a *Thirdspace* of political choice (Soja 99).

In order to increase the spaces in which the thinking and openness of *Thirdspace* is being explored Soja further mapped more ways and perspectives on spatiality such as the work of some feminist geographists, the spatial 'reworldings' of Gayatri Spivak and Edward Said and Homi Bhabha who has developed his own *Thirdspace* path in which he adds 'hybridity' to the radical openness, as 'a space or spaces of resistance being opened at the margins of new cultural politics'. With this scope the development of just such a meta-philosophy of geography, spatiality and critical urbanism (a spatial turn) might be addressed as one of the most important philosophical and intellectual developments in the 20th century. So how to open (up) a space in the margins or from the margins on to be able to develop other knowledge or knowledge about the other. To create a space like a home (for knowledge).

So. As I already argued earlier what if we consider the concept of home as an infrastructure and we treat it 'like an object, a thing, that creates the grounds on which other objects (things/matter) operate', Larkin notes that 'our study of infrastructure might thus centre on built things, knowledge things, or people things. One could borrow from **actor-network theory** to analyse all together as disparate elements of a single system, but the issue remains about **which elements comprise that system and which are excluded** (my emphasis)'. (329)

Actor–network theory (ANT)

is an approach to social theory and a research methodology, originating in the field of science studies, which is based on two key principles; putting all the factors involved in a social situation on the same level and doing away with the concept of social forces. Thus, objects, ideas, processes, and any other relevant factors are seen as just as important in creating social situations as humans. ANT holds that social forces do not exist in themselves, and therefore cannot be used to explain social phenomena. Instead, strictly empirical analysis should be undertaken to "describe" rather than "explain" social activity.
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Actor%E2%80%93network_theory (including every current way of informing ourselves)

If we do call home an infrastructure, what might be the main elements in- and excluded? Larkin quotes some scientists (among which N. Anand) who stresses on the fact that social networks are inseparable from the (technological) infrastructures: 'infrastructure in this sense is a kind of mentality and way of living in the world'. (331) Creating a collective space for humans and non humans involving ANT to be able to develop an infrastructure. What if we use (the concept of) infrastructure in relation to (the concept of) home as a means of creating a space instead of regulating life. When the concept of infrastructure is acclaimed as rooted in 'the Enlightenment idea of the world as a movable space open for change (at any time)… the possibility of progress is created, it might be possible to take home as an infrastructure as an 'un-fixed' state.

What I find interesting is Star's assertion - which everyone is supposed to repeat - that 'infrastructures are 'by definition invisible', taken for granted, and that they only 'become visible on breakdown' (336). Home is an invisible concept as well. It is out there, but almost more when you (are about to) lose it. Again I take a phrase from Larkin: '… visibility was necessary to continually renew its political effect' (336). When the concept of home might be made visible is it then possible to put home on the political agenda instead of the homeless? Another kind of perception. How to create a home. As a country. Instead of forced to house the homeless (refugees/fugutives). Proceed on that. Another time.

to conclude

Home. Another perspective. All the time. If there is no possibility to be certain that a government, a country, a city, a village has the knowledge, can or, is able to provide humans (and perhaps non humans) with a home, how can we create space, home in ourselves. Is it possible that humans and non humans in themselves are that space that we all need, that we all know, that space that we would like to call home. So literally the (post) human as that object that is able to contain everything as Braidotti argues, so that contains (a) home as well. Off course a lot (or all) stated before has consequences. For human and nonhumans (without hyphen is better), for society, for mankind (can we still speak of mankind) etcetera, etcetera and definitely epistemology. Will this be the end of epistemology as well? Can you say that? The or a most important term Foucault introduced and coined quite a while ago. Epistèmè which means literally *'knowledge and comprises the actual basic structure which offers the connection to the 'savoir' and all forms of knowledge based on that which are produced by science during a certain period' (Foucault 456). Every epistèmè converges (move towards each other, are focussed on 1 point, coming together in 1 point) in 1 core category: resemblance (renaissance), representation (classical time), analytics of finiteness (modernity).*

further thinking and consequences

Do I wander of. Maybe. Maybe all the time. But what. I try to do is to manage and struggle my way through contemporary thoughts and thinkers to 'create' (or has this already been created) a space (picture or visualize a square-like area) where thought, thinkers, nonthinkers, humans, nonhumans, subjects, objects, bodies, nonbodies are gathered. It will be a full space. Or maybe better not gathered, but that there is just the possibilities to gather. If the exclusion and inclusion (words I try to avoid) are terms and situations being made up by ourselves, by theorizing, by structuring, by ordening social spaces, in order to comprehend life, or anything beyond life, than we, human and nonhuman (we are now there anyway), must be able to un-do this as well. Not by theorizing, not by adding more knowledge to what we know, but by un-knowing. We have broken down already a lot of barriers (or maybe not we or I but yes theorists or philosophers or scientists) like nature, theory, modernity. We have to undo ourselves from all we know, from the value that we add to life by knowing. If we undo ourselves from the knowing, will it be possible to create a home, homes. Home as a place beyond knowledge.

a short (space) in between

Since I still promised you the laundrette. The earlier mentioned laundrette and I. So how do I relate all, the Other as well as Knowledge as well as Home, to the concept of a (preferably hand) laundrette. What makes the laundrette literally a home for knowledge, the other and me. In what way do I consider laundrettes as small intimate homes throughout the city/cities. Can they serve as such. Can I make them as such. The practices that are involved in a launderette can be considered as individual as well as collective. Since the advancing gentrification throughout certain city areas the launderette has become an 'oasis' (for some of us) in an 'enriched' environment. The space in itself is neutral, accessible, meant for people with a joint intention, caring for a simultaneous object separately. *In that it can be considered as a place of knowledge. Knowledge that is unexpected.* With Latour's Laboratory Life in mind I looked at this environment with an anthropological and ethnographic interest. It contains a sort of estranged reality with an extreme mix of different people *performing* the same thing, day in day out, thorough, everyone in his/her own way. Silent, sometimes asking, the new ones. This technological revelation of the fifties (or earlier – I preferably do not know the actual facts about periods) which became an individual materialistic asset turns to a collective asset in a particular way of living in an urban environment. Beyond the core technology of

the washing machine my thoughts wander off to the incentives of using the launderette, which are not only about a presumable lack of money, but also about (a lack of) space, (supposed margins of society and of sharing, of disowning and so on). Considering Winner's research on ways of engineering relationships between people, on ways of urban architecture it is not said that launderettes are purposely planned in every quarter of a city, but launderettes appear there where needed. Laundrettes themselves are often seen as a marginal aspect of society (as a matter of fact they look that way as well: broken chairs, broken laundry baskets, most of them kind of dirty, lost or forgotten laundry everywhere– but with that – as well as with other (political issues) what if we have a look at the launderette from another perspective – what if the launderette is decorated in another way, what if we value the launderette differently.

epilogue

For too long I was astonished by changing vocabularies, by changing attitudes towards whatever the things that were just there, towards anything and everything not familiar to us.

I did not get Latour's philosophy, which is not a philosophy, at once. Initially I was irritated by his haphazardous way of writing and thinking, but then I got drawn to his ideas and seriously think that this is/was the missing link within my thoughts.

WE MADE IT UP.
WE DID THIS.
THIS WHAT IS HAPPENING NOW.
BECAUSE OF OUR NEED, OUR LONGING
FOR POWER, FOR ORDER.

So.
We have to move forward by going back.

Revalue chaos, revalue our body, revalue the Other (who isn't the other anymore). In order to make us work on society, in order to make society work.

Revalue Deleuze & Guattari, whose thinking was drenched in chaos, revalue Nietzsche, smartest ever to refuse to think linear (I do not know about this, about that smartest part), value Braidotti for her affirmative thinking (a bit negative and depressing some times, but well), and value Latour for his affirmative, back/forward moveable movement in the sense that we have never been modern, so let's not pretend that we are.

epilogue 2
Why do I approve of Latour, why do I approve of Braidotti, why do I approve of Nietzsche, why do I approve of Deleuze & Guattari, why do I approve of Foucault, why Lefebvre, why Bachelard, why Woolf. Because their thinking creates space, vulnerability, radical switches in thinking, radical other ways of acting. I believe their combination takes care of a 'reenactment' (is this the right word?) of an era. The era we called Modernity. We are not going to have to face the future, cause there is no future, there is only what there is now: contemporary thinking and acting. Do not forget the acting. The way we are (getting) 'seduced' or 'sedated' by sovereignty, by epistemologies, to very slowly alter into a community (not communities) which denies access, can be 'counterparted' (is this a word) by (re)-reading authors mentioned above and pick/take from their affirmative approach whatever you need to actually act. Only reading, only thinking, only talking is definitely not enough. For too long we have believed in and trusted on knowledge, sovereignty or someone else than ourselves. It is time that humans and nonhuman beings rechtstandig gaan staan en jointly make society work.

epilogue 3
We don't have the words. We do not have the language. To speak up. But perhaps that is not necessary. We'll have to see whether we have to be silent. Perhaps we have to be silent in order to be able to act, to do, to be. To take responsibility. Responsibility for what. Get a grip.

epilogue 4
Art is not a solution. Art is a possibility. Art is a space. But not always. Sometimes it suffocates. Art suffocates when it is made as art while it is not.

bibliography

Arendt, Hannah. *Denken.* Vert. Thomas Graftdijk. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij de Arbeiderspers, 1971. Print.

Bachelard, Gaston. *The Poetics of Space.* Transl. Maria Jolas. New York: Penguin Books, 2014. Print.

Bergson, Henri. *Essays over bewustzijn en verandering.* Vert. Joke van Zijl. Leusden: ISVW Uitgevers, 2016.

Bergson, Henri. *Matter and memory.* Brooklyn: Zone books, 1988. Print.

Bergson, Henri. *Tijd en vrije wil.* Vert. Fréderique Worms Parijs: PUF, 2014. Print.

Bohm, David. *On Dialogue.* New York: Routledge Classic, 1990. Print.

Braidotti, Rosi. *Nomadic subjects.* New York Chichester: Columbia University Press, 2011. Print.

Braidotti, Rosi. *The Posthuman*. 2013. Reprint. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2015. Print.

Brown, Wendy. *Politics out of history.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011.

Chambers, R., & Conway, G. Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical Concepts for the 21st Century. Retrieved January 4, 2018, from http://www.unisdr.org/files/16771_16771guidancenoteonrecoveryliveliho.pdf. 1991.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Verschil en herhaling*. Vert. Joost Beerten en Walter van der Star. Amsterdam: Boom, 2011. Print.

Deleuze, Gilles & Felix Guattari. *A thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia.* Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press, 1980. Print.

Farrier, David. *Postcolonial Asylum: Seeking sanctuary before the law.* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2011. Print.

Foucault, Michel. *De woorden en de dingen.* 1966. Reprint. Amsterdam: Boom Uitgeverij, 2006. Print.

Geuss, Raymond. *Nietzsche and Genealogy.* In Nietzsche, edited by J. Richardson and B. Leiter. 322 – 340. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Ghosh, Amitav. *The hungry tide.* New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 2004. Print.

Hall, Edward, T. *Beyond Culture.* New York: Anchor Books, 1989. Print.

Han, Byung-Chul. *De vermoeide samenleving.* Vert. Frank Schuitemaker. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij van Gennep B.V., 2010. Print.

Han, Byung-Chul. *Psychopolitiek.* Vert. Hans Driessen en Marion Hardoar. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij van Gennep B.V., 2015. Print.

Latour, Bruno. *Laboratory Life: The construction of Scientific Facts.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1986.Print.

Latour, Bruno. *Politics of nature: how to bring the science into democracy.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.Print.

Latour, Bruno. *We have never been modern.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996.Print.

Larkin, Brian. *The Politics and Poetics of Infrastructure.* Annual Review of Anthropology, 42:327-43, 2013.

Lefebvre, Henri. *Critique of everyday life.* Vert. John Moore. London: Verso, 2008.

Lefebvre, Henri. *The production of space.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1974. Print.

Nayar, Pramod K. *The Postcolonial Uncanny, the Politics of Dispossession in Amitav Ghosh's The Hungry Tide*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2010.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *De genealogie van de moraal*. Vert. Hans Driessen. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij De Arbeiderspers, 2014. Print.

Ortega Y Gasset, José. *Wat is filosofie.* Vert. Willem Desmense. Utrecht, Uitgeverij Ijzer, 2009.

Rancière, Jacques. *De geëmancipeerde toeschouwer.* Amsterdam: Octavio Publicaties, 2015. Print.

Serres, Michel and Lawrence R. Schehr. Noise. *SubStance,* Vol 12, No 3, Issue 40: Determinism (1983) 48-4.

Serres, Michel. *Statues.* Paris: Francois Bourin, 1987.

Soja , Edward W. *Third Space, journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined spaces.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1996.

Sontag, Susan. *Against Interpretation: And Other Essays. London: Penquin Books Ltd,* 1966. Print.

Virno, Paolo. *A Grammar of the Multitude, for an Analysis of Contemporary Forms of Life.* Los Angeles: Semiotexte, 2007.

Woolf, Virgina. *To the Lighthouse.* London: Hogarth Press, 1927. Print.

⊙

AUGUSTUS 2018 – A MOST SILENT REVOLUTION IF ANY heb ik geschreven tussen 1 oktober 2015 en 31 augustus 2018. Ik heb de tijd (letterlijk) genomen. Toch voelde het alsof ik het in één adem geschreven heb. Wellicht was het vanuit één adem. Grote dank aan Marie Beauchamps die met veel inspiratie en veel plezier de vaart erin hield. Grote dank aan mijn dochters die mij tot voltooiing aan hebben gezet. Dank aan allen die mijn praten over moeten schrijven veelvuldig geduldig aangehoord hebben.

A.T.