

PALACE OF FATE

2 pm on a Sunday. The ~~narrator~~ protagonist of this story is asleep and, although the hour and day are known to us precisely, this sleeping ~~narrator~~ protagonist¹ is adrift on a temporal sea. Infinitely many Sundays extend behind her and in front of her. What is it exactly about all these days that makes them Sunday?

She wakes up and starts to cry.² She does not know why she is crying, but she does know that she cannot have what she wants. The images of her present failure combine with the images of her failures of the past, all of her possible future failures, the failures she has seen and could possibly see in films, the failures she has heard or could possibly hear in music – or read in books, forming a narrative of virtual³ failure which extends infinitely into time and space.

She is in the palace of fate⁴ and perceiving it through the **PRISM** of failure. She is mourning a failure that may or may not exist, because she cannot relate the image in front of her to any image of success she has seen.⁵

She is Kate Winslet in *Titanic*, failing to save her lover – tomorrow she will wake to find him blue, frozen, dead. There is nothing she can do. Icy heads of Leonardo DiCaprio floating on the North Atlantic as far as the eye can see. She cries for her mother – separated from her at a distance that, although measurable, cannot be traversed in this instant, and it is in this instant that she needs her mother. The distance is infinite in this instant. The impossible and the possible coincide.

She stops crying. She is still in bed, trembling.

There is a difference between the infinite and the infinitely many.⁶

// Perhaps this is an experience of THE SUBLIME:
~~find definition.~~

The "sublime" is a term in aesthetics [...] (which) refers to the experience of pleasurable anxiety that we experience when confronting wild and threatening sights like, for example, a massive craggy mountain, black against the sky, looming terrifyingly in our vision.⁷

// find better definition.⁸

*Not everything is a fish, but there are fishes everywhere.*⁹

CUT.

She is sitting in front of her computer, staring at it immobile, trying to understand why the **PRISM** of failure persists in breaking her perception into this horrific spectrum. If it is something she read, heard or saw somewhere, she is determined to delete it.

The files are out there. They have been downloaded. They're down, there's no up anymore. They're all down.

*They have to snip all the cords across the globe.*¹⁰

She can't delete it. And she can't let it go. She doesn't even know what "it" is anymore. "It" is just part of everything, a piece of the whole, like herself and inseparably linked to herself – now that "it" has fallen within the scope of her point of view and become part of her memory.

CUT.

Lytard remarks that Oedipus Rex might be considered a comedy because Oedipus "does not know how to ruse as a narrator with the story of which he is the hero".¹¹

DIVINE EYE¹²

In order to distract herself from the issue, she has been looking for a way to understand the function of the word God in Western philosophy.¹³

She can understand "God" as an infinite variable. God is everything a human being could never be, can do everything a human being could never do. God symbolizes that which a human being would be if all worldly and material constraints were dissolved. The idea of God stands for man's concept of his self as infinite and omnipotent.

~~She can understand "God" as an infinite variable. At the moment when it seems the human being is insufficient, "God" takes the place of "man". This is to help humans accept their own impotencies and limitations and forgive each other for their failings.~~

~~Divinity == Infinity – maybe this is stupid?¹⁴~~

Does this failure actually correspond with any image of failure she has seen? Has she spent her life amassing snapshots in a pile of failures, simply because they do not resemble any image of success she has seen? Could she not have done the inverse? Why is her category of failure so flexible, but that of success not?

Theoretically, it would be possible for her to look at the entire world differently and behave differently in it, and this would reveal the world to her as different. The world would, in fact, BE different. She would be the divine eye, choosing the appropriate point of view at every moment.

She runs her finger gently over the computer screen. "Where are you?" She places her fingers on the keyboard, hoping they will make the magic words appear, the words that will give her the appropriate point of view. "If I imagine you here, will you appear?" She tries to form the image of the best of all possible worlds in her head and push it out through her fingertips, to mold it first in the form of text, birth it into the sphere of the real. "If I imagine the words you will speak, will you speak them without knowing why? And to whom will you speak them, if I am not there where you are?"

She cannot control the precise effect of her actions on the world. They enter out into a mass of interacting actions of which she is effectively unaware.¹⁵ She gives them up to the unknown. Someday, something will come back.

*One can advance to a certain point, even though nothing further is possible.*¹⁶

Dear Office of Aesthetic Occupation,

I am pleased to inform you of my participation in your exhibition **The Phylogenesis of Generosity**.¹⁷

Enclosed please find a copy of my BFA, verifying my artist status, as well as documentation of my participation¹⁸ for your records.

Please update your list of participating artists accordingly.

Warm Regards,

Carrie C. Roseland

KUNSTKAMMER¹⁹ SOUNDKAMMER

// REVIEW OF TAREK ATOUI²⁰ SOUND PERFORMANCE AT GALERIE HETZLER²¹ BERLIN-CHARLOTTENBURG

[STANDARD ART REVIEW, PART 1: VISUAL DESCRIPTION]

We are in a typical gallery space. It has been divided into four sub-spaces. Speakers have been placed in corners and at intersections between sub-spaces. A group of pedestals stands at the most globally visible point in the gallery; controls, switches and circuit boards have been built into their tops. It is from here that the artist performs, and around this installation gathers most of the audience.

The sound begins softly. Some faint noises come from different corners of the space and travel into its near-emptiness, shattering against dividing walls, clattering to the floor, dissipating towards the ceiling.

I move around, listening, playing a bit with the sound.

The sound begins to build, it fills the space so densely that it becomes impossible to continue moving around.

[STANDARD ART REVIEW, PART 2: SUBJECTIVE INSIGHT]

By now, some people have dispersed loosely throughout the space, yet she is almost completely unaware of their presence. The only thing that exists to her is the sound. She concentrates her entire being on the sound. It is terrifying in its power. She leans her back against a plaster wall, lets the sound waves travel through her body, starting at her lower back and working their way in. Her head tilts to the side. Rather than forcing the waves to stop at her skin, rather than being a resistant body, she is convinced she can re-appropriate herself as an amplifier. Right here, right now.²²

// Relate this to BREDEKAMP on LEIBNIZ²³:

Thought/consciousness needs something (concrete?) on which to focus, otherwise it will expand infinitely in all directions.

// Reconstruction of discussion with Tarek after performance.

TAREK ... **MICROSAMPLES**²⁴: very short sounds following in such close succession, that they sound as one, and coming from different speakers dispersed throughout the space, that they fill the space, they feel as form: touching the infinite.

CARRIE Have you ever read Leibniz?

The sound expands in all directions while consciousness is focused. Interesting inverse relationship.

// Might this relate to **PRISM**?²⁵

Dear Tarek,

We spoke after your performance at Hetzler in Berlin a couple of weeks ago. I was the one who asked you if you had ever read Leibniz, do you remember?

I am writing a piece for the next case of *The Anxious Prop* [...] and quoting something you said to me about infinity in our conversation.

Do you feel I have accurately represented what you said?

I was also wondering if you could answer one or both of these questions, as you see fit:

Do you feel your work is relevant to contemporary discourse surrounding intellectual property?

Do you feel that intellectual property laws and the debates surrounding them have any relevance for your work?²⁶

thanks and all my best,

Carrie

// At this point, the ~~narrator~~ protagonist finds her roommate - with a **PRISM**. Overwhelmed by **BIG DATA**, he needs to split it into its component parts.

She comes home in the evening drunk and upset because she got drunk and said things she wishes she hadn't said. She is sure everyone will hate her now. What would they think if they knew she had never sent that letter to the Office of Aesthetic Occupation? What would they think if they knew she would soon panic and tell Luis she couldn't finish her article on intellectual property for *The Anxious Prop*?

Her roommate is laying on the floor under his desk, dangerously close to the router.

"What are you doing?"

He looks at her desperately. "Installing a **PRISM**."²⁷

"What?"

"I'm installing a **PRISM**." She can see a polyhedron-formed piece of glass shining in his hand, half-hidden by the blinking router. "It's going to filter our internet, looking for meaningful patterns."

“That sounds great.”

She says this without even considering what it means.

dear luis,

regarding the points you raised: i have scoured ****rg for leibniz and bredekamp texts. looking for the ray of light, looking for the windows. i cannot believe it is true, but it is: i have found basically nothing. but. rather than ask you for some pdfs or whatever, i decided to let this search be what it is. i have come across a number of other nice things. my text has three parts so far, and in the third i plan to do the ray of light and the windows as i can imagine them, given what i have found. and this shall be my true response to your email.

bises,

carrie

PLAY PALACE²⁸

She is in a dimly lit room. It is filled with bodies, so close together as to be in near constant contact, yet she is only tangentially aware of them. It is also filled with sound.

~~Like the other day at Hetzler...~~

~~she is convinced she can re-appropriate herself as an amplifier.~~

She is an amplifier.²⁹

Up to this point, the tall windows set into the walls at tight intervals³⁰ have been darkened by heavy roller shutters.

Now, those shutters begin to move. They begin to raise slowly in unison, and slivers of light begin to shoot into the room. As the shutters retreat towards the ceiling, the light becomes blinding.

The limit between the inside and the outside dissolves.

It is as if a window opens inside her; the light travels into her – just like the sound – and back out of her. Amplifier.

The limit between the inside and the outside dissolves.

Her gaze drifts around the room – now she can see everything clearly: sharp edges, bright colors. The faces of the people in the crowd, wide-eyed and delirious. The bar. Bottles glistening in a row. For a brief instant, she contemplates the scene as she would contemplate a photograph. The sound returns.

In my opinion, there is nothing in the whole created universe which does not need, for its perfect concept, the concept of everything else in the universality of things, since everything flows into every other thing in such a way that if anything is removed or changed, everything in the world will be different from what it now is.³¹

1 THE NARRATIVE MODE ENDNOTE

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Narrator#Types_of_narrators_and_their_narrative_modes

At some point, I realized my use of the word “narrator” was quite probably inappropriate. Although I found it very seductive to write about “the narrator of this story” within a story – it would have to have been done differently than conflating her with the protagonist. I suppose in execution it could kind of continue endlessly and might have fulfilled my ambition to write a story which is a Russian doll.

However. I had already given up on that ambition by the time I changed the “narrator” of this story to the “protagonist” of this story, that is, after diagnosing this narrator and assigning her a mode: This story is written with a “third-person limited narrator”. That narrator might be me, but it’s definitely not my protagonist.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Third_person_limited#Third-person.2C_subjective
Still, it may be tempting to perceive a lack of distinction between “myself” and the protagonist in this story. I think such a perception would be founded in misunderstanding, the well-documented tendency of the human brain to establish certain kinds of relationships between bits of information based solely on their proximity to one another. (This is the foundation of Sergei Eisenstein’s famous theory of montage.)

There is definitely an instability within the figure of “the protagonist of this story”. She is not a clearly defined persona with which we can agree or disagree. Her situation is made even more precarious by the multiple inclusions of first-person material by me, or by the narrator – if the narrator is me. But we just can’t know if that’s true. Maybe the narrator is me. I wonder if readers could feel like this vacuous figure is trying to suck them in, like she was sucking me in, and quite possibly the narrator too?

I even tried a mechanical conversion of this story entirely to the first person. The result was nothing I ever would have written in the first person. This “I” was so confident and stable. It was a very convincing style. But it wasn’t very interesting. It’s not being published.

2 THE VERACITY ENDNOTE

Sadly, much of what is recounted in these first paragraphs of PALACE OF FATE did really happen. I did really have these humiliating thoughts about Titanic, hallucinations of multiple frozen DiCaprio heads floating in the North Atlantic and I really did want my mommy. In fact, I even called a friend that Sunday, crying hysterically about how I wanted my family. It’s true.

Actually, most of what is recounted at all in PALACE OF FATE did really happen. Some of it might still happen – some of it has now happened by virtue of its having been published. Some of it should have happened, but I guess it didn’t really, to be honest. We can pretend it did. It’s fun to lose and to pretend.(2.1)
Some of it, I am pretty sure happened, not to me but to someone else.

And some of it is allegorical, I guess. Allegorical *argumentum ad absurdum*. I have a really obscure DVD full of interviews with Jean-Luc Godard, I’m not going to tell you what it’s called or do any of that academic referencing nonsense. I promise, it’s completely obscure, and it might also be true that I don’t have it legitimately. In one of the interviews, Godard says he and his colleagues weren’t interested in the distinction between documentary and fiction. A film is a film. Apparently Godard has said this so much that you don’t need me to give you a precise reference.

But I wonder how many people realize how completely radical such a statement is. I am quite sure that the person interviewing him did not. Godard is saying that no film can make any greater pretense to facticity OR fiction than any other, because all they are is films. It’s a formalist argument. There is nothing inherently

“fictional” or “documentary” in film. And I think the same thing can also be said for text. As specific media, with specific material limits and often rather coded forms and coded manners of reception, both film and text are inherently capable of communicating their own certain kinds of knowledge.

(2.1) Nirvana.

http://www.dailymotion.com/video/x157nIo_nirvana-smells-like-teen-spirit-official-music-video_music

I'm worst at what I do best. And for this gift, I feel blessed.

3 THE VIRTUAL ENDNOTE

It seems to me that the concept of virtuality occurs quite frequently in Deleuze's *Le Pli : Leibniz et le Baroque*, in comparison with other works.

4 THE NARRATIVE STRUCTURE & PALACE OF FATE ENDNOTE

This narrative is structured around four concepts developed by Leibniz + referenced in the essay: Horst Bredekamp, *Kunstkammer, Play-Palace, Shadow Theatre: Three Thought Loci by Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz*, in: *Kunstkammer, Laboratorium, Bühne. English*. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co., 2005. pp 265-282.

The first section of this narrative corresponds with the PALACE OF FATE: according to Bredekamp, referencing Leibniz' *Theodicy*: the PALACE OF FATE contains the “representation not only of that which happens, but also of that which is possible.” (p 278)

In fact, this entire narrative corresponds with the PALACE OF FATE – or: takes place within the PALACE OF FATE. And, the first section more precisely concerns a protagonist awaking in the PALACE OF FATE, only to find that there is a distortion in her point of view. The narrative will relate the resolution of that conflict.

5 THE WHO OWNS YOUR MIND ENDNOTE

In the interview also referenced in endnote (10), rlx says:

We're surrounded by images. Every day, everywhere. There's nothing you can do about it. But the problem with these images is that they're not yours. People's lives are determined by images that they have no rights to...

You see an image, it enters your memory – what it does there, you'll never really know – how it will connect itself with other images, sounds, tastes, smells, feelings also stored in your memory. It will never leave your memory, even if you will never be able to recall the exact shape or color of that image. And you will never own it. You will have no rights to it. Yet, it is your memory, until you cease to exist.

6 THE INFINITY ENDNOTE

Inspired by reading this text:

<http://steiner.math.nthu.edu.tw/disk5/js/history/infinity.pdf>

7 THE REFERENCE TO WIKIPEDIA ENDNOTE

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jean-François_Lyotard#The_sublime

Why was I reading about Lyotard? Because suddenly in the midst of all this research, I became motivated to start reading *L'Economie libidinale*. It's another case, really. But I would like to mention that the book opens with the following words: “Qui ne sait celer, ne sait aimer.”

8 THE BETTER DEFINITION OF THE SUBLIME ENDNOTE

I found this parallel to the previous definition found in wikipedia in Aldous Huxley's *The Doors of Perception*. (The Harper & Row Perennial edition of *The Doors of Perception and Heaven and Hell*, 1990. p 55)

*The literature of religious experience abounds in references to the pains and terrors overwhelming those who have come, too suddenly, face to face with some manifestation of the *Mysterium tremendum*. In theological language, this fear is*

due to the incompatibility between man's egotism and the divine purity, between man's self-aggravated separateness and the infinity(14) of God. Following Boehme and William Law, we might say that, by unregenerate souls, the divine Light at its full blaze can be apprehended only as a burning, purgatorial fire.

On Deleuze: *Writing with Guattari was dying as loving and being multiplied, death as transformative escape from the ego's limits. This is the meaning of the body without organs...*

<http://terenceblake.wordpress.com/2013/08/06/zizek-deleuze-jung-the-analogical-self-versus-the-digital-ego/>

9 THE SIMPLE ATTRIBUTION ENDNOTE

“Tout n'est pas poisson, mais il y'a des poissons partout.”

Gilles Deleuze, *The Pli : Leibniz et le Baroque*. Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1988. p 14

Le milieu extérieur n'est pas un vivant, mais c'est un lac ou étang, c'est à dire un vivier. L'invocation du lac ou de l'étang prend ici un nouveau sens, puisque l'étang, le carreau de marbre aussi bien, ne renvoient plus aux ondulations élastiques qui les parcourent comme plis inorganiques, mais aux poissons qui les peuplent comme plis organiques. Et, dans le vivant lui-même, les milieux intérieurs qu'il contient sont encore d'autres viviers pleins d'autres poissons: un 'grouillement'.

10 THE ANOTHER SIMPLE ATTRIBUTION ENDNOTE

<http://www.stealthisfilm.com/Part2/>

the subs: <http://www.stealthisfilm.com/subtitles/Steal This Film II.en.srt>

the lines quoted occur at 29:11,900, in an interview with rlx.

11 THE YET ANOTHER SIMPLE ATTRIBUTION ENDNOTE

Fascinating website on Lyotard's *Just Gaming* and literature:

<http://www.ruf.rice.edu/~wamorris/theory.html>

12 THE DIVINE EYE ENDNOTE

See endnote (4).

The DIVINE EYE: “God can annul all distorting through the choice of the appropriate point of view.” * The DIVINE OPTIC: “unifies all possible perspectives.” (both Bredekamp, pp 275 & 276, respectively): “God observes ‘not only the single monads and the modification of each monad, but also their relations.’” (Bredekamp quotes Leibniz’ correspondence with des Bosses, also p 276.) “Leibniz also aims to characterize the individual angle of view as the false security of only a partial perceptual field.” (p 277)

LEIBNIZ: (...) *as in those devices of perspective, where certain beautiful designs look like mere confusion until one restores them to the right angle of vision or one views them by means of a certain glass or mirror. It is by placing and using them properly that one makes them serve as adornment for a room. Thus the apparent deformities of our little worlds combine to become beauties in the great world, and have nothing in them which is opposed to the oneness of an infinitely perfect universal principle (...)* (quoted in Bredekamp, p 275)

13 THE QUALIFICATION OF GOD ENDNOTE

“Western philosophy” is perhaps a bit ambitious. Actually I came to the thoughts which follow while considering the function of the word God in Leibniz’ thought. I have honestly not taken much time to consider how applicable they might be to anyone else’s thought, Western or otherwise.

But I chose not to edit the sentence, because it is possible that there is some applicability. What happens when we every time you read the word “God”, you substitute it with “I” for the author of the text?

14 THE MORE ON INFINITY ENDNOTE

And maybe it is not so stupid.

http://www.gwleibniz.com/lсна_houston/abstracts/nachtomy.pdf

-
- 15 THE NOT “The Long Tail” ENDNOTE
What happens when we combine endnotes (12) and (13)?
“I can annul all distorting through the choice of the appropriate point of view.”
The protagonist comes to solve the solution of her distorted point of view by understanding that the secret code to philosophy is to understand that when philosophers use the word God, they are actually addressing their own self-perceived inadequacies. Now, she understands that after substituting “I” for “God”, she can substitute “you” for “I”, and unlock centuries of secret advice.
“You can annul all distorting through the choice of the appropriate point of view.”
- 16 THE STILL ONE MORE SIMPLE ATTRIBUTION ENDNOTE
From the footnotes to G.W. Leibniz’ correspondence with De Volder, as published in *Leibniz: Philosophical Papers and Letters*, ed. Leroy E. Loemker, Kulwer (Dordrecht, Boston, London), 2 edition, 1989. p 539
- 17 THE UNAUTHORIZED PUBLIC SCULPTURE ENDNOTE
First Prinzessinnengaerten Outdoor Sculpture Triennial, 3-10 October, 2013.
- 18 THE LEGITIMATE PROOF OF THE ABOVE ENDNOTE
Still waiting for the picture...
- 19 THE KUNSTKAMMER/SOUNDKAMMER ENDNOTE
See endnote (4).
Kunstkammer (cabinets of curiosities) were a central component of Leibniz’ theaters of nature and art, “an ensemble of *Kunstkammern*, laboratories and theatres, which should give a tactile-visual backbone to the academies of science to be constructed.” (Bredekamp, p 268)
Here the concept is transferred to a cabinet of sound.
- 20 THE TAREK ATOUI IN GENERAL ENDNOTE
Tarek Atoui’s website: <http://tarekatoui.com/>
An article on Atoui’s work: <http://norient.com/en/stories/tarekatoui/>
The author discusses the influence of growing up in war-time Beirut on Tarek Atoui’s work. It seems very relevant.
- 21 THE EVENT AT HETZLER IN PARTICULAR ENDNOTE
Hetzler press release:
[http://www.maxhetzler.com/index.php?id=1489&presslistview_referrer=1036&tx_hetzlergallery_exhibitionlist\[exhibitions\]=639&tx_hetzlergallery_exhibitionlist\[action\]=upcoming&tx_hetzlergallery_exhibitionlist\[controller\]=exhibitions](http://www.maxhetzler.com/index.php?id=1489&presslistview_referrer=1036&tx_hetzlergallery_exhibitionlist[exhibitions]=639&tx_hetzlergallery_exhibitionlist[action]=upcoming&tx_hetzlergallery_exhibitionlist[controller]=exhibitions)
Photograph:
[http://www.maxhetzler.com/index.php?id=1035&tx_hetzlergallery_artistlist\[artist\]=315&tx_hetzlergallery_artistlist\[exhibitions\]=639&tx_hetzlergallery_artistlist\[artwork\]=4033&tx_hetzlergallery_artistlist\[action\]=zoom&tx_hetzlergallery_artistlist\[controller\]=Artist&cHash=7373757df5688d4544293148b278dd82](http://www.maxhetzler.com/index.php?id=1035&tx_hetzlergallery_artistlist[artist]=315&tx_hetzlergallery_artistlist[exhibitions]=639&tx_hetzlergallery_artistlist[artwork]=4033&tx_hetzlergallery_artistlist[action]=zoom&tx_hetzlergallery_artistlist[controller]=Artist&cHash=7373757df5688d4544293148b278dd82)
- 22 THE RIGHT HERE, RIGHT NOW ENDNOTE
Yes, it IS a reference to that Jesus Jones song.
http://www.dailymotion.com/video/xct9nx_jesus-jones-right-here-right-now_music?search_algo=2
- 23 THE MORE ON KUNSTKAMMER ENDNOTE
In order that the imagination or fantasy is held in check and doesn’t start to wander, it is necessary to concentrate on a particular object and take trouble to consider not only the surfaces of things, but to observe in stages, as far as is necessary for one’s purpose.
Leibniz quoted in Bredekamp, p 265
- 24 THE MICROSAMPLES ENDNOTE
Tarek Atoui’s concept/terminology. From the Hetzler press release, see endnote (21):

This instrument will allow him to disseminate sounds in fragmentary or homogenous ways, and to shoot sound particles extremely quick from one point of the space to another, almost beyond perceptual abilities.

25 THE DISCOVERING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN KUNSTKAMMER AND PRISM ENDNOTE

See endnote (27).

26 THE IN CASE TAREK REPLIES ENDNOTE

I never sent this communication to Tarek. It's a fictional device which serves two purposes. 1) It needs to be clear that his lines are taken from my memory. So they're probably in some way inaccurate. It's very likely that there is some inaccuracy there. It's almost certain, but I can't be sure. 2.1) I think it's enough just to call the relevance of current intellectual property policy (26.1) and the discourse in its favor into question. 2.2) Asking these questions in this context, in this narrative, reveals how utterly trivial and beside the point this discourse and this policy is. We don't need answers. In fact, I think Tarek shouldn't waste his time and energy thinking about these questions. I hope he doesn't. But I might give the publication to Tarek, or someone else might. He might find it somewhere by chance. His gallerist might. I think it is highly probable that Tarek Atoui will someday receive this communication. So this is one of those things that didn't happen, but has happened by virtue of its having been published.(2) The publication is the sending of the communication.

(26.1) Just to clarify:

These comments and those which follow are mainly in reference to intellectual property policy/discourse surrounding artistic and scholarly/academic production. Policies and discourses surrounding scientific production (medication and agriculture) have incredibly dire ramifications. Kobe Matthys speaks on his work in this area in this video from The Oil of the 21st Century conference held in Berlin, 2008: [http://v2v.cc/v2v/The Oil of the 21st Century - Keep Up Your Rights, Case by Case](http://v2v.cc/v2v/The_Oil_of_the_21st_Century_-_Keep_Your_Rights,_Case_by_Case)

27 THE PRISM ENDNOTE

The Washington Post reporting on the PRISM program:

http://www.washingtonpost.com/investigations/us-intelligence-mining-data-from-nine-us-internet-companies-in-broad-secret-program/2013/06/06/3a0c0da8-cebf-11e2-8845-d970ccb04497_story.html

Wikipedia entry on the PRISM program:

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PRISM_\(surveillance_program\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PRISM_(surveillance_program))

28 THE PLAY PALACE ENDNOTE

See endnotes (4) and (11).

Define PLAY PALACE: "conveying knowledge through pleasure and man's passion for play" (Bredekamp, p 269)

If the "Drôle de Pensée" aims at increasing knowledge and constructive curiosity, which occurs through the collections and numerous other types of installation and groups of exhibits (...) the viewer is consequently placed in the same context of participatory cognition as the ruler who observes (...). (ibid)

29 THE UNIVOCITY ENDNOTE

These are the opening lines of one of my favorite novels (29.1):

Au grand galop de mon cheval, je paradis parmi les ventilateurs.

J'avais sept ans. Rien n'était plus agréable que d'avoir trop d'air dans le cerveau.

Plus la vitesse sifflait, plus l'oxygène entraînait et vidait les meubles.

Mon coursier déboucha sur la place du Grand Ventilateur, appelée plus vulgairement place Tien An Men. Il prit à droite, boulevard de la Laideur Habitable.

Unfortunately, I have to end this quote, lest I be persecuted for the morally

repugnant act of copyright infringement.

What I love about this excerpt, and this book in general, is that there is nothing like “I feel like I am...” No. “I am...” It doesn’t matter if this narrator is “really” riding a bike. If she is riding a horse, that is what she is doing, regardless of what kind of thing or animal is underneath her.

In the moment where one practices self-analogy: “She feels like an amplifier.” one effects a separation between the mind and the self. When one can rid one can rid oneself of self-analogy: “She is an amplifier.” The mind and the self retain their unity.(29.2)

Together we stand, divided we fall.(29.3)

(29.1) Amélie Nothomb, *Le sabotage amoureux*. France: Editions Albin Michel, 1993

(29.2) Discussion on Deleuze’s “Philosophy of Difference”

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/deleuze/#Dif>

“Univocity vs. Analogy”

http://users.rcn.com/bmetcalf.ma.ultranet/univ_vs_analogy.htm

(29.3) http://www.dailymotion.com/video/x1sseb_pink-floyd-hey-you_music

The line seems to have had its origin in Aesop, 6th century BCE:

<http://www.bartleby.com/17/1/52.html>

<http://www.bartleby.com/17/1/72.html>

30 THE BAROQUE ARCHITECTURE ENDNOTE

see endnote (9)

La monade est l'autonomie de l'intérieur, un intérieur sans extérieur. Mais elle a pour corrélat l'indépendance de la façade, un extérieur sans intérieur. (Deleuze, p 39)

‘... *Bien loin de s'ajuster à la structure, la façade baroque tend à n'exprimer qu'elle-même*, tandis que l'intérieur retombe de son côté, reste clos, tend à s'offrir au regard qui le découvre tout entier d'un seul point de vue (...). (Deleuze, p 40)

Deleuze’s discussion of baroque architecture has some relevance for the structure of this text, its “second life” in the endnotes. The dual structure was inspired by my reading of *Le Pli*.

(Une lumière) fait le blanc, mais elle fait l'ombre aussi (...) (Deleuze, p 45)

Deleuze’s lectures on Leibniz, in various languages:

http://www.webdeleuze.com/php/liste_texte.php?groupe=Leibniz

31 THE LAST ENDNOTE

G.W. Leibniz’ correspondence with De Volder, as published in *Leibniz: Philosophical Papers and Letters*, ed. Leroy E. Loemker, Kulwer (Dordrecht, Boston, London), 2 edition, 1989. p 524-525

i think [this quote] runs straight to the core of what is hopelessly wrong with intellectual property laws, the people who are shaping them and the people who blindly advocate them. but to thoroughly explain that, i should need many more pages than anyone wants to read. hence the fiction. i think we can access feelings and intuitions with much more economy of space and time, so using our artistic license as a weapon and turning our backs to the academic.

- author’s correspondence with the editors

I initially wanted to reference the lecture “In the Long Tail” by Mark Leckey earlier. It was one of the starting points for this text. But I’m referencing it here instead, at the conclusion.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Oi4NLXHWtHI>