



**HAL**  
open science

## The New Centre Presents: Interlocutories

Artemis Papachristou, Anne-Françoise Schmid

► **To cite this version:**

Artemis Papachristou, Anne-Françoise Schmid. The New Centre Presents: Interlocutories. New Center of Research and Practice, Interlocutories, Jan 2019, Berlin + Hangout (Google), Germany. halshs-01986905

**HAL Id: halshs-01986905**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01986905>**

Submitted on 19 Jan 2019

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

### The “non-synthesis”

As you say Artemis, we will treat these questions with an operational concept, that of integrative object that we have been able to develop in the field of science as well as in that of art and philosophy. The philosophies, sciences, arts and even technologies can no longer be self-modeled, they come in multiple forms. And the concept of complexity, which presupposes a convergence of disciplinary perspectives on an object, is no longer enough in the face of the extraordinary mixtures of interdisciplines, temporalities, intentions, and creation that set in motion an increasingly dissociated social life.

The main characteristic of contemporary objects is without synthesis: it is not actually an ontological conception, but more a process to understand what is contemporary.

In science, we can no longer simply articulate research on obesity, or cancer. The complexity of science no longer allows us to believe that epistemology is directly related to science; it indirectly participates, through the creation of a generic space, in the apprehension of knowledge flows of various kinds.

it

In the same way, we can not describe with a single register a work of art, such as that of John Gerrard, at the same time as an image, information technology (or computer science), virtual, dance, game of war; video game, stable and moving at the same glance . Or the work of James Turrell, both natural and artificial, a volcano and a pool, the sky and the sea, color and darkness, for the creation of such an art, what is needed is an airplane, not just brushes, canvases, pigments and colors ! Or also the work of Pierre Huygues, actually a set of works in the same place animated by the movement of the spectators. His exhibition at the Pompidou Center in Paris was a real integrative object, whose apparent unity was continually reformed, but with surprises and cuts, in front of everyone. In this case, to be a spectator is to participate in the work, which does not only happen to the artist, but to everyone while being in motion.

### The dark cogito of the contemporary world

We are immersed in the effects of science, and works of art come from a thousand sources, artists not only realize, but especially they allow us to recognize them as such, as explained by the painter Benoit Maire. The artist is the one who first recognizes that a work is a work of art. Without this, we would have trouble distinguishing them from a colorful usual image. ( another translation could be “variegated” image but I am not sure) Kant said that art is a creation without concept, now there is a lot of overlapping between philosophy, arts, sciences. Each object has many dimensions, which we perceive only by hypothesis or fiction. It can be at the same time dance, philosophy, computer science(or information technology) , telluric, like the work of John Gerrard.

There is no longer a philosophy of “sciences”, more of philosophy “of” art, the “of” is not only superfluous, but it distorts the question of the relation of philosophies to other disciplines and more generally disciplines between them. Philosophy does not fly over them, or it does just very little, it juxtaposes itself to others with the same weight as the others. It is clearly seen in today’s interdisciplinary regimes, which articulate fragments of science and knowledge, their links may be of philosophy, aesthetics, epistemology or any discipline that we treat as sub-determinative.

### A new use of negation

This situation leads to a new use of negation, it is no longer only a question of exclusion, but that of extension. A non-synthetic method in science and art displaces negation and completes it by a creative and inventive use of the “without”. From the verb, it can move on the noun (non-philosophy) or on the adjective (non-standard philosophy). This makes it possible to find and invent what one did not know about science or philosophy by an inventive use of the “without”. What is a science without a discipline? What is a philosophy without the transcendental? What is mathematics without a structure and without an object? This method allows us to enrich our idea of sciences, philosophies,

mathematics, because it forces us to replace by another discipline what has been removed by hypothesis. (I am not sure about this sentence grammarly) It also brings us to a new use of “with”, where concepts are formed as such by philosophers and scientists or artists.

This change on the method is fundamental: the philosophy, the science, the arts are no longer a given, but an “X” for which we postulate a number of properties, from which we remove by hypothesis the most important. The addition one is led to make is no longer “in” the object, it is artificially secured but with rigor and without the guarantee of the synthesis.

For example, it is no longer necessary to assume that a GMO is a product of molecular biology, it is no longer characterized by: a natural object + a genetic manipulation. Let’s treat it like an X, bring together all the disciplines concerned by the supposed impacts, treat them democratically, with the same weight. This will be based on each disciplinary iteration a transformation of what we apprehend as GMO. Ethics will no longer be a culmination of scientific discussion, but an integrated discipline from the beginning of research. The GMO will no longer be a product, but the realization of the intentions of research collectives and all the professions concerned.

[Common Language end ????? -I am not sure if you mean the computer sciences here\) \(Langage commun et informatique\)](#)

Similarly, the integrative objects make it possible to articulate the elements of language and the symbols of computer science. The language symbols deepen the notions and relate them to the real, the symbols of logic and computer science relate them to the results of simulations, this is what Franck Varenne calls the “simulats”. These are not the same relations to the real, and these two “reals” together constitute our contemporary objects. They deal with both structures, through mathematics, and ontologies, by computer science. They are dealing with the most abstract statistics as well as the common sense. Obesity, for example, articulates without statistics the statistics of human intestinal microbiota and common sense knowledge. As a general rule, scientific research objects designated by common language words can be analyzed by these procedures.

The concept of integrative object is not fixed or given, it is a procedure to understand the contemporary objects with other means than with the classical epistemology, mostly projected on contemporary sciences. It is itself an X, partially unknown, constructed by hypotheses, in connection with the intentions of the collective of researchers and supposes a superposition of heterogeneous knowledge and non-knowledge, which can not be reduced by a discipline, whether it is mathematical or computer science. It does not “apply”, it is just a compass of orientation in the forests and oceans of the knowledge and the arts that we create.

I will end with a philosophical fantasy, which could be addressed to each of us, strategist, curator, philosopher or artist, on the “dry” and the “wet” as fragment of ecology for our Earth:

[Interdiscipline \(or Interdisciplinarity ? \) on the Earth and on the Sea:](#)

There is a “dry” interdisciplinarity, the strategist converges fragments of science on a virtual continent, perhaps a new discipline. The guiding question will be that of a supposedly common language = X(language equals X). From an art from the X of the art. Philosophy from the X of philosophy.

There is a “wet” interdisciplinarity, richer, probably close to the earth, but wet by the waters of a science and a larger art, whose melody forms a set of small perceptions that isolated disciplines do not have and do not perceive. The problem will be on the identity of the objects it (/that this interdisciplinarity) creates.

The guiding question of the strategist or curator then, will be to create a space, where objects, partially solid, partially liquid, with their continuities and cuts, peaks and troughs( maybe “way -throughs”-not sure about this..), will find their way of interpreting these small perceptions created by the waves of science, philosophy, and art, but without ever being able to completely synthesize them. That makes interdisciplinarity the generic foundation of their relationships.

### *The strategist or the curator and the philosopher*

On Earth, the strategist must be an attentive surveyor to the entire territory, doing the impossible: that is to put side by side in the local and global thinking. On the ocean, the strategist must also be a sailor, building his boat while sailing. To be both a surveyor and a sailor is also to be a philosopher, one says of him that he falls on the Earth when he looks at the stars, but he lets himself to be guided by them when he moves on the ocean of metaphysics. And yet, in metaphysics, there is no line of sight to orient oneself. The philosopher falls where he is lost.

What strategy and what care is needed to avoid these risks? Not fall? Not get lost? Imagine an interdisciplinary “without” philosophy, which could be that of curator of art, a kind of interdisciplinary of the future. We do not know it yet, of course. But we can know the ruptures it can cause in our good old interdisciplinarity, because the future is not only a time, but a mode of apprehension. The future will allow us to distance and give meaning to all of these metaphors that form this landscape in our culture, art and agriculture (not sure about this either) of thought. And yet, there is always an oversight, the contingency of the separation of water and earth. A 17th century philosopher shows it in the form of rain: How is it that rain falls on the oceans, where it is not so necessary?

Our morality, since we are telling a fable (maybe it is better to say “myth”), is that the interdisciplinary strategist and the curator of contemporary arts must never forget that they are both on the land and on the water, and that they can only act that they know the impossibility. They need a faith of interdisciplinarity which forces them to take into account the contingency, or the orientation of the rain between the earth and the sea, which the ancients called the clinamen. (maybe a better word) This clinamen is not a decline, but the declination and the conjugation of new sciences, new forms of art and philosophies, where each fragment of discipline will be an occasion for the creation of other unexpected fragments.

*Many thanks to Leibniz, Malebranche, Kant, the ancient philosophers and the contemporary philosophers who have given a new value to the metaphor and verticality.*