In this particular volume the issue of art as interference and the strategies that it should adopt have been reframed within the structures of contemporary technology as well as within the frameworks of interactions between art, science and media. What sort of interference should be chosen, if one at all, remains a personal choice for each artist, curator, critic and historian.
LEA is a publication of Leonardo/ISAST.

Copyright 2014 ISAST
Leonardo Electronic Almanac
Volume 20 Issue 2
April 15, 2014
issn 1071-4391
isbn 978-1-906897-32-1
The isbn is provided by Goldsmiths, University of London.

LEA PUBLISHING & SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

Editor in Chief
Lanfranco Aceti lanfranco.aceti@leoalmanac.org

Co-Editor
Özden Şahin ozden.sahin@leoalmanac.org

Managing Editor
John Francescutti john.francescutti@leoalmanac.org

Art Director
Deniz Cem Önduygu deniz.cem.onduygu@leoalmanac.org

Editorial Board
Peter J. Bentley, Ezequiel Di Paolo, Ernest Edmonds, Felice Frankel, Gabriella Giannachi, Gary Hall, Craig Harris, Sibel Irak, Marina Jorjova, Beau Lotto, Roger Malina, Terrence Mason, Jon McCormack, Mark Naidi, Sally Jane Norman, Christiane Paul, Simon Penny, Jane Prophet, Jeffrey Shaw, William Uncio

Cover
Deniz Cem Önduygu

Editorial Address
Leonardo Electronic Almanac
Sabanci University, Orhanli – Tuzla, 34956
Istanbul, Turkey

Email
info@leoalmanac.org

Web
» www.leoalmanac.org
» www.twitter.com/LEA_twitts
» www.flickr.com/photos/lea_gallery
» www.facebook.com/pages/Leonardo-Electronic-Almanac/209156896252

Copyright © 2014
Leonardo, the International Society for the Arts, Sciences and Technology
Leonardo Electronic Almanac is published by:
Leonardo/ISAST
211 Sutter Street, Suite 501
San Francisco, CA 94108
USA
Leonardo Electronic Almanac (LEA) is a project of Leonardo/ISAST. For more information about Leonardo/ISAST's publications and programs, see http://www.leonardo.info or contact isast@leonardo.info.

Leonardo Electronic Almanac is produced by Passero Productions.

Reposting of this journal is prohibited without permission of Leonardo/ISAST, except for the posting of news and events listings which have been independently received.

The individual articles included in the issue are © 2014 ISAST.
The Leonardo Electronic Almanac acknowledges the institutional support for this book of

The publication of this book is graciously supported by

The book editors Lanfranco Aceti and Paul Thomas would especially like to acknowledge Su Baker for her continual support of this project and Andrew Varano for his work as conference organiser.

We would also like to thank the Transdisciplinary Imaging at the intersection between art, science and culture, Conference Committee: Michele Barker, Brad Buckley, Brogan Bunt, Edward Colless, Vince Dziekan, Donal Fitzpatrick, Petra Gemeinboeck, Julian Goddard, Ross Harley, Martyn Jolly, Daniel Mafe, Leon Marvell and Darren Tofts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>INTERFERENCE STRATEGIES: IS ART IN THE MIDDLE?</td>
<td>Lanfranco Aceti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>INTERFERENCE STRATEGIES</td>
<td>Paul Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>THE ART OF DECODING: n-FOLDED, n-VISIONED, n-CULTURED</td>
<td>Mark Guglielmetti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>THE CASE OF BIOPHILIA: A COLLECTIVE COMPOSITION OF GOALS AND DISTRIBUTED ACTION</td>
<td>Mark Cypher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>CONTAMINATED IMMERSION AND THOMAS DEMAND: THE DAILIES</td>
<td>David Eastwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>GESTURE IN SEARCH OF A PURPOSE: A PREHISTORY OF MOBILITY</td>
<td>Darren Tofts &amp; Lisa Gye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>HEADLESS AND UNBORN, OR THE BAPHOMET RESTORED INTERFERING WITH BATAILLE AND MASSON’S IMAGE OF THE ACEPHALE</td>
<td>Leon Marvell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>IMAGES (R)-EVOLUTION: MEDIA ARTS COMPLEX IMAGERY CHALLENGING HUMANITIES AND OUR INSTITUTIONS OF CULTURAL MEMORY</td>
<td>Oliver Grau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>INTERFERENCE WAVE DATA AND ART</td>
<td>Adam Nash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>INTERFERING WITH THE DEAD</td>
<td>Edward Colless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>MERGE/MULTIPLEX</td>
<td>Brogan Bunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>A ROBOT WALKS INTO A ROOM: GOOGLE ART PROJECT, THE NEW AESTHETIC, AND THE ACCIDENT OF ART</td>
<td>Susan Ballard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>TOWARDS AN ONTOLOGY OF COLOUR IN THE AGE OF MACHINIC SHINE</td>
<td>Mark Titmarsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>TRANSVERSAL INTERFERENCE</td>
<td>Anna Munster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Interference Strategies: Is Art in the Middle?**

If we look at the etymological structure of the word interference, we would have to go back to the construct that defines it as a cause of interference (in between) and, hence, (to break through), but with a particular attention to the meaning of the word interference: inter-pretative principally, as to explain. Art has perhaps etymologically (in connect) to pay the price to think of the interference as an accomplish site of inter (in between) and the Latin verb ‘render decent’ the naked bodies of Michelangelo’s frescoes in the Sistine Chapel. That act, which would bring forward the debate of interference: an accomplishment through the middle of two arguments, two ideas, two constructs.

It is important to acknowledge that the etymological root of a word will not necessarily develop in the academic exercise, and yet, in order to identify the ideological underpinnings of arguments that are the more common and the characteristically by a word.

This book, titled *Interference Strategies: Is Art in the Middle?* is a critical and aesthetic discourse, a project to do justice to the fact that sometimes one very existence of art is based on an interference: digital, scientific and aesthetic – and what are the strategies that could be adopted in order to actively interfere.

The complexity of the strategies of interference in contemporary political and aesthetic discourses appears to be summed up by the perception that interference is not necessarily an act of gesture. This perception appears to exclude the fact that sometimes the very existence of art is based on an interference: digital, scientific and aesthetic – and what are the strategies that could be adopted in order to actively interfere.

If I had to choose, personally I find myself increasingly fascinated by an interference: an instrument of war able to corrupt, degenerate and degenerating. It should be - to quote Artur Düring (1920), as Unger (1921) could not be a more critical painting, of the Nazi revolt, of the time, and of war in general, and therefore I find myself classified as ‘degenerate’ and condemned to the ‘burnt.’

Art is, in this context, not interfered, and should not interfere with any other interference, and by bringing something in between every waiving on the Nazi revolt, by placing something in between the perfectly constructed national masculinity of humanity and the system of a viewer. An element that interferes, obstructs and disrupts the carefully and diligently, carefully and diligently, and therefore the art, with the idea that it is self-consumer and therefore the interference is something that corrupts, degenerates and threatens to collapse the vision of the Nazi revolt.

In this context, an interference as a strategy, and modalities of engagement. It should be - to quote Raoul Hausmann (1923) – over the breeches that they have commissioned art and more with art itself, it should be corrupted and therefore had to be classified as ‘degenerate’ and condemned to the ‘burnt.’

Art and interference are strategies, as well as a manifestation of ‘degenerate art’ produced by ‘degenerate artists.’ Art that was not directly or indirectly condemned to be ‘burnt’ interfered with the Nazi regime as anything other than the Nazi regime, and therefore had to be classified as ‘degenerate’ and condemned to the ‘burnt.’

But it is in the middle that something is part of what I have been a long time an aesthetic conversation that provided the avant-garde movement as the destruction of the enemy or the future. In this particular volume, the issue of art and interference, and the strategies that it should adopt have been reframed within the structures of contemporary technology as well as within the framework of fine art and between art, science and media.

What sort of interference should have been interfered with art at all? remains a personal choice for every artist, curator, critic and historian.

If I had to choose, personally I find myself increasingly fascinated by an interference: a strategy that was not directly or indirectly condemned, and what is obvious, what can be hung on a wall and can be matched to tapestries. Nor can I find myself able to favor art that shrouds propaganda or business under a veil, while the nature of art is repeatedly written in capital letters all over it. That is because we are moving much closer in a world where interference is no longer an obstacle, it is an acceptable, on it is acceptable, it is so only within the pre-established contractual operative frameworks, that therefore corsairs its ‘interference value.’

This leaves the great conflict, the anti-interference, and art interference who is still possible? There are still spaces and opportunities for interference, and this volume is one of those remaining areas. But it is the extent to which art can still be thinking fast, leaving an overwhelming trajectory that is not interfered, and this volume is one of those remaining areas that is still interfered.
Interference Strategies: Is Art in the Middle?

If we look at the etymological structure of the word interference, we would have to go back to a construct that defines it as a sum of the two Latin words inter (in between) and ferro (to strike), but with a particular attention to the meaning of the word ferro being interpreted principally as to wound. Albeit perhaps etymologically incorrect, it may be preferable to think of the word interference as a composite of inter (in between) and the Latin verb ferre (to carry), which would bring forward the idea of interference as a contribution brought in the middle of two arguments, two ideas, two constructs.

It is important to acknowledge the etymological root of a word not in order to develop a sterile academic exercise, but in order to clarify the ideological underpinnings of arguments that are then summed up and characterized by a word.

This book, titled Interference Strategies, does not (and in all honesty could not) provide a resolution to a complex interaction - that of artistic interferences - that has a complex historical tradition. In fact, it is impossible, for me, when analyzing the issue of interference, not to think of the breeze maker (also known as Daniele da Volterra) and the coverings that he painted following a 1559 commission from Pope Paul IV to ‘render decent’ the naked bodies of Michelangelo Buonarroti’s frescoes in the Sistine Chapel. That act, in the eyes of a contemporary viewer, was a wound inflicted in between the relationship created by the artwork and the artist with the viewer (intento operis and intento auctoris with intento lectoris), as Umberto Eco would put it. Those famous breeches appear to be both: a form of censorship as well as interference with Michelangelo’s vision.

Interference is a word that assembles a multitude of meanings interpreted according to one’s perspective and ideological constructs as a meddling, a disturbance, and an alteration of modalities of interaction between two parties. In this book, there are a series of representations of these interferences, as well as a series of questions on what are the possible contemporary forms of interference - digital, scientific and aesthetic - and what are the strategies that could be adopted in order to actively interfere.

The complexity of the strategies of interference within contemporary political and aesthetic discourses appears to be summed up by the perception that interference is a necessarily active gesture. This perception appears to exclude the fact that sometimes the very existence of an artwork is based on an interfering nature, or on an aesthetic that has come to be as non-consonant to and, hence, interfering with a political project.

Interfering artworks, which by their own nature challenge a system, were the artworks chosen for the exhibition Entartete Kunst (Degenerate Art) exhibitions to the many images of pompously strutted corporate tycoons and billionaires in museums and art fairs around the globe, glancing with pride over the propaganda, or - better - over the breeches that they have commissioned artists to produce.

Today’s contemporary art should be interfering more and more with art itself, it should be corrupted and corrupting, degenerate and degenerating. It should be producing what currently it is not and it should create a wound within art itself, able to alter current thinking and modalities of engagement. It should be - to quote Pablo Picasso - an instrument of war able to interfere: “No, painting is not done to decorate apartments. It is an instrument of war for attack and defense against the enemy.”

If art should either strike or bring something is part of what has been a long aesthetic conversation that preceded the Avant-garde movement or the destructive fury of the early Futurists. In this particular volume, the issue of art as interference and the strategies that it should adopt have been reframed within the structures of contemporary technology as well as within the frameworks of interactions between art, science and media.

What sort of interference should be chosen, if one at all, remains a personal choice for each artist, curator, critic and historian.

If I had to choose, personally I find myself increasingly favoring art that does not deliver what is expected, what is obvious, what can be hung on a wall and can be matched to tapestries. Nor can I find myself able to favor art that shrouds propaganda or business under a veil with the name of art repeatedly written in capital letters all over it. That does not leave very much choice in a world where interference is no longer acceptable, or if it is acceptable, it is so only within pre-established contractual operative frameworks, therefore losing its ‘interference value.’

This leaves the great conundrum - are interferences still possible? There are still spaces and opportunities for interference, and this volume is one of these remaining areas, but they are interstitial spaces and are shrinking fast, leaving an overwhelming Baudrillardian desert produced by the conspirators of art and made of a multitude of breeches.
In this introduction I cannot touch upon all the different aspects of interference analyzed, like in the case of data and waves presented by Adam Nash, who argues that the digital is in itself and per se a form of interference: at least a form of interference with behavioral systems and with what can be defined as the illusory realm of everyday’s ‘real.’

Transversal interference, as in the case of Anna Munster, is a socio-political divide where heterogeneity is the monster, the wound, the interfering and dreaded element that threatens the ‘homologation’ of scientific thought. With Darren Tofts and Lisa Gye it is the perusal of references and notes

With Brogan Bunt comes obfuscation as a form of blurining that interferes with the ordered lines of neatly defined social taxonomies; within which I can only perceive the role of the thinker as that of the taxidermist operating on living fields of study that are in the process of being rendered dead and obfuscated by the very process and people who should be unveiling and revealing them.

With Darren Tofts and Lisa Gye it is the perusal of the image that can be an act of interference and a disruption if it operates outside rigid interpretative frameworks and interaction parameters firmly set via intenio operis, intenio auctoris and intenio lectoris.

It is the fear of the unexpected remix and mash-up that interferes with and threatens the ‘purity’ and sanctimonious fascist interpretations of the aura of the artwork, its buyers, consumers and aesthetic priests. The orthodoxical, fanatic and terroristic aesthetic hierarchies that were disrupted by laughter in the Middle Ages might be disrupted today by viral, a-morphological and uncontrollable bodily functions.

My very personal thanks go to Paul Thomas and the authors in this book who have endeavored to comply with our guidelines to deliver a new milestone in the history of LEA.

As always I wish to thank my team at LEA who made it possible to deliver these academic interferences: my gratitude is as always for Ozden Sahin, Caglar Cetin and Deniz Cem Onaygu.

Lanfranco Aceti
Editor in Chief, Leonardo Electronic Almanac
Director, Kasa Gallery
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The simple yet highly developed double slit experiment identifies the problem of measurement in the quantum world. If you are measuring the position of a particle you cannot measure its momentum. This is one of the main theories that have been constantly tested and still remains persistent. The double slit experiment, first initiated by Thomas Young, exposes a quintessential quantum phenomenon, which, through Heisenberg theory, demonstrates the quantum universe as a series of probabilities that enabled the Newtonian view of the world to be seriously challenged.

If the measurement intra-action plays a constitutive role in what is measured, then it matters how something is explored. In fact, this is born out empirically in experiments with matter (and energy): when electrons (or light) are measured by using one kind of apparatus, they are waves; if they are measured in a complementary way, they are particles. Notice that what we’re talking about here is not simply some object reacting differently to different prolegoms but being differently.

In the double slit experiment particles that travel through the slits interfere with themselves enabling each particle to create a wave-like interference pattern. The underlying concepts upon which this publication is based see the potential for art to interfere, affect and obstruct in order to question what is indefinable.

The role of the publication, as a vehicle to promote and encourage transdisciplinary research, is to question what fine art image-making is contributing to the current discourse on images. The publication brings together researchers, artists and cultural thinkers to speculate, contest and share their thoughts on the strategies for interference, at the intersection between art, science and culture, that form new dialogues.

In October 1927 the Fifth Solvay International Conference marked a point in time that created a unifying seepage between art and science and opened the gateway to uncertainty and therefore the parallels of artistic and scientific research. This famous conference announced the genesis of quantum theory and, with that, Werner Heisenberg’s uncertainty principle. These events are linked historically and inform interesting experimental art practices to reveal the subtle shift that can ensue from a moment in time.

The theme of ‘interference strategies for art’ reflects a literal merging of sources, an interplay between factors, and acts as a metaphor for the interaction of art and science, the essence of transdisciplinary study. The revealing of metaphors for interference “that equates different and even ‘incommensurable’ concepts can, therefore, be a very fruitful source of insight.”

In the double slit experiment particles that travel through the slits interfere with themselves enabling each particle to create a wave-like interference pattern.
INTRODUCTION

Diagram of the double slit experiment that was first performed by Thomas Young in the early 1800s displays the probabilistic characteristics of quantum mechanical phenomena.

When particles go through the slits they act as waves and create the famous interference pattern. The concept is that one particle going through the slit must behave like a wave and interfere with itself to create the band image on the rear receptor.

Interference Strategies looks at the phenomenon of interference and places art at the very centre of the wave/particle dilemma. Can art still find a way in today’s dense world where we are saturated with images from all disciplines, whether it’s the creation of ‘beautiful visualisations’ for science, the torrent of images uploaded to social media services like Instagram and Flickr, or the billions of queries made to vast visual data archives such as Google Images? The constant flow, challenges currents and eulogizes the drift.

The publication aims to demonstrate a combined eclecticism and to extend the discussion by addressing the current state of the image through a multitude of lenses. Through the theme of interference strategies this publication will embrace error and transdisciplinarity as a new vision of how to think, theorize and critique the image, the real and thought itself.

Paul Thomas
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