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(Response): A becoming on the line: painting and the genesis of form

Doria JD
Artist

Sayfan G. Borghini, PhD
Holon Institute of Technology

In appreciation for the thorough work of the reviewers and the important reflections each brought to attention, here follows a response, that aims to at least expand the few points I, we, understand as salient.

I wish to begin this response by rephrasing the ending words of the paper, to emphasize the critical aspect of the creative process that accompanies this work, and to phrase it metaphorically as “walking the fine line where generation is fertile”.

This metaphor is, of course, the domain of the “artist”, yet by all means, that “artist”, that “poet”, that “thinker”, is no exception to the line I wish to bring forth here. This line of generation in its fertility does not yield to any appropriation, neither by that which is called ‘thought’, nor by that which is called “art”.

With “fertile” I point at the correlation between a genuine genesis of form and the edge of thought. An unmediated correlation of which Art provides numerous examples. In the works of the dada artist Hans Arp, among others, the notion of chance and spontaneity breaks into the work of art (e.g. Arp 1916). It bears a totally new line of flight (in terms of generative capacity) both for the creative process, which is expanded beyond the willful subject, and for the descriptive order, or lack thereof, which sets the picture of the world (Gardner 2000).

The singular genesis of form and the emerging structure of thought that reflects it do not lead and follow one after the other, neither are they addressed with hierarchical significance, but rather, they suggest two superimposed faces of a same process of becoming.

In this sense I treat the written word no differently than the work of art, as I do not believe that breaking the determinism of matter is a privilege of ideas, or of objects. I believe ideas emerge within the same creative process as matter, striving towards individuation through the shifting grounds of ambiguity, through exploration and form-finding, avoiding the repetition of deterministic paths mostly by interaction.

My pursuit of open-endedness aims to entice the generative engines that operate in the creative process. “Fertile” from this standpoint demands an open-ended world that allows the future not to be completely defined by the past, nor to be confined totally within the
subject, as it pursues the depth and complexity that provides the rare instances, in which the subjective meets the surface of the objective and vice versa.

Our measuring devices, though, cannot but distinguish and separate between form and process, between objective and subjective, and it is upon such chasms, between our intuition and our measuring devices that our culture strives for much needed bridges. For the peaks of our subjectivity (insights) and the heights of our objectivity (measurements) do not rest in the same poetry.

The way into a work of art is a ritual. The reverse engineering of it may, if at all, uncover a path made of critical phases, one of these being when all lines of distinction fade away and everything bleeds into everything else. The making is charged with a sense of infiltration into a state of perceptiveness less riddled with “rulers of perception”. This is where ideas meet colors, passion meets atoms and nature meets imagination.

This is when “matter” becomes active and soft, and creativity loses its illusive locality. Deleuze, I believe, calls this realm of reality “Body Without organs” (1969). It originates with Antonin Artaud’s radio play - To Have Done with the Judgment of God (1947):

> When you will have made him a body without organs, then you will have delivered him from all his automatic reactions and restored him to his true freedom. (Artaud 1976: 571)

Substantive conjunctions seduce the creative process to explore outside the boundaries of the familiar, seeking co-emergent intensities rather than well-defined forms, intensities that drive unexpected processes.

The question I am keen on exploring asks where is the genesis of form placed in our culture and minds today? In whose hands does it lie? And what picture of the world does it mirror? As, wherever the genesis of form is placed, it determines the “generative capacity” of the resulting world.

In our cultural evolution, successive waves of thought and expression liberated the genesis of form from the hands of gods, as we departed from mythology and set our gaze upon an eventful quest, which brought science, philosophy and art into being.

Though it is beyond the scope of this short response, a careful sampling of the repertoire of theories and dynamics of development in our background, might suggest that the lines of development of the picture(s) of the world do not necessarily converge into one unifying truth, but rather towards an increase in the generative capacity of the world and us.

The Moment we disconnect Form from a scarce resource, be it an idea, an essence, or god; the moment we disconnect the Word from a-priori representations and defined elements in the world; the moment we think of matter itself as pregnant with morphogenetic aptitudes (a-la Deleuze (Adrian 2010)), that is when a generative capacity is introduced into the picture of the world.

Painting as Multitude emerges with such flow of contemplation. It partakes in the relation between a flow of becoming and the traces of emergent forms, seeking the next bend in the tale of this continuous poiesis. Bearing in mind that forms are interrupted instances in the flow of morphogenesis. All the works presented along the essay are those unique instances where the illusive non-border between process and form is rendered visible.

---

1 “For a large class of cases — though not for all — in which we employ the word ‘meaning’ it can be defined thus: the meaning of a word is its use in the language.” (Wittgenstein 1953: 43)
Rather than composing, I “grow” my images from the materials, surfaces and mediums I am using. Technology is my organ of apprehension through which I curate the generative capacity of the work. In this plasticity of production I find myself to be a multitude and art to be singular, yet, in a never-ending becoming.

These impossible creatures are as alien as they are familiar, always in the soft middle, always in flight on the fractal borderline between process and form. They and we, whatever this we may embrace, exist in an endless dance of becoming, exciting and being excited, walking the fine line where generation is fertile.
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