1. The discourse of modern art is founded on a number of interlinked phenomenons. 1) The emergence of fake as the antinomy of art by the Bastiniani-case in 1864. 2) The direct references of Manet and Courbet to specific works by Tizian and Velasquez. 3) The establishing of art history as a scholarly discipline. What they all did, was perfecting the past in a discreet chronotopological grid. For us, this is perfectly in accordance with our experience of the past. The past is not contingent, but what was, is now necessarily so. And the future is causally dependent on the past.

But what it also did, was that this perfecting of the past implied a symmetrical perfecting of the future. This was not recognized at the time, of course, as the non-contingency of the future is highly contra-intuitive. But it became realized by Marcel Duchamp when he registered the effects the rejection of his *Nude Descending* in Paris and its subsequent succes-scandale at the Armory Show the year thereafter. And it was completely understood by Ad Reinhardt and Robert Smithson. Up until then, it functioned as a kind of secret for the initiated in the guild of the avantgarde for those who wanted and were able to understand.
2.
But this secret is no more operating. The receipt of artistic recognition of the avantgarde does not produce artistic meaning any more. We see this all the time. I believe this is coincidental with the advent of the concept of "the contemporary" for instance with the opening of the The Aldrich Contemporary Art Museum in November 1964. But more importantly I believe it was with the public response to the Scull auction at Sotheby Parke Bernet in 1973 that the concept of the contemporary became the paramount concept of art. And with contemporary art, the future of art had again become contingent.


Painted Bronze - Ale cans af Jasper Johns, sold for $90.000 originally was being bought for $960, Johns's Double White Map, sold for $240.000 was bought for $10.200; De Kooning's Police Gazette, sold for $180.000, was in 1963 bought for $37.000 and one of Warhol's Flower, bought in 1964 for $3,500, was sold for $135.000, and so on.

This is because, it became obvious for all and everyone that not only could a huge revenue be produced within an extrem short term investment, but that artistic value could be generated if one were able to predict the future. But predict the future means that the future is contingent. Prediction is a bet, more or less set, more or less linked with producing what is to be predicted, but still a bet, an investment with all what it implies with regard to risk calculation and stakes. Pop art, the genre Scull invested in, was not the perfected finality of art of modernism, but an imperfected contingency. It could have been pop and it could have been otherwise, and after pop everything can be otherwise. Consequently, art thereafter became a contingent discourse, a game of investement, economically as well as artistically.

3.
But if the future of art is contingent (which, for any other area of knowledge, is perfectly normal), art, as a discourse, will
inevitably disappear, what will rest is production trends, not unlikely the development of the product 'oil painting' developed from the 16th to the early 19th century. Then you should stop producing art for instead designing a marketable service or product. If one believe art will continue to be the kind of specific discourse as it is today, although not necessarily identical, the artist has to opt for a non-contingent future.¹ That is, that the future is already existing; the art work has to be an effect at a future cause.

Art is a discourse of a kind that radically differs from politics, finance, or music. For such discourses the contingency of the future is unproblematic and obvious, not so for the fine art system. If it is, it is defined by the future’s desire of the past.


The first part of the performance-installation consists of the paranoid unravelling of the persons and strategies behind "The Artist Pension Trust" (an actually existing pension fund for artists). This describes the situation for the contemporary artist in which the future is contingent. "The Artist Pension Trust" is an intelligent answer to the challenge that any artist will face, economically as well as artistically, where a career typically will top during a short time with high profit and influence, but also with a long tail with low and even no profit or influence at all. As in any area in society, we have to face the contingency of the future, and so have art as well, The Artist Pension Trust seems to argue, being a kind of social security for artists. Thus questions of social engangement -- or any other type of change through art -- is made

¹ But as far as I can see, this does not automatically imply predestination, as predestination presumes a necessary past.
from the horizon of a contingent future, where one possible future is preferred before other possible futures, and the art work being the intentional cause of why a better future did happen rather than a worse.

In the following parts of Scratching on Things I Could Disavow, however, a quite different situation is drawn up. Already in the next 'chapter' of the Walkthrough, about the schemes of the Louvre dependency in Abu Dhabi, the narrative is quite different. Predicting a Guggenheim "in Abu Dhabi, or Qatar, or elsewhere in the Gulf, sometime between 2017 and 2024," a visitor will find himself unable to proceed through the entrance because he "simply feels that if he walked in, he would certainly hit a wall. That he would literally hit a wall." "This event has already happened. This headline has already been written," the narrative concludes, "About this, I am absolutely certain." From the viewpoint of this narrative, the future is not contingent, but already existing, and furthermore intensively craving its past, as for instance the future Arabic artists's desire for the colour red, which they no longer can use, but with the help of telepathic contact with Walid Raad produces. The approach of Walid Raad could easily be mistaken for mumbo jumbo if it was not for being such a realistic description of the powers of art.

The examples are numerous. Just to mention one: when the priest and pomologist Korbinian Aigner's gouaches of apples were included in dOCUMENTA (13), the reason was of course not to rehabilitate an 'art' that never was. No one could care less about art than Korbinian Aigner. Nor did it concern any 're-writing' of art history. That, which had become possible for art in 2012 was the apple-priest's
systematic and archivistic documentation of apples, this archive's project character, and this project's meaning for the question of art and life in the frame of the bare life of the concentration camp prisoner. Therewith appeared a compossibility of Aigner's project and the desires of the art world. Aigner's project - or just activity - was never, and will never be, composable with the West German (or international) Post-War Art. -- Hilma af Klint - The Baroness, Elsa von Freytag-Loringhoven.
When the Altamira cave paintings was discovered by the Spanish nobleman Marcelino Sanz de Sautuola 1879 it was rejected as a modern fake or hoax by the learned community. It was first when the cave of La Mouthe was discovered in 1895, that the prehistoric origin of the cave painting was recognized. And 1895 is incidentally the year when the cinema was invented by the brothers Lumière.

The curious thing about this discovery of the prehistoric cave paintings was that they, before 1895, wasn't seen. They remained invisible, and so in plain sight. Actually it wasn't Marcelino Sanz de Sautuola who saw the paintings, it was his then 7 year old daughter who made him aware of the obvious fact. And furthermore, a number of caves haven't been discovered at all as they have always existed and been used by humans. For instance the cave of Niaux which contains graffiti dating from 1602 and was throughout the 18th and 19th centuries, a veritable tourist attraction with guides, souvenirs and the like. The cave paintings must physically speaking, have been seen, but no one paid any attention. They didn't gave meaning. The local guides, who brought the tourists into the cavern, had obviously noticed the paintings in the now famous 'Salon Noir,' since they called it 'the museum.' However, they could not give any meaning to them because they were not 'historical,' they were totally outside history and probably they didn't even speculate upon the question 'when were they done?' as they couldn't at all be related to time or history. This is corroborated by a note by the local scholar and prehistorian Dr. Félix Garrigou, who, as late as 1866, was unable to see the paintings as prehistoric. He wrote in his notebook: 'There are drawings on the walls; what could that possible be?' and forgot all about them until they were officially discovered in 1906.2

Since the early 20th century cave art was included as the origin of art in our art histories. The first specialized art history of the upper palaeolithic age was published in 1952,3 which organized the finds on a historical narrative similar to how art history worked.

---

2 "A large round room with funny drawings. What is it? Amateur artists who drew animals. Why that? Already seen before." (Une grande salle ronde portant de drôles de dessins. Qu'est-ce que c'est que cela? Amateurs artistes ayant dessiné des animaux. Pourquoi cela? D'jà vu avant.)

3 Abbé Henri Breuil, Four Hundred Centuries of Cave Art.
during the 20th century, that is by an evolution from simpler and primitive forms towards a higher degree of complexity and differentiation. The problem is that more recent datings more often than not radically contradicts this argument. Surprisingly often are the more elaborate and complex figures considerably older than more primitive or simpler figures -- and with 'older' we are talking in magnitudes of 10,000 years, time spans longer than historical time itself.

The cinematographic interpretation of cave art is not at all new, it was noted already in 1964 by Gerald Noxon in *The Journal of the Society of Cinematologists* and most recently by Werner Herzog in his *Cave of Forgotten Dreams*. And actually the very first observation, by De Sautuola after his daughter had pointed at the paintings, was very much a cinematographic experience six years before the first cinema:

"As De Sautuola, lying on his back on the floor to take in the whole scene, shaded the light with his hand the whole ceiling sprang to life, and with the flickering of the acetylene flame the figures moved in response, so that he seemed to be in the midst of a resting herd of the vanished beasts."
Now, this linking cave art with cinematography is rather obvious and almost a commonplace in art theory. But one have to make up for oneself: is this link accidental or causal?

If we would grill art historians or artists today, I believe most would admit that the similarity of cinematography and cave painting is accidental and a curious coincidence. I would argue otherwise. I believe it makes sense to state that the cave paintings from 40th to the 10th millenium before our time is the causal effect of the cinematographic invention during the few decades in the ending 19th and early 20th centuries. Unfortunately, this leaves me with the burden of proof, which I can't lift without invoking higher intelligences and thus disqualifying my argument in the same take. But it goes like this: The cave painting is the materialization of a cinematographic desire born from an angel, vision or intelligence from the future, and not from the evolution of the palaeolithic man and his surroundings. Exactly in the same way that "The Baroness" Elsa von Freytag-Loringhoven, Hilma af Klint, or Korbinian Aigner (involuntarily) answers to the desires of the most recent developments of art in the early 21st century. And if Hilma af Klint or Korbinian Aigner, without their intention of being so, were visited by the future of art, then the cave artists were visited by the angel of cinematography. The failure to make up a chronology of cave art, is not so much due to the limited - but in my opinion still impressive -- successes of forensic science, but rather because the chronological enormous time-span of 40.000 B.C. to 10.000 B.C. is perfected as a singular event stemming from the same cause.

What this would mean for the artists in the studio I will leave out, but it would definitively imply a cultivation or even engineering of the receptive capacities and/or the construction of receiving apparatuses together with the strength of obeying the necessity imposed in a similar way af Klint followed the assignment given to her by the intelligence Amaliel.

---

4 I believe it is worth noting that this is a new definition of the more psychological concept of "inner necessity" that we know from the ethics of art during modernism.
For art history, and research into art, the situation is different. For the historian of art (as different from the historian of trade or philosophy), the problem is that when the future of art became contingent (with the Scull auction), the contingency of the past followed suit, as the past art only exists through its future cause, and if the future art is not known -- is contingent -- then we have no chance of determining which past art actually did exist. This makes art history an impossibility, a case for which James Elkins recently argued convincingly in his *Stories of Art*. And this, consequently, makes teaching art history for artists an impossibility, something I believe most art students apprehend more or less intuitively. This situation is radically different from the one only a few decades ago, when it was necessary for artists to study art history to be able to navigate and operate within the discourse's already perfected future -- the logic of the avantgarde.

It is not about writing art history backwards, this is precisely what Gombrich and every art historian have been doing during the 20th century.⁵
Nor is it to make the ahistorical claim that the art works only comes to existence in the act of perceiving, as would be Didi-Huberman’s claim, for instance in making Fra Angelico radically contemporary by situating the production of art in the physical act of perception.

... Unfortunately, both these caveats makes it extremely difficult to sketch a positive and productive framework for art history and art theory for artists as either of the solutions are opted for by every anachronistic art history in currency today.

But the first and most important reversal which should be done is, I think, that transform every temporal designation to a spatial, and transform time to topology and gravity (attraction/desire); the art historical time should be reformulated as a vector space, organised on a n-dimensional grid of causality and aspects, where causality is time-symmetrical (the future is not necessarily the effect of a past cause, and the past is not necessarily the effect of a future cause, but causality is bi-directional) and where aspects (punctual or

⁵ If Picasso, then Giotto - and not, for instance, a burgundian shoemaker or carolingian goldsmith. Backward causation is by no means a novum for art history, on the contrary, it is what defines art history.
iterative, perfected or imperfected, intentional or accidental, inceptive or terminative etc etc) shape this vector space.

-- Which future art world would desire a work like X?
-- Which past works became actualized by a work like X?
-- Why should flies don't have art?
-- How would an art world look like the alchemical art was regarded as an art discourse?
-- If cooking was regarded as an art discourse?
-- Which promise does work X embody?
-- Which depts does work X release?
-- Which kind of assignment is implicit in a work like X?
-- Why was work X invisible at time Y, and what made it visible at time Z.
... and the like.

Art history, I think, will transform to something more fittingly labeled art topology.