

End / ending: Hotel Kvjev, Bratislava (04.04.08 – 13.04.08)

international coffeeshop (ics), Lillian Fellmann

PART TWO

The request for continuity, apparent in the rotating shifts and the different intensities of day and night-work. (End: if there is no *next* point, how can one even move at all?)

The GRIDIRON Hotel, Kvjev Session: dialogue with Inga Zimprich



...It's not to say that things are slowing down with the "Hotel Kyjev: Time's Up"-project. On the contrary, we're moving ahead fast. International Coffeeshop (ICS) strives to encourage "truthful speaking," (without wanting to tackle the concept of „truth, this goal shows at least that the truth, symbolised by the moment „NOW“ is conceivable). What is then the agency of the artist and what is its relationship to time?

...Time goes unrecognised for the most part. It only gains physicality in a moment of crisis or when what seemed to be here to stay becomes threatened to end. One could say that these moments bear a complexity of pleasure and pain, are beyond language or ask for a perverse abundance of it. These moments of dissonance shall be intervened and scrutinized, phantasized about and be laid open in dialog and production. This living process of negotiating a physical site performed by different knowledge producers challenging and supporting each other, and their context...

...Half a year ago the hotel was meant to be torn down in Fall 2007, today protest against this act is vivid and powerful...

<http://www.archive.org/details/Hareandt1947>

In the arrow paradox, Zeno asks us to imagine an arrow in flight. He then asks us to divide up time into a series of indivisible nows or moments. At any given moment if we look at the arrow it has an exact location so it is not moving.

According to Zeno, at any instant, the arrow must be at rest. However, this has been disputed, since being at rest is a relative term. One cannot judge, from observing any one instant, that the arrow is at rest. Rather, one requires other, adjacent instants to assert whether, compared to other instants, the arrow at one instant is at rest. Thus, compared to other instants, if the arrow is found to be at a different place than it was

and will be at the times before and after, then we have reason to claim the arrow has moved.

A proposed solution to the paradoxes is to consider that space and time are not infinitely divisible. Just because our number system enables us to give a number between any two numbers, it does not necessarily follow that there is a point in space between any two different points in space, and the same goes for time.

If space-time is not infinitely divisible (and thus not perfectly continuous), it is "discrete" (composed of "lumps" and "jumps"). This means that motion, at the smallest physical level, may be a series of jumps from one quantum space-time coordinate to the next, each occurring over distance and time intervals that are not divisible into smaller measures. Thus the total number of quantum jumps made while traversing from point A to point B would be finite, and there is no paradox.

First assume that a hare is chasing a tortoise. The tortoise starts some distance ahead - lets say 10 metres. They both start running at the same time. The hare runs at a speed of 10 metres every second and the tortoise runs at a speed of 1 metre every second. After 1 second the hare has got to the tortoise's starting position, but the tortoise has moved 1 metre in the same time, so the hare has not caught up yet. The tortoise is now 1 metre ahead, but by the time the hare travels 1 metre the tortoise has travelled 10cm. The tortoise is now 10 cm ahead, but by the time the hare travels 10cm the tortoise has travelled 1cm. The tortoise is now 1 cm ahead. I could keep going on indefinitely but you should see that the tortoise is always a bit further on when the hare gets to where he was.

The distance the hare travels in each step is 1/10 of the previous step distance. If you believe that you can keep on dividing a number by 10 forever Zeno must be correct. But we know he is not correct so there must be a problem somewhere. The mathematical world and the real world don't agree, as we know the hare will catch the tortoise. Maybe the error is our assumption that we can keep dividing a number by 10. We must change this assumption and state that in the real world (unlike in the mathematical world) space cannot be divided into an infinite number of steps. If this is true there is a smallest distance one can travel. Let's look at what this means. If the distance between A and B is the smallest distance that can be traveled and you were standing at A and moved to B you would never be anywhere in between. This sounds almost as strange as our original statement that a slower object could not be overtaken by a faster one, but Quantum Mechanics (The study of the very small) seems to backup this idea. In Quantum Mechanics there is a smallest distance you can travel. It a distance around 10^{19} (1000000000000000000) times smaller than a proton. Distances this small are smaller than atoms by as much as atoms are smaller than stars.

Everybody knows in the real world Zeno's Statement is wrong. After all, if it were true the world would be a **very** different place. For one, the current hunting debate would not exist, as there would be no hunting. No one would chase a fox if they could never catch it. The Greeks couldn't do this neat mathematical trick. They didn't have the concept of the limit. They didn't believe in 0 and they couldn't handle the infinite. This

is the biggest failure in Greek mathematics, and is the only thing that stopped them discovering calculus.

...Having to assume another identity in order not to have to appear, the Department of Haunting inhabits the Department of Reading and the Department of Practice as a technique rather than a figure. Unlike the movement of getting somewhere, inhabitation is the time of remaining, which makes a space a place. The notion of inhabitation as we find it within the Department of Haunting suspends the necessity of presence or participation - in particular with regard to the concept of public space...

...The mode of the again and again corresponds to the figure of the ghost, which, not granted its historical embedding, has to appear again and again. Neither the one haunting nor the one haunted are free but endure each others involuntary inhabitation..... it is the insisting gesture of appearance (a technique, rather than a figure)..... At the same time we believe the Machine of the Department of Haunting is to create a passage through which what cannot achieve a consistent form of appearance can arrive (a technique rather than a figure)...

"Zur Debatte als Vorbereitung" (PAST ACTION)

**Die Zeit (Zeno) als Schutz. : Wer nicht bleiben kann, Muss fliehen.
We will work as receptionists (inhabitation (= Zeno) – daily insistence – the necessity of presence and participation (= Zeno).**

the Faculty's (dis)appearance (FUTURE ACTION)

Starting from the end, dividing our shifts so that together 12h by 12h we would establish a constant continuity between the to-be-observed time? (this doesn't have to mean starting Saturday and working backwards towards Monday. Starting at the two different ends of the week doesn't sound convincing either.)

The slower versus the quicker shouldn't be related to our personae but rather be subject to a PROTOCOL situation / structure. I will bring two wooden cut-outs (one hare and a tortoise), and two films (hare + tortoise, see web link above and a short film by Rico about the "Zur Debatte als Vorbereitung".

21.03.2008