

Episode 2: I enjoy not being in control of my material

Rosa Zangenberg: You are listening to Taking Art Apart, a podcast presented by West Den Haag.

I am Rosa Zangenberg, visual artist and writer.

Yael Keijzer: I am Yael Keijzer, philosopher and writer.

Rosa: We're launching an experimental series of themes that one may come across when stepping into the artworld, whether as a young artist, established institution, or curious viewer.

In this episode, we examine the material - the matter that gives shape to the objects we define as art. Traditionally, we associate art with a physical object, an entity that can be hung, placed, or simply touched. But more and more, the requirement for something physical seems to become irrelevant in the artworld. Firstly, digital art challenges this drastically, and has done so for decades already. Secondly performance art has changed the concept of an object as opposed to the maker forever. So, indeed, what makes something an artwork? Is it the touch of the artist on whatever the artist may touch?

Lately, this assumed irrelevance of the physical object has become even more irrelevant with the rise of the NFT - the non-fungible-token. Yet, we still long for something physical - whether being clay or human bodies. Will the artworld ever allow for the concept of the physical to disappear completely? Even in spite of the times and the obvious convenience of making everything digital.

Lotus Rooijakers: So I'm going to tell you a little story about my fire extinguisher collection and also about something that happened with them during the building up of an installation I did in December, 2021. And, at that point, I had 175 fire extinguishers, and so I decided to hang them on the wall. It's really easy to forget how much work this was since each fire extinguisher has a different way of hanging. Some have a different hook, some don't even have a hook, and some can be up to 20 kilos. So this was a very intense job and thanks to my friends, Jan, Julia, Oliver, you were great. Otherwise, I really couldn't have done this, and I don't know

if I would recommend using these objects, actually, since this physical part is very dominant. They're really dominant, not only in color or in any, it's also physically. The transport, the storage, and also hanging them. Like I said, it's just very... at some point, you just really have to challenge yourself to work with these things, and I really like that. And I also like to keep on thinking about ways of working with them and kind of find solutions to work with them. And I guess I enjoy this... this not being in control of the material, sometimes. I think that's also challenging me and it motivates me to keep on working with them.

And all of my fire extinguishers were already used or they're too old. They're disapproved. And at the same time, you need to have fire extinguishers that are approved and they have to be in a fixed position and they also have to be visible. So they have to fulfill these fire safety regulations. So that's where it becomes quite confusing since somebody, I don't know who it was, put an approved fire extinguisher next to my, yeah, collection, which was still on the floor while I was building up. So I hung one of the approved ones hidden in my collection. So if there is a fire, it could become a very dangerous, extremely dangerous game. Yeah, I call it a game. Because I think that you could compare it to a Russian roulette where it's like a Russian roulette with fire extinguishers, where you need to choose. "Oh, which fire extinguisher am I going to get?" You need to make these quick choices.

And so yeah, this was already quite an interesting mystique part behind the fire extinguisher. So I decided to keep the approved fire extinguisher in my installation. And then another crazy situation occurred where, just before the opening, another or the same anonymous person decided to pull the lever of one of my fire extinguishers. And I came in and the whole black room, the floor was covered in white powder. And I know that some people might like white powder at some point, but in this case it wasn't really suitable. So, I don't know what this anonymous person wanted to say to me, but there's no other way to let me know that you don't like my work.

Rosa: We might be aware of the mediums that constitute the arts, but are the mediums aware of us? In this little anecdote

that you just heard, artist Lotus Rooijackers introduces her current main medium, its possibilities, restrictions, use and conventions.

Yael: For the next couple of minutes, I, Yael, would like to give a lecture on the power of the material. I am personally inspired by art critic and writer John Berger, who I believe tries to democratise art by breaking down developments of art history, and phenomena like the nude painting, into its value for today. Rather than taking for granted the artist's agency towards their material of choice, can we propose this relationship is interdependent?

You might have heard about Berger's thought provoking collection of essays in 'Ways of Seeing' from 1972. In these essays, he goes into the impact of perception and the development of mediums, such as photography, on our appreciation of art from the past. A large part of 'seeing' depends upon habit and conventions. For example, the technique of using perspective is the centre of European art, and in some ways determined how we saw things from then on. And everything changed with the invention of the camera. We could now see things which were not there in front of us, and from perspectives less accessible to eye and body. You will now hear a fragment from a manifesto written in 1923 by Russian film director Dziga Vertov:

I am an eye, a mechanical eye. I, the machine, show you a world the way only I can see it. I free myself for today and for ever from human immobility. I am in instant movement. I approach and pull away from objects. I creep under them. I move alongside a running horses' mouth. I fall and rise with the falling and rising bodies. This is I, the machine manoeuvring in the chaotic movements recording one movie after another in the most compelling combinations. Freed from the boundaries of time and space. I coordinate any and all points of the universe wherein I want them to be. My way leads towards the creation of a fresh perception of the world. Thus I explain in a new way the world unknown to you.

The invention of the camera has changed not only what we see, but how we see it. Also retrospectively, we now view history through the lens of the present, and it has changed how we

view paintings that were painted long before. We can see the Mona Lisa through a picture, or print in on regular A4 -paper and hang it in our living spaces. My question is, are these images any less real? The reproductive quality of the camera has questioned the integral elements to an artwork, namely its material, medium, uniqueness and value. We can see this in the development of digital art as well: the meaning of a work is now transmittable, and comes to you like the news of an event or spectacle. In some ways, art in the digital era is more like information, or the transference of ideas that are not linked to an object of cash value or esthetics.

'The Medium is the Message' is a memorable expression that pops up ever so often in discussions on the effect of media, coined by Canadian philosopher and media theorist Marshall McLuhan. This nearly 60 year old slogan seems to have predicted the growing importance of becoming aware of the mediums, and their vast networks of influence on our ways of thinking and (scientific) reasoning. During multiple ongoing crises, natural, political, existential or viral, we have found ourselves increasingly dependent on information and connection. The digital medium of the internet reigns supreme; work meetings, hangouts, lectures, even sermons have moved unto virtual platforms in a seemingly smooth manner when we needed it, despite some glitches and WiFi issues. Alas, while offering new ways of connecting with each other, and with creativity running high and fast, we might not, or might not be able to, stand still to reflect on the bigger implications.

What is the background of this process of conversion to an almost total digitalisation of our life, who is in charge of it and how are we shaped by them? And also, how can we shape the world through them freely? Perhaps it doesn't make sense anymore to rationally criticise or analyse our condition. Art might have been sublimated into the production of cyber-society and calculable probabilities.

New mediums generate new environments, like the tv became a new window through which we can see the world pass by. As we engage differently with different kinds of mediums and images, we are at the same time limited by their possible uses. The mediums already delineate how we perceive and use them, merely already by having a different purpose. For instance, paintings or sculptures were, in the past, and often still are, mostly

made iconographically. That means the artist chose the subject matter with agency, and to express or refer to something else.

Could the same be said about photographs? Czech media philosopher Vilém Flusser writes in his 1985 book 'Into the Universe of Technical Images' about the promise and threat of this technological development in media. Photographs are not 'made' by people, pixel by pixel. Rather, it is shot by an apparatus which has an operating function. The objects in the image are not created with an artist's agency, and so the element of intentional iconography diminishes. A picture rather shows a situation, where cause and effect come in to find meaning. It guides the eye to think of fire, when there is a picture of smoke. Naturally, this is often looked at as if it were an icon. And it doesn't take away that a technical picture isn't able to move a viewer.

What lies close to this type of image is, then, the interactive digital image, which is more than a snapshot picture. These are the type of images that you can change, programme, or choose to close the window off on your desktop. It entails an interface with a flexible structure, where the viewer is not 'given' an icon to passively consume, rather they become affordances, meaning that the images signify what you can do with them, instead of what they mean. The viewer now becomes a user.

If we connect this idea to the case of new media art, the question remains whether this two-way medium can add more engagement between art, artist and viewer. How we interpret a work might inevitably resort back to traditional imagery. After all, the way we visualise ideas and make them into works of art is conditioned by the development of technology and the medium through which we're used to express the world. And besides, is a supposedly interactive digital image, like the homescreen of an iPhone, really that open-ended?

Taking this in mind, to what extent is art now still a contribution to cultural production, if it is so easily reproduced, anonymised, appropriated and consumed? What are we doing or funding it all for? McLuhan, whom I mentioned earlier, proposed a research path towards a 'media ecology'. This would allow us to preserve the techniques we still need from the past, such as critical reasoning and literacy,

allowing these to take on new purposes and roles within a user-society.

Cecilie Fang - *an i and we*

Cecilie Fang:

my *i* seems to be less *i* than *i* thought it was

it grew into *we*

i tried to

grasp it
control it
shape it
transform it

to realize

i was the one being and becoming

grasped,
controlled
shaped
transformed

created anew by a mutual touch

i wonder

is it possible to be without becoming
when our body is what we take in?

when the touch *i* gave
was the one *i* contained

and the touch *i* contained
was the one *i* gained

when our body is embodied, yet embedded in the otherly

each touch, grasp, shapeshift

an explosion of previous form

is it possible that i find myself destroying
to create?

and by creating, to touch and contain

one's touch on the other
may
might
was
or maybe
is
a touch upon oneself

our skin seems to be a carrier bag

carrying touches
carrying traces

our skin as a carrier bag
of the otherly

a lifetime
 carrying
 others

a lifetime
 being
 becoming

the otherly

Rosa: Young artist Cecilie Fang, takes 'media ecology' to the next level. Humans are shaped by their environment through a so-called planetary metabolism. Our bodies are co-dependent on the world, becoming what we are in, touching, and breathing. Maker, material and form are mutually connected.

The urgency of a 'media ecology' awareness is more present than ever and, perhaps, the rise of the NFT's can justify this. Functioning as its own ecosystem, the connection between the medium and receiver has to be taken care of, in every sense. This can be the case for more or less every kind of medium we consider - but it especially applies to the function of the NFT. NFT is nothing without the receiver. In a sense,

its entire existence depends on a receiver - a trader of some sort.

Or does it?

Coming up, we have a discussion between myself and the two artists Thijs Jaeger and Lotus Rooijakkers - both of whom have distinctive ideas on the NFT and its rapid infiltration into the art world - and especially art market.

Lotus: *Yeah but it's, it's uh, at the art academy, we don't talk about it. So that's also an interesting thing, right? It's kind of still a little bit..*

Rosa: *The concept of the NFT*

Lotus: *Yeah*

Thijs Jaeger: *That's a bit of a blasphemy or something. It's like, "Ooh NFTs. You, you do that? Well, better stay away from that".*

Rosa: Hello. Um, first of all, maybe you can start by introducing yourselves?

Thijs: Uh, yeah, I'm Thijs Jaeger, I'm an artist living and working in The Hague. I graduated in 2017. My work involves sculpture and installation.

Lotus: I'm Lotus Rooijakkers, and I am also an artist. At least I'm trying to be. I'm graduating this year. To enter the, yeah, scary art world, I work with installations, performance and paintings.

Rosa: I wonder if you, as young artists, have some kind of pressure to take an interest in the NFT as an art form? It seems to be suddenly everywhere, like online, it seems that the NFT is a thing. It suddenly..

Thijs: It's already old. It's not, like, really new.

Lotus: You have the people that know about it right away, that's the people who are really into it. And then you have

the mainstream and for the mainstream, I think right now it's quite.. it's quite new or it's still very.. people are starting to find it interesting right now, they're really like "okay?. So more and more people are getting into it. Maybe I should do it as well". And if lots of people feel the pressure to also join this mainstream.

Thijs: I think the pressure is mostly because people see money, they think of like, "oh, NFT's is related to it, a lot of money", because when you read about it, it's about how much they're worth and not specifically, uh, what they are. I have thought about it. I don't know if I really want to make one. I feel very distanced from it. Also, the works that are made are mostly like, not really like, relatable to me. Uh, and I did see some interesting stuff, uh, but I think it's not really like in the essence of what it is, uh, because NFT is, of course, it's like an image that is put into the blockchain or video, or like a digital file. So it's like engraved to the one who owns it. I think that's interesting that you, uh... I think before, when somebody bought a painting, the artist put their autograph on it and then it was, like, certified by the artist. But now it's like written on this data chain where this artwork has an ID and, uh, everybody can see where the artwork went or who it bought. I think that's a very interesting thought that it's like publicly available and everybody can see it. Everyone can see it and, and it's unchangeable. So that's maybe interesting. People fake artworks, or they can make copies of it but, eventually, you can see who really owns the image.

Lotus: Yeah but it's, it's uh, at the art academy, we don't talk about it. So that's also an interesting thing, right? It's kind of still a little bit..

Rosa: The concept of the NFT

Lotus: Yeah

Thijs: That's a bit of a blasphemy or something. It's like, "Ooh NFTs. You, you do that? Well, better stay away from that".

Lotus: I mean, there's some, there's some people who, like I said before that people buy a physical work and then read it

like this artist. And then they say, ah, I might also buy an NFT

Thijs: Yeah but it is always about like, you make an NFT to sell it. Right?

Lotus: Some people don't, some people really don't.

Thijs: Some people don't, but like, okay 99% is basically about that.

Lotus: My friend is making NFT's he's really every day working on digital work. And, uh, he says that when you want to really be into it and everything, you need to be very active on Twitter.

Thijs: Yeah.

Lotus: You need to post everyday, you need to say good morning, good night. Uh, or not well, every day, but not too much, but not too less. And then every day, and in this way you get exposure.

Thijs: But I think, yeah, that's the thing. Like, you can put your NFT online, but like, people need to know that like it's going to be something, or you're active, or you're interesting enough to own it.

Lotus: And that's where it comes down to your network. And this is also another thing, which is, I think when you want to sell, you need to show where your work is. This is a kind of network. This is also real life, but that's also a taboo in the academy. Like, uh, networking has such a bad connotation, which is, I think really good with NFTs that people kind of naturally learn to network... or naturally, but they know they have to be on Twitter, they know they have to do this to get exposure. There's a more clear protocol towards selling. You know what to expect and you know what to do to get this, uh, exposure, but it takes like hours per day. It's a full-time job to get where you want to be.

Rosa: Yeah if hours of the job is to just promote yourself on Twitter that's also quite special... that being an NFT artist successfully, like half of it is using Twitter.

Lotus: Yeah, exactly. It's really like... this friend of mine, he's spending eight hours a day to be on Twitter and to make an artwork every day to post.

Thijs: But I think that's the difference between maybe the art world and NFT is that it's, it's in a certain way contained. So you make an image, you promote yourself, you try to sell it, which is like a very low, uh, "dremple", like a very low...

Lotus: Barricade?

Thijs: Barricade to go into.

Thijs: It also feels a bit like an experiment still this whole NFT.

Rosa: But we could also see that like 30 years ago, museums were really against video art and, like, they really didn't trust to buy a video artwork because they... yeah, that was just something that would pass by. But now, they are just so much incorporated into collections and to galleries and museums and like... every respectable museum needs to have equipment to show videos. But just some years ago...

Thijs: It's interesting because a video can be reproduced, you know, you can put it on a recorder or like on a CD. And with paintings or like a material kind of stuff. Yeah. That's where it's interesting because yeah, if I only have 200 copies, then can I never make a copy again? Or can I yeah. You know? And then...

Lotus: Who's gonna control that?

Thijs: You cannot control it, but then the blockchain becomes interesting because it's like written down in this thing and then it's like, okay, it's there forever. And everybody can see it and say like, "Hey, that image is just from him, and there were only 20 of these and that's it"

Lotus: It becomes very strict.

Thijs: Yeah, I think always, nah, maybe also in the past 40 years, like, that it was always a contribution, you know, or like an interesting topic when for, for instance, the Bible was getting printed, instead of people rewriting every word on

it, take like, take the Bible, they started to add, uh, extra stories that were never in the Bible. They started to make a story about "Vagevuur", like hell and, like, it was never in the Bible! Then people just said, "oh now we can reproduce it. Let us make it extra scary!". And people would stay in belief and it becomes very epic and I think that always happens through time that, like, at some point we can start to make mass-production out of it and then these certain rules of who owns it or what is owning, it starts to shift and, yeah... And also with these blockchains, that's like, uh, yeah, I think it's, in that sense, interesting that it's like digitally written down.

Rosa: A literal attachment to the artwork.

Thijs: Yeah.

Rosa: An addition to the work also.

Lotus: Yeah, until the moment where the whole world shuts down and then, you know, what to do?

Thijs: Yeah. That's also interesting, like, does it ever shut down? It doesn't.

Lotus: Well, I mean, yeah.

Rosa: When that day comes, when you have to choose between the digital world and the physical world, we probably will choose the digital world.

Lotus: I think it's also always good to put things on paper.

Thijs: Yeah. I mean, oh, that's interesting with wallets and, like, because the NFT is, uh, related to the wallet and who owns it. And then if you lose your password, all wallets have a physical phrase key. So you have, you can always redo the password, but if you want to recover your wallet, if you really like lost everything, you have to put in certain words, or you have to write down these words because they specifically asked you to please write down your secret phrase words and not keep it digital so that you can re-enter your wallet. That's what they advise.

Lotus: Yeah, because if you, if you, if you forget this password, you're basically..

Rosa: So the ultimate security is handwriting.

Thijs: Material, write it down. Put it in a safe.

Rosa: That's also interesting. The fact that we always think "oh technology is the infallible or the only objective truth", but in the end it fails to be the most secure thing.

Rosa: So one thing I also wanted to ask, which is a bit like a general question maybe, but like, what is the material to you in your practice? Do you see the physical as an elementary aspect of fine arts or is it not really important?

Thijs: Uh, I, in my practice, uh, my work goes through stages and that stage starts somewhere and then it always goes through physical and digital phases and then it ends up somewhere there in between. Uh, I think the material is very interesting because I went to Japan for quite long and there, I was very interested in that they really believe that the material has a soul. That's why they are so close to robots and like most people have the uncanny feeling or an uncanny valley with robots, or like they feel it becomes too real. But in Japan, for example, they really feel closer to it because they believe that it really has, or can have a soul. So I think that's very interesting. And then I learned about Wabi-Sabi. They believe that everything that's perfect should be also imperfect. So, for example, if you see a temple and everything looks perfect to this temple, but then there's like a leaf falling on it and then for them it's like complete because it breaks the perfect. There is no perfect. But yeah. Um, but I was very interested in Neanderthals because they were in their cave and then when they came out of their cave, they saw the world and then everything they saw was a tool. So I think that's also how I approach my work. It's like, everything can be a tool. I just started to play with it. And then things exist.

Lotus: Yeah. I mean, that's something you still need to discover right? You don't have, uh, the answers already.

Rosa: That also makes it more free for you because if you know the purpose of the tool, it limits you to the purpose, in a

way. Maybe what about you? And, um, what, how do you relate to the material?

Lotus: I don't know if I can, uh, make it that, that specific, but I do have... like I find these things, which might be something I don't recognize as being from someone else. And, uh, I won't say I stole it, but it's not, I'm actually stealing it, but it's not on purpose yeah. They could be on the streets, found objects, and then it's more about the repetition of the object as well. So the quantity of the object, not necessarily the quality. But then it's also about the performative aspect behind the background of the artwork. So the conversation I have with the people owning these objects, for example, a fire extinguisher, uh, which I find on Marktplaats. I go there, I speak to the people, I ask why they do it, why, why are they selling it? And all the conversations I've had with the metal recyclers who own them or the fire department... Uh, so it's.. those are aspects that people don't see but they can maybe visualise it behind the objects, which are standing in the gallery space.

Rosa: Yup.

Lotus: But yeah, it's, it's just, um, yeah, that's it.

Lotus: Then that's where I could maybe have a link from this collection, physical collection of fire extinguishers to why wouldn't I just... I have the photographs of each fire extinguisher. Why wouldn't I just put it online? Put it on the blockchain. It is so much easier, looking at the physical aspect and all the storage and everything. It would be, for me, very easy to just sell it through NFTs.

Thijs: Nobody is stopping you.

Lotus: Well, this is a dilemma, you know, because...

Rosa: How important is the physicality to you? Because if it doesn't matter...

Lotus: Yeah. I mean, it's..

Thijs: You're making a book. You said you were making a book. Now why don't you make NFT's out of it instead of a book. It saves you a lot of money.

Lotus: Yeah. Or you could do printing on demand, but I mean, it's also, that's why it's in this, you're kind of in the splits.

Thijs: But you are thinking about it.

Lotus: Yes, definitely. But it's two different worlds. I mean, it's also, yeah. It's like..

Thijs: But if you, if you have, like, a hundred images of fire extinguishers, or you have a hundred real ones. That's way different. Right?

Lotus: Definitely. But it's also interesting to think about. Oh, it might, it might be nice to also put it on NFT. It's not, it's not, one or the other.

Thijs: But why do you want it? To make money?

Lotus: Well, I mean, that's something but I think it's also for the exposure, but yeah, that's a good question. For the money, maybe yes. But yeah, good question. Why would I, why would I print it? Why not just be a bit more ecological? And be on and I put it on NFT?

Thijs: I don't think NFT's are that ecological.

Louts: But that's another discussion. That's another discussion.

Rosa: And if you would do this, would you, then, consider the pictures another work or what would you do with the original fire extinguishers?

Lotus: I could at least keep my collection together and then sell the pictures of it or, or sell the pictures online on the, with NFTs and then, yeah, adding the physical fire extinguisher to the buyer. That's also something you can do because you can combine it. It's just something you need to discuss beforehand.

Thijs: This is what I also thought before, like if I would make an NFT, I don't like that it's, like, if you buy it, you also buy the physical work. That would be.. Although I was also thinking of making, like, if somebody would buy a ceramic

something and I would 3D-scan it and then they would have the digital file, but also the physical. But then I felt like, yeah, but if they want, because people want to trade NFT's. If someone buys my NFT, they want to sell it at some point. Because it's about money, you know, it's not about owning one and doing nothing. It's about owning one and trying to do something. So then the person who has bought the physical work also needs to send the physical work.

Lotus: Yeah. But it's not always about money. It's also really about collectors buying a work from someone they already have physically, but they see, ah, this artist is also on the NFT. Okay. Let's buy her work.

Rosa: But I really question the integrity of this collector then, because then it really says something about the specific collector that they collect to just collect. And then I also just, I question the NFT in this sense that like, what are you going to do with it? Are you going to put it as a, you can put it as a screensaver on your computer or something, but it's really limited what you can actually do with this afterwards, except from just knowing that you own it.

Thijs: Yeah, exactly. And I think that is the only really interesting part of NFT. It is like it's engraved into this blockchain and then it says: "you are the owner". So, yeah, I think money or yeah... Money and ownership is something close-by stuff. I mean, there was something interesting in a way past, I think when the iPhone was just there and the apps. And you had to pay like, um, money for WhatsApp and like, around that time, there was like an app called "the Jewel" and it was just a rotating gem, or like 3D made gem that rotates. It was costing 500 euros to download that app. So someone will put it on at 500 euros and you can download this app that was just a rotating red diamond.

Rosa: It was the predecessor to the NFT almost.

Thijs: Yeah it was almost like an NTF and now you cannot download that app anymore. So the app is gone and people really want to have that app again.

Rosa: And the people who still have that app might be worth millions, or the phone that has that app inside.

Thijs: But there were some people who owned it. But for instance, you also had this website, that's also interesting. You can buy pixels on the website. One pixel was one dollar. So people started to buy pixels on this website and there were 1 million pixels and within, like, three days, this whole website was completely sold out.

Lotus: It's also then about..

Thijs: Owning land.

Lotus: Owning land, It's kind of, um..

Rosa: But all the time, it's just about owning. That's the main purpose.

Lotus: Maybe that's the conclusion.

Rosa: Owning for the sake of owning.

Lotus: Yeah, of the NFT.

Thijs: Maybe that is the conclusion of the NFT

Lotus: But I still believe that there are people who actually like, love the works they buy.

Rosa: I really hope that is the case.

Thijs: Yeah. But then I still think like, I can also love it without owning it or like having it.

Rosa: And you can also love a painting or love a sculpture yourself without owning it.

Thijs: Yeah, you can just go to the museum and watch it.

Lotus: Yeah okay but...

Thijs: But I mean, that's, that's the thing.

Lotus: So sometimes people, no, no, I get what you mean. But sometimes people also buy the work to support the artists because they like each other because it's to support.

Thijs: That's true.

Rosa: I want to end it here, but thank you very much for wanting to talk and, yeah, I enjoyed it a lot.

Thijs: Thank you.

Lotus: Thank you.

Rosa: That was it everyone.

Special thanks to: Lotus Rooijackers, Cecilie Fang, and Thijs Jaeger for taking part in this episode.

If you want to know more about the guests and their practices, as well as extra source materials, please have a look at our description box. This podcast is made possible by West Den Haag.

Next time, we move from the material of art into the reception of art. It is often assumed that an artwork is never finished without its viewer. And if so, is the artist responsible for how the work is viewed? Who is really the artist?

Guests in this episode:

Lotus Rooijackers, <https://www.lotusrooijackers.com/>

Cecilie Fang, <https://ceciliefang.com/>

Thijs Jaeger, <https://thijsjaeger.com/>

Further references:

'Marshall McLuhan and the Arts' at West,
https://www.westdenhaag.nl/artists/Marshall_McLuhan/1/17_09_McLuhan

'Vilem Flusser and the Arts' at West,
https://www.westdenhaag.nl/exhibitions/16_04_Flusser

John Berger, Ways of Seeing (1972)
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ways_of_Seeing

Marshall McLuhan, The Medium is the Massage: An Inventory of Effects (1967)
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Medium_Is_the_Message

Vilem Flusser, Into the Universe of Technical Images (1985),
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vil%C3%A9m_Flusser

