

### On ABSENCE Doings—The Cuts of Disappearance

Álvaro Hernández, Regina Gutiérrez, and Diego Aguilar<sup>1</sup>

In Colombia, where the performance *What Is to Disappear?—What We Not Know about an Empty Chair* was created, one of the last reports of the Commission of Memory has given a statistic of more than eighty thousand people disappeared. All the participants of this process have been in one way or another in relation to “acts of disappearance,” whether because some of our activist work has been with people that directly suffered the consequences of the Colombian internal armed conflict and disappearance became an ever-present occurrence, or because the disappearance of a family member has been suffered directly. Here, we worked absence and disappearance not in relation to the lack of presence of the disappeared but rather—and in relation to the many dialogues we have had with people who have suffered the traumatic consequences of acts of disappearing—to the affective and imperceptible mattering of what actively remains among us, the absent presences, perhaps, as well as the continuous presencing of their absence. We are thinking through our own artistic practices to work with such an indeterminate real, but also with and alongside the work of people, artists, and activists, especially from Latinoamérica around disappearance. We all live among the death and the undead, and those of whom we have no certainty of either death or non-death. In this sense, this work is an attempt for thinking disappearance from a perspective of what Lynette Hunter calls affective politics (Hunter 2018).

---

**Diego Aguilar** has been, since 2016, a professor of media art and art and technology at the National University of Colombia, professor in the Master of Visual Arts, and Director of the Technopoetics Research Group, which focuses on the dialogue between knowledge between art, science and technology, configuring questions about the photographic, documentary, moving image, optics, screen, narrative and the body. Producer of experimental video and artistic practices in digital and low tech media, he has participated in international exhibitions and festivals in countries such as Spain, Argentina, United States, Indonesia, Germany, Chile, and Colombia—for which he has won several recent awards in holography, video art, and experimental video.

**Regina Gutiérrez** is a multidisciplinary performing artist and theatre educator specialist in the areas of movement, physical theatre, and acting—including corporal mime, acrobatics, and scenic combat. She has participated in numerous productions as an actress, assistant director, and producer. As a theatre educator and researcher of the performing arts, she has worked with low-income children and adolescents, and on social projects, investigating the theatre body as a vehicle toward knowledge. She has led performances with women from different regions of Colombia on topics such as gender violence and sexual abuse and has been part of the activist movement involved in the recovery of territory for Afro-Colombian communities as well as in the formation of green movements along the Atlantic Coast of Colombia.

**Álvaro Hernández** is an interdisciplinary artist who has received international awards and participated in and created pieces of street theatre, physical theatre, collaborative theatre, and other performances with artists and communities in Asia, Europe, North America, and Latin America. He has collaborated with Indigenous communities of Amazon and the region of Putumayo in Colombia and has developed performances joining art and activism within Colombian communities affected by the armed conflict. He has been the artistic director, playwright, and dramaturg of *Entropico Teatro* since 2003. Hernandez is currently investigating modes of doing with plants and other than human relations, trying to map relational territories that go beyond the bifurcation of modern thought. His interest is the activation of post-capitalist ecological ways of doing, forms of senti-pensar the world that contribute to the generation of impactful actions in relation to the socio-environmental crisis. Hernandez is a professor in the Department of Arts-ASAB at Universidad Distrital Francisco José de Caldas, Colombia.

This essay remains undone. It attempts to engage with different registers of the experience of working absence throughout the process of the coming together of this work. Thus, in the writing as well as in the process of making, it does not clearly separate between the process of creation and the performance, just as it does not work along the opposition between absence and presence. Each part is a way of engaging with what the work did and could have done and how it worked or how we felt it working. Hence, the writing is a way of keeping ongoing what-where else the work could do.

## I. Encountering

*Alvaro said: locate as many features as you can all around your body, sense spots more than specific parts of the body, sensations that feel awkward or out of place, others that pass or feel moving, others that connect. Feel them irradiating more than in isolation. Try to hold to them and trace a line along their course, starting in any of them, feel the ways they moved . . . now, drop the line and feel them all at the same time.<sup>2</sup>*

The process from the very beginning was bounded by particular constraints that could have been understood as “obstacles” but were embraced as platforms to enable otherwise relations.<sup>3</sup> The largest constraint was that the cast members were in four different parts of the world. A video artist was in Argentina, a dancer between countries, two performers were in different regions of Colombia, and the director and a performer, and also the assistant director, in the United States. A set of propositions was adapted to make this situation work and advance the project. It was decided that the director and assistant director would separately develop material according to certain guidelines and transmit it to the others via the Internet in meetings scheduled in advance. They would work separately without sharing their material so that the material was random and unconnected. Nobody really knew what this performance was about, which was intentionally one of the guidelines of the director. Nothing was fixed, every piece of material—diagram, videos and stills of movement and/or objects, letters, fragments of text, sound recorders—was just a door to generate scores for more unknown.

Each of the performers took pieces of those materials and engaged with them in as many ways as they could find. We all shared online different fragments that would blind each other to the whole of what had actually been done. The pieces were collaged, gathered in a sort of media patchwork. The pieces could be taken separately or together with others and then used to originate a new part. The video artist began to develop ways to intercalate the fragments so that other textures would appear, unidentified images, that were there but not quite. What emerged of this digital venture of sharing material and making it available and presencing in unknowable ways was the question of what moves and how it is moved from media to embodiment. The different locations of the performers made it impossible to share an actual space, and thus, the sharing became a work to be done through the fragments virtually collected. The online sharing was the site in which the actual presence of the performers was virtually co-composed in order to become more, to emerge and move within a set of terms “not already identifiable” (Manning in Bordeleau et al. 2017, 16).

The virtual connectivity of the fragmentary sharing was pressing toward a precise work about presencing whatever was felt by the participants as disappearance. Images, video footage, and visual or sound interventions of the materials downloaded and shared through the Internet became connectors, sensory motors moved by the work done through the collective interventions occurring in separate time-spaces and colluding in the work of each one of us. The way these virtual sharings occurred was also a mode of taking in, and being porous to the change incited by the “inexpressable

and inexperienceable” force of the not-known,<sup>4</sup> and was particularly important in linking what could make presence in the work of the performers in its different locations—the ripples of what was there and yet not, not yet identifiable or determined as such, a potentiality to work without knowing exactly what it was, or what it could become.

When we met at last in Bogota, we recorded rehearsals every day: to document, to revisit what happened, to have a memory of them, to repeat, replicate, and reactivate. Mainly, though, rehearsals were recorded with the purpose, up to some point, of producing propositions for change. Everything that we recorded was revisited every day and then reworked during rehearsals, for materials and performers become loose and lost and thereby, something could rapidly shift; usually, a lot was changed each day. From one rehearsal to another, the performance could completely modify its shape or sometimes just be affected in imperceptible manners that on many occasions took effect as a result of our observations of the recording videos and audios. This uncomfortable, unstable sense was a constant technique that emerged in the effort to make disappearance/absence and its emerging ecology of dramaturgy appear.



From the performance *What We Not Know about an Empty Chair*. Directed by Álvaro Hernández. Photo: Diego Aguilar and Álvaro Hernández.

### de-FRAMING OUT-in FRAME

Two cameras are placed at the edge of two of the sides of a rectangular space, with *nothing/no-thing* in it. The performers arrive at the usual time of rehearsal, put on appropriate clothes, talk about daily stuff, and after a brief time, tried to enter the space for *rehearsal* to start, but they are stopped at its edges. The cameras just started recording the space, and they will be recording for about one hour and a half—to be exact, one hour thirty-six minutes and twenty-one seconds. During that lapse of time, “*nothing happens*,” “*nothing is to be done*,” except the camera capturing the movement of *nothing in space*, and the bodies of the performers at ease on one side and separated from the rectangle by a distance of two metres or so, without any *real* task, any goal to accomplish. They do not really know

what is going on or what this is about since they were not told what to do, apart from not entering the space and being aware of the cameras to avoid getting recorded. No speaking is done, as it would interfere with the recording. After some time, the performers start moving along one side, the side of the rectangular space that is not caught by the camera, at times bored, at times actively involved in finding a way to engage with the camera's doing. The cameras keep recording until they are stopped (one hour thirty-six minutes and twenty-one seconds). We all take a break. From what? Someone might be thinking. And yet "something's doing" (William James, quoted in Massumi 2013, 1). "That much we already know. Something's happening" (Massumi 2013, 1). Already so much doing and changing in the transformative ongoingness of event taking form. We take a time. Is that what a break is about? Taking some time?

Everyone gathers after a five-minute break, *this time*, with the task of carefully observing what has been recording during one hour thirty-six minutes twenty-one seconds. *Nothing* else to be *done* besides observing the images recorded of this *time/space* with a complete absence of objects: empty? Full of nothingness? During the same length of time: one hour thirty-six minutes twenty-one seconds. The images of both cameras are downloaded on a computer and then played simultaneously on a big screen, each view on a side of this screen split into two halves.

What is it that the performers are looking at on the screen? Nothing? The time/space is there in the images projected on the screen. Is it an absence of any-thing? But even that absence happens in time/s: one hour thirty-six minutes twenty-one seconds of lived time felt otherwise, other time, by the engagement of the performers with the one hour thirty-six minutes twenty-one seconds of image-movement on the screen. Looking at the time of this absencing, with a fullness of time being felt, is maybe looking with *nothing* to see except time.<sup>5</sup> The moving images passing on the screen take time and move in time, some time, and yet time is nothing to be seen, time disappears and is itself disappearance. This disappearing time moves, passes, transforms and changes, becomes anew in unpredictable ways opening up as potential for multiple futures to come. Time is then to be felt, feeling time of duration, a turning to the passage of the flow of time vibrating internally in us (Lapoujade 2018), time becoming in a-tension, time tending, at-tending<sup>6</sup> with the passing of past tendencies.

Right after the watching of the video recording is finished, *this time* without a *break*, the performers stand right at the edge on the sides of the space. Each one chooses a spot and WAITS, at-tending to the stillness doing in disappearing time. Whatever has been caught and captured by the camera helps the performers to engage in their waiting, accentuating differently for each performer particular qualities and rhythms of time. In the co-composition of the recorded images and the dynamisms generated by the movement of the stillness of the waiting bodies, performers begin to feel the passage of Waiting-Time. What we call Waiting-Time contains both the linear, progressive, and deterministic conception of time in its incessant ticking and also felt time, flux, and continuous moving of time becoming, changing differentiating, time-duration. What is the time of the disappeared?



From the performance *What We Not Know about an Empty Chair*. Directed by Álvaro Hernández. Photo: Diego Aguilar and Álvaro Hernández.

During the performers' waiting, time/s unfold. Their still bodies' movement syncs with the history and stories of time-consuming seconds, minutes, hours, of linear time ticking, time reduced to containment, imprisoned in the recurrent unicity of its determination, and, at the same time, their movement moved in stillness inserts different temporalities. The performers attend to be moved and feel time moving, to become and be altered by time, to get engaged in the dynamic, their bodies continuously middling in a fluctuating movement of change and open-ended multiplicity of time-duration.<sup>7</sup> It is through felt time, time in its permanent movement of change and differentiation (Grosz 1999) that absence and disappearance are foregrounded: through its uncontainable felt force, in its nonexistent, not-present but virtual-real potential. Each of the practices and propositions created in the process of creating *What We Not Know about an Empty Chair* engages with the "presencing" (Hunter 2019) of absence and disappearance, attuning and at-tending with what is taking out of place.

For if disappearance is "time not to be had" even when time is nothing to be had, in other words time out of present, time intense, eventing, continuously fleeting and shifting, it is reserved yet with the potential to become. And, on the contrary, to make disappear is also the freezing of time, the taking of someone else's/some thing's time, leaving them absent of time, with an absence of time that otherwise could have been "filled" (Derrida 1992, 3) if time were/would have been left to be done/have. This camera montage, then, considered how to engage and respond to the presence of disappearance. The essay is about the doings of this process in feeling absencing time and absent presences. The temporalities immersed in the process are felt in excess.

On the one hand, the surplus of the "rest of the time," the time left undone, frozen and framed in a waiting for something never to arrive, clock time excessive and obsessively marking time. The time-

trauma of those left waiting, sufferers of the too many disappeared that, as Donna Haraway remarks, include

human resisters to criminal nation states, the imprisoned, missing generations of the Indigenous and other oppressed people and peoples, unruly women, trafficked child and adult sexual and other workers, black and brown young people, disposable young people of every race or ethnicity, migrants, refugees and displaced people, stateless people, human beings subject to ethnic cleansing and genocide, and already about 50% of all vertebrate wild life that were living on earth's lands and oceans less than 50 years ago, plus 76% of fresh water species. (Haraway 2018, 73)

Disappearance made of extractivist practices of life ongoingness, in permanent undoingness of life,<sup>8</sup> in a continuous surveillance of bodies for the sustainment of practices and forms of killing.

But, on the other hand, there is the deframed felt excess of time ongoingness, time constantly changing and vibrating, creating the potential for indeterminate and unexpected becomings, time flowing out-in movement moved toward the search for futures to come, on the movement making of the new, of unpredictable unknown worldings, uncertain configurings for new “people to come” (Deleuze 2004, 345). Where is “the rest” of the time of the disappeared? The time that was not left to be there, and the felt time of absent presences. What is left? What remains in past traces of multiple pasts becoming in unknown futures. In *Waiting-Time*, as it was understood in this process, the performers engaged in both a radical sensitivity and hyperawareness to the recurrent, determinate unfolding of linear time, felt second by second, minute after minute, but also, in opening up ways of not-knowing, unpredictable, emergent and surprising taking of forms where the intensity of flowing time's inner vibration can be felt, when the traces of disappearance take and make presence. In the midst of our time/s, forms of living and dying emerge as surplus and excess of life intensive, and in new entanglements of death and life coming and becoming together.

Disappearance opened up in this particular process the performers' modes of engagement with the always incomplete, always impossible task of fully grasping the experience of the work becoming. The task was not to represent the disappeared or the experience of disappearance but engaging everywhere and everywhen with the nonperformativity of absencing. What would that do to the performers? What would it become throughout the process? And how would that be felt by the audience? These are questions we are keeping in motion across this piece of writing.

### **The Camera and the Body: *Waiting-Time* and the Cut**

In the video recording of “emptiness” in the space, the cameras frame the absence of things. The frame conducted by the cameras is a “cut,” a world gathering that can limit with precise boundaries everything in it. Everything that divides and makes difference of what is in it and what is not, what is excluded and what gets to be contained, that demarcates its inside and outside, extracting and capturing a slice of life-movement, excising its uncontained potential. Although the violent cut performed by the frame of the cameras restricts the limits (curating and encircling what is to be seen), it can also be, as Jean Luis Comolli points out while speaking about Pedro Costa films, “an opening, a call to the non-visible . . . a portion of the visible determines part of the non-visible—what is left over or outside that, unframed by definition, and can be surmised to be without boundaries in time or space. Inseparable from the screen, the off-screen is cloaked in indeterminate shadow” (Comolli 2010, 63–64). The frame made by the camera creates a container that cleanly

separates its own reality, making it independent but also a double of a time that “exists outside” as an excess outside of it. Whatever is inside the container has been isolated and extruded from some supposedly pre-given reality for which the image stands. Most framing operations dissected by the camera gaze in the mainstream normatization of film-video tend to aim for completeness and transparency with images that represent and reproduce a “given” within the frame, and in appearance become more real than what they supposedly stand for. Whatever is out of the frame remains in the shadow, present, but with no apparent effect.

Our question would be here: how does the work with the cameras turn the nonvisible, what is “left outside,” “the out of field” (Deleuze 1986) of the frame, into view? Or more specifically, how does the framing of the empty space enable the performers to bring absence, that is, a flow of the excess and a flowing of time, into the feeling of sensations, affects, and percepts? There is no real answer to that question, but in the context of this performance, we would say, by creating ways to bring stillness into movement or better yet, by finding ways to be moved by the movement of stillness. That is what we call Waiting-Time.

When the cameras recorded the “empty” space, the engagement was not with what was in the frame or left outside of it, but rather with/in the potentiality of the movement image, on the reversal and refusal of the image, its imaging of nonimage.<sup>9</sup> Rather than attending to what was and what was not visible on the recorded images of the “empty” space, what mattered was the particular engagement of the performers to make, to do, to create, to generate, themselves and others and the felt movement-becoming of time waiting, that are invisible to the eye. The camera created “insensible” projects as a force re-forming and in-forming the outside-in of the moving image and bodies stillness blurring any clear divide between inside and outside. The waiting in this camera practice of presencing absence here attempts to join what is and what is not.



From the performance *What We Not Know about an Empty Chair*. Directed by Álvaro Hernández. Photo: Diego Aguilar and Álvaro Hernández.

At the edging of these bodies on the dynamic unfolding of Waiting-Time, they breathe in-out time. In an utter tension completely dynamic and manifested in their precarious balance (Barba and Savarese 2006, 35), almost there and not yet to be, almost moving and yet not, in the same place but still way away, the bodies of the performers breathe out a trajectory without moving. No more than an inch, their bodies elongating in the space, prolonging their connections, the trajectory emerges throughout in relation to these present bodies and those absences “not here or there, and yet here and there.”<sup>10</sup> Right there in their middling, the performers breathe in and out, out-in, moving imperceptibly throughout their future trajectories. A powerful intensity that edges all the way toward the in-pulse of their movement becoming, becoming movement, here still-awaiting, not yet and yet, nothing.

The movement of stillness already moving between time ticking and untimely<sup>11</sup> time feels the intensity of its own waiting, the potential coming to be and not yet let go. Disappearance intensively waits, intensively feels time ticking, and time flowing and echoing in the midst of multiple times.

If there is something left after the violent and traumatic cut of disappearance, it is the intensified sense of a Waiting-Time. What sort of time is that of the disappeared? In the silent noise of a never arriving? The empty time/space awaits with an intensity similar to that of the stillness of the bodies at the edge of the rectangular space. The cut performed by the cameras in their framing, just as the rectangular space in which rehearsals occur co-creates a container, an out-in framing of uncontainable mattering. Whatever empty space we thought of it, was now/it had always been full and will be cramped by the activity of its potential eventuating. A frame captured by a video camera of a space absent of objects, no-thing in it, and simultaneously being projected on a screen. Just that. A performance that never came to be, part of this process of making presence of disappearance.

Some bodies at the edge, edging across the intensity felt by time passing, vibrating, moving intensively in still waiting-time. The no-thingness felt by the time captured by the cameras opened up forms to hold still, to make stillness felt with the overlapping and multitemporality of time/spaces becoming in Waiting-Time: time-image in a void, unbecoming, time felt intensively in the absence of any-thing and any-body on the verge of movement becoming, coming to be. We all wait, we keep waiting for their “re-turn.” The making of this empty space by both bodies and cameras, outspaced, that is, made room for things to come, bodies to be moved rather than bodies expecting to move. There is an a-tension in Waiting-Time that reverberates in the potential to make felt absence affective sense, middling, in the entanglements of sensible and insensible matterings. In the stillness of Waiting-Time vibrates a radical quietude that activates the potential brought forth in the unfolding of indeterminate past tendencies, waves of energy spreading and distributing. What is being felt, not quite, not yet, is an inner vibration, a multiplicity of minute streams shifting, orienting and disorienting, feeling carried through adjustments and disadjustments, relentless energy with no fixed location, all around in multiple directions at the same time, balancing and out-balancing, in the fragile balance of middling.



From the performance *What We Not Know about an Empty Chair*. Directed by Álvaro Hernández. Photo: Diego Aguilar and Álvaro Hernández.

After some time, no less than hours, we breathed in-out for the last time, waited . . . stepped back and finished the rehearsal. Nobody actually got to enter the space. After that, then, we waited and made Waiting-Time and time to wait every single day.

At the edge of the rectangular space where rehearsals happened, the bodies struggled to pre-feel/pre-sentir<sup>12</sup> what moved movement to occur. And now-then we did. We walked.

To come to move is to traverse a gap, an interval, movement moving, and what movement moves. To move is then to become undone by doing-becoming of movement. There, the performers did not anticipate the movement, nor did they know where to move, undoing knowing to know the destination or any prediction for movement to be moved. The performers at-tending in stillness engaged in tracing the slightest of changes perceived throughout their bodies when movement is felt to move-them, and then they walked. For some, movement moved them forward and back, for some toward the sides, or back toward the top, or down toward the ground and up through the centre, in any case, at least in two directions at once, or in many directions at once. Movement does not have a direction but rather dis-orientations, multiple tendencies moving all at once with different orientations.<sup>13</sup>

## 2. Affective Technologies

*It seems that any weird event we come across may relate to the piece somehow. I am becoming obsessed with ways of seeing or looking at things in strange ways. Every day we go to look for chairs in antique shops. We take photos of them and make strange video footages, we basically sit, but there is always some strange feeling about it. I think we are not actually looking for the chairs but for the feelings they carry.<sup>14</sup>*

How did the performers respond, give “response,” and relate to the immaterial, incorporeal, imperceptible, untimely dimensions of absence-disappearance? How did our bodies and practices change in the relation with technological devices to feel with absence and disappearance? Rather than embracing determinate paths and choices through which performers and participants of this process would have acted to produce an encounter with absence-disappearance, we were moved to think-act with/in chance and change, in insensible occurrences happening when undoing oneself to the indeterminate. In focusing too much in our present and therefore subsuming to the deterministic logics of a radical presentness of the present, we can risk losing the sense of our losses. We would need to lose the self to the encounter and, therefore, at-tend, tending-toward, along and among the tendencies of inexpressible forces of becomings and coming otherwise.

In *What We Not Know about an Empty Chair*, those were problems crossing every single practice developed during the process. The technologies used, the cameras, computers, holograms opened up pathways for at-tending in the practices of the performers and the audience members. Yet even though this essay focuses on the intervention and use of technological devices, it cannot do so without making the relation with the bodies across which and with which those connections were established. In this sense, the process and the performance are akin to what Luciana Parisi calls “technoecologies of sensation” (2009), a notion invested in working the ways in which technical machines change and affect the capacities of a body to feel. The process fully embraced the technical machines/devices used all along the creation of the performance to open up modalities of attentions, sensation and perception, ways for the bodies to feel and make felt difference and change with-in the process. The use of technologies and their intra-action with the bodies of the performers during this process is immersed in a particular practice of understanding the process of creation, which is called here, the dramaturgying.<sup>15</sup>



From the performance *What We Not Know about an Empty Chair*. Directed by Álvaro Hernández. Photo: Diego Aguilar and Álvaro Hernández.

The interplay between the recorded material and the ways of embodying it enhanced our perception of time/space and the materials with/in and effected a more porous sense of our bodies. The recording devices always present during rehearsals and performances kept on changing the ways in which the bodies of the performers experienced the affect of the threshold between presence and absence. Instead of moving as if space were already predefined, the performers traced sensations, affects and percepts that made them move, lured them to be moved. This is what we call *trajectories*, emerging vectors of affective traces through which the becoming of time/space remains and projects. The trajectories then became intriguing intricacies to feel the rest—*Lo que resta, el resto, los restos*, in Spanish—the remains, what remains of the disappeared. But what remains? That is something we will never know and so is through the detailed embroidery of our doings that we could-can feel the change that happens/ed to our bodies when we open/ed up to the unknown.<sup>16</sup> Each time a performer was moved by orientations of affects in the unfolding-making of their trajectories, the others engaged in response and moved in relation to the remains, what was left, the residue of their actions. We called that “picking up the crumbs,” the imperceptible rests that could act upon the change of the others’ bodies vanishing trajectories.

### Recording Devices: The Body and the Image

During the whole process of making the performance *What We Not Know about an Empty Chair*, technological devices of different kinds were brought to the rehearsal space to provoke unexpected encounters and relations with the bodies of the performers. Cameras to record video and take photographs and sound recording devices were used from the beginning of the process as a means to play and put in trouble the performers’ forms of engagement. Computer coding, “false holograms”<sup>17</sup> and digital interventions of images were used later on to interfere with and intervene in the material recorded and make available other sources for the performers to engage and become with. The actual presencing of absence happening through/with the performers’ actions and the potentiality of the virtual world emerging in their affective responses was always an open question. In that sense, the technological devices created other forms of looking upon the events occurring in the rehearsal space, adding layers of complexity and forms of response to what was happening with the bodies of the performers and the relations created by their actions. The intervention of technological devices was in itself a means to intervene in the piece from the beginning and create within it assemblages of connections that made present virtual worlds in which bodies could engage with imperceptible, insensible fields. The technologies at hand aimed to shape other sensory connections that could help the engagement of the performers with the uncanny affect of disappearance.

The whole arrangement of technological devices in the rehearsal space—constantly recording and then being revisited in different ways—effectively and affectively amplified the somatic effects of the networks and circuits crossing and trespassing bodies and time/space. In a way, the cameras and screens were, following Shaviri, attending to “the continuity between the physiological and affective responses of” the bodies of the performers “and the appearances and disappearances . . . of the bodies and images on the screen” (Shaviri 1993, 255–56, in Sobchack 2004). While Shaviri refers to the cinematic experience and the relationship between bodies and images, we take Shaviri’s ideas to refer to the way in which the recordings and technological interventions in this performance provided a constant source for expanding and feeling the “somatic complexity” (Hunter 2016, 1ff) occurring across these “circuits of vibration” happening in the middling of the actual bodies and their alteration through the devices. The technological devices constantly activated ways the

performers could respond in attempting to animate this new interrelated dimension occurring between actual and virtual presences.

The director/performer of the piece and the assistant director/performer worked in close collaboration throughout the process using the technological devices in different ways:

– The video recorder and sound recorder devices were used traditionally to create material for documentation of the whole process, including the performances. The ways in which the process was documented were varied, but they strangely bind together not only what happened in the time of the rehearsal but also what happened before or after. There were recordings and images of numerous drawings, diagrams, and the processes of getting to do them. There were registers of multiple events that might or might not have had a relationship with the piece but potentially could have, or that could make something happen (a lot of images of people sitting, footages of people turning corners, children playing, water running, raining, clouds, doors closing or opening, sunsets, trees, etc.). There were recordings of things, objects, that may have generated something (a shattered glass, the dents on the surface of a crashed car, empty spaces, small parts of things, corners, people alone, rare positions, holes, lots of chairs, forks, spoons, mirrors, old things, etc.) or images that sort of register a thought or a concept (colours, gradients of light, dark, close-ups, zoom-ins). There were registers of unidentifiable things and several recordings of the performances. Many sounds were recorded at close range, making it very difficult to identify what sound was or where it came from when amplified.

– The recordings (both video and sound) were used to create scores for the performers to start a work, or to observe attentively what happened during the rehearsal and remember or engage deeper with some specific things that may have worked or could potentially work if more exploration were added. For example, very small and specific things would serve as potential scores: the “redness” of a certain light, the speed of a particular trajectory, the specificity of a way of sitting, the many possible ways of sitting, the proximity or distance between one thing and another, a way of looking, a circular or angled movement, a word or a way of saying it, etc. Also, a part of the recording—a very small one, usually—was watched and emphasized by the director as a starting point for some particular work that, without knowing exactly what it was or might do, could eventually lead to something. For example, the way in which a performer went down to the floor and came back up, or the way a chair was located in the space and the relation that was created by it, or the three steps and the sudden turn of one of the performers. Many of these details were seized right there in the moment of their happening during the rehearsal and taken into very different directions, but many others were caught on video and then transfigured into potential sites to enable experimentation and improvisation.

– The cameras were used to enhance the sense and perception of time/space for the performers. Instead of seeing how different the space was in the screen from the actual space, the focus was put into how one and the other could make possible different sensoriums and nurture forms of sensing across time and space. There were multiple experiments of this type done with cameras and sound recordings. On one of them emerged our whole engagement with *Waiting-Time* described above.

– Images, video footage, and sound recordings were isolated and repeated and showed as simple details. These details were then copied and repeated for the performers in the space and then used as points of departure to move in whatever uncertain ways that could come. Most of the work done using these techniques was not directed toward the creation of any particular thing but rather as a

way to gather affects, sensations, and percepts that could then be realized through the interaction between the bodies on stage and those bodies being made on the screen.

– The recordings were allowed to intervene and interfere and then showed to the performers as something new that could potentially originate something different. A repetition of an isolated second or half-second of sound, a light intervention of a still image, an overexposition, or some sort of effect that most of the time made the original image or sound unrecognizable, or its original source reappeared as a “shadow,” just recognizable in the background, felt rather than recognized. Whatever was lying in the background was inverted to the fore.

– More complex procedures with the use of holograms of diverse types were used to intervene and interfere in the bodies’ connections and ways of engagement with absence and disappearance. During the process of rehearsal, a video artist designed small printed geometrical shapes that were hung on some part(s) of the performers’ bodies. Every time their movements happened to come across the camera’s lens/gaze, the software read the code and translated it into an image of an object projected on the screen. Bidimensional objects become visible on the screen as if they “magically” appear as a result of the performers’ movement. The performers created ways of making the hidden object parts of their bodies appear with their movement. Later on in the process, more sophisticated holograms were used that actually emerged on space. Some of them emerged with sound; every time the performers sang or spoke, the holograms got activated, took form.

All these different forms of relating to the technological devices and ways of working with the material products of their use were aiming to intensify whatever possible felt experience emerged of the potentiality carried by the incorporeal force moved by the affective experience of disappearance. Every technique that evolved with the technological devices was tangentially stretching the porosity of the performers’ bodies into the unknown reconfigurings of the bodies’ actions. Many materials gathered with the recordings and other devices became entry points to the physical, readjusting, disjoining the continuum of chains of actions of the performers. The unseemingly disconnected and fragmented materials rejoined in paradoxical relations coming “together-apart” with the precarious actions of the performers bridging the gaps in their middling. Actions were associated and dissociated, jointed with/in relations and disjointed with the sudden felt affect of a new dissimilar material. For example, with a performer sitting (actually sitting during rehearsal) while a light is passing through a window—recorded by video—what they came to be together-apart was completely unexpected, opening up ways of affecting and being affected. The technological devices incited the encounter with the incorporeal and affective presence of absence and disappearance, with “bodies without image” or bodies presencing (Featherstone 2006).<sup>18</sup>



From the performance *What We Not Know about an Empty Chair*. Directed by Álvaro Hernández. Photo: Diego Aguilar and Álvaro Hernández.

One of the performers waits at the edge of the rectangular space attending to the passage of movement moving, in the lure for nonmovement move, doing “nothing” in waiting, and in so doing, yielding restlessly with the flow of currents and vibrations of unexpected becomings and un-becomings. At the threshold, the felt latency of what exceeds the viewed in the camera’s frame of the empty space and between time doing and the undoing of time of the bodies’ Waiting-Time, it opens up as a gaze into the void the absence of any presence and the doing of the very presencing of absence: the “co-presence of the living” with the unknown sensations of absential configurings, never fully realized and always becoming. And in within not-moving, not yet, the multiplicity of energetic waves weaving across the vibrational intensity that flows across the micro-movements, resisting to rest, voicing the echoes of the disappeared. Waiting for so long that temporalities break open into the fissures of time doing and the undoing of time, into the midst of the untimely time of the undead. Waiting until the felt force of what was/is doing moved us. We kept on mobilizing the ways in which absence, and with it, the openness of bodies to the unknown was made presencing by doing.

The rehearsals were video-recorded to remember what was done and have the possibility to engage again with a certain part or detail. As the performance was constantly changing, on some days radically, one way to remember parts left undone or unfinished or others with no apparent sense or connection was using video cameras and audio recorders. This was important because we did not work adding parts in progression, but generating material that had the purpose of undoing the usual doings and reconnect with materials differently and thus become engage with otherwise forms, sensations and relations. In other words, whenever something emerged, everything could change. The performance evolved by chance and indetermination, and sometimes that meant that everything that had been done was put aside, or left to rest and then be taken back again under other circuits of connections.

The other way of using the video-recorded material was with the aim of creating forms to destabilize the present perception of spacetime and hence open gaps, disorienting remains that could be filled, that is, traversed through emerging turning points of inflection and change. The recordings were observed or heard and then put to work in relation to the unfolding trajectories of the performers, in some way making palpable the crumbs, affective remains emerging across their doings. Sometimes the recordings were played first but many times simultaneously.<sup>19</sup> Emphasis was always put on what could be felt in between, in the middle of a movement(s), objects-things, a fragment of time, a sitting, an action or chain of actions, chairs, the movement of a rope, the knotting of the rope, words, etc.

Once these spots for felt sense were conjured, the work was to “fabulate” with them. Reactivating anew potentials, unknown configurings in the middle of layers of multiple pasts, virtual potentials readdressed in the concrete materiality of the “crumb,” and their force projected in timespace through the mattering of the performer’s doing. Regina Gutiérrez, one of the performers, created a recording with sounds of objects and materials used in some form during rehearsals or outside rehearsal time but that were actually taking part in the process. She then used earphones and let herself be affected in her movement by the audio. In the incorporeal traces of the “crumbs,” performers encountered their ways to make them emerge anew.

The material generated served the purpose of encountering different states, dense chains of memory-time that led to the encounter of changing states. The crumbs created trajectories of affects<sup>20</sup> and percepts that made room for openings to variations felt. At each rehearsal, new encounters emerged in the coming together of the actions of the performers and the unknown sensations intersected along the trajectories of crumbs, so the performance kept changing all the time.

The bodies of the performers were grappling at all times with sustaining the gap, the dislocation, an otherwise coherence/incoherence opened up in putting them-selves in the interstices of an unperceived, unconsciously felt non-presence yet made by their practices intensively active and real, non-presence presencing. In working on the indeterminate middling of absence-presencing/presence-absence, the performers rendered them-selves loose by de-touring, re-turning, turning and shifting, re-orienting and being oriented otherwise, acting upon and in the midst of the unfolding field of relational forces, attuning, at-tending<sup>21</sup> and listening attentively to the felt force of absence unbecomings, and becoming in presencing and back. Becoming oriented, breaking loose in dis-orienting and being re-oriented along the torrent of actions and attentions that emerged when at-tending/tending toward what moved and moved them, engaging with the indeterminate mesh from which unpredictable emergences took form in the passage of changing states. In the “precarious balance” that occurs in the middle of the passage of balance and unbalancing acts, the fragile unstable bodies hold the intensity of their continuous becomings. Absence was never the complete lack of presence, but rather the rendering of the bodies’ capacities to be continuously turning, shifting, moving, re-locating, re-situating their bodies in their continuous failed attempt to be making presence-present and thus creating multiple ways of absence becoming palpable. In carrying the feeling of the continuous movement of changing states, absence opened up as the “false positive” of presence, or its radical negativity, a turning into what is not (-yet?), which is an opening up of the multiple configurings and reconfigurings, the out-now of action becomings, a middling in-between times/spaces, here and there, now and then, here and not-here, presence and absence at once.

### The Holographic: Image and Body

The action of bodies and images in conjunction oriented the process toward making felt sense, following Comolli, “the side of the shadow”: “The part of the body transforms in the stakes and agent of representation: open up the spectator to the possibility of perceiving and maybe understand what does not make itself easily be seen, what escapes to the concrete of representation, what cannot be or does not want to show, what leaves stupefied the machinal eye” (Comolli 2002, 5).<sup>22</sup> Comolli refers here to the possibilities of the hologram and the holographic experience to make perceptible, palpable in some sense, what Comolli calls “the shadow,” what may not be grasped or have been lost by the concrete image-representation.<sup>23</sup> The possibility of grasping the insensible and affective incorporeality of absence is what the image-making and the work of the whole performance attempted, and as far as images were concerned, the work was made, thinking-doing with holograms.<sup>24</sup>



From the performance *What We Not Know about an Empty Chair*. Directed by Álvaro Hernández. Photo: Diego Aguilar and Álvaro Hernández.

The hologram’s concrete materiality, its physical characteristics and qualities, configure a site of potential for image-making otherwise that resists the habits of transparency and hyperreality of mainstream audiovisual media.<sup>25</sup> The making of images through the holographic experience became, just as the whole process, a particular attention toward a multidimensional and multitemporal layering that crowded and made “turbid” the experience of the performance.<sup>26</sup> Unlike transparency, the performance, in connection with the image-making through the holographic, put layer upon layer, superimposing, overlapping connections and relations.

In the process of creation, the special characteristics of holography opened up a rich terrain to think and do otherwise with images in the midst of the becoming and unbecoming of absence mobilized by this performance. This does not mean we believe that the hologram is the only possibility for

such a middling, but it was the medium we engaged with to encounter modes of engaging with what absence and disappearance might/could become during this process.

In a hologram, light behaves in various ways at the same time, when traversing and colliding with the mirrored surface and with the translucent photosensitive surface of it. The light in a hologram reflects, that is, it re(turns) flexes (folding, bending, or braiding). The light, when encountering these objects (mirror, hologram), bends over the surface and changes direction and folds instantly to return the gaze, return the light, and return the image contained in the surface. In a hologram, the light also diffracts, as the hologram can only exist if a diffraction grille is recorded on the film, and the information of the object given by the bounce of the laser light is superimposed and interlaced on the initial net. Therefore, the image is created in that superposition of two pieces of information: one that creates a matrix grid, and another that has differences in distance, depth, and volume coming from the captured object. Thus, the reconstruction of the hologram is given by the braiding of these two diffractions, which is always changing because the position of the observer will change the way that weaving of light is related. This makes it possible to reconstruct the object from multiple points of view, with its depths floating in the air or penetrating the bottom of the surface. And finally, a hologram refracts the light, re(turn) fracts (divide, fracture). When light passes through a translucent surface with different refractive index (due to different atomic structures and densities), light is divided into its spectra. In this way the white light is divided into the wave fronts that allow one to see the colours of the rainbow when it crosses the surface of a prism or the vertices of a glass or mirror, so that depending on the type of hologram, the light can be divided on the surface, to make one or another colour visible depending on the position of the viewer.

Holograms are objects and topological images that divide and inhabit two or more dimensions. The surface belongs to the spectrum of the second dimension, but the image inhabits the third dimension from its ghostly and its physical and optical actualization occurring at the same time, and furthermore for its instalment in the temporal dimension. A hologram can be said to be topological because, in itself, the surface has the virtual power to divide and still contain and fold while preserving the information of the whole of the image in the fragment. A hologram can be fragmented into many parts, separating each part into different spaces, and even then, each part has the entire information of the object inscribed. A hologram needs to be journeyed, rounded, sculpted all around its faces so it can be perceived in its variety of arrangements. But, just as with this performance, it can never be completed, only partially, always exceeding views, since what emerges is continuously changing and becoming different.

The “cuts” a hologram performs do not separate, as in the framing of a camera that wants to perform an exclusion, a clear and transparent splitting of inside and outside. Rather, there is an unframing or deframing, a sort of middling, a vanishing of the boundaries performed in the overlapping and superimposition of temporalities taking presence in the “presencing” (Hunter 2018) of bodies’ doing. Multiple pasts are carried along an event of events, action of actions, sitting of sittings, and, through the continuous shifting, twisting, curving of the bodies, fissures are opened, gaps in which the imperceptible and indeterminate may be pre-felt, felt sensed and become otherwise in a collective. Absence is rather the felt experience of the excess or the excess felt without location, with no definite terms or position; it is the affective fielding of absent presences/presencing.

## Holographic Editing

During the performance, a hologram (or “false hologram”<sup>27</sup> in this case) was modified live through free intervention with video editing software that was at the site, working and reworking of the actions and bodies of the performers in particular ways.

A performer danced occupying the space with her back, being moved in refusal of a forward advance, a sensation of carrying a feeling that occupied everything and could not be localized. It moved through her back side, behind, and every movement was a way of touching it, making palpable that back-feeling. The body loosened the frontality and inverted itself at each moment. Every time, she moved forward the body, prolonged toward the back. Always something there behind, haunted and haunting.

Another performer moved by trying to readjust, re-membered, as in putting the members together of her dead brother. Each movement released a touching that touched her brother’s remains, and it was a remainder of some other movement that she could not predict or knew exactly where in the body was the next touching happening; she attended carefully, and each movement changed where her brother’s absence was felt. Her movement attended to the fleeting and vanishing points, changing from one point to another, from one part of the body to another, imperceptibly and yet fully sensed by the audience. This performer’s daily practice was to notice carefully the marks, sketches, traces left by absent objects that lasted long enough in the same place to make an impression of time. And then, each step of her trajectories during the performance was stepping onto those absent presences. Her journal describes rocks, beds, plant-pots, refrigerator, heavy chairs, liquid substances dried up or half cleaned, books, trees, cars, forest, spots everywhere, holes, not there and surviving presence. The trajectories, as was pointed out, were full of virtual traces across which the performers felt the latency of multiple pasts, passing, and coming together in unexpected and indeterminate forms.

1. The holographic editing worked with the video image from a closed-circuit camera system. That is, the editing of the bodies in the performance was made from a camera that, in real time, received the image of the space, the performers, and the present audience. This enabled the digital transcoding of their image and gave the possibility of live editing, through subtle effects, the movement of the bodies that appeared on the scene. In this way, on the holographic screen, located to one side of the stage, those who participated (both performers and audience) could see a reconstructed or deconstructed image of themselves, depending on the editing dynamics of certain moments of the work. While the actual bodies moved through space, the digitized bodies disappeared from the holographic screen while the fixed objects remained; or otherwise, the digital bodies multiplied, changed the temporality with respect to their real double, or stopped in the space of the screen.

An instant of the performers’ movement was captured by a camera in closed-circuit and immediately projected onto the screen, caught in the moment and suddenly dissolved into small like-particles, sort of remnants, debris, traces of the body already gone, that nevertheless contained its passing, a becoming of its next-state, a passage to another instant of movement captured again by the camera. An instant of time becoming that immediately fled and morphed into something else. An image transiting, becoming other, carrying in its transit what was once and what could come to be. The images of the bodies captured live on the screen recalled the different temporalities of the bodies becoming on their movement across the stage and their middling, the in-between state where bodies

were, still imperceptible, immaterial traces of unpredictable and indeterminate becomings, passing from one image to another across the gap. The same body took form in the next instant captured by the camera but already changed, in another time. The time in between one image and the next, appearing and then reappearing on the screen after and before their own dissolution carried the intensity of disappearance, the affect of undead bodies, constantly there in time-waiting and yet vanished in untimely time. Bodies becoming through the screen and emerging in different time-images that too quickly disappeared. Sometimes, a body got captured by the camera, and then, when emerging in the next image after the in-between dissolving time, it was not anymore. The initial body had left the spot where the camera was able to capture it, and another body had replaced it. A body had dissolved and then emerged another, or with others, bodies were actually one and all at the same time.



From the performance *What We Not Know about an Empty Chair*. Directed by Álvaro Hernández. Photo: Diego Aguilar and Álvaro Hernández.

As the holographic surface-screen was translucent, the images projected onto it morphed, enveloping the space in a sort of spatialization of the image, a taking and making space of the image. The translucent images became colour, degrees of intensity of light texturing the space and the bodies in different ways. When the images traversed the screen and collided with a different surface, especially a worn and old wall that was in front of the projector across the performance space, they doubled. Doubled instances, now images enlarged and in-formed by the encounter with a new material, texturing and altering, reworking the materiality of the space and the form of the image. The first image—the one on the screen—and its secondness separated and connected in ubiquitous and pervasive ways, re-informing one another, rebuilding new sensations of the space and the spacing of time in between these image-events, images altering and changing each other in connection and separation.

2. A different kind of relationship with the holographic occurred when real-time images projected on the screen shared their temporality with prerecorded images of the performers happening during the process. Most of these prerecorded images had in common a state of fragility as they were emphasizing past events when the bodies' adjustment felt awkward, misadjusted, precariously balanced, or in an effort to engage a particular position, speed, or body tone. Recorded bodies hanging upside down during rehearsals and then turned around during the imaging of the performance as if they were originally standing and yet exhibiting on the screen the effortful qualities exceeding their reappearance. Images of bodies climbing chairs, sharing the time-space of one sitting, sitting in different ways, sustaining particular speeds in their action of sitting, remaining in-tension. Past event images then morphed without losing their singular temporal quality with real-time images of the audience and the performers' doing. The present time constantly reactualizing in the passing that bridged past occurrences and future becomings, conforming a temporal collage of time/s superimposed and reworking each other in their relations. The audience included on the screen became another participant captured on the audiovisual montage enabling the unexpected emergence of audiovisual and temporal narratives. The transducer of images, image-maker, improvised concatenating and superimposing images that occurred either in the past or in the actual happening of the performance. The images on the screen created a new organization of the events, a different order running in parallel to what was actually happening on the performance space. Images transformed into events. If one were to stay only with the screen, one would have seen a parallel performance that reorganized and reoriented the action of the one happening live with both intra-acting in a movement of doing and undoing each other.

3. Finally, in the background of the performance, the one body in the work, seemingly immobile, and yet flowing across networks of connections, co-composing images that traced the tendencies and multiple affective trajectories of objects, performers and the audience within the holographic screen / connective surface of projection. The video-performer, constructing the dynamics of the hologram images in "responsiveness" to the affective field of forces composing among performers and audience; in the search for immediate reconfigurations of the actual happenings in the performance space emerging from his engagement with the presencing of the bodies and the absent presences. The video-maker located behind the holographic screen, in the *out-side-in* oriented his imaging improvisation across series of past images reassembled and morphing in times superimposed and new ones taking place and being assembled at the moment, images continuously becoming other, imaging. More than something to see, movement moving of sensations, s-seeing/s-cening atmospheres.

### 3. Absencing

*A body we can't see but we not-know is there somewhere . . . somehow . . . there and then, here and not here . . . something we couldn't catch but almost . . . a thought that will never be back but scrambles and meshes with others . . . a body like . . . hers/ours going in some direction until we don't see it anymore . . . the sight that follows that body until it vanishes . . . the vanishing of the sight spreading in grains of light.<sup>28</sup>*

What emerges is a surface of becoming, continuity of transformations that expresses as it is now-out, in the now becoming of these particular events eventing. The imaging of this performance coming through the surface of the screen-connective and transforming tissue places in relation both bodies' actual and virtual presences. The audience members enmeshed in the permanent folding and enfolding of actions coming together in the relations enabled by the proximate doing with the

performers<sup>29</sup> and in those of the screen surface of projection, without rest, on more than one plane, dephasing in manifolds. And in there-then, there is an expression of the not-known, body-not and bodying.

By the end of the performance of *What We Not Know about an Empty Chair*, a performer coils a fifty-metre rope that touches, pushes and crashes everything together, touch touching and touching touched touching twenty-one chairs and plenty of objects sliding with-through the rope pulling and piling up all around the centre of the space. The audience is moved to a side and pays attention to the slow and violent cutting of rope taking everything together and apart, and “together-apart.” Only four chairs are left undone by the rope’s movement. Four performers take a metronome and sit/sitting still, WAITING. Only the metronomes move, the rope and the performer coiling it. The metronomes seize the tempo, the intervals of time variation. It is a ticking timing the internal of tempo vibration, the constant sound of different tempos. Meanwhile, the rope knots, connecting and intersecting in its passing, and keep going, doing, time feeling, time cutting, felt time.



From the performance *What We Not Know about an Empty Chair*. Directed by Álvaro Hernández. Photo: Diego Aguilar and Álvaro Hernández.

## Notes

1. This piece is written by the stitching and weaving of fragments of conversations, journal notes, and the thinking that emerged throughout the process of creation of the piece *What We Not Know about an Empty Chair*. Because of the collaborative nature of the whole process this essay tries to weave together the thinking process that happen among three collaborators: Álvaro Hernández, Regina Gutiérrez, and Diego Aguilar.
2. From Regina Gutiérrez’s journal.
3. “Otherwise” here is used the sense of “alterity” (Levinas 1974).
4. Manning considers the virtual not as opposed to the real, but as an “always an integral aspect of the actual” (Manning 2012, 224).

5. See Derrida on “nothing” (Derrida 1992, 6).
6. At-tending is a central concept in Hernandez’s research on emerging ecologies of dramaturgying.
7. As articulated by Bergson, Deleuze, Lapoujade, or Grosz.
8. See a reading of the performance of *What We Not Know about an Empty Chair* from a perspective of an affective politics in Hunter (2019).
9. Inspired by Deleuze’s concept of the outside (Deleuze, 1989, 2006).
10. From the text of the performance by Álvaro Hernández.
11. See Elizabeth Grosz on the untimely. 2004, 117), and on becoming undone. 2011).
12. The Spanish *pre-sentir* seems to us to encompass better the uncanny, ghostly, indeterminate felt sense that moves along absence-disappearance. *Presentir* (without the hyphen) is used recurrently in Spanish (or at least in Colombia) to refer to uncanny affects.
13. This whole first section refers only to one rehearsal, which encounters propagate all over the process. The writing in it attempts to “propagate” what emerged in the rehearsal, thus making blurry the time(s)-space and separation of rehearsing and performing, process, and piece of art.
14. From Regina Gutiérrez’s journal.
15. The creation of the process in itself is enacted, practised and formed through what we call the “dramaturgying.” Rather than explain what is, this essay splits open the processes of the process; the practices emerged in the “coming together” of this piece.
16. Bruno Mazzoldi (2019) points out the displacement needed from the present to the doing when thinking of the uncertainty of the present brought forth by these “catastrophic” times. Lynette Hunter’s notion of “presencing” (2016) also refers to the idea of presence as a changing and processual mattering by doing and thus moving toward a fluid and porous sense of body and self. Here, during the process of making this piece, the way to engage disappearance and absence was by slowing down and paying attention to the detail in the doing. The displacement of the present is something that disappearance permanently remains.
17. This term is coined by Diego Aguilar, the video artist collaborator of this process. The term will be explained later in this essay.
18. We are inspired by Featherstone’s (2006) “body without image” notion in which he refers to the body from an affective perspective, as something constantly shifting, moving and feeling, in contrast to a more static, fixed and bounded conception of the body. We use here “body without image” to refer to the incorporeal and affective quality of disappearance as well as to the passage from images captured through the devices to nonpossible images, the affective resonances of the disappearance, but also to the body shifting between what is being seen and what is being felt seeing.
19. This is a “technique” developed by Regina Gutiérrez and Álvaro Hernández working together in rehearsals and their journal writing. There was a time when all the performers wrote letters. There was a time when some of us drew lines in space.
20. Trajectory here does not mean (only) displacement or movement; it also refers to the openings through which, in between which affective tonalities are released, features that redistribute the connections and encounters gathered in the eventuating of an event coming to be. Trajectory is used in similar ways to Deleuze & Guattari (1994, 2004) but also in the way that trajectories are composed by theatre directors or choreographers (see, for example, Pavis 2016).
21. At-tending refers to the orientation or disorientation toward what bodies are moved. At-tending is a tending-toward, movement moved by the tendencies (Massumi 2013) of the event’s taking-form.
22. Translation by the authors. “El lado de la sombra” or “The Side of the Shadow” is the title of Comolli’s book.

23. The situation is different here compared to the first quote of Comolli at the beginning of this text, however approximate. In the first one, Comolli refers to cinema in relation to frames. Here, Comolli is talking about a completely different experience and medium, the hologram, where the idea of frame becomes at its best blurry, and perhaps does not work here anymore. As we'll see, the hologram works in a completely different way from the images recorded and projected at the beginning with a camera.

24. Diego Aguilar, a Colombian video-artist and the video-performer of this piece, has worked for years with holograms. With other collaborators, he has created an art-laboratory to develop art pieces, ideas, and thinking around holograms. They construct and make holograms of diverse types.

25. What here relates to the detailed aspects of holograms comes from the particular thinking of Diego Aguilar.

26. When Álvaro Hernández, the director of this piece, and Diego Aguilar, the video performer, got together to work in this process, they realized both were working on ideas around disappearance and absence. Neither of them knew exactly how the other was doing it. When they started rehearsing together, without knowing or aiming toward some definite outcome, parallels between the work with holography and the work happening around the performance opened up spaces of common thinking and doing. Holography can potentially open up a hauntological means for the image-time.

27. In this work, a “false hologram” was the site to perform the image-making during the performance; that is, an audiovisual projection that contained two-dimensional animated images, real-time captures in closed circuit, videos and 3D animation, projected on a translucent micro-engraved surface that received the light from the projector. This film is called “holographic projection film” because of its microscopic treatment, its configuration of material changes having on the surface a “hologram” that supports a significant percentage of light.

28. From the text of the performance by Álvaro Hernández.

29. The audience members were seated-sitting in chairs while performers moved among them, right in the middle of everything doing, and at the same time becoming together with the performers on the movement of the imaging.

## References

- Barba, Eugenio, and Nicola Savarese. 2006. *A Dictionary of Theater Anthropology: The Secret Art of the Performer*. London: Routledge.
- Barad, Karen. 2010. “Quantum Entanglements and Hauntological Relations of Inheritance: Dis/Continuities, Spacetime Enfoldings, and Justice-to-Come.” *Derrida Today* 3 (2): 240–68.
- . 2014. “Diffracting, Diffraction, Cutting Together–Apart.” *Parallax* 20 (3): 168–87.
- Bergson, Henri. 1990. *Matter and Memory*. Translated by N. M. Paul and W. S. Palmer. New York: Zone.
- . 2007. *Creative Evolution*. Translated by A. Mitchell. New York: Dover.
- Bordeleau, Erik, T. Pape, R. Rose-Antoinette, and A. Szimanski. 2017. *Nocturnal Fabulations. Ecology, Vitality and Opacity in the Cinema of Apichatpong Weerasethakul*. London: Open Humanities Press.
- Comolli, Jean. 2002. *Luis. El lado de la sombra*, in *Dictionnaire des Utopies*. Under the direction of Michèle Riot-Sarcey, Larousse.
- Comolli, Jean Louis. 2010. “Frames and Bodies—Notes on Three Films by Pedro Costa: Ossos, No Quarto da Vand, Juventudeem Marcha.” *Afterall: A Journal of Art, Context, and Enquiry* 24 (Summer): 62–70.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1986. *Cinema 1. The Movement-Image*. Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- . 1989. *Cinema 2. The Time-Image*. Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galera. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- . 2006. *Foucault*. Translated by Sean Hand. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. 1994. *What is Philosophy?* Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell. New York: Columbia University Press.
- . 2004. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1992. *Given Time: I. Counterfeit Money*. Translated by Peggy Kamuf. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Featherstone, Mike. 2006. "Body Image/Body without Image." *Theory, Culture & Society* 23 (2/3): 233–36.
- Grosz, Elizabeth. 1999. *Becomings: Explorations in Time, Memory and Futures*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- . 2004. *The Nick of Time: Politics, Evolution, and the Untimely*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- . 2011. *Becoming Undone Darwinian Reflections on Life, Politics, and Art*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Haraway, Donna, and Clarke E. Adele, eds. 2018. *Making Kin Not Population*. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press.
- Hunter, Lynette. 2016. "Ways of Knowing and Ways of Being Known." In *Sentient Performativities of Embodiment: Thinking alongside the Human*, edited by Lynette Hunter, Elizabeth Krimmer, and Peter Lichtenfels, 1–18. Lanham: Lexington University Presses.
- . 2019. "Affective Politics in Álvaro Hernández's Chairs." *Corpografías. Revista de Investigación Creación* 6, no. 6 (Enero-Diciembre): 16–37.
- Lapoujade, David. 2018. *Powers of Time. Versions of Bergson*. Translated by Andrew Goffey. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. 1981. *Otherwise than Being*. Translated by Alfonso Lingis. The Hague: Springer.
- Manning, Erin. 2012. *Always More Than One: Individuation's Dance*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Massumi, Brian. 1995. "The Autonomy of Affect." *Cultural Critique: The Politics of Systems and Environments, Part II* 31 (Autumn): 83–109.
- . 2013. *Semblance and Event. Activist Philosophy and the Occurrent Arts*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Mazzoldi, Bruno. 2019. "Desde ya lo que resta." *Corpografías. Revista de Investigación Creación* 6, no. 6 (Enero-Diciembre): 239–48.
- Parisi, Luciana. 2009. "Technoecologies of sensation." In *Deleuze/Guattari & Ecology*, edited by Bernd Herzogenrath, 182–99. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pavis, Patrice. 2016. *The Routledge Dictionary of Performance and Contemporary Theatre*. New York: Routledge.
- Sobchack, Vivian. 2004. *Carnal thoughts. Embodiment and Moving Image Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Steven, Shaviro. 1993. "The Cinematic Body." In *Carnal thoughts. Embodiment and Moving Image Culture*, edited by Vivian Sobchack, 255–56. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Youngblood, Gene. 2012. *Cine Expandido*. Buenos Aires: UNTREF.