Dear Ane Mette,

As we have agreed to work on a correspondence between the two of us, I would like to take this opportunity to start to discuss some points of fragmentation expressed in your work. Does that sound all right to you?

First of all, it seems that in your work you are being responsive to existing structures and processes, which are then transposed and repositioned according to the logic of mathematical configurations—often leading to a sense of repetition and rhythm. For instance, in your sound work *The Concept of Clouds (That Will Never Exist)* you present a digital drawing of rain, generated through the digital multiplication of a single recorded raindrop. I would argue that this already connotes the first differentiation from the document, or its actuality, and its appropriation into the realm of fiction. A second removal, or further abstraction takes place in the coinciding work *Untitled (Measurement Drawing)*: a drawn tape measure that comments on the structure of the sound work. For your current exhibition at Motive Gallery, the tape measure has been evoked—as a recurring motive—but has taken the shape of a 16 mm film.

My first question would concern the idea of derivation and recurrence in your work: are we still talking about the rain, or has the work’s potential activation and perception rather taken a different turn?

All the best,
Niekolaas

---

Dear Niekolaas,

Fragmentation is of course interesting. I will try to explain a little bit more about my work. The work *Untitled (Measurement Drawing)* doesn’t necessarily comment on the structure of the sound piece, as you have mentioned, although it does question certain systems. The system that multiplies the raindrops minute by minute is a mathematical numerical sequence—foregrounding a more abstract way of thinking—and then the droplets are positioned randomly through a five channel audio work. I just returned to my studio where I am drawing millimetres and centimetres all day long: the very opposite of the arbitrary raindrops. The structure is a strict and meticulous repetition, yet it is abstract at the same time. At the start of my projects, I set out with a set of rules or a system, and through the process this intentionally becomes random and intuitive. For example, the tape measure shows all the differences in millimetres, both manually and through the production of copies.

Ane Mette

---

Dear Ane Mette,

Regarding your previous entry, I was reminded of a scene from the film *La Notte* (1961) by Michelangelo Antonioni. During a certain pool party of Italian socialites, the protagonist, a writer, has a conversation with a friend who questions the act of writing by asking: “Isn’t writing an irrepressible but antiquated instinct? A lonely craftsman putting one word after another.”, upon which the protagonist quips, “The job can’t be mechanised.” A reversed approach seems to be present in your work: the idea of bringing narration back into the frame by manually delineating that which was previously and repetitively mechanised and standardised. Would this manual act be a means to deviate from common thinking through the expression of a certain porosity of borders, to question, in a way, those principally artificial measures we normally take for granted?

With all my best,
Niekolaas

---

Dear Niekolaas,

Writing can be very interesting when it’s mechanical. I often compare drawing with writing, and I guess writing is more comparable to the mechanisms of drawing than any other kind of creative work. Kenneth Goldsmith works with “uncreative writing” and conceptual poetry, which has had a certain influence on my work. Sometimes I borrow the label “uncreative writing” and place it in relation to...
my work as “uncreative drawing”. I remember the impact of his work *Day* when it was published in 2002; it was very poetical, while he was basically retyping the New York Times. It becomes something else then, not mechanical – definitely showing the porosity of borders. You clearly see the narrator, and to consider narration in reverse is interesting. It makes me think about one of my drawings called *Untitled (Reversed Drawing)*, consisting of meters of paper coloured with dry pastels, rolled together with a label that indicates the origin and the length of the work. The work is indeed connected with *Untitled (Measurement Drawing)*, and the tactile length of the 16mm film.

All the best,
Ane Mette

**MADRID, 04/04/2013**

Dear Ane Mette,

Regarding the tactile characteristic of 16mm film, I was wondering about your motives for utilising this medium in conjunction with the presented imagery. In a recent conversation with Hito Steyerl, she stated that “Next time I see another 16mm film projector rattling away in a gallery I will personally kidnap it and take the poor thing to a pensioners’ home. There is usually no intrinsic reason whatsoever for the use of 16mm film nowadays except for making moving images look pretentious, expensive and vaguely modernist...” However bold this statement might be, I was wondering how you relate to this medium in light of today’s dissemination and circulation of images?

With all my best,
Niekolaas

---

**OSLO, 08/04/2013**

Dear Niekolaas,

Yes, it’s a bold statement, just like when Kenneth Goldsmith said “If it doesn’t exist on the internet, it doesn’t exist.” What is especially true is that everything needs to be digitised for it to exist in the future. It is also true that today’s circulation of images on the internet is like an ecosystem, it reproduces both old and new media. That the internet can capture everything is perhaps the most interesting thing about it. When Steyerl claims that artists must express themselves through contemporary means of production, it is of course a possibility, but I disagree that they should be the only means of production. I understand why artists want specific media and specialised equipment in their installations, old or new, expensive or not. This is important because different kinds of equipment and media alter the nature of the work.

My motive for using a 16mm projector in the gallery is that it allows me to show the physicality of film. The 16mm projector will run on half speed and shows a tape measure that moves with the same speed as the looped film. It doesn’t show an animation or image of this movement, but what it shows is rather a visualisation of the length of it: it shows the actual drawing. The film is transferred from a drawing made on transparent leader. This process is similar to my previous drawings and animations. I think that my work, generally speaking, is a visualisation of time and production through the use of different methods.

All the best,
Ane Mette