This might have something to do with uncertainty. And how we might even imagine undoing the fixity of images, their relationship with the past and potential effect on the present. As an auto-corrective device, the digital image paints a coded mirror of representation with an increasing propensity for deletion, enhancement, appropriation and idolisation. Despite this, the basic function of the image remains the same as it has since the first daguerreotype and before that, the first visible impression of a body inscribed onto a surface outside of itself. The image, whether reflected or recorded, shows us something we are unable to see; it shows us what we look like. Images resemble ourselves to ourselves in order that we might see our own appearances, external to the perception of our bodies that is limited to an eyes-downcast view and the feel of our own touch.

The unimageable has become equated with the unimaginable. From images we have learned how to be in and for images. As with the telescreen, the liquid crystal displays of our modern devices simultaneously transmit and receive. They can show us what we are looking for, what we should be seeing and even what we look like when we are looking. In this sense, we are as one with our own machines, together limited to the capacity of our inbuilt potential. We can seek out almost anything, but firstly we need to know what we hope to find. Search engines offer suggestions based on prior inquiries both personal and universal. Visually apparent, or translated into a codified trace of presence in electronic cards or cookies or calendars, our image is crucial to development. It shows us how we both act and appear, and therefore, how our movements might proceed on the basis of this perception.

We have come to know our self-images to the point that misrecognition can occur and even when we know that what we are faced with is clearly a manifestation of our own representation, it can still invoke the response: ‘That doesn’t look like me.’ Or rather, ‘I do not recognise myself in that image.’ This slippage in identification transpires not so much due to photographic distortion or the static capture of an odd fleeting expression – for these anomalies are now instinctually understood. Rather, what takes place in this moment of uncertainty is that we know we are seeing ourselves, but at the same time and for some reason we appear ‘different’ and our image looks back at us as a stranger. Encounters with such images are infrequent and they can be uncomfortable, but they serve to remind us of the gap between our ‘real’ and reflected selves. And just for a moment, in that void that separates the image from the self, they open up a space of wonder.

This vibration between semblance and nothingness is also a space of potential. It is the playing ground of rAndom International, whose work combines complex mathematical algorithms with meticulous handmade craftsmanship to create structures that affect both perception and behaviour. Pushing the limits not only of playback surfaces, but also their ability to reflect and communicate with immediate presence, rAI challenge the defining edges of what constitutes a self-image. By encouraging the viewer to move in ways beyond the imitation and repetition of familiar actions and simultaneously reducing resemblance to its most basic perceptible formation, our bodies appear to us as both present and ethereal phantasms. We move as an interface in dialogue with the sculpture, forming the next change, shaping each etching of presence and absence, marking out an
impression of our figure in light, space or sound. Yet what takes place during this encounter does not belong purely in the realm of the visible. The body reflected in the work may bare no physical resemblance to our own figure. This is a closeup form of vision, close enough to touch. Our relationship to these objects offers a new conception of our selves, beyond the flesh, a reflection without a body. The trace of a movement is our only shadow, barely discernible, yet infinitely recognisable.

The relationship between vision and knowledge has longstanding foundations and the optic has been legitimised, certified and ratified by art history. Within this ocularcentric tradition – that privileges sight over the other senses – the clearer the vision, the clearer the translation of vision into language: from the seeable to the sayable. To see things more clearly, to gain a better perspective over a situation, to give it a good hard look, to eyeball something: all of these sayings about seeing are bound up in forms of knowledge and critique. Haptic images obscure this connection by reducing the level of visible referents so that other senses are called upon to assist in the process of perception. This kind of visuality is not in opposition to optics, it is not a case of the hand versus the eye, or of feeling as opposed to seeing. Haptic perception implies an intimate form of seeing that involves not just the eyes of the viewer, but also their bodies. Traditional injunctions of ‘do not touch’ reinforce the inviolate space around art objects. The transgression or violation of the thing that says don’t touch me is that which says it wants to be handled.

rAndom International build objects and spaces that come to life in the presence of life, stimulating more than the eye, but a relationship with the entire bodily surface. At once perceiving and perceptible, as we play on these instruments of sense, time, and motion, the score of our interaction is momentarily inscribed and then forgotten. In order to witness the possible spectacle on show, we learn how these minimalist perceptual machines translate and are translated by our bodies in motion. We act like we want to be seen, not as we are, but as we can be in another dimension. The choreography is determined by the reaction between the body and the apparatus so that each become mutually parasitic interfaces that generate new movement through a double-act that continually crosses thresholds of proximity and response. Hovering in a space both before and after the image in an abstraction of impulse and memory, we act differently. The space between our selves and the world is brought to the surface, in three dimensions. And then it disappears.

Unlike images, these apparitions do not return. The lights dim, the canvas fades to white, the audio swarm lays dormant, latent, ready to momentarily return to life with the next incoming perception. What remains is not the visible trace of what has been, but a physical memory of what has occurred. These apparatus do not enhance human functions in the way that a camera can extend the eye or an electronic device might simulate memory. They are not prosthetics, but portals. What opens up before us is a way of approaching movement as a generative force, and of transgressing the ocular world of images. The haptic experience offers a kind of consumption that is not visual, but that absorbs into the body through its surface. The self appears as a projection that emanates from the skin and onto the world. In the dance with these transmutated self/others, the dynamic relationship between body and machine develops new forms of movement and interaction. We move differently for another body, and in pushing its capacity, we simultaneously expand our own.
What could these studies in motion teach us about our future selves? The intimacy and ephemerality of the encounter with these delicate machines expands our conception of how a portrait of the self might appear and that it is always in flux and inseparable from the animate body. What is brought to life here is the realisation that there is no self that can be contained within an image, that this mask is a shield that can only show us how we look at what we look like – and what we might like to see. The self is always somewhere else, before and after the image, interior and exterior to the body. rAndom International invite us to sense our own behaviour. What becomes apparent is the affective properties of movement on future sensations and perceptions not only of our own selves, but of the bodies and matter that share our proximity. Within and beyond this porous interface, *Studies in Motion* may also serve to advance an imperative for empathy, and at the present moment that surely is another subject worthy of our attention.