http://epizeuxis.otdac.org/
http://conduplicatio.otdac.org/
http://mesodiplosis.otdac.org/

Opening Times: I feel like web browsers have basically dominated most of our Internet engagement, certainly "surfing" and to me the browser window provides the visual cues of what the web 'looks like'. For a while around the 90s, the reference and visual mode of browsing seemed briefly replaced by imagining the Internet as a giant other realm, accessed through virtual reality (for instance in *Johnny Mnemonic*, *Lawnmower Man* or *Disclosure*). Now the navigation functions pretty transparently - as in, I don't think about it anymore. This work plays with that and brings it to attention. How do you think about the browser window and framing?

Constant Dullaart: The web is one of the most visual experiences of the internet, many other protocols, and networked apps on our phones are using protocols that dont have the 'browsing the network' aspect too it. Like flipping through channels, clicking from link to link, starting an information journey, and experiencing the browse as a narrative. This was the magic surfing clubs were trying to harness i think, it was great to share browsed experiences and even induce them on NastyNets or Del.icio.us. A cool translation of the idea of channel flipping, and the absurdity of the mixed infrastructures through which we encounter information is http://ipbrowser.digitalmethods.net/about.html by Govcom btw, where you can flip through ip addresses (insert IPv6 pun here). Anyway, the celebration of browsing as a poetic gesture, a gesture that can be manipulated, like a live collage is what I am still interested in. Reframing the way information is framed. Using available formal constraints to create a poetic re-interpretation of a current manifestation of the web. Like Picasso and Braque using newspaper fragments in their collages, referencing external meaning as a juxtaposition of signifiers.

OT: Yeah, it was like an information journey and it felt like the internet surfing clubs captured and sort of distilled this nostalgia for this earlier 90s

and early 2000s type of browsing. I remember you'd find a site and when you're done with it you go to their links page (everyone had a links page) or my favourite inclusion was when sites with "webrings". You felt more like a flaneur in this format, you could move through pages and information organically and get lost. The only thing I can think of now that comes close to that is Wikipedia. Otherwise all browsing seems so purposeful - you need to know exactly what you want to find, then that specific thing will come back to you in a search.

Along with this shift was maybe a move from more niche responses to the internet, its aesthetics, its form, to a much broader, cultural affect of internet of its engagement. I mean its so embedded in society and everyday life there's no longer a "digital" qualifier needed anymore, it's just reality. Has your practice or thinking changed with this shift? From of more novelty specificity to broader mainstream interaction? Do you think such a shift even took place?

CD: It was specifically mid 2000's browsing,
the amount of people connected to the internet reached a billion, and search machines made life easier, and especially publishing was made easier.
True we are engaging information purposefully again, the mesmerising glare of oceans filled with random facts and images is something we got used to perhaps. And we are stuck in dedicated filter bubbles, stuck on our balcony with a curated sight into the wild. In the end we are back in the culturally local hermetic environment we were in before global networked media. This has been crucial in my practise. the Death of the URL, my balconism manifest, TOS. Perhaps the cultural effect has increased by idealism and access decreased. Individualism in times of hyper capitalism ism. More people are connected, but it seems the potential they can engage with is siphoned in oder to increase access. Some things dont get more interesting if you make it that everyone can understand.

OT: Yes it seems people's potential to engage is now regulated by these gateway services like Instagram, Twitter, Facebook and YouTube. Sort of pre-defined structures rather than an earlier 'wildness'. This work seems to interrupt how people's engagement is regulated. How do you see *Conduplicatio* working with this formal intervention?

CD: The first job of a middleman is to make you forget there is a middleman.
The regulation of engagement, or even throttling of access, or injecting unrequested data is how information can be commodified.

This can be done in several ways and for several reasons. Which is what I tried to work with in this commission.

By applying a visual response to these methods, throttling access in a visual way, repeating the portal to information in a specific formation over the portal itself. This is why I named the works according to rhetorical devices engaging with repetition.

"We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed..." (Second Epistle to the Corinthians).

OT: I like your idea of poetic gesture through web-browsing earlier. These pieces work something like concrete poetry but in browser form. What are your thoughts on working visually with the structure of the web?

CD: The way we look at representation of information is what I am interested in, and how this is changing, True this is a formal approach, but I do believe the medium is the message, in the sense that the dynamic frame influences the content. And perhaps certain updates / content are arbitrary and anecdotal. How do we escape teh (please leave these spelling mistakes http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Solecism) limited relevance of Apple's instructions how to take good looking photo's with their iPhone 6 camera? Nevertheless, by commenting on and in the frame, creating a collaged version of the content within the work deals with this content, the external reference that is this content is included in the work. Not altering a part of the landscape, but your view on the landscape.

OT: In five words or less - what's your general attitude to internet browsing in 2015?

CD: In it for the lulz.