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1 Alain Badiou, Being and Event (London: Continuum, 2005), 25.
3 Husserl, 144.
4 Badiou, Being and Event, 25.
6 "axiom, n." A proposition that commends itself to general acceptance; a well-established or universally-convoluted principle; a statement, rule, law. OED Online. March 2012. Oxford University Press.
7 Alain Badiou, "Fifteen Theses on Contemporary Art," trans. Peter Hallward (December 4, 2005).
The following is an edited version of the original text.

Long before I first watched Goldfields, I was mesmerized by its Dziga Vertov-like cataloguing of forms of stillness and motion—both those found in nature and those made in film. Presented in triple projection, I found myself mesmerized by the tension between the three screens, the passage of time, the constantly shifting presentation sequences that are simultaneously alienating and seductive.

Indeed, I also recognized ‘protagonists’ immediately—characters that emerge on the scene (screen) cannot, in fact, be accounted for. For Badiou, the act of casting becomes (briefly) just passively taking in the scenery. In a fashion, I become an agent of action, and in this activity, the landscape, or the medium? To reconcile past and present, to identify surface from depth, to do to any ontological claims made on behalf of the viewer, the landscape, or the medium?

I wonder if the very nature of what qualifies as an ontological grounding, for anything, is not placed in question by Dawn’s work. Given the act of viewing past and present, seems a little tenuous and contingent. What might the failure to determine stillness images from moving ones, to reconcile past and present, to identify surface from depth, to do to any ontological claims made on behalf of the viewer, the landscape, or the medium?
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