- I think maybe we should start with the fim we just have seen,”How to make a Utah teapot”. The Utah teapot is a reference object for 3d modelling, can you maybe speak a little bit about the object, and why you found it interesting to be dealt with in your art.

The Utah Teapot is a 3D-model made in the mid 1970s for 3D modelling software. The purpose of the model was to test different functionality in the software such as how shadows are cast and light reflects from the environment in a 3D scene. Due to the shape of this teapot it was practical to use for such operations and it was also accessible as a free dataset, something which saved people time doing their 3D work.These are some of the reasons why this teapot has become an industry standard in computer graphics and achieved somewhat of a cybercultural icon status. I discovered the teapot when I was trying to learn more advanced 3D modelling, and discovered that it was part of the standard shapes library in the software, next to strict geometric shapes like spheres, cubes and cylinders. To me this odd and seemingly out of place shape pointed to the fact that one doesn´t operate in a “ Digital Plato´s Cave” when working with 3D modelling, these softwares which today has a huge impact on visual culture have a specific history behind them which is influencing what is being made. I also find the contrast between this ancient craft of pottery making and this relatively new craft of 3D modelling very attractive and potent today on the verge of a new era for object making with the first 3D printers becoming accessible on the consumer market.

- Who is the woman in the film, It seems like she has been doing Utah Teapots during her whole life, which is actually not the case right?

The woman in the film is Anne-Lise Karlsen, my studio neighbour. She has over 30 years of experience in making pottery and she has for many years been the leader of the western norway crafts organization. I showed her a picture of the Utah teapot and asked her if I could film her while making one, and as you can see it was an easy job for her. I actually had to re-film some shots, and I could mix the new footage with the existing sound recording because she does things in exactly the same rhythm each time she makes the teapot. If you look closely there are some differences in the 3D model shape and the ceramic one, so she has made her own version of it.

- The mix between different relationships to making, as well as form and function, sometimes a relationship based on digital tools, and some times on analogue ones, seems to be a recurrent phenomena in your art, can you elaborate on that a little bit? maybe also giving us some background to the work you show in this exhibition, occupational knots.

To me making and learning is connected, so when I pick up a new tool that means I have to learn a new thing. And then this brings me new questions and puts me on a lead that sometimes can end up in a work, which for instance is the case with the film we just saw. So I suppose that exposing myself to new tools and new ways of making is maybe a creative strategy, although I haven´t thought about it like that before. When I started working with the sculpture series Occupational Knots I first needed to tie a knot for a practical purpose. Somebody suggested to me I should take a look at the Ashley Book of Knots, an encyclopedia comprising almost 4000 knots, made in the 1940s by Clifford Ashley. In this book there is one chapter called Occupational Knots, where Ashley goes through a to me seemingly random or subjective selection of occupations and suggests different knots that might come in handy for them, presenting them with elaborate illustrations and anecdotes. I picked a handful of these illustrations and used them as starting points for making work. For instance the blue structure

with the yellow rock is Ashley´s suggestion for the artist who needs to tie down the easel when sketching in the wind.

- Considering craft techniques and practical knowledge: it's almost unavoidable to discuss the body and its connection to the rest of the world through different forms om machines, tools etc. I know you have been occupied with old standards of measurement, not used anymore, maybe you can tell us a little bit about this, in what context you are doing this and why you think it is an interesting field of research.

I am interested in systems and what they are based on because they provide us with a filter that we see the world through. This is the case with 3D modelling software which I touched upon in regards to the teapot, but even more fundamental is perhaps how we measure or quantify the world using the metric system. Since the enlightenment we have learnt that our senses are fallible and subjective and we have gradually moved away from the idea of the body as a source of knowledge. A meter is today defined as the distance the light travels in 1/300.000 part of a second. This is ofcourse not something we can perceive and it is in that sense an abstract concept. As we all relate to the world in a more physical way than this I was curious to find out about other ways of measuring and quantifying space more related to our experience of it. I started doing research on body-based systems for measurements such as a stones throw, a days walk, a halt, an arrow shot, a rowers shift all of which were in use in Norway before the introduction of the metric system. I decided to try the measurements out and then I naturally gained some insights about them which I didn´t have before. Many people use physical activities today as a way of “clearing their head”, allthough I think this just means that they allow access to another part of their head. It is funny how similar some of these activities are to traditional manual labor. For instance you can go to crossfit and spend 15 minutes hitting a big tyre with a sledge and go home again without having made anything. What type effects physical activity, sensory input and culture has on our thinking is being done a lot of research on in Neuroscience at the moment, for instance at Karolinska Institutet where I was following the course “The cultural brain”. Some would say that making use of the body as a source of knowledge is nostalgic or adhering to some trendy mind-body-fitness ideology, but I think it is more about acknowledging how we function as human beings and make use of this when we decide how to do and make things and live our lives.

- We have previously been discussing this knowledge gained from manual, analog craft, and analog relationships between the world and the body. An a recurrent reference for both of us is, it seems, Richard Sennet and his theories on craftsmanship and practical knowledge. Just to briefly introduce Sennet to the audience: Sennet is a sociologist based at the London School of Economics. He has been writing extensively on social relationships, rituals and how these comprehend a historical relativity, due to historical changes in man’s relationship to craft. To me it seems that Sennes is often coming back to a notion of a well functioning society based on a respect for our cognitiv need to develop skills. In The craftsman, one of Sennett's most popular books, he takes the example of the medieval guild, as well as the operating system Linux, in these two systems of making Sennets recognizes a pending between reflection, critical distance and acceptance for non rational creativity: a sort of role model for a good way to produce thoughts as well as things, and also a model creating social sustainability and a healthy environment, generally speaking. So, what do you think of this approach of Sennett, has it been of any influence to you in your practice.

I think that´s a very good way of condensing or summarising Sennett´s view on craft and the value and potential it has. As with many other artists I think, when I read Sennett for the first time I had the experience that somebody

could finally put clearly in words some of the thoughts I had around my practice. It was a big help to reflect around my own making process and how the way in which I make things influence what is being made and to put this into a larger social context.

- There is of course ways to criticize Sennet, as well as the current passion for craft in fairly rich parts of the world, and the world's cities: is there really an emancipatory potential in craft? And if there is, for whom and why one can ask. And this is actually another way to address the issue of craft, through it's possible exclusions. What do you think about this, also in relation to your research on different craft techniques? I am thinking for example about recognition of different actions, considered or not considered craft: making high quality beer can be a craft, cleaning can not, begging on the street neither. My suspicion is that what is actually giving an activity the value as craft today is monetary value: do you agree?

This is quite a difficult question, but I will do my best to respond. I suppose you can think of emancipation in relation to craft in two different context, one is the broad sense of many different types of labor which Sennet talks about, and then there is the making of consumer products. To touch upon the latter one first I think that with the way technology is developing with easy access to digital tools and 3Dprinters entering the consumer market it could point in the direction of a desentralized structure for production of consumer goods and a higher level individual decision making over ones own material reality. Then you can of course ask for who will this be available and I am not sure if I feel equipped to make such a prediction, but if one should be optimistic we can look at how internet is available to a large part of the worlds population even if some thought that it would only be available to people of higher socioeconomic brackets.

When it comes to being a creator of you own job that is a complicated question, and I think if you work in a strict fordist model where you are only performing a small fragment in a larger operation then maybe there isn´t any space for a critical reflection or non-rational creativity, something which is probably the case for many beggers or cleaners. I think Sennett uses the japanese car factories as examples of good and healthy work environments because the workers could give input on how the production line could be improved, and claims that this is one of the reasons why they were more successful than for instance american car factories. I don´t think I am as pessimistic as you when it comes to who can access the values of craft, I think that this is something which is very basic and human and the fact that some types of craft has a monetary value connected to it doesn´t obscure these values in other crafts.

- Let's get back to your art: I am curious about some things I really appreciate in you practice: it seems that you often reuse, maybe even exaggerating, pedagogical models of teaching craft: everything from youtube tutorials, to written manuals, and also focusing on the "example" of how something is made. This last notion of the "example", is as I understand it, what makes up a great deal of the aesthetic quality in Occupational knots, and which also gives the work something like a touch of humor, or maybe joy (maybe the same feeling you have when you watch a youtube movie and actually learn to do something): what do you think of these interpretations of mine, do you agree? Any reflections?

-I think that is a great way of interpreting my work, you got it :) In the sculpture series Occupational Knots I work with two contrasting forms of knowledge about knots. One the "Ashley Book of Knots" which I told you about before. Ashley made his own elaborate pedagogical system to categorise and communicate this knowledge. It is

clearly an honest presentation of his subjective knowledge about knots. Then there is the mathematical knot theory, which was created in the late 18 century was an attempt to make an objective and universal theory on what everything in the world was made of. The hypotheses was that everything was made out of one type of string that was tied into different kinds of knots which would correspond to different elements, like a table of elements only with atoms replaced by knots. The titles of the sculptures are found in a mathematical knot theory book and to me they exemplify how this theory expects us to remove ourselves completely from our physical understanding of the world. For instance the book says “we imagine the string as having no thickness”. But these two approaches to knots don´t only contrast but also overlap in some surprising and fascinating cases, which is part of what I have extracted for the fanzine accompanying the project. It´s nice to hear that you see the humor and joy in the work. I do have a lot of fun when I make work, much because I leave many things open to be decided along the way, I let the world interfere with my ideas and in this way there is an element of play and not just fighting practical problems.

- There is a wonderful text by Roland Barthes on the “Déraison” of the objects in Diderot’s encyclopedia, made to comprehend all the world's knowledge, also the practical knowledge, in a huge book work. Barthes mentions the uncanny-ness in the illustrations in the books: this since they are supposed to be without metaphors, they are made to be clear examples of something: pure information so to speak. But of course these images fail to do this: they escape and produces unwanted knowledge. What do you think of this notion of visual material, be it illustrations as well as sculptures or installations: do you make use of metaphors in your art, or do you see what you do as pure extracts of the reality around us? And in any case, what happens when reflections on “materials for use” move into the exhibition space?

I think it is quite funny and a bit impressive that you ask this question, it seems like you know my work and even the way that I think well. I don´t think so much in metaphors and can often be quite slow in getting them, so I usually never start out making a piece with the intention of creating a symbolic narrative. But I also don´t believe in this possibility of pure extracts of the reality around us, in the same way as I don´t believe in the neutrality of 3D modelling software or the metric system. I accept and appreciate that the viewer of my work creates the work together with me and also that the exhibition space is part of this construction.

- Just to finish, what are you working on right now? And how are you planning to develop your practice in the future?

At the moment I am working on a solo show for the Hordaland Kunstsenter which will open in one month, where I amonst other things am making a series of new sculptures based on building blocks of a 3D modelling software. I don´t really make plans for how my practice should develop other than these approaches and strategies for making work that we have discussed so far.