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Artists Phil Jones¹ and Aharon Amir² created the Narcissus Search Engine for N.E.W.S. in 2009.³ Narcissus searches a body of documents for matching keywords and shows them to the user in the normal manner. However it records when users click-through to see the results and will penalize results that appear too popular. Initially Narcissus will push a popular result down its ranking but, if the result continues to be clicked, will obscure it altogether for a time. Hidden results will eventually return to visibility if they are matched by enough searches while hidden.⁴

We think of Narcissus as a ‘Search Art’ practice. Narcissus will discover the ‘shadow’ data which would otherwise be ignored in favor of the popular. The way Narcissus operates – the Narcissus Opera in a sense – is a mediation focusing on the use of the positive feedback that leads to filter bubbles in so many contemporary internet services. It invites you to reflect, evolve, and question rather than seek entertainment or the security of the known and expected.

Narcissus is Phil and Aharon’s first attempt at using search as a language, an aesthetic that is in and of itself a technology of the imagination, to be with and be skeptical of. Since Narcissus, Aharon has been developing an artistic practice of search in a number of different works that involve him searching both online and in physical spaces and engaging or recruiting others to join him.

The following dialogues are distilled from a conversation between Aharon and Phil discussing these works and the poetics or language of search itself. We hope the reader will get a sense that we are not giving an answer but are engaging in our own search

---

2. See, http://aharonic.net/blog/tag/search-art/, http://aharonic.net/blog/tag/search/. I’d like to apologize for the unintended authoritative tone I seem to have in the texts.
4. The algorithm uses Complex Numbers for ranking. And penalization can push a result into the ‘imaginary’ zone where it will not appear at all.
for these questions, in which the reader is welcome to participate.\textsuperscript{5} The full, unabridged transcriptions of the dialogues are available and searchable via Narcissus itself,\textsuperscript{6} and the original recordings are also available.\textsuperscript{7}

\textbf{About Narcissus}

Aharon Amir: I think Narcissus asks you to search within yourself how to imagine a search filter, by being confronted with a visibly changing result to the same query. This draws attention to the filter, and because it shows something you might have not seen previously, Narcissus has the capacity to make you imagine the results differently.

Phil Jones: Narcissus is about imposing a certain filter bubble.

AA: It’s very up-front about it.

PJ: But it’s not self-evident, if we didn’t tell you. Or do we, via Narcissus, draw attention to the fact it’s hiding things from the users? This seems like the classic problem in literature, how to make a boring character interesting to the reader. How do you make a strategy of subterfuge in an artwork into something that is visible?

AA: I think what you do, and this is one of the maybe traditional elements in Narcissus, is that it kind of gives you clues. To remain with your literature analogy, there are different clues given to you in a story that say what the writer is trying to convey. Narcissus speaks in the language of a search filter. You search and click the result, then next time it’s not there or is in a different position. That’s a language of search you learn to read.

PJ: OK. I suppose if you repeatedly search the same things, use search as a kind of backup of your own memory, then it would be more obvious. You’d keep ‘forgetting’ things.

AA: Remember when we talked about the Guinea in the pub? The coin. There was a question that the Guinea was called Guinea because gold came from Guinea in Africa.

PJ: People started Googling on their mobiles.

AA: Well, the sequence was: people first tried to mine their memories. Then they tried to search. And I was saying this is a typical difference between our generation and [my daughter’s] because the younger generation goes: ‘why do I need to mine my head?’

PJ: They’d dive into search faster, whereas we waited for our memory to fail.

AA: So we now remember differently. Sometimes all you recall is how to search for the thing. I’m looking for a film. No need to remember the name. All I need is to search something with vampires in 1964 in Rome.

PJ: I’ve got ‘Last Man on Earth’.

AA: Yes, that’s the film. You don’t need to remember. Sometimes it’s a question of remembering a term and where you searched for it. Whereas let’s take something classic. Finding your key is an exact thing. There’s just you and the key. You need to remember exactly where you put that key. With a phone it’s different because it’s connected; you don’t need to remember where the phone is, you just need to find someone with the number of that phone, and they can call it.

PJ: Externalized memory. Interestingly, Google Mine wants to catalog all your stuff (including your keys?). But to return to my earlier point, sometimes we aren’t searching for the same thing as part of externalized memory but doing a one-off.

AA: Sometimes. However with Narcissus, the result would be the outcome of other people’s searches, and maybe you wouldn’t get the meaning of it. Just like you might read a book and miss out on certain things. In fact people read interesting stories several times because each time you discover different elements. Or pieces of music: if you get the idea of a piece of music the first time, that’s pop music. You listen it to a few times, and then you don’t listen again because it’s not very interesting. Narcissus plays with the filter itself. It’s being tongue-in-cheek without this pseudo-democratic ‘you can have your choice’.

PJ: ‘Pseudo-democratic’?

AA: When stuff tries to pretend that it doesn’t have a filter, it gives you pseudo-choice. But Narcissus doesn’t do that. It imagines a new kind of filter; this imagination helps you search the filter inside you. It questions the filter.

PJ: I agree it questions the filter. But it doesn’t give you the option of eliminating the filter.

AA: It doesn’t give you the false sense of eliminating the filter by making your own filter that isn’t a filter but is actually a filter. It doesn’t do that. Narcissus doesn’t do this pseudo-shit.

Filter Bubbles
AA: I think ‘Search Art’, and Narcissus for a start, is interesting in that it’s the beginning of a different way of imagining. By ‘Search Art’ we’re saying, ‘let’s put it on steroids’. Let’s do, ‘how do we imagine stuff as a search?’ We are learning to value the links, pointers, networks. We don’t need to value the singular object, just like we don’t need to value the imagination of the singular genius. We can imagine how we link with the world and produce meanings, in a more interdependent and co-operative way.

PJ: But doesn’t relying on external search make us vulnerable? People doing the search for us can be manipulating; they start controlling what we see. We’re address-

---

ing half of that problem in Narcissus – the innocent side effect of positive feedback loops that reward popularity. We’re not addressing the more pernicious problems of, say, search engines that choose to censor the results as opposed to things that seem like a good idea but have unfortunate results.

AA: Could you elaborate?

PJ: The idea of positive feedback loops, let’s say the PageRank algorithm or highlighting popular search results, was done for a ‘good’ reason, which is the idea that some results have a higher quality than others and that popularity was a good way of discovering high quality sources. It led to a different problem, which is that popularity isn’t just quality. Popularity can also express popular prejudice. Popularity can be group-think and restrict creativity. So a search engine that promotes the things that are already popular ends up unfairly highlighting things that don’t deserve it. That’s one sort of problem. And that’s the problem that Narcissus talks to.

There’s an entirely different sort of problem which is that someone might think, for example, that people shouldn’t know about documents on Wikileaks. The U.S. government then tells Google that people shouldn’t be able to find that kind of stuff, and some of it might disappear from the index.

AA: That’s a political question.

PJ: Exactly. That’s not something we have addressed so far. But we could make a search engine and then deliberately censor some results and not show them. That’s a different question. Both are kinds of filter bubbles and both are problematic, although they have a dynamic and character that’s very different. Something that seems to be responsible for even more constraining of your search is the attempt to infer what you ‘really want’.

Siri for example: it tries to infer what you’re saying from your context. For instance: ‘Because I know your position in time and place you are probably in the kitchen, and looking for chocolate cake recipes rather than ready-mades cakes.’ Even Google used to be easier for the user to control. Then it began to give you more of what it wants to, rather than your query. The search is more and more a front. In the name of making it easier, they make more and more assumptions that increasingly narrow possibilities down based on their stereotype of you. That’s a problem.

AA: Is it not a mirror of false dichotomy, made up of freedom and security?

PJ: Computers do something very problematic: they eliminate areas of uncertainty. When spying was done by people we could perhaps have security and freedom. People make judgments. The police ask, ‘is he really causing a problem or is he just a bit noisy?’ So they let you off. But when you have a computer, it doesn’t do that!

AA: I kind of feel that as a sort of paranoia. You are guilty before anything else. Say Captcha: instead of learning that you are not a bot, it is predisposed to thinking you are a bot. So you are guilty before anything is proved. You are a bot unless proven otherwise, not innocent.
PJ: Computers don’t have to do this. The programmers chose the whitelist approach rather than the blacklist. But you cannot program a computer not to choose one option or the other.

AA: Don’t some programmers decide to use one way over another?

PJ: Not all the internet is like that. Say, Facebook, they try a blacklist approach.

AA: With Facebook, they want you to mingle. ‘Guilty unless proven otherwise’ seems to be more prevalent. Would a distributed search engine such as YaCy be less susceptible, I wonder?

PJ: If it’s distributed then the policy would have to be public and agreed on by the participants. But the policy would still need to be mechanical. Look, I agree that this world of software creates this kind of paranoia. However, you’re slightly diagnosing it wrong. What gives you that sense of rigidity is that the software forces you into one thing or the other. Not so much a bias towards guilt but the lack of room for open-endedness. That restrictiveness is also a source of security.

AA: Maybe there is a connection between technology’s restrictiveness and a false sense of security. In terms of Narcissus, I think it’s interesting that we put ‘distributed’ into the initial specifications, precisely to question distribution over networks from the perspectives of search, visibility, and power. Like, we wanted to have different groups being able to search and influence each other’s hidden data. However this element in Narcissus is yet to be implemented, perhaps because the technology is expensive? Why is that? Is it not a question of tradition, habits, and costs? Is centralized technology cheaper because imagining it this way is more prevalent? Do we go with what’s well understood or what’s ‘secure’? I guess this is also where the bit about agreed upon policies come into play in Narcissus’ question of network distribution.

That’s a very interesting question I think, both in terms of the NSA and the fact that people will use technology not just because it makes them feel like they do stuff quicker, but because it makes them feel secure.

**Search and Research**

PJ: So are people scared of search? Is it about a sort of fear? We mustn’t go off the ‘beaten track’ or we’ll get lost and won’t find what we’re looking for.

AA: We don’t know in terms of general people. But I’d say people tend towards research: ‘I want to know who did this or that film.’ Or why we call ‘orange’ an ‘orange’. I think people limit themselves to a range of queries, rather than go on a ‘search’ that is open, where they say: ‘Let’s check out what we might bump into by colliding with elements’.

---

A practical example: one of the search-art activities I did recently, at the ‘Hack the Barbican’ event in London\(^\text{12}\) (HtB) was titled: ‘How to Imagine Swapping Spaces Between Hackers in the Gallery and Residents of the Barbican’. I went to people with ‘search in mind’. I tried to find a person or a few people with whom you might want to imagine how, what, and if this swapping of spaces can be done. And then to get talking and imagining together. I was very surprised that, without exception, people’s reactions were to try to figure out for themselves what would happen. I had to say, ‘look, actually it’s a negotiation’.\(^\text{13}\)

PJ: Sorry, what were you asking?

AA: How they could imagine together with other people or with an artist-resident what would mean the swapping of spaces. What each person did, instead of picking up with ‘would you like to do a negotiation?’ then saying ‘I have a flat, you do music’, they said ‘I would like the end results of this process to be this.’

PJ: But they’re talking to you, right? Not to the other person. How could they ‘negotiate’?

AA: I was using myself as a link between people. So people kept coming to me with, ‘No, I can’t do that because I’m not going to just let anyone into my flat’. And I was like, ‘this isn’t the question, man! Why are you focused on the end rather than the linking process?’

PJ: But isn’t that what they’re accustomed to? Starting from the end-point and thinking backwards. So when you ask them, that’s what they’ll do. Until you ask them to start earlier and think forwards or sideways or something?

AA: Following an exchange with my ISP\(^\text{14}\) (internet service provider), it became visible to me that what I really wanted to say is that searching has a different trajectory of sequences than researching or seeking. A search is from, rather than for, with, of something. I search from a term or idea – not for that term or idea. Indeed, it could be said that Google and the likes, by matching the query terms, are being narcissistic. Looking for similarities, reflections of the term. Is this a difference between language of research and search?

**A Language of Search**

PJ: You talk of ‘giving as a search’. For example, there is a pedagogical technique where you give students an exercise to work out, with the assumption that they will learn more, understand things better, if they work it out for themselves rather than being told facts. Is this the same kind of thing?

AA: It’s a step further. Instead of saying ‘I know that one plus one equals two, while you don’t’, and I let you figure it out so you’ll understand better, I’m saying, ‘Let’s see. Do I


remember how it was before one plus one equals two? Do I recall when I was search-
ing?’ Maybe I was in the jungle, thinking of the desert when this happened. Now the
question is that for you, something else might happen, precisely because it is a search.
No one has a clue how, what, or whether it will happen.

PJ: What if it hadn’t been a search?

AA: If it wasn’t a search, I’d give you more precise elements. Or, I’d think that the result
of walking in the jungle, for example, will always be one plus one equals two.

PJ: Hang on! Are you saying that search is defined by the indeterminacy of the results
you are going to get? Search means ‘I’m doing something and I don’t know what I am
going to get’? Any activity that has no goals can be defined as search? I don’t think
that’s what you want to say.

AA: Yes. I see your point... Well, first I think search is open-ended in the sense that
you don’t know. But there’s more to it. Say I am in a new city, looking for a house – the
Gaudi house. That is research, in my mind, because you have a certain goal. Search is
not anything you happen to do.

PJ: What limits it?

AA: I think at the edges there are negotiations rather than limits. Limits project tra-
jectory-like into a territory.\textsuperscript{15} Edges are space-times, periods, places where we are
goal-less. You have certain precise elements that maybe the artist develops – ingre-
dients that, like molecules, like elements of an atom, are immanent for one another.
Once they are together, they can be used as search. The atom had no idea it could
be a bomb.

Narcissus search is perhaps an early, primitive sort of example of this approach, this
language. You have certain ingredients – the algorithm, the database arrangement,
the visualized layer, and the content – that can be taken separately into other works,
ideas or projects, but together, they are required by each other to make this organism,
searchnarcissus. In that sense they are both separate and immanent for one another.
Together they make a search language based on degrees of invisibility that can be
used, abused, and applied in ways we can’t imagine. Like Japanese, Swahili, or Con-
text. It can be in someone else’s imagination – however unlike these other languages,
Narcissus is ‘Given as a Search’ rather than stuff to imagine while being beholden to
projected pre-conceptions.

PJ: Can we get up in the morning and say something like ‘today I am not going to do
any search’?

AA: To be honest I don’t know. I think this links with the non-spectacle-yet-innate ele-
ment. Perhaps we cannot live without doing search.

roo/a-rhythmic-way-to-imagine-territories-or/.
PJ: This seems to be becoming very abstract. ‘Search’ becomes another label, a general word for all these other things that we cannot help doing. Like ‘existence’. It seems to cover everything.

AA: Well, no... I mean we say there is a difference between search and research.

PJ: But not between search and cleaning your teeth?

AA: No. I don’t think that we do a search every time we clean our teeth. It’s a sequence. Certain sequences and rhythms. Once we do that sequence, it becomes search. And we do that sequence very instinctively. But it’s not everything we do.

PJ: That’s why I am asking. There are times we do and don’t. I’m trying to get the times we might not do search. Your original example, walking in the jungle, thinking of desert, getting one plus one equals.

AA: Well, yes. But walking in the jungle is not, in itself, a search. Doesn’t mean or imply search. I think we are talking about a complex activity. Like a complex number.

PJ: Multi-dimensional.

AA: Even a simple search in Google is multi-dimensional. You need at least three actors. I call it a sequence. BTW, when you have a minute, watch this SharkWheel video?16

**Skateboarding and Search**

PJ: Yes, talking of wheels and surfaces, skateboarding. You were searching for the Gasworks Gallery.

AA: ‘Searching for Gasworks Gallery’17 on the way to Furtherfield Gallery.’18

PJ: Do you think this is the same kind of work as in the Barbican?

AA: Well I didn’t expect it, OK? I kind of bump into things rather than expect. There’s always a collision, and what comes out of it. I can say, considering it beforehand, I thought, ‘somebody is going to beat me up’. That didn’t happen, but I did think this might be a possibility. Because I said: ‘Look, I know where Gasworks is, and I’m not going there. I’m just wondering if you would know where it is.’ It was basically asking if a person has a clue where Gasworks Gallery might be. And (initially) how many pushes of the skateboard I would have to do until I bump into someone else who has no idea where Gasworks Gallery is. I was asking them to speculate on that.

PJ: What do you mean by ‘speculate’? Making a ‘guess’?

---

AA: Yes, some sort of guesswork. It’s almost random. Then I asked ‘how many pushes’ and some people gave me 100 pushes.

PJ: Why ask the number of pushes to the next person who doesn’t know, rather than the number of pushes to get to the place?

AA: The focus of the search was the movement towards Furtherfield and between collision points. My interest in that was to have some sort of reflective critique of the Situationists, what I see as the conservative element in Situationism. The attempt to ‘map’, the attempt to see the situation as a whole. Rather than slowly building something without knowing what it is.

PJ: So it’s a kind of ‘anti-mapping’. A strategy for avoiding mapping? You’re trying to find something that is unknowable or uncapturable inside the territory?

AA: ‘Avoiding’ implies wanting or is a logical maneuver. But this, I think, is something different. More a strand of collisions in a collider, with the collider being the opposing movements and questions. The people and questions – they are collision points. Strung together there is a certain rhythm. I’m trying to do something that mapping avoids: a ‘pre-mapping’ process. The issue with producing a map is that you can transfer it from one person to another. You can say, ‘This is the map of where I’ve been, and if you want to go there, you can follow it’.

That skips the process. Prior to making the map, there was a search, and you encapsulated it in the map. That process of encapsulation is conservative. So that’s why I was interested – not in Situationist ‘drifting’, because I know where I’m going – but in doing something that has a search in it. And the search happens between collision points along the way.

Initially I thought that the transferable elements would be the numbers of pushes across certain distances. As I was doing it, I realized that I was being conservative myself, so it evolved (because it’s a search process itself) into ‘what kind of pushes will I need to do?’ And people looked at me like ‘what do you mean?’ [Laughs]

PJ: Well if they’re not skateboarders they may not know the kinds of pushes.

**Search and Spectacle**

PJ: What is the connection between search and spectacle?

AA: The connection is giving something as a search, not as an answer. For Google, search is a theater. You think you are searching how to get from Brasilia to Rio. You search planes, buses, etc. But Google shows you hotels in Rio. Google’s real financial interest is the information about you.

PJ: Why ‘theater’?

AA: Because just like ‘security’, with Google things are not what they seem. It’s not ‘come and give us your details so we can push some ads’. It’s: ‘let’s pretend you search while we observe you’. We need fake search bots to obscure the information
they gather on a certain IP. (A kind of accelerationist strategy, though I don’t advocate accelerationism.)

PJ: ‘Giving it as a search’ seems like offering people the chance to pull things out rather than pushing to them. Is it like the difference between going to a restaurant with a set menu, and going to the supermarket where you can get the stuff off the shelves and make it yourself?

AA: One of the differences. It also happens to be stuff that we do innately. It’s not even a talent that few have. We all do this. This is an interpretative activity. You see or hear something. And if I asked you what you saw or heard, you would give me your own version. That’s one of the main differences between us and other animals. That’s why when apes use tools, an ape will see another ape using a stick to pick up ants and think, ‘I can do that’. A human will look at it and say, ‘how can I make it slightly different?’ You ‘imagine from’ not ‘imagine to’.

Search is talking that very language. Rather than giving it to you in a static way. (Even though we know it isn’t static, so you will have to take away the bombastic-ness. It’s like ‘fucking hell, I’m giving you a headache’.)

PJ: So ‘giving as search’, whether it’s our artwork (Narcissus) or Google, is actually keying into something that humans are doing all the time, that’s perhaps ignored by other sorts of media that were always pushing something at you?

AA: I don’t know about media – that’s very big.

PJ: Well, spectacle is something that betrays that human need to be going and pulling, in favor of bombast or pushing?

AA: But not so much media as ‘approach to the media’.

PJ: Someone could do a painting where you went in and found ambiguities?

AA: Allowing you to search rather than find what you wanted. Going back to Narcissus, it is a search in itself, it’s never going to give you what is culturally desired. It’s like the desire of the non-desired. That’s what’s interesting. I don’t think this is medium-specific.

I want to say something else that I think is important. One of the difficulties with the Situationist critique of spectacle is precisely that we do spectacle not just for political reasons but also as an innate activity. If I want you to remember something or you want to remember something, one way of doing it is to make a spectacle of it. By putting something in a rhythm or rhyme or using a gun or some other power. But by making something a search, I’m losing the ‘specificity’. I can’t tell you ‘this is

red’ (and want you to remember ‘this is red’). I’m being more humble. I don’t know what is important. But I know this sequence is interesting. Well, I don’t know if it’s interesting to you.

PJ: The point for the Situationists was that dérive, drifting, was a strategy of resistance against the spectacle. For you, you’re always talking about it as being something that’s provided to us. One can present something ‘as spectacle’ or ‘as search’, but it’s something the artist or society does to the others. This is different from the psycho-geographic thing where drifting is something you take. Something you go and do. With Narcissus, we were talking about us as artists giving search to the viewer. When we talk about the dérive we’re talking about someone going to a city and saying ‘I will do my own drifting in the city’. Not that architects give us that.

AA: I take the drift itself as part of a larger sequence; a bunch of Situationists came up with the idea, you picked up on it and said, ‘Hey, that’s a good idea, I’ll do drifting in Brasilia tomorrow’. In that sense it’s similar to the sequence I’m talking about. There’s no difference.

PJ: So, search is trying to recover something human in the face of the spectacle? I take the point that making a spectacle is itself a human thing, and not artificial or imposed on humans.

AA: Spectacle is a political thing. I accept the Situationist critique that says there is a capitalistic abuse of spectacle. Appropriating this desire that we have. I accept that. That’s what happens. But I am saying that if you do drifting, let’s not make a spectacle. This in itself has a difficulty – how do you transfer from one person to another? This is an innate thing for us. We share things. We say ‘have you seen this?’ or ‘hey, I drifted yesterday, that was great fun.’ This is the problem. How do I give you something similar to that? I’m your friend, I’d like to share it with you. How do I do that? The only way we know how to is through making a spectacle out of stuff – drifting included.

PJ: You faced this problem in your Firefly search.21 You went to the gallery and searched and the question was how do you convey to people that they can search with you?

AA: This is the bane of my life. It’s a question of how to share without the spectacle. Without putting a gun to someone’s head.

PJ: Surely that’s a very negative analogy. To compare making a performance for people with threatening to shoot them.

AA: Of course. But I think it’s hard to disagree that there’s an issue of power.

PJ: Between the performer and performed to?

AA: Even without the performance. Saying, ‘I want you to remember this object or

---

sculpture or whatever. So I want to make it in a way that you will feel in awe of it. That there is a power of it over you.’ There’s always a certain element of power with the spectacle. Maybe it’s not a fundamental element, maybe it’s arguable how important. But we agree it’s there. For me it always feels like a gun to the head. Shakespeare’s Macbeth or Duchamp’s Urinal, they’re results of searches. There was an element of searching and these are developments of these searches. So instead of putting myself in the center of the world, saying ‘I have this fantastic idea’, I attest that I’m not the center of the world.

PJ: Just say, ‘This is what happened when I did search’?

Borders and Security
AA: Think of an airport. The security in airports is nothing but search. It drives people nuts! They have no idea who might have a bomb. They have no idea about anything. So they are going to search and search and search. They are going to build these machines and give people power to ask stupid questions. Like, when we came back from Israel: ‘Where in London do you live?’ ‘Well we live in Brighton, it’s south of London.’ ‘Ah! The north of England?’ ‘Yes,’ we said.

PJ: They did that to try catching you out. Like Google, it’s a theater. A pre-judgment.

AA: They search in special machines, special tables, special gloves, special tools to look for bombs, special rooms – all to search and search and search. Constant search. All they know is that they search, rather than what they search for.

PJ: Perhaps it is done to discourage people. In that sense, it works. It’s an interesting use of search, not just to find stuff.

AA: Yes. In that sense it’s a very theatrical piece. It’s a sort of a show. But I always fly with a bomb on me.

PJ: HUH??!!

AA: Yes. I always carry oranges onboard planes. They let me do that, and oranges explode very easily.\(^{22}\)

\(^{22}\) See, http://arty.li/ZgU.
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