

‘TAKING THE LINE FOR A WALK’ - within Paul Klee’s modernist practice

Ivana Wingham

‘Abstract’

Paul Klee’s work, posthumously published in the Paul Klee Notebooks Volume 1 ‘The Thinking Eye’ and Volume 2 ‘The Nature of Nature’¹, describe his teaching based on what could be described as modernist synthetic practice. However, Klee’s work and thinking demonstrates an oppositional, dialectical mode of looking and thinking that is both synthetic and analytic. Klee’s concern in his work and teaching is both with optical and non-optical ways of visual thinking. For him these ways are experienced through ‘an interplay of movements in the universe’, that, ‘at their centre’ have ‘the ‘I’². Here, the relationship between the body and the line becomes evident in his description of the line (which could be active, middle or passive), a line that has been ‘taken for a walk’.

This paper suggests addressing four particular aspects of Klee’s work concerned with epistemological limits: the limit of looking, the limit of visibility, the limit of subjectivity and the limit of phenomenology arguing the presence of cultivating ‘critical ambivalence’ in understanding his work as apparent modernist practice.

Introduction

The visibility of the world, optical and non-optical ways of seeing, and an understanding of creative process is something that was of great concern to Paul Klee. His work and research was particularly concerned with visibility of the world, the relationship between painting and geometry, and the invention of techniques by which such visibility can be achieved. Klee claimed that ‘what we can see is a proposal, a possibility, an expedient’ and that ‘the “real truth”, to begin with, remains invisible’³. Further, he claimed that the ‘artist’s efforts are directed to making the “real truth” visible’ as ‘art does not reproduce the visible, but makes visible’⁴. For Klee, to make this happen, ‘I and you, the artist and his object, sought

¹ Edited by Jurg Spiller and translated from the German edition, ‘Das bilderische Denken’ (Benno Schwabe & Co, Basle, 1956) in 1961, Percy Lund Humphries, London and New York, 1969

² ‘The Thinking Eye’, p.79

³ Requoted from Paul Klee’s ‘Diary’, Christian Geelhaar, Paul Klee and the Bauhaus, (Bath: Adams and Dart, 1973) 25.

⁴ Ibid.26.

to establish optical-physical relations across [the] invisible barrier between the “I” and the “You”’.⁵ He claimed that while the development of a purely optical sight produced excellent pictures, ‘the art of contemplating unoptical impressions and representations and making them visible was neglected’⁶. Klee’s concerns were particularly in the domain of abstract art as opposed to traditionally understood representational art. In particular, Klee believed that the ‘artist of today is more than an improved camera’⁷, and that the artist’s engagement with the world should be a complex one, involving subjectivity, optical and non-optical ways of seeing, and the inseparability of body and visibility.

Limit of looking

By defining the visibility of an artist as beyond the hegemony of the eye, Klee regarded tactile intuition as part of his visual thinking. In his work on line and movement, Klee suggested that the ‘line exhibits the basic property of measurement’, while anything that can be measured has tactile connotations by implication. For Klee, ‘tone is a weight’, where the weight of something suggests mass⁸. In attributing measurement and mass to lines and tones Klee displays his concern with the tactility of the world and its relationship to abstract art. In his *The Thinking Eye* and *The Nature of Nature* (the posthumously published opus consisting of essays, notes, diagrams, sketches, drawings, investigations and paintings done during his painting and teaching career in Bauhaus and Dusseldorf Academy) Klee went on to develop the most important aspect of his theory of art - movement. For Klee ‘movement underlies the growth of all things’ and is expressed in a threefold way: the initial impulse in ourselves, the actual progressive carrying out of the work itself, and the getting of the work across to others, to the beholders - these are the chief stages of the creative act: conceiving, creating, imposing the creating⁹. But in addition, Klee suggested that in this process of visual creativity, ‘there is the non-optical way of intimate physical contact, earthbound, that reaches the eye of the artist from below, and there is the non-optical contact through the cosmic bond that descend from above’¹⁰.

⁵ ‘Ways of Nature Study’ Paul Klee Notebooks *The Thinking Eye* ed. Jurg Spiller trans. Ralph Manheim, vol. 1 (London: LH, 1961) 63.

⁶ Ibid. 63.

⁷ Ibid.,63.

⁸ Christian Geelhaar, *Paul Klee and the Bauhaus*, (Bath: Adams and Dart, 1973) 27.

⁹ Requoted from ‘Graphic art’, Ibid. 29.

¹⁰ ‘Ways of Nature Study’ Paul Klee Notebooks *The Thinking Eye* ed. Jurg Spiller trans. Ralph Manheim, vol. 1 (London: LH, 1961) 66.

Klee's ideas lead us to consider how an artist can see the relationship between the optical and tactile intuitions in his creative process. Furthermore, how can we understand the relationship between Klee's optical and non-optical way of seeing and what does this mean for a creative process?

To consider these questions, it is useful to introduce some ideas from psychoanalytic studies of vision. Jacques Lacan, in *Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-analysis*, makes a clear distinction between the 'eye' and the 'gaze'. Criticizing Maurice Merleau-Ponty's *Phenomenology of Vision*, in which 'the dependence of the visible on that which places us under the eye of the seer'¹¹, Lacan introduces into the seer, apart from his eye, also 'his movement, his grip, his muscular and visceral emotion' (...) 'his total intentionality'¹². For Lacan, the 'eye' 'is only the metaphor of something' that he wishes to call 'the seer's shoot (pousse)-something prior to his eye'¹³. Furthermore, Lacan, referring to Diderot (his *Letter on the Blind for the use of those to see*), states that 'the geometral space of vision' (...) 'is perfectly reconstructable, imaginable, by a blind man'¹⁴. 'What is at issue in geometral perspective is simply the mapping of space, not sight'¹⁵.

Rosalind Krauss refers to the 'shoot (pousse)' in discussing Lacan's tactility of vision and 'space of pointing'. Krauss suggests that, for Lacan, the 'space of pointing' is the space that he calls 'geometral' which is 'namely the space of perspective' or a 'tactile space.'¹⁶ This space is 'mastered by the subject as though he were reaching out to grasp it, to palp it, running fingers over its front and sides, manipulating it'¹⁷.

Lacan also underlies the outside of the eye, the 'gaze'. For him the 'gaze' is the place where the subject is in the visible as 'what determines me' (...) 'in the visible, is the gaze that is outside' and through this gaze 'I enter the light' and 'from the gaze I receive the effects', 'I am looked at' and 'I am a picture' or 'I am photo-graphed'¹⁸.

¹¹ Jacques Lacan *The four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-analysis*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller trans. Alan Sheridan (London:Vintage, 1998) 72.

¹² Ibid. 71.

¹³ Ibid. 72.

¹⁴ Ibid. 86.

¹⁵ Ibid. 86.

¹⁶ Rosalind E. Krauss *The Optical Unconscious* (Cambridge: MIT P, 1996) 87, refers to Diderot who showed in 'Letter on the Blind for the use of those to see' this being a tactile space.

¹⁷ Ibid. 87.

¹⁸ Jacques Lacan *The four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-analysis*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller trans. Alan Sheridan (London:Vintage, 1998) 106.

As Krauss states, for Lacan, the 'space of light' is 'dazzling, pulsatile: an atmospheric surround that illuminates the viewer from both back and front, so that from the start there is no question of mastery'¹⁹. Unlike the 'space of pointing', in the 'space of light', 'the viewer is not the surveyor - standing at a point just outside the pyramid of vision - but caught within the onrush of light, he is what blocks the light, what interrupts the flow'²⁰.

As Krauss suggests, in the instinctual field of vision one thing that holds the viewer (as a screen) is the 'gap' that both 'produces and hides behind' in which 'what is thought to be visible will never appear'²¹. For Lacan, to enter the picture, is to be projected there as 'a cast shadow thrown onto the manifold of the world's image'²². Here, 'instead of the perspective pyramid he imagined is something more like a projector's lamp, an intervening obstacle, and a shadow cast onto a distant wall'²³. The body of the viewer, his position in space, his shadow cast on a distant wall, and the interruption of the flow of light also result in the inseparability of body and vision for Lacan.

Limit of visibility

The work of Paul Klee that suggests a clear distinction from oppositional thinking concerning vision and body, as well as, visual and tactile intuitions. In his diagram of visual thinking Klee distinguished on one side of this diagram the 'Eye' and the 'I' (the artist) and on the other side of this diagram 'Visible intensity' and 'You' (the object). Between Eye/I and Visible Intensity/You appearance flows into the Eye through an 'optical-physical way'. From above and below there are flows of non-optical influences coming into the eye, below - 'terrestrial roots' - 'static' or above - 'shared cosmic continuity' - 'dynamic'. By positioning the Eye/I (the artist) in this way, Klee clearly saw the unconscious relations happening between the artist and the object. Equally, in suggesting that there are non-optical ways contributing to the artist's vision, he declared these non-optical ways as being above and below the usual eye's focus. Through these non-optical ways the influences and intensities that come to and through the body and mind of the artist are not purely visual, but are also tactile and metaphysical. It is here that Klee's artist enters the picture; he is at the same time coming through what could be called Lacan's 'gaze'.

¹⁹ Rosalind E. Krauss The Optical Unconscious (Cambridge: MIT P, 1996) 87.

²⁰ Ibid. 87.

²¹ Ibid. 88.

²² Ibid. 184.

²³ Ibid. 184.

Klee also discusses his concerns with the phenomenological constraints of a tactile way of looking. Here, he declares that ‘we are led to the upper ways (dynamic) by yearning to free ourselves from earthly bonds’²⁴, which he sees as ‘static’ and linked to gravity. His famous metaphor for any artistic achievement is to try to transgress the limit of gravity: ‘to stand despite all possibility of falling’²⁵. Klee’s desire to transcend the gravity is through ‘pure mobility’²⁶.

However, to achieve such mobility, later discussed in term of the line, Klee starts with bodily orientations in a space of three dimensions. Klee suggests that ‘the ‘I’ orients itself in space according to three dimensions’ and ‘it judges its position in this space according to the concepts; above-below, lefthand-righthand, in front-behind’²⁷. Further Klee attributes the change in color (or tone) to be in relation to this positioning of the body. The above (head) is white, the below (feet) is black while grey is in the middle. By positioning the body within the three dimensions of an imaginary cube, and allocating the weight of a color (tone) that depends on the position of the body and its relation to the closeness to or distance from gravity, Klee has not only located his thinking within Euclidian space as the starting point of his art theory, but has also declared a very clear interest between painting and geometry. Klee called this diagram ‘synthesis of objective body and subjective space’²⁸. In this diagram Klee positioned the body between these orientations. Here, Klee was not considering at the ‘space of pointing’ or ‘perspective’. For Klee, there was ‘no merit to drawing in proper perspective’, because ‘anyone can do it’²⁹. ‘The value of the whole process [perspective] lies solely in the possibility of checking’³⁰. Neither was he suggesting that there is only an optical way to create vision. Rather, Klee’s interest in perspective was in displacing the single visual point of the static observer. For Klee ‘the position of the “I” changes to left and right, thus displacing the visual point’ and ‘this shift of the visual point results in movement and countermovement’³¹. In this respect ‘the eye follows various stimulus points, on the basis of which the space is limited by points of various distance’³². Through experiments on shifting viewpoints and conclusions from the problems of perspective Klee developed a basis for the figuration of movement³³.

²⁴ ‘Ways of Nature Study’ Paul Klee Notebooks The Thinking Eye ed. Jurg Spiller trans. Ralph Manheim, vol. 1 (London: LH, 1961) 67.

²⁵ Ibid. 67.

²⁶ Ibid. 67.

²⁷ Ibid. 44.

²⁸ Ibid. 44.

²⁹ Ibid. 149

³⁰ Ibid. 149.

³¹ Ibid. 140.

³² Ibid. 140.

³³ Ibid. 140.

Limit of subjectivity

Klee's abstraction of the phenomenological constraints is described in his 'subjective theory of space'. This consists of 'combined operations' in which there is a 'multi-dimensional simultaneity of projections'³⁴. These 'projections are in different positions, deviating from pure central perspective'³⁵. Here Lacan's description of the gaze is relevant: in the 'space of light' there may be a projection on the canvas. The suggested projections are close to what Lacan sees in the instinctual field of vision, in which one thing that holds the viewer (as a screen) is this gap that both produces and hides behind and where what is thought to be visible will never appear. Klee sees a way of deviating from perspective through a simultaneity of projections. In other words Klee's own work on simultaneity of projections depicts clearly only a partial visibility of the artist's vision, even when aiming at the whole and synthesis.

Klee acknowledges that in finding a synthesis through a variety of projections one needs to take a series of steps. The first step 'is a regular deviation based on projection', where he understands projection in terms of the mobility of the viewpoint. Here the 'viewpoint is not strictly static' but 'is displaced' and the 'objects move along'³⁶. Klee sees limitations in the possibilities of representation in the methods of construction by central perspective with a motionless visual point. Klee's desire is to depict variety of things at once could be obtained in moving either the object or the observer. For Klee, there is a way of achieving 'irregular projection' by 'combined operations and projection in different positions' therefore 'deviating from pure central perspective'³⁷. He suggests three main points in how to deviate from pure central perspective, through 'deviating progressions', 'deviating position of the vanishing point' and 'deviating perspective (and building boxes and building blocks)'³⁸. In other words through 'organic processes', which for Klee are deviations from the rules (of perspective) such as changes of scale which depend on the distance from the beholder, displacing objects so that they appear to move accentuating parts or omitting certain parts to produce an effect of 'irregular projection'. These, and other deviations, introduce in Klee's opinion 'freedom into movement and movement into freedom'³⁹.

For Klee, this method suggests a particular philosophical view of the relationship between space and the body. Rather than conceiving space as lying outside the body of the observer, as in pure central perspective, Klee suggests that through 'combined operations and projection in different positions' a

³⁴ Ibid. 141-2

³⁵ Ibid. 141-2.

³⁶ Ibid. 153.

³⁷ Ibid. 155.

³⁸ Ibid. 155.

³⁹ Ibid. 152-155.

deviation from pure central perspective is possible. For him, the new method of ‘irregular projection’ can be achieved by ‘organic combinations of the main forms of perspective’ from ‘interpenetration of space and body’ and ‘simultaneous inner and outer form’⁴⁰. Philosophically, this allows for representation to be achieved ‘according to essence and appearance’⁴¹. Points to be considered in achieving this are ‘simultaneous, multi-dimensional phenomena’ (which for him means multi-dimensional simultaneity of projection with temporal succession), ‘multi-dimensional contacts’ and ‘more complex structures’⁴².

Klee’s concern with simultaneity of projections and multi-dimensional contacts, together with his desire to describe and depict the interpenetration of space and body, and the simultaneity of inner and outer form, show his desire to bypass the limits of phenomenology and the opposition of the body and the mind. As Robert Kudeilka states: ‘In “making visible” Klee revealed that what we see in the picture plane is never purely visual, but includes factors such as gravity and the position of our own body’⁴³. The world for Klee is a simultaneity of various experiences and forces of the body and from the universe. He says: ‘And now: what a modern man experiences as he walks across the deck of a steamer: 1. his own movement, 2. the movement of the ship which may be in opposite direction, 3. the direction and velocity of the current, 4. the rotation of the earth, 5. its orbit, 6. the orbits of the moons and planets around it. Result: an interplay of movements in the universe, at their centre the ‘I’ on the ship’⁴⁴. Klee is, of course, aware that the body cannot detect the movement of the stars or the changes in orbit. However in stating the inseparability of the body and the forces of nature in his teaching, in his work on verticals, horizontals and wandering viewpoints, he has proposed the inseparability between the body and the painting.

Limit of phenomenology

In his diagram of *Ab-ovo-spatio-corporeal*⁴⁵ Klee depicts various domains of microscopic and macroscopic dynamic in which the only apparently fixed limit is shell of the body. Everything inside the body is dynamic and everything outside the body is dynamic. He uses the metaphor of an egg broken in yolk and white to describe the inner space, the shell (of an egg) is the limit of the body and the surrounding space is the outer space. Within the inner space there is movement and growth represented in

⁴⁰ Ibid. 155.

⁴¹ Ibid. 155.

⁴² Ibid. 155.

⁴³ Ibid. 81.

⁴⁴ Paul Klee Notebooks *The Thinking Eye* ed. Jurg Spiller trans. Ralph Manheim, vol. 1 (London: LH, 1961)

⁴⁵ Ibid. 6.

what he calls ‘primordial cell’ which is ‘set in motion by fertilization’ and ‘growing’⁴⁶. So the shell of an egg (metaphor for the skin of the body) is the only limit between the inner space and the outer space. He understands the relationship of the body and space as inside (inner space), limit (body shell), and the outside (outer space) constructing the inseparability of the whole. For him this whole is of a dynamic nature and is ‘spatio-corporeo-spatial’ or space-body-space⁴⁷. By suggesting the inseparability of the whole the role of the body can be seen as a pivot of the dynamic forces between the inside and the outside, as if being a torsion point or a point of exchange – a dynamic relationship set between the artist and the world. His concerns with non-optical routes that are come to the eye of the artist from below and above, his work on wandering viewpoints and irregular projections, these can be seen as torsion and twisting influences on the artist’s vision and the projection of his own body into the painting. According to Kudielka, Klee displayed ‘an overt and profound affinity to the “dynamic equilibrium”’ trying to ‘reconcile the frictions and dissonances within an enveloping tension’⁴⁸.

Concerned with a subjective theory of space, implied and exemplified in his work throughout *The Thinking Eye*, Klee opened some questions of the inseparability of the body and space beyond Cartesian thinking. Suggesting that the outside and inside of the body is in a dynamic tension, demonstrating through examples how to deviate from pure central perspective and achieve irregular projection, showing in his diagrams the desire to bypass the oppositional thinking and create a third tension-like connection, implying the coexistence of the whole between inner space body and outer space. These all demonstrate Klee’s philosophical thinking having a phenomenological and a metaphysical cast.

Such an approach bears similarities to the psychoanalytic reading of the unconscious and forms an allegiance theoretically to the work of Elisabeth Grosz. Grosz’s argument locates the exchange of ‘inside out’ and ‘outside in’⁴⁹ of space as what preconditions to any discussion on subjectivity. Klee’s concern with a subjective theory of space centres on the subjectivity of the viewer and his own implication in the image in relation to his position in space. In other words, for Klee, the body is a threshold concept through which not only oppositional thinking be discussed and to which all optical and non-optical ways converge, but also it is the absent body in shifting viewpoints in the picture or the threshold between inner and outer space. Grosz’s argument stresses the ‘indeterminable position of the body’ as hovering

⁴⁶ Ibid. 6.

⁴⁷ Ibid. 6.

⁴⁸ Robert Kudielka, ‘With the appropriate means’-Klee’s teaching at the Bauhaus 1921-31’, *Paul Klee The Nature of Creation/ Works 1914-1940* (London: Hayward Gallery and LH, 2002) 83.

⁴⁹ Elisabeth Grosz, ‘*Volatile Bodies Toward a Corporeal Feminism*’ (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana UP, 1994)

‘perilously and undecidably at the pivotal point of binary pairs’⁵⁰. Klee’s thinking on the indeterminacy of the body in space while moving is seen in a variety of exercises on how viewpoints shift, and what such technique might provide in terms of irregular projections in a picture. While Klee provide us with strategies of visual thinking involving the indeterminacy of the body, Grosz provides us with theoretical techniques how we might re-think the body. Her work on the porosity of the skin of the body where she suggests that ‘the information provided by the surface of the skin is both endogenous and exogenous, active and passive, receptive and expressive, the only sense able to provide the ‘double sensation’⁵¹. The idea of double sensation may be seen in Klee’s work in which he displaces the subject in the painting through shifting viewpoints in such a way that the inside and outside of the painting becomes quite fluid. He was aiming at bypassing the separation between the observer and space by creating new forms of line and new forms of looking.

When Klee was working and drawing he would start with nothing else but the pencil and the impulse to set it in motion. For Kudeilka, Klee’s drawings should not be looked at in terms of ‘subjectivity’ as they were ‘far from being driven by the intention to characterize, to describe or even formalize something’⁵². Rather, for Klee, it was the unintentional approach to drawing that comes to being by ‘the point of his pencil that sets itself in motion’⁵³.

Kudeilka’s argues against seeing Klee’s work in terms of subjectivity, preferring rather unintentionality. He separates Klee’s work from the Surrealist way of working in terms of automatic writing, and discusses his line in terms of its relation to middle voice in ancient Greek and narrative. This view provides an interesting insight into Klee’s work. Nonetheless some points need to be brought into consideration.

Firstly, Kudeilka suggests that subjectivity is to be understood with the intention of characterizing, describing and formalizing something. This definition of subjectivity suggests the separation of the subject from his projection. Elisabeth Grosz offers slightly different way of describing subjectivity. She suggests that ‘the constitution of the subject as an integrated and functional psychical totality is an active ingredient in the constitution of the body’ and the contributions of psychoanalytic theory was to ‘understand how body functions’ particularly ‘the ways in which the psyche is a projection of the body’s

⁵⁰ Ibid. 23-24.

⁵¹ Ibid. 35.

⁵² Ibid. 53.

⁵³ Ibid. 53.

form'⁵⁴. In other words, if we agree with Grosz's understanding of constitution of the subject, then it would be very difficult to separate unintentionality and subjectivity once referred to a body.

Secondly, equating Klee's line with the narrative or middle voice in ancient Greek and separating Klee's way of drawing from Surrealist automatic writing suggests the separation of the oral and tactile senses in terms of form giving. Here Grosz, discussing Merleau-Ponty, outlines a relationship between subject and object that is not one of causality but in which 'the relations of mutual definition governing the body and the world of objects are "form-giving" insofar as the body actively differentiates and categorizes the world into groupings of sensuous experience, patterns of organization and meaning'⁵⁵. Having in mind Klee's own claims of the dynamic nature of the whole, the inner space of the body being dynamic and seen as a whole with the outer space, the proposition to look at the line as movement is to suggest that both psychoanalytic and phenomenological ways of projecting the body through a line is evident in Klee's work on the line.

For Klee, the line can be defined in terms of three types of movement. A line can be active, middle or passive⁵⁶. The active line or 'linear-active' is a line that takes a path that occurs 'from point to line'⁵⁷. This is 'the most highly-charged line' and also 'is the most authentic line because it is most active' as such line 'goes for a walk, so to speak, aimlessly for the sake of the walk'⁵⁸. The middle line or 'linear-medial' is a line that 'at the beginning it is linear, the movement of a point' but in the process of movement 'ends by looking like a plane' where the 'planar effect' is 'obtained by circumscribed lines'⁵⁹. This is a line which 'is short of time' and 'wants to get to 1, then to 2, then to 3, etc. as quickly as possible' and this Klee sees 'more like a series of appointments than a walk'⁶⁰. Finally, the passive line or 'linear-passive' is a line that becomes a plane. It is the line that 'works as a planar element'⁶¹. Klee says that 'we still see lines but not linear acts', and, in addition, 'what we see are linear results of planar actions'⁶².

In his analysis of the line Klee clearly attributes action to the line. Without movement or action a line is no longer a line. The difference between an active, middle or passive line, is distinguished by the form of

⁵⁴ Elizabeth Grosz, 'Volatile Bodies Toward a Corporeal Feminism' (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana UP, 1994) 27.

⁵⁵ Ibid. 87.

⁵⁶ Paul Klee Notebooks The Thinking Eye ed. Jurg Spiller trans. Ralph Manheim, vol. 1 (London: LH, 1961) 103, 109-120.

⁵⁷ Ibid. 105.

⁵⁸ Ibid. 105.

⁵⁹ Ibid. 109.

⁶⁰ Ibid. 109.

⁶¹ Ibid. 115.

⁶² Ibid. 112.

action that the line displays. The line is not merely an artistic tool for representation, but admits multiple philosophical and theoretical positions in relation to the activity of the line. The line is a projection of the body, implies bodily action and motion, implies exchanges between the subject and object and intensities between the two, implies a connective tissue between the artist and a world in which the body and the world are inseparable.

Conclusion

It could be argued that Klee's work on new techniques of achieving a simultaneity of visual projections bears a close resemblance to what could be read as ambivalence. Klee never left the earthbound reality to fly into the cosmos [his metaphor]. What he wanted throughout his work was to depict the fluidity of movement of everything in universe. He gave no primacy to optical or tactile intuitions, rather, he kept them in tension. He deviated from perspective but only while working from some rules of perspective. Klee could be seen almost as a feminist painter of subjectivity, whereby he tries to bypass the binary oppositions by wavering between geometry and painting, idealism and materialism (or what he calls ideal or material statics), between rule and intuition, between visible appearances and invisible forces. This idea of 'cultivating critical ambivalence'⁶³ is what Grosz discusses in feminists' relationship to Lacan, proposing that by being indifferent to something one might be able to locate difference elsewhere. What Klee's work suggests is that his work on movement as lying in between the various tensions of binary opposites in his work and teaching equally suggest a search for difference somewhere outside the system of binary opposites. Klee's work as the 'in-between' of tactile and visual intuitions allows us to start further discussions of how a different approach to geometry and the picture may appear.

⁶³ Elizabeth Grosz, Jacques Lacan A Feminist Introduction (London: Routledge, 1995) 190-192.