

By developing three positions, Pierre-Damien Huyghe considers art as a “technical conduct”. The technical character of the artistic conduct is already present in the Latin term *ars*, which refers to the Greek term *technê*. For Huyghe, the artist does not exploit techniques in view of a precise purpose in this “technical conduct”. The implicated techniques are, moreover, liberated from the constraint to serve. The work of Masaki Fujihata is a significant example of art as a “technical conduct”, and therefore of the liberation of techniques.

This artistic approach is a very important one, but it is very fragile. It is fragile because it is not “necessary”. Here, the “necessary” is defined as the unavoidable, while the “unnecessary” expresses the contingent. Already Aristotle defined the “unnecessary” as the “useful”. Consequently, the “useful” does not inevitably serve a certain purpose.

This idea leads to Huyghe’s first position, which proposes the separation of the notion of “usefulness” from the idea of a determined service or function in regard to techniques. For Huyghe, Masaki Fujihata puts into light this separation. He expresses the “usefulness” of certain techniques by liberating them from their constraint to serve.

The second position stresses the possibilities of a group of techniques and their association with each other. Art as a “technical conduct” reveals the extra-ordinary character of the techniques implicated and shows that technologies contain multiple possibilities.

Here, the field of operation is not an “instrument” but an “apparatus”, which is rich of possibilities. By using technological “apparatuses”, the artist fights against the idea that techniques are exhaustible. While Villem Flusser defines “apparatuses” as exhaustible, Huyghe considers that every technique can be enriched perpetually. This is particularly the case, when different devices are associated with each other. Subsequently, technology reveals almost infinite resources.

Huyghe’s third position highlights the idea that the artist does not implicate technological devices in order to express preexisting ideas but searches for new ideas and possibilities in these technologies. In this respect, the “technical conduct” of the

artist can be seen as an attitude of “discovery”. The artist “discovers” what is hidden by the service and by the common usage of the technology. Consequently, the created artwork is non-discursive; it situates itself in the “making” and is not limited to a declaration. Something is “made” because the position of the artist is that of a “discoverer”. The invention of techniques is the precondition for the artist’s “discoveries”. It is not the artist who invents techniques, as for example the invention of photography preceded the art of photography, and the invention of perspective preceded the analysis of its possibilities in the field of art. In this sense, Masaki Fujihata is a “discoverer” and not an “inventor”.

Therefore, art is certainly not a secondary activity but a subsequent one. The artist “discovers” the technique and participates in its acceleration.

When there is “discovery”, there is authentication and an act of authentication is a subsequent and “useful” one. For Pierre-Damien Huyghe, the artist, working in the field of technology by authenticating as a “discoverer”, reveals the nature of technology’s power and the plurality of its possibilities.