



**The Making Of
The Making Of**

The Making Of The Making Of

Residency May - June 2006

Mette Ingvarlsen



ipaepuefa - fa

INTRODUCTION

Media Motion, or how media moves our bodies, <i>Mette Ingvarsten</i>	7
An Inventory of projects taking part in The Making Of The Making Of	11

PART ONE: methodology, research and process orientation

INVITATION To all who might be interested, <i>Mette Ingvarsten</i>	19
Method Monster, <i>Eleanor Bauer</i>	23
Glossary, <i>Eleanor Bauer</i>	27
Overwhelming, the doing of research, <i>Mårten Spångberg</i>	29
Mettedology, <i>Andros Zins-Browne</i>	41
Definitions of terminology, <i>Bojana Cvejic</i>	49
Procedure for over-production, <i>Mette Ingvarsten</i>	51

PART TWO: Open Source

The Open Source Definition, <i>Bruce Perens</i>	53
Open Source Paradigm in the Arts, <i>Tomislav Medak</i>	55
OPEN SOURCE, notes from a conversation, <i>Elke van Campenhout</i>	59
A continuation of a conversation on open source, <i>Mette Ingvarsten</i>	63
An ongoing actual Talk, <i>Heike Langsdorf</i>	65
Innovative Communities, quotes from <i>Eric von Hippel</i>	69

PART THREE: The format of material experimentation. Voice, affect and sound in performance and other media.

Contemporary Popular Music-Copies Without Originals (excerpt), <i>Steve Wurtzler</i>	71
The screaming point, <i>Michel Chion</i>	75
Voice map, <i>Mette Ingvarsten & Peter Lenaerts</i>	78
CINEMATIC BODIES, AFFECTS and VIRTUALITY IN A WORLD OF SPECTACULAR EXPRESSIONS, <i>Mette Ingvarsten</i>	79
Voice Pressure (after Bruce Nauman's body pressure)	88
Feeling, Emotion, Affect, <i>Eric Shouse</i>	89

EPILOGUE:

context	13
<i>nadine</i>	15
colofon	17

Sommaire:

INVITATION A toutes les personnes éventuellement intéressées,

Mette Ingvarlsen

Mette Ingvarlsen lance, à toute personne intéressée, une invitation ouverte pour développer avec elle une banque de données rassemblant des connaissances sur la méthodologie en matière de chorégraphie. Tous ceux qui le souhaitent peuvent réagir sur base de leur pratique ou d'un discours théorique, en répondant directement au questionnaire ou en écrivant un autre texte. Voici quelques exemples de sujets abordés dans le questionnaire : quelles méthodologies peuvent être utilisées dans le développement de matériaux, à quel niveau la méthodologie joue-t-elle un rôle, comment fonctionnent les méthodologies d'un point de vue idéologique etc.

Method Monster

Eleanor Bauer

La chorégraphe Eleanor Bauer développe une méthodologie très particulière: le « Method Monster ». Dans son texte, elle décrit l'importance pour le créateur de procéder de manière aussi bien intuitive que méthodologique. Et ce dans un dialogue constant entre la mise en place active de cadres méthodologiques dans lesquels le travail peut se développer et le développement rétroactif de définitions méthodologiques pour le travail qui s'est développé « spontanément » dans le studio.

Lexique

Eleanor Bauer

Si nous devons vraiment parler de méthodologie, il est peut-être nécessaire d'utiliser un nouveau vocabulaire. Un lexique qui ouvre des possibilités.

Etourdissant, ce que la recherche peut faire

Mårten Spångberg

Chorégraphe, théoricien et artiste, Mårten Spångberg analyse la relation difficile qu'engendre l'introduction du terme « recherche » par rapport à son pendant scientifique. Selon lui, le mot « recherche » appliqué au domaine des arts est compris de manière totalement erronée ou employé sans esprit critique. Cette négligence a fait de la notion de recherche, au lieu d'un instrument servant à produire de la connaissance, un terme permettant de maintenir des relations hiérarchiques et des idéologies réactionnaires dans le secteur de la performance.

Mettedologie

Andros Zins-browne

Le chorégraphe Andros Zins-brown répond au questionnaire de Mette à partir de sa pratique et de son expérience tant comme élève/participant aux workshops que comme chorégraphe, une activité qui l'oblige à réfléchir à une langue qui lui permette de parler à d'autres danseurs de ses méthodologies.

Définitions de la terminologie

Bojana Cvejic

Ce théoricien et dramaturge trace des frontières provisoires pour nous aider à comprendre la terminologie de la recherche.

Marche à suivre pour la surproduction

Mette Ingvarlsen

Surproduction comme méthodologie : un aperçu rétrospectif et un plan.

PART ONE: methodology, research and process orientation

INVITATION

To all who might be interested,

Mette Ingvartsen

This is an invitation. A first attempt to start something that could (with potential contributions) develop into various proposals on how to distribute and circulate general questions about performance practices. For the moment working on how artistic processes can be shared, not only through the production of collective artistic works, but also through producing other forms of exchange, confrontation and discussion between multiple artistic disciplines and discourses is a way to expand possible perspectives in the field.

Below you will find a series of questions relating to methodology, written in order to initiate longer-term exchange and communication about different working methods and their respective results. These questions are not intended as final proposals but can be continued or completed. This is an invitation for you to do so.

Feel free to take, use, develop or question anything you might find of interest in this text. A response can be anything from answering the questions to re-writing them entirely, to stating why this is not answerable or something completely different. Please reply to the questions in whatever way you find is relevant to you, your work, the field of performance, theory, thought or practice.

The basic idea is sharing how to think of work protocols as a way of working together without a particular objective (such as making a performance) aside from the discourse produced. For larger

groups of people to engage in this form of collaborative exchange, you are also invited to pass this text or your own response to it on to other people who might be interested in participating.

Answers, rewritings, statements or whatever you decide to respond with can be sent by mail to a slowly growing network and at the same time be posted on www.everybodys.be in order to make it available for others.

Potential re-writings/improvements of the basic questionnaire can be made available for further rewriting.

A potentially large number of questions, questioning methodology

- 1) In the book *Bersonism* Deleuze writes “Intuition is neither a feeling, an inspiration, nor a disorderly sympathy but a fully developed method”. What do you think about this statement or simply the idea of intuition as methodology?
- 2) Do any of the following methods appeal to you and why?

collaboration as methodology
improvisation as methodology
secrecy as methodology
chance methods
concept as methodology
transparency as methodology
sensation as methodology
overproduction as methodology
appropriation as methodology
ever changing methodologies as methodology
open source as methodology
hijacking as methodology
- 3) What kind of ideological positions do you think these respective methods relate to?
- 4) Do you think methodology and aesthetics are directly connected/reflected in the artistic product?
- 5) Do you think methodologies in art practices are objective or subjective. If objective, then how can they be shared?
- 6) Can you think of a method that is not yet established in the performing arts?
- 7) Do you think product-oriented processes exclude research?

- 8) How would you define research as a methodology?
- 9) What do you think about using scientific research methodologies in art, or rather how would you define the differences between scientific and artistic research methodologies?
- 10) How would you define the organizing principles behind your current method of working?
- 11) Do these principles produce stability or instability in relation to the process of working?
- 12) Is being clear about the method you use an important tool for developing your work, or does the process of defining fix the potential directions you could move in?
- 13) Is the sharing of your work directed towards the moment of presentation or is it also happening during the process of working. How?

METHOD MONSTER

Eleanor Bauer

In the performing arts our media and means of making include, among other things: the body, some level of collaboration, communication, or co-construction when not working alone and hence a certain degree of inter-subjectivity, and memory — physical memory as well the mental traces of conceptual developments and progress. These are not media of consistency; we are dealing with materials that are always shifting and changing day-to-day, and hence are not easily conducive to maintaining the consistency of a purely methodical procedure. When it comes to materializing method and what actually happens in the studio, even with methods that are built to create their own contradictions and bifurcations, I am suspicious of the performing artist who claims to control her or his variables, following strict methods and plodding along scientifically to identify results. Either because of the reasons stated above that our media don't offer themselves easily to such procedures, or because there are always choices that escape such procedures, aesthetic or personal, attractors and desires that push the work in one direction or another, because we are people and busy with producing experiences. But it must be more than laziness and simply seeking our own entertainment in the studio that constructs the familiar artistic discourse of rejecting/releasing hyper-control, seeking the unexpected and unpredictable, searching for the anomalies and mutations, inviting influence and confluence, including disturbance, etc. As trite as these things sound by now, or whether they are merely a part of contemporary cultural and theoretical obsessions with inclusion, fluidity, the leaky and the impure, especially in regards to the corporeal, the frequency of these kinds of aims are a practical indication that a majority of artists and art makers in the field of performance today don't plan "a, b, c," in order to see "a, b, c" executed. Perhaps because the work is not in making art objects, but in making something performed, there is an investment in the outcome as a working process, the execution as a renewal rather than a repetition, a real-time making in itself, an updating that activates itself within the act of performance and in each performative step of the process. It is my experience that method in performance-making practices seems more aptly to be something always in formation, temporarily crystallizing to the extent that it serves progress, and just as quickly being replaced or altered to adjust to whatever is learned along the way.

We can find exceptions often in performance crossovers with the visual arts, when inanimate matter is involved and what is done stays put, as a permanent materialization of the method by which it is produced. But when the media are subjects, as mentioned above, a method is never sealed from corruption. You could argue that the work of Merce Cunningham is made by a methodologically regulated process, but the effects of this method on and within the bodies, the way it is realized, executed, embodied, and passed on as repertory constantly escapes the regime. A few instances

within performance in which I can imagine method working without infection by unaccountable circumstances, are in examples from the Fluxus movement, which did not, by the way, identify itself as performance, though many Fluxus happenings and objects were highly performative. In these cases I have in mind, the work is methodical in order to be methodical, and in a sense the method is the art itself. With many Fluxus scores, the authorship lies in the conception of the method more than seeing it through:

EVENT SCORE

Arrange or discover an event score and then realize it.

If the score is arrived at while awake, then make a dream realization, that is, note all dreams until a realization of the score has been discovered in a dream.

If the score is dreamed, then make a waking realization, that is, search in your waking life for whatever dream or part of a dream constitutes the score

George Brecht

The text itself is performative. Brecht's method is to describe a method that lives in its description. The imagined experience of fulfilling it and the thoughts that come to mind of its realization create an experience that is self-sufficient, a serendipitous little performance between the reader and the text. It's a virtual performance, a performance of potentiality, richer as such than it could be in any materialization. Yoko Ono's paintings often underlined this emphasis on the method being the art itself, as in the original, instructional version of *Painting to Hammer A Nail* which denotes a painstakingly consequent method for producing a painting, but itself is a painting not made by the method described. The painting describes a score for an event through the painting as an art object itself, as loud as the content of its text. Paintings made by the process described in *Painting to Hammer a Nail* were indeed made, but as live performances of this methodical process, again emphasizing the process itself as the art more than the integrity of the art object produced from it.

Strict methods with dependable results have their artistic utility within the Performing Arts Proper indeed, not just for performing methods, but as methods for making something else than the method. As my friend Trajal Harrell recently said, "What do you do when you get in the studio? There's nothing to do there!" The empty room gives us nothing, nothing but space and time. A sterile luxury. Advantages of having methods we are aware of using are that we have things to do when we get into the studio and that the work is stronger than the constant shifting of our interest, confidence and motivation (which becomes even more important when we are working with others). Understanding the way we work in terms of methods can provide us with tools to apply when we are stuck, directions to move in when we are not sure, a feeling of purpose when we are working like dogs and don't yet know what towards. Yet the moment when the tools disappear is the crucial moment of transformation, when you begin to make something besides an answer to a question or a materialization of a method, a

moment in which the method begins to serve something besides its own verification.

I think methods are useful that produce the desire to work, the desire to look farther. Hence tasks as methods, impossibility as method, and the use of productive paradoxes. Deborah Hay's method, for example, is to work always and only on impossible scores in order to produce interest. Unless it is completely impossible, there is always the option of finding a clever solution and being done with it, so in order to never be finished but always busy she writes impossible scores. Completely opposite from the Fluxus examples, her scores must be performed in order to be activated, exist always and only as a performance practice, and the language of the score is so physio-perceptual that just reading one invites physical investigation. Hay's is a method for producing physical curiosity and continuous work, with an open range of acceptable results. The method is the stable underpinning, the consistent base to the unruly possibilities, and the daily work of not knowing what will be produced and reinventing/refining the parameters of what can be produced.

There is also a way in which what we do when we are moving forward without a method in mind is producing its own methods. I don't think that making work always requires knowing what tools you are using and how and why, because we are smart and we are interested and we are makers and every so often that is enough (granted that "we" of course are smart, interested, makers in this case). When we want to move quickly and something feels correct in one way and not any other way, why not trust that intelligence called intuition and use the time later when that momentum disappears to look back and say: "what did we do first, then what did we do second, why did we make these choices?" Through this retrospective reasoning, methods are revealed based on the interests followed or the manner of relating to the work, and can be re-used, re-applied, transformed into tools for later use, in short, methodized. When I am excited about making and feeling productive, capable, and dare I say, "inspired", I am working with a surplus of ideas, problems and solutions, and perhaps 90% of them are utterly useless, but to stall this movement of thought and productivity is to eliminate the 10% that proves workable. What can be done then is a negotiation between foresight and hindsight, and when it's not, there stakes are not as high in the doing because the process has been sealed from producing anything one couldn't have known before.

Method is one way to view what is happening in the work, one lens, and there are many other things happening in the process of making that are more or less helpful frames at different times. Therefore, and if only in my own work, I am for method-awareness. I am not for procedure-obsessed method-madness. I am not for chaotic method ignorance. I am for a hybrid of foresight and hindsight, method implementation and alteration, needing method and escaping method, creating methods from anti-methods, responsible irresponsibility, seeking the method within the madness, the method monsters. The work is the monster of the method(s). Monstrous because it is irreproducible and a product of connections between the method you planned and the method as it became, the method as it is infected with other methods in order to become something else, specific to the project, something not universal or re-applicable, something unscientific, something you can never do the same because all of the circumstances cannot be reproduced and the methodology acknowledges and is a synthesis of that specificity.

GLOSSARY

Eleanor Bauer

antimethod - (n.) 1. a method that comes into use between the use of recognized methods 2. the way we work when we think we are not following a method 3. the retrospective surfacing of structure within disorderly processes 4. the negative, undefined space between, around and within method that makes the tangibility and existence of method possible. 5. the inseparable, complimentary, invisible opposite of method.

megamethod - (n.) 1. a great or large method which encompasses all other methods and can be applied as methodology to any other set of methods 2. a set of a million methods that comprise a single concept of methodology 3. a method of methodizing method, meta-meta-method

metamethod - (n.) the application of a method upon itself, the methodical use of a method according to itself, a reflexive method of using method, the methodization of a method

methantics - (n.) the study of meaning in methods, what different methods mean, a branch of **methodics**.

methodal - (adj.) 1. of or relating to the method of a process (from 'modal') 2. describing something actually made by a method (as opposed to 'methody'). Usage note: **methodical** describes a process, **methodal** describes the product of such a process.

methodate - (v.) to use method as the medium between two poles or subjects (n.) methodation; (n.) **methodator** one who methodates or provides methodation between.

methodics - (n.) the study of method, including what different methods produce, how different methods come into being, their lineage and history, the separable components of a method, the defining characteristics of a method.

methodol - (n.) a drug, known to reduce symptoms associated with methodosis, methopia, and metholomania

methodosis - (n.) 1. a process in which a method is transferred between two organisms 2. a process by which a relation between two organism becomes understood and performed methodically, becomes methodological 3. A mental illness characterized by obsession with methodology.

methody - (adj.) 1. describing a procedure that appears methodical, carries the surface characteristics of a method. (from 'truthy') 2. the appearance of a product whose process was methodical 3. (n.) a counterpart to melody and harmony which reveals the process of composition.

metholomania - (n.) the perception or belief that one has found the method to replace all other methods.

methomatic - (adj.) of or relating to **methomatics**, common variation: methomatical) (n.) a machine that produces method.

methomatics - (n.) 1. the analysis of method according to numerical values and proportions, a branch of **methodics** 2. mathematical methods applied to fields of study and inquiry other than mathematics.

methopolis - (n.) a state or society existing purely through method

methopic - (adj.) seeing only through method

This glossary has been created by Eleanor Bauer with thanks to Anne Lin Akselsen, Heike Langsdorf, and Merriam Webster.

Overwhelming, the doing of research

Mårten Spångberg

Over the last ten years or so, new sets of terminology have been flourishing within performing arts circles. Some of them were picked up from visual art, others from various areas ranging from entertainment to scientific discourses. Revisiting this period of time, during which I myself have been active in the field, I have found that the terminology machine used tends to be updated in respect of market strategies, including applications, public talks, reviews, presentation texts etc. rather than through an explicit need to formulate different or alternative modes of production and representation. I should not try to escape the attraction of such strategies as I myself have been sitting on various seats in respect of our landscape and have been quick in adopting terms of which I hardly knew, or know, what they actually implied. But I must confess that I have developed a certain desire to clean up their use, not so much in respect of definition and epistemology, however much I have been a spokesperson for such, but from a user's perspective. What I mean here, is that I believe that the terms used and in use as often as not try to implement different and alternative strategies in ways that are oblique to the major strategies applied by the field and its markets. And if we in the field are not cautious with their use they might be recuperated, if not obliterated, by market forces. A significant example is 'research', which was (as far as I can remember the term showed up in this shape around 1997) issued by makers mostly with good intentions. After just ten years of use, the term seems to have lost its capacity as an alternative ground for production, as well as its etymology from scientific use, namely to research, as a matter of coming to terms with one side or another of a problem and with it, its particular capacity of knowledge production. Several of the terms contained in this glossary are weak in respect of capitalist notions of production as well as representational strategies, which makes it even more important that makers and curators use them in ways that are proper in order

not to be inscribed in such modes of production and representation. It is also important that makers should be conscious to what strategies lie behind the adoption of certain terms by curators and funding systems. For example, the term 'research' was first issued by makers but was quickly picked up by curators and presenters. Why? I can see two main reasons: 1. When the market economy and audience were failing in the mid 1990s, it was important to issue new arguments to gain public support. One of them was to address the importance of research in order not to require a large-scale audience, or said in a less direct way, it was a means of deviating from a 'spectacularization' of the field's representations proper. 2. Continuing on the notion of spectacularization, it could also be seen as a way for market forces either to localize and fix productions that were dangerous due to their critical potentiality, or in order to maintain a certain kind of production within a particular size of economies of circulation, distribution and language with regard to support, infrastructure, logistics, visibility, and mediation. In short, by issuing a research framework in, e.g., a festival, it implied to announce certain productions as something that a regular public should not see, but that they were for a 'special' kind of audience made up of connoisseurs. Hence to issue a research programme as part of a festival was a means to maintaining for the large-scale audience an entertainment-based programme and at the same time satisfying the critical implementations of the makers and doers in the field.

On the other hand, what kind of ambitions was it that the field's makers and doers needed to satisfy when characterizing their proposals 'research'? Most of them were probably relevant, but several were indeed labelled as research not only due to fashion but also through ignorance, because of an incapability to create works that were so to say finished, or in some cases, because makers and doers were incapable of producing a coherent method of working. However, at the end of the day, are we actually capable of

addressing artistic work without some sort of research procedure? Isn't it a contradiction in terms to think that one is not researching, or in some or other way experimenting when going to work, in the studio, in the study or other places?

It is my belief that research economies normally are weaker than economies of production and it is therefore important to be cautious with how the small economies for research are being used. It would be a shame if they at some point were considered as similar to economies of production due to their misuse in respect of, e.g., a use that is understood as simple preparation for a conventional production. I will not here address the dangerous fields of what the terminology in this glossary implies with regard to representation. Isn't it so that, for instance, research lately also has developed into more or less a style, with proposals for light, style of performance, set and/or kind of dramaturgy (normally flat and fragmented)? If so, this can only have a negative effect on the field in its entirety.

Laboratory

Even more peculiar is how performing arts have used the term, or label, 'laboratory'. It appears that the field has mixed the term up, considering it something more than a site, or confinement, where certain systematic (or not) activities can be executed. It seems that the performing arts per definition regard 'laboratory', or in the worst of cases 'lab', as being a creative environment in which inventions take place. I don't want to be general about what a laboratory can imply, but it is a fact that its very condition is to be a neutral site that does not intervene in, or preferably alters specific and sensitive experimentation to a minimum extent. It is only in our fantasies that innovators spend day and night in the laboratory and it is indeed naïve to assume a laboratory, in any discipline and any part of the world, to hold any innocence.

In fact I believe that the notion of a laboratory in the performing arts is primarily influenced by popular culture. A research and laboratory concept derived from Jules Verne coupled with Mary Shelley, mixed with black and white movies where the genius changes the world or engages in alchemic or life-giving success stories that inevitably end up in hell. This certainly is as good as any other image and construction of a laboratory, but what our field should keep in mind is what laboratories propose or do in respect of the field. What is the lack that needs to be compensated for by a laboratory, and what is this lack nourished by? Could it possibly be that such romantic notions of the

laboratory in fact obtain the opposite of its intention, which, I assume to be a de-territorialization of the field in view of a more progressive future? I believe that the laboratory, as used in the performing arts, to a large extent is a means of recreating an artist genius, but formulated externally to artistic production, which long ago shook the sticky clown "The Genius" off its back through modernism, while giving priority to intuitive processes in which the methodology favoured is one that ends up with the researcher's hair standing upright, completely black in the face, with a disorientated smile of methodological ignorance shining through the soot.

The critical voices of certain groups within the performing arts environment that laboratory and research emphasize are, in other words, correct if the concept of research and laboratory used coincide with proper definitions according to an academic or scientific agenda. As this is not the case, the same terminology in fact promotes intuitive processes in which methodologies are often mediated as obscure or even as something that would lose its magic if articulated, when in fact any standard definition would emphasize that it is not a site with a priority for research and experimentation, but that the aim is to provide fast and reliable results.

When recapitulating the exhibition 'Laboratorium' curated by Hans Ulrich Obrist and Barbara Vanderlinden, it is imperative to note that it was not an attempt at forefront research and experimentation, nor to provide fast reliable and fast results, but to provide a specific framework within the field of visual art negotiating the work of art as process, as knowledge production, conversation, or dialogue. The exhibition was not a site for experimentation; it was a site of presentations of processes that rigorously applied laboratorial strategies.

It is indeed remarkable how the performing arts over the last ten years have nourished research and laboratory, almost unconditionally, whereas in other art forms similar attempts have had no, or little, significance. Whether this is ignorance in respect of modes or production in other art forms, or evidence of how the performing arts have again been trapped by capitalist strategies in a vain attempt to reinvent the body as a site for experimentation or, even worse provocation, is not to be unfolded here. Nevertheless, it is obvious that performance through the ontological discussions issued in the early 1990s concerning gender, ethnicity, sexuality etc. has been kept as a mascot of some pretty conventional narratives.

Collaboration/Collectivity

In this respect it is also important properly to negotiate for instance the differentiation between more or less conventional management models and terms such as ‘collaboration’ and/or ‘collective/collectivity’. It seems to me to be a bad omen when simple teamwork and collaboration are intermixed and confused.

It is my belief that collaboration and collective/collectivity need to be the topography of a work or works to qualify as relevant when faced with groups and constellations that announce their method as collaborative. As far as I know even the most demonic director or choreographer is in some or other way collaborating. A conductor in front of a symphony orchestra is still involved in collaboration with very specific features on top of that.

If a group or constellation wishes to address collaboration as an important feature of its work or its being some kind of community, it is at the very least appropriate to know and to be able to articulate what specific features the collaboration or collective wants to emphasize. If what one wants to emphasize is the importance of working together, that the result can become different or that it deviates from models of authorship, it is my belief that one should stop talking immediately as I can hardly imagine any work situation that is not constructed around these or similar issues, whether they are understood as positive or negative. There seems to be a political paradox inherent to any collaboration or collective that does not pose its very existence as the work and its socio-political nexus. Isn’t politics motored by these very operations between equality and liberty and therefore becomes the only realm necessary to invest in terms of intra- and extra-structural notions of domination? It is furthermore interesting to note that within the field of performing arts the production of collaborations and collectives is generated in respect of processes and appearances through strong spatio-temporal coordination, i.e. collaboration and collectivity are hardly ever addressed under any other circumstances than superficial deviations of authorship through which the instigator, the delegating unit, receives an even stronger position. This is very similar to the co-ownership raised by, e.g., consultant companies in the 1990s, which without further difficulties could be reduced to a redistribution of loyalty from the community of workers to the community of owners.

From process to ownership

Collaboration doesn’t start in the studio and end in the

dressing room, nor does process have any particular relation to site or duration. Three decades on, the performing arts have returned to process: quoting, doubling, honouring and deviating through the complete mismatching of heroes of the neo avant-garde, recycling aesthetics to make collaboration etc. recognizable, resurrecting ideology in an easy way in order to disguise the fact that we have nothing to voice, but, it seems, less in a manner of emphasizing heterogeneity as a clumsy means to escape malign capitalism à la late 1990s. Isn’t it just magic that collaboration and process rocket to the sky at the moment the performing artist buys himself a mobile phone, or as soon as soon as performance constellations get themselves e-mail addresses starting ‘info@...’?

What artistic work is not issued through some or other process? Hardcore conceptual work, yes. But that is something that we haven’t seen in the performing arts since the late 60s, considering that a conceptual work, at least as established in art history, is protocol based and can therefore, on a display level, not involve any process or collection of experiences due to the work’s representation. It is therefore not enough to speak about process but it necessarily has to be conceptualized or preferably reveal its conceptualization in its representation. Never mind any interdisciplinary attempts which often sound great on the level of application but seldom offer any further production of ideology or knowledge in their presentation. With both process and interdisciplinarity it is awkward to realize that their manifestation — as with collaboration — seems to have been formalized to include only a process just prior to a finished product, but is rarely considered to include any other frame of time or space.

What process-orientated work in performing arts needs to look further into are matters of ownership. To what extent, and in respect of what mechanisms are, or aren’t, processes also owned by somebody, or some entity? An activity, whatever process is involved, necessarily will be represented by or through somebody, or some entity, and it is therefore important to address not what process is implied, but what differentiation of ownership a given process provokes due to what market or environment. It has become common for, e.g., performers to be mentioned in credit lists as co-creators, but it is rarely considered what it would imply concerning co-ownership. Even though I risk becoming tedious, I still want to raise these questions about responsibility that inevitably arise in respect of process and production. It is far from obvious that co-authorship would imply a wider range

of transparency or legacy of a work, not in respect of laterality of procedure. On the contrary, it seems that co-authorship decreases opportunities for resistance, doubt or failure because each individual or institution involved runs the risk of losing face, a feature inherent to democracy. Its regime of cowardice is exponential to any legitimized consensus.

In fact, the process-orientated work that has flourished in performing arts over the last ten years has been an important factor associated with the currently conservative climate. Is it perhaps so that an autonomous author instead could venture into a greater degree of radicalness because a collaborator is familiar with exactly what responsibility is at stake? Something that must, at least for the sake of critique, be true. The entire range of collaboration, process, coproduction, coauthorship etc. is the performing arts' own opportunistic response to a society of control. What then is the solution? I believe it lies in the use of an extensive amount of terminology and in changing its meaning continuously, as a means of de-territorialization and in order to enable any user to recognize that an assembly of terminology not only establishes markets, but also is an important instigator of history and historicity. A discourse indeed has, or issues, the terminology it deserves, and as seen in Gilles Deleuze's two books on cinema, any assembly of terminology also is what produces paradigm and territory. But this is not enough. It is important to observe and inquire what terminology can be of use, which etymology cannot be derived from academic or scientific backgrounds. Can performing arts instead conceptualize terminology from pop culture, everyday language, sports, cooking, or management in order to produce autonomy, something that certainly has produced resistance because an appropriated use naturally is a means of establishing, e.g., dance as an art form proper? This is the trap in which Doris Humphrey got caught with her "The Art Of Making Dances", in its form almost a classical treatise, and is it not precisely here that Yvonne Rainer's "NO" manifesto is most valuable, and provocative, namely as a matter of defining dance, choreography, or performing arts, as radically different from any conventional aggregate of commodification? This certainly is not a matter of diminishing or questioning the role or capacity of though theoretical, academic procedures or any abstract models available, through, e.g., esoteric parallax, commercial value, availability or didactic purposes, nor of favouring properties of any foreign assemblages, but simply one of destabilizing circulations of language within the field of performing arts so as not to exclude any utterance or production.

The intensity with which academic practices have been invaded by performativity over the last ten years has brought with it an increase of theoretical academic surplus into the practical and productive field as well. The increase in terminology with an etymology in these discourses is evident and however positive their influence may have been, they are productive precisely because they are specific and territorial. With the recent depression of performativity and its thinkers, it is clear that academic discourse will leave the field, and especially its practical applications, as soon as it possibly can. Following canonical theories of research the likelihood is that performance studies will sustain its position in the academic marketplace. At that moment it will be important for the field not to end up in the cold as a result of accumulations of terminology that are incompatible with other productive fields. I am therefore convinced that the production and establishment of terminology have to evacuate the fatherly control of certain academic systems, especially ones promoting master/disciple relations. Instead, each participant and constellation in the field needs: 1. To identify the limits: what is the realm that an assemblage of terminology can, should, or need to configure, change or otherwise shift? 2. What possible external demands can be identified; in respect of what interests are the understood limits viable? With these two conditions in mind to create a third: to establish a dynamique d'enfer, a dynamic from hell... so complex that all interconnections, mutual dependencies, the proliferation of interfaces, the superimposition of users and providers all together form a group of capacities, shackled together by mutual obligations, exacerbated by the very complexity offered by the concept unwittingly. Today, instead, it is imperative to divert terminology and find ways around institutional frames and capitalist economies and perhaps even to use terminology with such abundance that not only active creators and doers in the field have to invest and announce positions and opinions, but also other participants in order to create a shared criticality which can produce not multiplicity, but a multitude. Performing arts today need to create terminology, which differentiates its participants instead of bringing them together merely in order to necessitate a livelier discussion on all levels. It is first through a shared interest in accuracy in the use of terminology that, for instance, the field can initiate discussion on curatorial practices and economic circumstances. Flexibility and mobility must be conceptualized, precisely as a means not to be positioned according to a given subject. The performing arts have to understand what a critical position is and have to proclaim their

mobility, not in respect of the market but of other and different coherences. As long as the performing arts associate with, and refer to, existing assemblages of terminology, however general, they will never be given a voice, i.e., will not be accounted for. To produce a voice it is, of course, not enough to appropriate another voice, but it is only when an autonomous site can be established that a voice can be established, when something that does not exist can be given a name. Only something with a name can have a voice, and it is in this act of naming that speech can pass from one period, or age, to another. This is not a matter of an uprising that can be put down; it is a question of some kind of progressive revelation that can be recognized by its own signs and against which there is no point fighting⁽¹⁾.

Yet within this work, we participants of the field are subject to a responsibility which is extremely complex to handle in its multiple directionality, whose operability is to expand the conclusive concept of the performing arts in order to give a multitude of processes, productions and products, discourses and intuitions, amateurs and professionals, collaborations and collectives the opportunity to create performing arts so far unthinkable.

II

The complexity of the establishment of research and related discourses within the field of performing arts has taken the course of an avalanche. From the product and image intensive period of the 1980s, following a period of politically orientated work, the 1990s and early 2000s will most probably be remembered as the era of research. Overnight, research was established around 1997 and already consolidated with the now legendary exhibition 'Laboratorium' in 1999, which also included a small number of contributions from the performing arts. The reasons for this development would need a thorough analysis addressing the phenomenon also from perspectives of economy, ownership and social/political justification, as it is my belief that the actual interest in the community of makers and programmers was and is rather exaggerated.

It is fascinating to return to the mid or late 1990s and witness how dancers, choreographers, set designers and even the production manager in a microsecond developed an obsessive passion for research. Artists who had never shown interest in process-oriented investigatory strategies transformed into first-rate researchers and with production phases of more or

less a year the laboratory rat had found its place in the performing arts. With the introduction of the R-word, a truckload of firmly established terminology exited the stage. Somebody defining his work as experimental was looked upon as the plague and even only a vague hint towards avant-garde equalled immediate banishment from the entire scene. However much research caught performing arts with the intensity of a hurricane, it was – and is also far too often – superficial in content and consistency. The lack of frames transformed whatever one called research into research.

The difficulty however is to what extent this is a positive or negative quality. Any field of research carries out the research it deserves and it is always necessary with a super-contextual shift to manifest a change in a field of research. Epistemologists have examined how paradigms emerge, consolidate and dissolve as regularly as the sun rises, but since we know this we must conclude that, e.g., in the performing arts we execute the research we desire. But it is also possible that what the performing arts consider research in fact is something entirely different, something that will become apparent within the next few years when in the flood of research the tide turns and another current builds up. To initiate a crusade against the inconsistency of research in the field would therefore be to shoot in one's own foot, independently of the ambitions of the field. The engaged believe in research and will continue to do so until they don't believe any more and at that moment it will seem as impossible to have believed in it as it is natural today. A critique elaborated in this manner would inevitably position itself outside the field, which would propose a new or other foundation, or institution, which in its turn would need a thorough investigation. Addressing the field through negotiations vis-à-vis governmentality, however, could offer interesting observations about what research, so to say, has done or produced in respect of the performing arts.

Before starting, a brief detour into the state of the belief in research: ten years after I first heard the word in the performing arts context, it is clear that the believers are already doubting, if for no other reason than the very fact that research today is as trendy as Dixieland jazz or T-shirts manufactured in sweatshops. What once was a close to hysterical inward migration has over the last couple of years turned into a slow but unstoppable stream of defectors returning to more classical templates of production. Moreover, the belief structure has changed; it is no longer the creators

or programmers that praise research, but rather a mixed group of theoreticians, who in addition are late converts who have moved into rather than initiated the field's topology. The high-end ambitions of research platforms have too often, in accord with academic writing on the development of a field of research, turned into a retreat for individuals that either can't reach or are denied a position in a conventional frame of production, or are considered a threat to a common frame of production.

The orientation of research in performing arts initiated an expansion through a series of politically correct tactics that emphasized interdisciplinarity and interculturalism — quite in the same way as performance studies — and it didn't take long before research was hijacked by enthusiasts with the single mission to find themselves a place to belong. The third step in the development of research in performing arts, after establishment and expansion, implies redefining the field and rehabilitating its symbolic value. This process is inevitably painful as it implies exclusion and closing doors, but it is necessary in order to define not only a territory, but most of all topological and methodological consistency.

What research in this sense has done to the field of performing arts is in fact not an auxiliary elaboration of its intra- or inter-relationships, but has rather undermined its status and exclusivity in general.

The field's resistance against and even aversion to methodology is strong evidence for the state of research being overall weak, similar to the phenomenon where anti-intellectualism normally indicates stasis or the decline of a field. Research in performing arts has yet to establish an accurate set of tools and a thorough methodological protocol in order not to perish in the climate of late capitalist research production. Tools and protocols cannot be appropriated from other fields, nor can they be autonomously produced from within the field, as both would result in a corrupt discipline due to personal, relational, economic and image reasons. Tools and methodology should be created in accordance with well-established ethical checkpoints combined with a thorough analysis of the field's specific conditions, in this case, e.g., notions of temporality and the impossibility of repetition or otherwise.

The common consideration is that methodology is an obstacle to creative and artistic potentiality or, in other words: freedom. But if this is the argument, we have made a fundamental mistake in making artistic work or processes synonymous with research, when

in fact those protocols are oppositional and in so being to no extent competitive. It is urgent for the field to make distinctions between engaging in artistic processes and research, hence a thorough apparatus of definition also would clear up any hierarchical misunderstandings. There is no higher or lower value in engagement in research processes; it is simply another practice whose aim is to produce other kinds of knowledge and artefacts. Without methodological accuracy and consistency, it is impossible to evaluate the quality and importance of a certain work and keep processing outside the domains of taste and individual desire, which in the case of research implies that its knowledge economy remains passive and consolidating instead of active and potential. Instead of producing restriction, a thorough methodological framework would enable the field to validate work for what it is, and moreover produce a platform for an active criticality that would grant a critical reciprocity between providers of research platforms, economic frames and researchers, creators and users of research results. It is important, too, that methodology under no circumstances should be related to science or academia here, but simply be a set tool and protocols that offer opportunities to identify, compare and differentiate a territory of research and hence produce autonomy based on production rather than heritage or charisma. The lack of accurate methodological protocols manifests power in the providers of research and platforms to the extent where research, instead of expanding and emancipating the field's knowledge production, consolidates it and furthermore places an unacceptable emphasis on success, especially in respect of representation and efficiency. Only through the establishment of an accurate methodological frame can research free itself from the superficial demands of capitalist economics. What research has produced relative to the field up until today, instead of a surplus and hence a lateralization of knowledge, is the hierarchization of processes and practices that in a larger perspective homogenizes the momentum of the field's endeavours.

At the time when research first appeared, it was due to a need to change the strong product orientation of the market and its subsidy systems. Questions were asked to what extent, e.g., a choreographer could, so to say, update his or her practice when there were no economic or physical frameworks for other kinds of work than production. Only in rare educational frames could research activity be considered and a dominant part of workshop opportunities were at the time directed towards the passing on of established

skills such as release technique, or a choreographer's individual perspective of dance and performance. Research-related activity at the time appeared to be a means to shortcut those manifestations, especially in relation to result and representation. A number of projects and processes were initiated by individuals or small communities, often on an idealistic basis, but with the institutionalization of research in performing arts an opposing momentum came about. Everybody engaged in research practices at the time was, of course, enthusiastic about all expansive opportunities that appeared, as the formulation of a field is precisely when and where active and vivid knowledge production is most potential. The field's territory also stakes out a grid for what kind of research and activity it can muster, but as the distance between creators and managers is distinct in the field of performing arts, this development was quite soon appropriated by venues and festivals and taken out of the hands of the researchers. Instead of releasing performing art practices, the introduction of institutional research frames resulted in further consolidation, and today it is clear that rather than being an emancipating movement, research has institutionalized the practice even more.

When an autonomous artist in the performing arts field today receives a research grant, he or she actually is not at all free to engage in an open process but is instead limited to the extent where individual creativity is being institutionalized. Prior to the institutionalization of research, every individual was free to engage in unrestricted processes of thinking, practicing and experimenting, whilst today these activities have also been mapped and applied to, however vague, protocol of authorization. In this respect what research has done to the field of performing arts is not to emancipate it from the circulation of exchangeable commodities, but has instead also commodified work understood as engagement in some kind of research process. Research was implemented in a mode of production due to proprietary licensing which stratified its discourses and immobilized its capacity of any de-territorializing radical knowledge production.

It would be telling to return briefly to the recent history of performing arts in Europe. The circulation of what is conventionally called contemporary dance, performance and theatre takes place in institutions and venues that, at least as a model, were established around and just after 1980. At that time, a young generation of artists and managers detected and

worked for a new system for the presentation of a new kind of work. For a period of 10 to 15 years, these venues were established and consolidated as sustainable economies. Systems of exchange, networking and production were elaborated and often quite clear hierarchies of circulation grew strong, something which a 'general' audience reacted to and favoured as to expectations and reliability. When research appeared in the mid-1990s, it could generally be understood as a counter-reaction to known frameworks, initially as a creator-and-doer-based initiative. A heterogeneous group of independent new players appeared on the market with new needs and desires, players that to a higher or lesser degree did not wish to be inscribed in the established market or simply were not welcome. Process orientation, research and a kind of ad hoc production basis appeared to be an attractive mode of production, but with the incorporation of the previously mentioned modes of work in venues and festivals modelled in the 1980s, research instantaneously turned into precisely the opposite. Instead of opening up a new platform of circulation and ownership, research-based work became characterized as a means of maintaining the power of established venues, festivals, companies, and makers. A choreographer or group identified with research was, instead of being a potential — and I would argue, positive — threat or opportunity, disarmed and classified in a way where it could never grow out of the, so to speak, small format. There certainly are exceptions, but it is easy to detect what kind of artist is identified with research and it certainly isn't those who are engaged in larger institutional frames, even though they are perhaps the ones who most of all could need a break from the obsession with production.

What research has done to the field of performing arts is not to open for the elaboration of new and alternative modes of production, of new and alternative kinds of work. It has actually made it largely impossible for young and progressive initiatives to elaborate and obtain sustainable economies and audiences. In other words, research has been incorporated into the 'conventional' models of the performing arts field in order to maintain the hierarchies created already in the 1980s. This consolidation of power has increased the identity of the artist over a romantic set of protocols purporting individuality, oeuvre and calling on the one hand, and precariousness on the other. The unique opportunity and complexity of the performing arts that the expressed and the expressing often, if not as a rule, coincide, offers a minimal distance between invention and expression. The choreographer dancing has always

been a hands-on researcher, or in other words, their own guinea pig, their own structure of experience and sensation. Such relations, implementing their own, individual and commonsensical methodologies that to the same extent intensify regressive strands, that enter realms of execution for the simple sake of pleasure or economic gain and inventive capacities often using intuition as methodology, encourage differentiation in the field. A clear example is Alexander technique, but these inventive practices more often take place in informal settings over years of hard work, and rarely in unorthodox circumstances. With the introduction of research, the relation between creator and executor has changed where the formal awareness of the process has been institutionalized. Research has, as a matter of fact, made it difficult simply to go and dance, to use one's imagination and make it happen. Research proposes certain hierarchies of process and production, individual and group processes and work, and most of all formalizes relations between the validity of a process and work-relative sets of discourses active in the context at a certain moment. With the introduction of research, the performing arts have not been offered increased opportunities for inefficiency or processes dealing with extreme topics, on the contrary: what research has done to the performing arts is to make it trend- (who today would make an image-based work with an extremely elaborated lighting design?), format- (collaboration is everything and a pseudo-lateral working process imperative), discourse- (bring some books without pictures like S, M, L, XL to the studio and work as you always did), media- (show a video at the end of the piece where you are instructed in doing something you can't really manage and speak about knowledge production on a personal level) sensitive, and hence has homogenized its expressions.

This litany could go on forever, engaging in what we thought was doing well but turned out to be doing exactly the opposite. But has research then only been negative for the performing arts? Certainly not. On the contrary, the expansion of the field of performing arts with the realm of research has been essential to the field's survival and as performance and performativity in the 1990s became buzzwords for any intellectual with dignity, it is rather encouraging how open the field has been to the engagement of, and in, other kinds of knowledge production. In fact, initially there are only two issues that need to be raised in respect of how to change a possibly negative development. But there is of course a slight problem with those two – which is that they both demand the format of a Ph.D. to be thoroughly discussed. What follows here is in a sense

comprehensive but tries to formulate, in brief, some perspectives.

1. What adjustments have to be considered after ten years of working with the criteria of research?
2. With the institutionalization of research, what has occurred with regard to distribution of responsibility?

It is today ten years ago that Hotmail was globally released. In 2006, Hotmail has approximately one billion hits a month. It is also ten years since SMS appeared in conventional private-user mobile phones. In 2005, the world-wide volume of SMS was estimated to be more than three hundred billion messages. Amazon and EBay similarly were created in 1995. Google was released in September 1999 from a garage in Palo Alto. In the Spring of 2006, Google CEOs mention 150 million queries per day, or more than 50 billion per year. Skype was registered as a domain name exactly three years ago, on April 23, 2003. At this very moment there are 5.5 million users on line, out of more than a 100 million downloads. Considering that research in the performing arts has the same ten-year-long history and that Skype was invented two-thirds into that brief history, it is quite easy to conclude that adjustments might be small in perspective, but enormous in proliferation. There is of course the danger of rushing to the next base while forgetting the kids in the shopping mall, but new modes of communication and production do not imply a homogenization of results, nor an arrogant relation to the history of research, but there certainly are no reasons to evaluate research that jumps over classical resources as less prominent. On the contrary, if research in the performing arts nourishes a desire to be something more than a tiny field for the already engaged, it is obvious that all opportunities must be explored.

Generally speaking, the field can choose to confirm research as it is established in and through strong and historically prominent fields, or bring forth the specificity of the field and explore it as something that other fields could gain momentum from. Good examples are Doris Humphrey's book "The Art of Making Dances", which largely is a defence of dance as regards the classical treatise producing a form of expression that is specific due to its universality, and on the other hand Yvonne Rainer's "NO" manifesto and adjoining texts, where instead the art of making dances dissociates itself from expressions constituting sustainable artefacts. Humphrey is easy to cancel

out and to be asked to get a grip and start painting or writing poetry, as she also necessarily confirms classical, male representational orders. Yvonne Rainer instead differentiates and potentializes dance in relation to all other expressions, and in this act, at least announces that dance and performance can only be 'inscribed' in representational orders we are familiar with, but precisely in this 'forced' translation produces itself as ontologically critical.

The setup of research in performing arts is based on modes of distribution and circulation that today are largely outdated. Ten years ago is basically closer to J.S. Bach walking to Lübeck to listen to Buxtehude in 1705 than to the ease with which we move all over Europe today. So, why is it still important to work on research on the basis of discussion, exchange and same-room organization, when time and economy allow us to meet in the sushi bar of the Ryanair terminal somewhere? – And that's only for those of us who don't communicate over digital platforms or group chats.

The communicational tools that the field uses naturally influence the result of its endeavours, and it is precisely in producing distance between, e.g., new communicational tools and the position of the body and movement that conventional dialectics are maintained and further consolidated. If the body and its movement are in one way or another fundamental to human life and consciousness, it is unlikely that Skype, PDF or P2P (peer-to-peer networks) will affect it any more than central perspective, combustion engines or moving images. They could, however, offer the potentiality to understand and utilize the body and its movements in new and alternative ways. These are certainly issues that directly concern research in the field and also this publication, which I hope will be available on the net to download for free, so that interested persons who have different access opportunities can take part in our research and thinking.

Is it a good or a bad sign that there are almost no video clips of contemporary dance and performance work available on the Internet, when on the other end of the line it is obligatory to send videos to venues and festivals? It is surprising that however the performing arts have been engaged in collaboration, collectivity, processes of orientation and research, the material is not made available on the Internet, as it is a platform that would increase, e.g., the possibilities for visibility in a decentralized way, give individuals and groups living and functioning outside urban contexts the opportunity to familiarize

themselves with contemporary dance, and open up the quite homogeneous formats especially of dance performance? And, most of all, give a larger group of researchers access to material produced here and now: not only performances, but interviews, lectures, presentations, rehearsals which would not only be vital for the scene, but would furthermore increase mobility and a decentralized, lateralized, user-innovative climate. As Erik von Hippel has shown in his recent "Democratizing Innovation" (Cambridge, 2005) economies that stimulate user innovation obtain significantly enhanced heterogeneity and versatility in product development. It is not often believed that users are keen on keeping their innovations to themselves, but a consenting climate where sharing is stimulated instead creates responsibility for the situation's or product's quality, status and place on its market. Open source-like licensing increases the client's identification with a product; responsibility increases and abuse decreases. When EBay experienced a need for prohibition due to abuse of the company's platform, instead of creating complex sets of legislation it turned to the community of users that subsequently innovated self-regulatory monitoring systems.

The common mode of engaging in research in the performing arts is behind closed doors and without an attached web page, live streaming, wiki, or blog. Why does research in performing arts that wishes to place itself inside the contemporary urban mosaic desire to be closed off, locked away, instead of in the middle where it happens and where today's movement practices are communicated and produced?

The body always moves. Blood pumps through the veins, stimuli flow to the brain and responses shoot back to keep whatever is going on, going on. At some moment, quite often, the body starts moving through space, or its spatio-temporal coordination changes. Sometimes we recognize these changes as dance, at other times as walking or being hit by a car. Still, these movements are recognizable precisely as movements framed by a continuous context. Is the body actually moving, or does it remain immobile? Its domain has been enlarged but it is still under control.

With a glance back to the 20th century we might find that the body perhaps only moved a handful of times. That it passed out of coordination without anybody noticing, and moved into the light, into the recognizable again with – for those who were willing to see and sense – an enormous power, and on second thought had always been there, always already. Only when expanding or ex-territorializing itself and its

conditioning has the body really moved. It is not the ex-territorialization that is the movement, but the re-territorialization, re-coordination or recoding. One could say that the body moves without traces, imperceptibly, and that movement is representation catching up. Those movements that are moments, however always on the move, are the rare instances when the body is truly mobile.

Research functions in quite the same way: intrinsically it is always moving, or better yet, is remixed and re-recorded. Sometimes it is set in motion, shifting its coordination, but it is still a matter of repetition, or rather seriality. The known moves, but how often is it that the unknown moves into the known? Always — however imperceptibly. It is only in those instances when the known catches up that the unknown appears. Those moments are the rare cases when research is truly mobile.

Space is striated. Its continuity is divisible and its parts are consistent. It is this consistency that provides us with the opportunity for orientation in time and space. The striation of space, literally and metaphorically, produces a sensation of security but when enhanced turns into some or other kind of prison.

In an early film by George Lucas, 'THX 1138' (1971), a futuristic world is shown in which the humans are caught up in an absolute control society. Their lives and environments have been turned into an inescapable striation. A small number of individuals, however, rebel against the situation and are imprisoned, but instead of putting the prisoner behind steel bars, George Lucas offers a brilliant solution: the prison is represented as an endless, absolutely white space, without beginning or end. Space has become smooth, without horizon and therefore deprived of coordination or orientation. Simplified, one could say that striated space equals knowledge or reproduction and that smooth space constitutes the unknown, i.e., territorial and ex-territorialized, respectively.

In the extremes of both versions, one is imprisoned.

Brian Massumi developed the concept of phaspace, which is a space composed of incompatible entities. It is discontinuous but undivided, i.e., it consists of incompatible superimposed phenomena that offer an orientation, however unreliable. Or better yet, a multiplicity of becoming orientation. Phaspace is those instances of true mobility where knowledge appears and the body really moves.

Translated into frames of research, striated space equals a set-up where the coordination between research and institution or production is static and immobile. Smooth space, on the other hand, could be identified as a situation where the division between researcher and institution or production has been completely abandoned. What the two set-ups have in common is that neither research nor the body can move. On an abstract level, a research set-up aiming to make knowledge move is one that offers itself as phaspace. Such research frames therefore are those where the engaged is continuously shifting from being a researcher and representing an institution or product, a receiver and producer, a staff member and guest. Where a multiplicity of orientation is possible as long as the engaged is willing to negotiate the validity and ontology of each and every decision and its process of emergence, i.e. according to what mode of production a decision can be taken. Therefore, the question is not if we need positions such as researcher and institution or product, but how it is possible to produce a frame in which engagement in any position is the result of a particular negotiation.

Needless to say, the downside of a phaspaced research platform is one of sustainability and initiative, but on the other hand, the upside is the opportunity for a radical heterogenization of knowledge, ability, and desire.

Is it possible to rethink research not in the sense of what it needs but, on the contrary, through what it doesn't need? What are the fundamental needs of research in performing arts?

Secured needs and allocated resources inevitably produce striation and decrease the opportunity for the mobility of knowledge and its agents. Research in performing arts is not in need of further stability, grants, institutions, structures and labs, but of mobility and versatility. It is in the cracks between the implicit striation of methodology and epistemological accuracy, and the smooth terrain of radical mobility that research can boost prosperity in the field.

How does research in performing arts identify its user? Does the field itself actually need users, and if so, how can it be its own client without becoming a self-indulgent territory that produces closer and closer family relations? Since there are very few traces as to publications, video material and ongoing discussions (I have, e.g., not found any blogs related to the field), it is not evident whether the field wants to have users at all. It is not easy in this field to detect the user — but thorough methodological consistency will certainly offer the opportunity to clarify who he or she can be,

which when the basis of research is individual and, in a negative sense, project-to-project based, will be far more complex, and it will therefore be difficult and energy intensive to create a community of interest. If the field identifies the user as already initiated and active in the field, the current climate is quite effective and productive in the sense of creating a clan-like circle, or rather a small number of competing circles whose opposition is based on negative critique and exclusion, which in the long run can only create a vicious circle.

If research projects were evaluated not only according to the topic but perhaps also to its presentation format in respect of a specific user group, it would be possible to measure the success of a research project from a multiplicity of perspectives. In contrast to the way today it is often connected with how 'cool' the topic is estimated to be, and how inspiring, i.e. successful and understandable the presentation of the project is with regard to a general user who is always supposed to be satisfied within ninety minutes.

Such an approach could also open opportunities for complex and mature research into a wider field of performing arts practices, such as work related to children, reception, learning processes or disability, and for more conventional approaches it would similarly expand the capacities to relate to larger frames than what has been made popular by other fields of research concerning different performatives such as gender, colonialism or identity politics.

In the initial phase when research in the performing arts was first established, it was important to make many and different individuals participate. Research, as we have seen earlier, needed to grow as a field and it soon became connected to participatory activities especially in relation to inter-disciplinary and cultural practices. But however much somebody participates, it implies that one should leave one position and engage in another. When participation, when the research period was over — in our field normally spanning from a couple up to 20–30 days but very rarely longer — it was easy to change the costume and forget about research. It is not the activity of researching that is important, but how processes activate individuals, and how many. An example from history could be Dr. Ignaz Semmelweis, who in 1847 through empirical research found out that it was a good idea to wash one's hands after handling dead bodies. The factors were many but Semmelweis, even though he managed to convince other doctors to participate in his experiments, did not manage to activate in them the results of his research. Consequently, Semmelweis'

research was forgotten and he died in a mental hospital at the age of 47. In the same year, Joseph Lister started a series of related experiments and it was through his research that medics were first convinced to start disinfecting hands and instruments when passing from department to department. This anecdote, brought together with the communication technology we can today use easily and at a cheap price, can perhaps assist researchers in performing arts instead of working on participation to emphasize how its research is distributed, circulated, to activate individuals and groups to be involved and use research results in their daily practices.

In order to activate a larger group of users and doers, it is also important to look further into how research results are being licensed, something that is complex in our field as most creators earn their living by transforming their research into circulating products. However, it is clear that proprietary interests often, on a long-term basis, tend to create much less feedback and innovation, as well as responsibility. Open-source-like licensing instead tends to increase responsibility and grass-roots initiatives.

Internet publishing, e.g., will not only create activation but also a faster and cheaper mode of publishing where material output is less stable and therefore can be rewritten and updated continuously.

Furthermore, open-source-like licensing is an opportunity for not striating the field of research but can — instead of the way research has conventionally functioned via permanent membership, often via a pledge — allow for more fluctuant concepts of ad hoc association where a differentiation of expertise can lead to higher specification rather than suffer under the concessional regime of interdisciplinary practices.

I would like to mention a related issue in respect of institutional organization connected to research. In any academic, medical or other public research it is unconditional that the head of an institution should have merits in research. A professor is assessed on the basis of his/her research rather than on the basis of being a good boss, even though that isn't a bad thing. This construction places the head of an institution in a healthy paradox where the research and the infrastructure, or economic basis balance each other as he/she has to keep up negotiation in two directions. Corporate research, on the other hand, is naturally dependent on economic expansion, placing the researcher under the oath of efficiency. Looking into the performing arts field we can note an

unclear framing in respect of leadership. Currently directors of research platforms are not themselves engaged in research, nor do they have the necessary knowledge in the field to evaluate the projects together with the research teams. In scientific research it is also common that a research project should be further evaluated by, e.g., an ethical board. The lack of such procedures can easily lead to conflicts of interest and consequently to less accurate research projects.

This begs our second question concerning responsibility. It is very easy to blame institutional frames and their inherent inefficiency, but we also know that no institution is better than its researchers and it is only when the two resonate together that the result can be innovative. In the case of research in performing arts it is my experience that researchers rely to a large degree on the capacities of institutions and platforms, and often act in passive and demanding ways. As research has no market outside itself, has no or very few engaged users, it is often understood as something doers and creators engage in between production periods. If this were the case in, e.g., medical research, doctors would be surgeons during the week and do research at the weekend. It is clear that such a division will not win anybody a Nobel Prize, nor produce innovative medicine. If an executing doctor takes an interest in engaging in his work also at the weekend, this is all positive, but we shall perhaps, also in our field, make a difference between being interested and proper research processes.

When it comes to research in performing arts, this problem is not easy to solve due to the market share for research being relatively small. But it is only if the researchers produce a demand and argumentation for its share in the budget that it can grow. It is, however, also interesting to consider that in corporate business the conventional amount of money spent on research is approximately 3.5% of the total budget, and in high-end fields up to 7–8%. Since performing arts considers itself a high-end field, it is surprising to notice how few the institutions, venues and festivals are that allocate any budget at all to research and development. I therefore believe that only if the researchers themselves devote time and economy to research can we experience a renaissance of quality. In short: it is today, and in the near future, time to look into what responsibility the field's creators and researchers claim.

It is only through collective engagement in a consistent methodology and specific epistemology, a thorough and ongoing analysis of what research has produced in respect of the field when it comes to both its aims

and its users (and because of this, elaborate proper licenses), in combination with individual responsibility as to what processes we are actually engaged in that we can look forward to a research climate that will enable the field to expand and create research, as well as performances that add something radically different to our expression and the world.

Mårten Spångberg

(1) See Jacques RANCIÈRE, *Disagreement, Politics and Philosophy*, (Minneapolis, 1999), p. 24-27.

Methodology

Andros Zins-Browne

- 1) **In the book *Becoming Deleuze* Deleuze writes “Intuition is neither a feeling, an inspiration, nor a disorderly sympathy but a fully developed method”. What do you think about this statement or simply the idea of intuition as methodology?**

1. Intuition is a methodology without a technology. Everyone uses it but no one can teach it. Or no one can teach it to someone else - but I think intuition becomes a method when you can teach it to yourself; that means learning when and when not to listen to yourself. Everyone has intuition, there's nothing special about that. The problems that I see with regard to intuition usually have to do with the romantic notion that intuition has an inherent value, or the neo-liberal/humanistic notion that everyone has intuition and that this fact itself is worth expressing in art practices because of the 'difference' or 'diversity' that this produces.

What's often ignored is the material aspect of intuition. Not all materials allow me to work intuitively, or in a way that intuition becomes more relevant and productive than construction, for instance.

As someone proposing projects to a group this becomes a particularly interesting question: what proposals can allow a group to work intuitively - in a way in which the material is not the object of knowledge of the choreographer. In this way thinking how to produce intuition becomes a methodology.

- 2) **Do any of the following methods appeal to you and why?**

collaboration as methodology

improvisation as methodology

secrecy as methodology

chance methods

concept as methodology

transparency as methodology

sensation as methodology

overproduction as methodology

appropriation as methodology
ever-changing methodologies as methodology
open source as methodology
hijacking as methodology

a. Collaboration as a methodology isn't interesting to me. Collaboration as a necessity is much more interesting.

b. Improvisation isn't in itself an interesting methodology for me. There have already been many interesting methodological uses of improvisation, some of which I've studied, but they aren't my own. What is still interesting to me about improvisation and what I still feel requires a method is the fact that every performance is improvised and knowing how to take advantage of this fact.

By this I mean that if every performance were 'set' we would feel the same after each performance of the same piece. Why is it that not a single performer ever gets off stage feeling the same about a performance on two separate nights. This is an interesting question for me at the moment, or its implications are interesting in that they point to the fact that there are many unset factors in a given performance - timing, communication with the audience, real-time experience of the performance on stage, the relation with a given environment (and each audience in each theater on each night is different). Any performance with all its set lights, choreography, costumes, etc. has to cope with this. But how to make using these factors, including them into the performance (as they are anyway already included) is still a matter of blank improvisation which for me requires a methodology.

c. Secrecy as a method isn't interesting for me, just as overexposure isn't interesting. I like transparency, but secrecy might be a necessary method for certain problems as long as it isn't mystified - the work of the Atlas Group comes to mind as a good example of secrecy as method - where the position and currency of truth in the performance is secret or at least always evades becoming transparent.

d. Chance - no

e. Concept is a basic necessity but how it's used and what role it takes always requires a kind of method I think.

f. Transparency - as I already said, I like it.

g. Sensation can't be a methodology but can be a means of discovering a methodology. The work of Body-Mind Centering (BMC), Cranial-Sacral work, and Feldenkrais come to mind here. We all sense, so what? But how sensation can become articulated, logical, systematized, is for me completely fascinating. I don't think that William Forsythe thought about how he could develop a method to deconstruct the language of Ballet. Rather, I can imagine that years of Ballet training produced a set

of sensations for him - an organizational system that within an individual body with a certain (then) contemporary 'cultural awareness' created the event of the deconstruction of that language. This as an event is really fascinating to me, and I think it's only possible because the sensation and not only the form of the language was understood and personalized.

For me some of the strongest methods come from sensations precisely because sensation isn't articulate and therefore it necessitates articulation/ systematization in order to be useful to others. This means that it has to pass through a lot of resistance from being a highly subjective set of experiences in order to become a reliable way of arriving at that set of experiences - from the personal to becoming a more objective common knowledge or tool. Of course sensation itself cannot be communicated, only the conditions and ways of arriving at it. But this can be very difficult, and I'm sure that there are many practitioners who have a strong personal understanding of sensation but are unable to articulate this. More often than not though it's the form developed from sensation that becomes the 'methodology.' If it's really a methodology it should have no prescribed form, but should be a way to arrive at many forms, experiences, sensations etc. which is one of the reasons why I like Feldenkrais work so much - which never works with sensation but the specific information that might lead to sensation - and Body-Mind Centering less, which for me works directly with sensations.

h. Over-production as methodology would be more interesting than over-production as symptom.

i. Appropriation as methodology is quite close to the work I've been making the past three years at P.A.R.T.S. I wouldn't say that I have a method of appropriation. I would say that thinking a social problem which leads to the conceptualization of a context (sport, prison, concert etc.) has been a sort of post-factum methodology - it has just been the way that has seemed to make sense for me to work. When I started ballet at age 7 I could never remember the combinations so I was always copying others. Copying and doing at the same time turned out to be a great practice for me. Imitating, copying, and appropriating - moreover making this copying authentic and one's own has been productive for me and has also maybe had an important political significance.

Appropriation has appealed to me because I no longer believed in the currency of original movements - not that they don't exist but that they could no longer have the political and aesthetic impact that they had for me when I began to study contemporary dance. This meant that I could only realize my relation to movement and all of the desire for 'individual language' related to that, through what I could already imagine existing in the world. As I started last year to work with groups of people I found this gave easier access to them than something to 'learn' from me - there was something more common to approach. This made the working relationship less hierarchical even if I proposed the angle from which to approach a given problem.

Appropriation was also a way for me to work with 'meaning' in the sense of 'aboutness'. Without using material from the social world - contextualized material - I found no access to aboutness in dance. Maybe this is becoming less and less important for me, but the pieces I've made so far have run a bit to me like abstracted essays on virtual or real social or cultural situations and for this I found appropriation to be a necessary tool to communicate what I wanted the performance to speak on.

But I think appropriation is a bit over. I'm still thinking though about how to over-appropriate. How to appropriate enough languages and synthesize them (not do them simultaneously,

but appropriate them separately and allow them to synthesize in the body) that they produce their own language. But this is maybe just a method that seems like it should make sense because of an actual ambivalent desire to still use appropriation but 'go back' to creating individual dance language (!) -Case in point that methods aren't necessarily good - they can also be a way to explain away your hidden desires and make them sound completely necessary! This must be avoided. But I don't know yet what this over-appropriation would be about, or I have some interests in it but no method yet until I start to work on it!

j. Ever-changing method is necessary. I'm skeptical of anyone who uses the same method (maybe besides the method of intuition, although its good if you can change your intuition too) in two separate projects.

k. Open source is a great possibility both as a methodology and for finding methodologies. This was for sure the case in the last project Limewire, in which we could develop movement methods from the peer-to-peer file-sharing program "Limewire". To describe very briefly, a problem which we worked with was the question of what a contemporary 'youth movement' would be today. One of the answers that we came to was the program Limewire in which users download music and other files from each other. But, we said, in this case the mass 'youth movement' behaves firstly as a network rather than a mass and secondly via the logic of the copy. This means that rather than sharing something immaterial en masse, the system absorbs all difference in order to materialize, individualize, copy, and make property. Of course, in the network everyone owns, but what one owns is always connected to the others. There is no individual and there is no group. Every individual difference is absorbed into the evolution of the network.

To give a simple example, if I am connected to Limewire and I am the first person in the world to own the unreleased System of a Down song, my difference from the network is immediately absorbed into the system- everyone else can immediately have it too- hence the idea that a 'counter-culture' is impossible within a network structure. No matter how different the information is - it is immediately absorbed and connected into the system.

But we were also interested in how it is connected. Limewire and other peer-to-peer programs behave quite interestingly in that they often source a given file from several users in order to compile a copied file. This means that to download the System of a Down song "Fuck the System," I might receive bits of that song from several users in order to download my copy of the whole file.

In the Limewire project we translated these principles into a methodology for movement practices. Three basic techniques that we developed through this section of the piece are

1) Using a loop (within the language of rock, hardcore, metal, punk etc. concert expressions) we break down the material to singular body parts and copy and reassemble each of the parts to make a unison expression between all of the performers. So from five expressions in loop breaking into five parts of expressions re-combining into one full-body unison expression.

2) morphing unison expressions until they differentiate and then synthesizing parts - I copy A's left hand and B's right hand, while keeping my own head. Like this there are parts shared between the performers which are always morphing and changing and following each other in and out of parts of unison but everyone shares only parts of each other.

3) group unison in which all difference is consumed into the unison. This means that by using unison loops of these 'counter-cultural' expressions, performers morph the loop into differences which are immediately consumed and absorbed by the group so that unison is always evolving but always maintained by absorbing all differences to the system. Smells like teen spirit...

1. I'm in an airport in London as I write this, in one of the most over-secure environments I've ever been in, so even writing the word 'hijacking' makes me a bit nervous. But yes, hijacking as a methodology sounds good. If for nothing else it might force one to look for those things that are still considered sacred and private, which in performance isn't always an easy thing to do.

3) What kind of ideological positions do you think these respective methods relate to?

3) It really depends. I use appropriation, Martha Graham used appropriation; obviously we don't come from similar ideologies, and indeed there is a difference between appropriation for critical and non-critical purposes (THX, B.C.!) But I think that everything that had been thrown out in art in terms of methods (chance, trance, or mysticism) is an open possibility now - which is one of the things which is so great about making art work in this time. There are no extinct ideologies because ideologies have no value in themselves anymore. Ideologies can be appropriated or imitated because I can be convinced that not having any ideology is my ideology. Of course I have ideology (THX, B.C.!) But I can also divorce myself from that ideology or borrow others for the sake of a performance. There is no need, as there was up until and through Modernism for the work to represent one's own ideology. I can take LSD for 5 months and live naked in the desert painting animals, given that I approach this method with the right irony and distance (this is one of the things that make Werner Herzog so great). It's really this ability to assume and immerse oneself in an ideology while having a kind of distance, or at least awareness of it and what it might achieve - which is interesting - much more interesting than respecting the stable identity of ideologies and therefore subscribing or rejecting methods of working that might represent these ideologies.

4) Do you think methodology and aesthetics are directly connected/reflected in the artistic product?

4) Methodology and aesthetics are almost inseparable. I feel more and more that when I see a good piece, I think "how did they make that?" and when I see a bad piece I think "well, that's probably how they made that." But as I said before, I think methodology is a bit of a pretentious term. I think most good pieces are the writing of a methodology in their production. Rather than having the wisdom of a method under their wings, most interesting works for me seem to have found a method in their way of working and that is an aesthetic which I definitely like to see.

5) Do you think methodologies in art practices are objective or subjective. If objective then how can they be shared?

5) It's strange because methods are objective, and yet when I learned Forsythe improvisation

from Betsy Corbett - all my highest respects to her - it felt like it was definitely something else. This means to me that methodologies, even strong ones that you can make CD-ROMS out of or whatever, still have a high degree of subjectivity to them - methodologies are specific to the context in which they are created and they have to be necessary to the problem which they wish to approach. I cannot, now that I've learned Forsythe's techniques, approach the question of youth-movement now with 'video-scratching' or 'room-writing'.

This is perhaps more an educational problem but I don't think methods should be taught as techniques. They are not techniques - one cannot go and use them in their next piece. What's good is to learn how developed a method can become and how different methods make very different products. But to be given a book on composition by Thierry De Mey or a CD-ROM of Bill Forsythe is an interesting historical document maybe but a very bad artistic tool.

6) Can you think of a method that is not yet established in the performing art?

6) Like I wrote earlier - how to engage with the real-time aspect of the performance - how to engage with the public and with the other performers in real-time, how to make a performance particular to that space and time - how to make a performance an event which is much more manipulative and intentional than the Fluxus "happenings" - this still requires a method for me. DJs have this as a methodology -they have to read the party and which kinds of intensities will stimulate and which will turn off the partiers given the environment and the music that's already been played. They have to rehearse a lot, but they have to read the room and their performance relies completely on the feedback they receive from the audience. I think we in performing arts could learn a lot from DJs.

7) Do you think product oriented processes exclude research?

7) No

8) How would you define research as a methodology?

8) Research needs methodology so it acquires it in the way of working. The research of the meaning and uses of methodology is a methodology which is necessary to this research. I think it works like that.

Unfortunately I think we've gone through, maybe still are a bit in this period of an "aesthetics of research" and this has been a bit of a fart in the wind but maybe also a necessary one, I don't know. There are some people whose work is research and this is great. For me I am always thinking research of what, for what. Even if the ends I hope for are missed completely in the result. For many makers and programmers research has become an excuse though, and then it loses its necessity, loses its possibility in fact to develop and necessitate its own methodology.

9) What do you think about using scientific research methodologies in art, or rather how would you define the differences between scientific and artistic research methodologies?

9) Oh science is so sexy in art nowadays! In terms of scientific methodologies I think I learned a lot from THE SCIENTIST, Xavier Le Roy when he mentored our project this year - mostly very unsexy things that scientists do - like test something several times before throwing it out, changing one variable at a time, measuring change and development, setting up the conditions for something to happen, letting it happen or not happen and then observing. These are all very good to practice.

10) How would you define the organizing principles behind your current method of working.

10) My “organizing principles” are about to change a lot I think, that could be wishful thinking, practical realization that I am no longer in a school so my ‘principles’ of work must and will change, or intuition. But a bit of all I think. My organizing principles have been different for each project but most commonly-

- 1) have a problem, something that interests, or stimulates me positively or negatively.
- 2) Collect images where this problem might couch itself.
- 3) Read and watch films, have discussions with the right people, write a lot about this interest.
- 4) Make some kind of formal proposal and in it try to think how can I imagine this problem in terms of a physical problem, dynamic, practice, or context.
- 5) Ask the right people to join in to collaborate.
- 6) Work in a way that stays close to my initial intentions but never tries to fit these intentions into becoming. It is always based on what material does to the interest and what interest does to the material- switching a lot between thinking something is related and then trying it, letting it have a life of its own until it seems unrelated, then choosing if it’s more interesting unrelated as it is, or would it be more interesting if I were to go back or try to reconnect more to some of the more initial problems/ interests. Finding situations or scores that reproduce the problem within the working situation and to put us in that situation and see what happens- what is interesting and what is cheesy.

- 7) throw away the 95% that is cheesy.

11) Are these principles producing stability or instability in relation to the process of working?

11) Stability and instability are both necessary in the working process. Its good to have the stability of ‘I know what I’m interested in’ with the instability of ‘this is how I think we can get at it’. Its good to have the stability of developing a body practice with the instability of how it will be interpreted and/or utilized, its good to have the stability of my own aesthetics with the instability of not knowing and having to negotiate the aesthetics of others and their not knowing mine and having to negotiate theirs with mine. And so on.

12) Is being clear about the method you use an important tool for developing your work or does the defining fix the potential directions you could move in?

12) I don’t think it’s useful to define your method in process. As I think I said earlier I think defining methods is useful probably for grant proposals and otherwise for performance after-talks and

reflections on finished work because they help enhance the knowledge of the field of performance making. In process it's much more interesting to be clear about the intentions and especially the interests. Why you think that one mode - you could say method but it's a bit of a stretch - of investigation might have certain results and why you think what you're doing is pertinent to what you're looking for. But I think work should be used to develop methods in situ, not try out already clarified methods. The event of a way of thinking or processing- what we can later call a method - is what I try to work for because that's when you can understand the work you're working on.

13) Is the sharing of your work directed towards the moment of presentation or is it also happening during the process of working. How?

13) In the last project, Limewire, I have been very open throughout the process. Thank god. There have been so many people who have participated in the rehearsals, either as supposed performers, or just as guests that I can't really remember how many now. I often invited friends to come to rehearsal and just rehearse with us, even if they came for a couple of hours between other rehearsals of their own. I held a workshop with the second year students of PARTS with some scores that I made for iPods - which eventually lead to the structure of the beginning half of the piece, and of course there were the usual very bad showings and invitation of friends and mentors to see what we were doing and comment. But for me the revelation of the project was for sure inviting others into the rehearsal process. This helped to make sure that the piece never made itself precious, or as Xavier Le Roy said of the piece, 'everyone can do it, but not everyone can do it.' And I think this is a great quality to go for. It became a sort of method to have others involved, but it was also that the material lent itself to this kind of sociality. I'm much more in for continuing to make work shared in process - if you can make something that people want to participate in, there's nothing better -I also think that this kind of working helps shift the work away from object and into event, which is just a more interesting field to be engaged in.

Definitions of terminology

Bojana Cvejic

METHOD – “way”, perspective, epistemological frame, mindset, paradigm; does method allow for flexibility, in the way that one can use different methods or is “having a method” similar to having a habit? or should method be distinguished from procedure by degree of abstraction, i.e. a method can have different concretizations in different procedures, (e.g. how I proceed intuitively is different from how you proceed by intuition; what makes the two different procedures belong to the same method: shared values, beliefs, assumptions, opinions, insight = paradigm (knowledge)

Examples: intuition (synthesis), analysis, construction

METHODOLOGY – a specific area of interest; methods in development and change

PROCEDURE – to process something, form by transforming; procedure has a logic of functioning, therefore, it assumes consistency, reproducibility, transferability; a procedure operates differently in different contexts; a procedure in different contexts (where it becomes different operations) remains concrete even when abstracted from the operations; assumes the value (can’t be reduced/identified with paradigm) less than the method; procedures are historical and change throughout history; methods have the stability/inertia of tradition

Examples: interpretation, evolution (ex nihilo creation), appropriation, demonstration, dislocation and relocation of one medium into another

OPERATION – how a procedure is implemented (with what technique, what purpose, effects) in a particular (concrete, historical) situation; if procedures are more “mathematical”, operations are more sociological (cultural);

Duchamp’s famous Houston lecture in 1954, “the coefficient of art is the difference between what the artist had planned to make and what he did” – the gap between intentions and effects

thinking further than just the procedure, thinking of the implementation of a procedure in a particular context – linked to spectatorship (reception patterns)

examples: recognition, representation, identification, empathy, the sublime, sensation, defamiliarization and estrangement, emancipation

TECHNIQUE – formal aspect of how a procedure is being operated; what technicality a procedure requires in a particular operation; skills to be learnt or had (in different degree)

MODE OF PRODUCTION - ?

Procedure for overproduction

Mette Ingvarsten

you make something
you make something out of the something you have just made
you make something which cannot be bought
you make a gift
you make something which is the opposite of what you have just made
you make fake money and you sell it for real
you make a little note inviting people to invite other people
you make a meeting about what other people are making
you make communication
you make a trailer for a movie somebody else once made
you make a performance for webcam that no one will watch
you make an animation
you make yourself into an animation figure who can make other things than you can, so
you make an album
you make voice expressions that no one can read but everyone can understand
you make something which has no physical existence
you make thoughts make other thoughts
you make a lecture performance
you make a text out of the lecture and publish it on the net
you make a video registration which is so long that no one will ever look at all of it
you make a compressed version so they might anyhow
you make sure not to make compromises
you make a space
you make a workshop in the space
you make a fictional documentary about the workshop you already made in the space
you make a chair you can sit in when you have made enough other things
you make a choreography for furniture
you make sure not to make anything that cannot also be used to make something else
you make functions change
you make people go look at a squash match and call it a performance

you make someone write that it was a great show
you make things up
you make small lies
you make people curious by being secret
you make up a strategy
you make a party that no one knows where the DJ plays the music
you make people move
you make a fake fight in the party
you make a rumor about a scandalous performance
you make a discussion
you make yourself misunderstood in order to be able to change direction
you make a lunch meeting for everybody
you make a text about the discussion which can be rewritten by others
you make a collection of the texts and redistribute them
you make a library
you make a book about the making of the library
you make something that can go on when you cannot anymore
you make a recording
you make cinematic expressions
you make a casting for a film which will never take place
you make the making more important than the result
you make other kinds of products
you make products circulate
you make circulation

DINA 2

Residency: May - July 2006

Mette Ingvarisen

The Making Of The Making Of

Published in November 2006 by

nadine

Herderstraat/rue du Berger 30, 1050 Brussels

email; info@nadine.be




<http://www.nadine.be>

part One and Two of this publication fall under the creative commons licence:

You are free:

to copy, distribute, display, and perform the work
to make derivative works

Under the following conditions:

-  Attribution. You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor.
-  Noncommercial. You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
-  Share Alike. If you alter, transform, or build upon this work, you may distribute the resulting work only under a license identical to this one.

For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work.

Any of these conditions can be waived if you get permission from the copyright holder.

Your fair use and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

Texts in part Three are reprinted here with the kind permission of the authors.

falsificado em Portugal
ipaepuafa-u



supported by: de Vlaamse Gemeenschapscommissie van het Brussels Hoofdstedelijk Gewest, de Vlaamse Overheid, de gemeente Elsene/commune d'Ixelles