

The a.pass Research Centre hosts Associate Researchers in cycles of one year. *Publishing Artistic Research - The Annex* is a booklet aiming to weave a context around the five research publications resulting from the collective work during CYCLE II (2020-21).

SITING DISCOURSE. Diary excerpt from Live Archive,
by Breg Horemans

WHERE DO YOU DRAW THE LINE BETWEEN ART
AND POLITICS. Interviews, by Davide Tidoni

MAND/INGA. Expanded performance, by Esteban Donoso

POP-FI POSTER. A game, by Lili M. Rampre

I'M NOT SAD, THE WORLD IS SAD. Artistic research novel,
by Pia Louwerens

a.pass (advanced performance and scenography studies) is an international platform for artists and theorists who are interested and engaged in artistic research practices, based on principles of self-organization, collaboration and trans-discipline.

Out of the concepts of performativity and performative spaces, a.pass offers the researchers the possibility to critically develop

their independent artistic research projects in a collaborative learning environment.

The institute includes two complementary segments that operate in parallel and in dialogue: the Post-graduate Program and a Research Centre.

www.apass.be

a-pass { advanced performance
and scenography studies



CYCLE I: Research Center 2020/2021, *Publishing Artistic Research, The Annex*

CYCLE II: Research Center 2020/2021, *Publishing Artistic Research* *The Annex*

What your research did to me

a-pass { advanced performance
and scenography studies

CONTENTS

CYCLE II: Research Center 2020/2021 <i>Publishing Artistic Research, The Annex</i>	12
CYCLE II: List of individual publications <i>The Annex - What your research did to me</i>	14
THE EDITORIAL	18
THE SCORE	26
THE CONTRIBUTIONS How much talking about the other is talking about yourself?	28
<div> Magnets</div> <div> Auto-theory of Writing</div> <div> Spatial Scripts</div> <div> Drifts of Desire</div> <div> Fans of Paranoia</div> <div> Looking for Anchovy Paste</div>	
EXCERPT: How much talking about the other is talking about yourself?:	
<div> DAVIDE ASKS ESTEBAN ETHNOGRAPHY, A TROUBLED UNDERTAKING</div> <div> KRISTIEEN ASKS DAVIDE I SING AS MUCH AS THEY DO</div> <div> BREG ASKS KRISTIEEN FLEMISH IDENTITY</div> <div> PIA ASKS BREG SELF-INSTITUTING</div> <div> LILI ASKS PIA AFFECT THEORY IS LEGIT, EVERYONE</div> <div> ESTEBAN ASKS LILI FANDOM</div>	
Biographies	66
Colophon	72

CYCLE II:
Research Center
2020/2021, *Publishing*
Artistic Research
The Annex

Documenting, archiving, and publishing are intrinsic to the ongoing practices of a.pass – a platform for artistic research practice. They are research tools that enable critical reflection and exposure of artistic research processes. Methods of communication are practices of making-public as well as an activation of the performative potential of these concepts. The program seeks to find public formats or outlets for research in the course of its ongoing development. It facilitates an understanding of the politics of such processes.

a.pass searches for a publishing practice that does not regard knowledge production, art making, aesthetics, context, and politics as separate communication channels, but as a witnessing process of simultaneous artistic creation, contextualization and doubt. Publication is addressed under the hybrid transdisciplinary term of “performative publishing,” which contains the multiplicitous forms of publishing practices present at a.pass, and questions the publication’s purpose within the sphere of artistic knowledge processes. “Performative publishing” opens other forms of doing that reflect the speculative attitudes of artistic research.

a.pass Research Center hosts associate researchers in one-year cycles. Breg Horemans, Davide Tidoni, Esteban Donoso, Lili M. Rampre and Pia Louwerens were part of “Cycle II 2020/21”. Their research topics range from cultural discourse analysis in the dance field, institutional critique and immaterial art production, architectural encounter dispositifs, decolonial dance history and politics of listening. Throughout the year, they contributed with concerns, concepts and “ways of doing” inherent to their practice. They share their research trajectory and their entanglements in a collective digital publication on madewitholga.be. Excerpts of their collaborative work are published in *The Annex*, which functions as a printed index to the online collective publication, as well as to the multiform performative publications of the individual researchers.

Lilia Mestre

CYCLE II: List of individual publications

The Annex is a booklet that collectively weaves a context around the following 5 research publications:

SITING DISCOURSE

Diary excerpt from Live Archive,
by Breg Horemans

Siting Discourse is a dialogical diary that explores the protocols, politics and accessibility of a digital architecture-as-archive (www.taata-projects.com). Horemans shares the writing process through a recorded sequence of screen captures. *Siting Discourse* exposes the Live Archive's digital spatiality and the implicit *gestures, attitudes and coincidences* of discourse making that it aims to facilitate. The title is a reference to the Live Archive as a (web-)site for discursive documentation and it addresses the academic citing mechanism as a form of "structural misquoting." *Siting Discourse* is a collaboration between Siebren Nachtergaele (Social Sciences HOGENT, Theatre Studies UGENT, BE) and Andrew Filmer (Theatre Studies, Aberystwyth University, WA). Their first encounter was shaped by means of a *drift*.

WHERE DO YOU DRAW THE LINE BETWEEN ART AND POLITICS

Interviews,
by Davide Tidoni

Where Do You Draw the Line Between Art and Politics consists of a series of interviews with individuals who have been active in various capacities at the intersection of art and politics. Between historical documentation, political memory, dialogic reflection, and motivational support, the publication examines the experiences, commitments and feelings that operate and inform aesthetic priorities in social spaces outside of art institutions; it's a repository designed to inspire and encourage the politicization of aesthetics, as opposed to the aestheticization of politics.

MAND/INGA

Expanded performance,
by Esteban Donoso

Mand/inga is a performance that entails a reading of a script, and a screening of a film at once. It's an instantiation of a collaborative process with Thiago Antunes in which we re-visit our own family stories, tracing along our relation to such issues as gendering, religion, spirituality and race. The script and film register an ongoing conversation between friends, as well as a conversation with our own lived memory. This process is also an attempt to trace out a methodology for working with self-narrated queerstories and their interconnected resonances. *Mand/inga* is a term that takes many colloquial meanings in Latin America – in Brazil it usually refers to “black magic,” whereas in Ecuador it denotes the racial mixtures between black, indigenous and white backgrounds.

POP-FI POSTER

A game,
by Lili M. Rampre

Pop-Fi poster is a “choose your own adventure” game developed by Lili M. Rampre in collaboration with Júlia Rúbies Subirós. The game traces pre-public discourse, a semi-private collection of thoughts that, once shared and circulated, can shift a wider agenda on what matters to artists the most. The game aims to popularize common fictions and pop the bubble of others. Collectivizing half-digested thoughts potentially means bridging between personal and structural to effectuate change. *Pop-Fi poster* is part of Pop-Fi: a multifaceted project that entails a performative workshop ventriloquizing popular movie icons, video installations and script-readings. Pop-Fi foregrounds concerns of an artistic community through a variety of formats that act as a discourse prism. *Pop-Fi poster* is both a visual aid for the workshop and an autonomous object. Pop-Fi's next step is developing strategies to funnel from anecdotal to factual and think about data and its visualization techniques informed by direct experience, commitment to action and intersectionality.

I'M NOT SAD, THE WORLD IS SAD

Artistic research novel,
by Pia Louweren

I'm Not Sad, The World Is Sad is an autotheoretical, semi-fictional account of a performance artist who lands a part-time job as an Embedded Artistic Researcher in an art institution. Invested in queer theory and institutional critique, she sets out to perform the artist “differently” through a process of negation and passivity, inadvertently causing her relationship with the institution's curator to grow increasingly speculative and paranoid. Louweren's labor as tour guide, security guard, artist, hostess and researcher at different institutions begins to overlap and blend under the name of “performance.” *I'm Not Sad, The World Is Sad* is a fragmented story of paranoid and reparative reading, script and utterance, exposure and vulnerability.

The Annex: What your research did to me

THE EDITORIAL

The editorial is based on snippets of writing, informal discussion and scored conversations, by and with Breg Horemans, Davide Tidoni, Esteban Donoso, Lili M. Rampre and Pia Louwerens, produced during the researchers' one-year trajectory at a.pass. Kristien Van den Brande who facilitated the last block focusing on performative publishing, continuing the work of the preceding Research Center curators Vladimir Miller and Nicolas Y Galeazzi, edited the text. Artistic coordinator Lilia Mestre followed the overall process with timely feedback, to slow down or accelerate the proceedings wherever needed. We also used her "conversation score", infamous at a.pass, to spark the writing of this editorial. The contribution of Davide Tidoni "*How much talking about the other is talking about yourself?*," published in *The Annex*, is based on the conversation score "Relay Score" by Jacob Wren.

TAKE 1

What your research did to me is a collective online publication by a.pass "Research Center Cycle II," with excerpts printed in *The Annex*. In response to a self-defined score, we - the associated researchers Breg Horemans, Davide Tidoni, Esteban Donoso, Lili M. Rampre and Pia Louwerens - produced an online assemblage of conversations, film clips, letters, auto-theoretical writings and a storytelling/feedback game.

In a collaborative research environment like a.pass, a lot of creative and critical energy is devoted to developing modes of sharing. These modes range from spontaneous and informal, to highly orchestrated, artificial, constrained and designed. Whether called hosting, adopting, participating, initiating, presenting, borrowing, testing, or what have you - they all come with a different distribution of entanglements with each other, and eventually with a wider public.

The publication *What your research did to me* takes as a point of departure the fact that modes of sharing already happened, and that along the way, our initial projects lost their clear contours. They crossbred into each other and made (un)traceable lines and knots, without losing definition. When deliberating the making of a publication to impart something of our collective process, the first impulse was to find a common denominator in research subject (e.g. listening), if not in research method (e.g. note-taking). This strategy yielded a somewhat pernicious effect in that it tended to fade the singularities and intricacies of our approaches how one inclined to another - but not necessarily to all. Sharing wasn't the same as amalgamating into uniformity. Proximity engendered centrifuge as much as centripetal forces.

The solution we adopted, suggested by Lili M. Rampre, was to list each for oneself, moments where one's research was inspired by someone else's, and to readdress that moment of implicit borrowing or appropriating back into collective work, either with the proprietor of the question or with the entire group, and in any case, witnessed by all.

As such, the publication *What your research did to me* is more than an account of co-habitation and influence. It is a multiplier of sharing, making it the propagator for even more compelling set-ups of exchange about work, writing, desire, personal background, (non-)habitual patterning, institutional leeway and the critical-affective scope of doing artistic research. The process of witnessing is enhanced by exhibiting fairly raw materials (audio and video recordings, letter writing) on the public facing platform *madewitholga.be*, an experimental publishing website that fashions a constant interplay between production and reception, display and feedback, reading and writing. Accordingly, the publication *What your research did to me* is not determined by exhaustion but by a desire to persevere in our peculiar modes of sharing while transmitting them on a public interface.

Kristien Van den Brande
Research Center Curator, Jan-April 2021

Interception

- B: Wait a minute, are we now making “a conventional publication”? I mean, by “making an editorial” we acknowledge a “contract” between us and between all the contributions reaching the reader, right? I would like to know what this contract is.
- K: Contract has very strong legalistic connotations. How would you make a contract with an absent reader?
- E: Yeah, we’re always fantasizing a reader and there’s a lot of anticipation in that. We have these dialogues with something that is not exactly there. It’s there as a function, but it’s not completely embodied or specific, and maybe a way of coping with this anticipation or this looming thing of readership, is that we come up with principles of guiding whoever it is through this maze or field of contributions. Maybe it becomes less about anticipating the reader, and more about

accounting for what happened, more as witnesses of the processes we experienced.

- L: Can the editorial then work as a compass? A score or a manual for the reader?
- B: As in, “we would like to script you, dear reader”?
- D: Isn’t it intimidating?
- B: I’m thinking of the style of the editorial of Esteban’s book *Lexicon* for an affective Archive (Giulia Palladini), hyper-personal and hyper-addressed, almost like a dialogue in itself.
- P: Shouldn’t we mention the highlights of the publication?
- E: I would like to tell the reader that they are about to enter a house with this room and this garden and this cellar and this veranda and a messy storage room and a shared fridge we keep partitioning and rearranging to our different tastes and allergies and needs, and that it’s not tidy, and it’s not a house in a decoration magazine, but we have spent enough time in it to feel cozy, and I’d like it if we could formulate it in such a way that it’s not a warning but something welcoming.
- ?: It would be great if there were hidden connections in this house. There probably are tons of connections that aren’t even visible for us.
- ?: So... some kind of guide, or task even, for the reader to look for relations and connection points?
- ?: The image of “hidden connections” makes me more and more uncomfortable. I think it leads us back to the critical mode of paranoia, which is always pointing at what the speaker doesn’t say.
- D: I’m frustrated. How can we write an editorial before knowing exactly what’s gonna be in the publication?
- L: Maybe we can start from the current status of the future publication. It seems everyone took responsibility for producing a part of it. I’m not sure whether there will be coherency or not; we should drop that idea. I hope the effort everybody makes to move closer will be rewarding for all of us. But what about the reader?
- B: Incoherent in our coherence. Or coherent in our incoherence?

- L: It seems to me that in speaking about our research, indirectly we have created a specific kind of presence for each other. Coexistence has produced more than just a juxtaposition of different elements. Perhaps we can't systematize it under one umbrella, but there are some concerns and some strategies that we have been circling around. Or maybe there is some kind of personae that we have acquired in the common space.
- P: Yeah, we hang out every week, but I can't say we know each other, really, also due to Covid, of course. We have this weird intimacy of knowing someone only through their research discourse. We couldn't really dive into each others practices, nor get to know the person behind the researcher. Still, through all of our not-shared vocabularies and not-shared ways of working, we developed a common tongue, a shared descent. Maybe? I'm not sure. Because we take it for granted, like siblings take for granted that they share a parent or a caretaker.

[pause]

- K: Have you thought about possible titles? What do you think of re-take files?
- B: Hm, like the X-files?
- K: We discussed the publication for a long time, back and forth, revoking decisions made earlier, without really getting started. We only began producing material when we decided to organize rehearsals and do re-takes later on, a trick to outwit our doubts. Would be nice if the publication kept a trace of these steps of rehearsal and re-takes, no?
- E: I like What your research did to me more.
- L: *Me too.*

(*Interception* is an edit based on editorial brainstorm on collective writing pad, conversations during buro-olga and a session of *Conversation Score* with "Familiarity" and "Paranoia" as keywords)

TAKE 2

Dear reader,
 Dear a.pass library cabinet on the 3rd floor,
 Dear future self,
 Dear girlfriend who is invited to our limited audience book launch,
 Dear mum who is not invited,
 Dear messy backpack,
 Dear olga-user,
 Dear phone with a too-small screen,

Whoever you are, wherever you found me, we would like to explain the boring stuff to you of how this publication came to be. We would like to tell you something about this patched-together group of artistic researchers, coming from different backgrounds and media, having aligned and collided in an institutional context (the research center of a.pass), and our conditions for meeting: 15 months, weekly or biweekly, with a pandemic in-between – still counting – that turned our mode of interaction increasingly digital, dispersed over various ether-pads and video conferences, and never ever having hugged. Never having gotten drunk together. We would like to tell you that we still don't understand each others' practices completely, but none-the-less, we have developed a certain familiarity, some would argue an incoherent familiarity, and some prefer to call it camaraderie, others still describe it as colleagues-on-an-outing. But whatever the word, it is clear to us that it indicates a certain time spent together during which we developed a certain intimacy – one that we weren't even so aware of. Until Lilia mentioned it – until she said that, unlike her, we do know about each other – and then we went like, oh yeah, indeed. It was a hard way of building a group together, being online and stuff, but there was a cool and steady kind of returning back to each other – a consistency, or shall we say commitment, or even insistence. In any case, spending time wasn't about slowness, and even less about affinity. Because we don't need to be friends to help each other out, and it's gonna sound like we really don't like each other, all this emphasis on NOT and BUT, but – but! – it's been really quite special. Because, who else can you do this with, over and over again.

We should not forget to introduce the exciting part: which is the score. So you, reader, know where all these questions and answers and methods and cross-references and idiosyncrasies and even this rambling is coming from. We should warn you that we gave up looking for an all-encompassing structure in which everything makes sense – everything responds to a strong principle that makes everything... Oh no, we already said that part. Or did we? Also that it made us too paranoid? Anyway. The score goes more or less like this: I have a question, but it's not really mine – it originated with your practice. Maybe you've uttered it, maybe it was hovering over you, maybe it was the group who addressed it to you, or maybe you tried to push it far away and it kept popping up. Maybe you didn't consider the question so interesting, but I sure did. Because somehow the question attaches itself to my practice. So we take this half-breed in-between-question of ours and do something with it. But the ball is in my field now so I'll think of something (a score? a conversation?) we can play with. And this constant back and forth, taking something however small from the other and expanding on it, dear reader – that's what our year has been about. So maybe, now you have a look, and see if there is a question that sticks to you too, and who knows – if it sticks so badly, you think of something (a score? a conversation?) too?

Take 2 is an edit based on writing initiated by Pia Louwerens, with fragments from a session of Conversation Score with "familiarity" and "paranoia" as keywords)

Buro-olga were regular meetings during the last block "Printer's Devils" a help desk for practical and technical needs around using the internet platform madewitholga.be as a publishing platform.

Conversation Score is a score by Lilia Mestre igniting the production of discourse through dedicated keywords and time-slots for each speaker.

The Annex

What your research did to me

THE SCORE

(0. Inventory of questions in your research inspired by someone else's research)

1. Pick one operative question* that was generated** by some one else's research practice on your research practice. Describe the interstice: where have the research practices crossed? What have you understood about the other's research? How or at what point was it important for yours? What was the question you got impregnated with? What has it produced for you*** as thinking, as material?

**"Generated" is deliberately passive. The other person didn't necessarily have that question. It might hover above somebody's research, or the group might have brought it up.*

*** Operational questions (versus methodological/philosophical): questions that are already working on us. We don't need to investigate them separately; we assume they are already operational.*

2. Define how and with whom you want to elaborate on that "operative question," so that we can practice it together or in groups.

**** Be mindful to include yourself in the practice. The premise of step 1 is that a question from someone else worked on you. The purpose of the set-up is not to mine or extract more from the other or from the group, but to give something back to who or what inspired you.*

3. Do it, i.e. make a rehearsal set-up, ask feedback from the group, and organize a re-take if necessary. Record rehearsal and/or re-take.

4. Prepare recording [video, sound, (timed) notes, (timed) drawings, etc. from rehearsal and/or re-take] for madewitholga. Start editing.

5. Write the editorial together.

The Annex What your research did to me

THE CONTRIBUTIONS

The publication *What your research did to me* is a collection of contributions in response to a collectively defined score published on madewitholga.be.

The first contribution '*How Much Talking About The Other Is Talking About Yourself?*' is published in this Annex in its entirety on p.36.

HOW MUCH TALKING ABOUT THE OTHER IS TALKING ABOUT YOURSELF?

Initiated by Davide Tidoni,
with the participation of Breg Horemans,
Davide Tidoni, Esteban Donoso, Kristien
Van den Brande, Lili M. Rampre, Pia Louwerens

How much talking about the other is talking about yourself? is a written q&a started around the topic of fieldwork and the constructed relation between observer and observant. The contribution started from 1) my own interest in listening as a dialogical practice which positions the listener in a state of interdependency between “self” and “other,” and 2) from Esteban’s research on the Ecuadorian dance group he was a part of and his position as both insider and “external” observer. Each researcher then appropriated the theme in their own way making connections with personal interests, stories, and things we have in common.

MAGNETS

Initiated by Esteban Donoso,
with the participation of Breg Horemans,
Davide Tidoni, Esteban Donoso, Kristien Van
den Brande, Lili M. Rampre, and Pia Louwerens

Magnets is a series of short videos describing objects that have an inevitable attracting force within our research. Each of us filmed a sequence in which we went through our relationship to these *magnets* and their corresponding fields of attraction. I was sparked by listening to Pia talk about the construction of one of her scripts and thought about fragmentation of a research process and how a research is made out of different fragments that have become magnetized by other fragments. When introducing each of our magnets, the range of ways of understanding what a magnet is and does, subsequently elicited other reflections about objecthood, materialities and immaterialities.

AUTO-THEORY OF WRITING

Initiated Pia Louwerens and Esteban Donoso
with the participation of Breg Horemans,
Davide Tidoni, Esteban Donoso, Lili M. Rampre,
and Pia Louwerens

Self-narration, especially the fragmented re-framing and scripting of the self, plays an important role in both Esteban's and Pia's research methodologies. Pia invited Esteban to join her in reading the essay, "Putting Coyolxauhqui together," by Gloria E. Anzaldúa. Using the second person singular, Anzaldúa describes the writing process as it takes place. Esteban and Pia invited the rest of the group to apply this "self-writing" to their own research processes: could you take 45 minutes to describe in writing, in the second person, an "alchemical point" in your research process – a point where the research transmutes into research material? *Auto-theory of Writing* collects the recorded readings of these voices.

SPATIAL SCRIPTS

Initiated by Pia Louwerens
in conversation with Vladimir Miller

It was during the first lockdown when an online session on archives, hosted by Breg, led Vladimir to show a documentation photo from a commoning practice. The photo depicted sloppy layers of written upon papers, hanging on the wall. They functioned as a script, a score, a schedule and documentation. Pia and Vladimir started talking about how objects in space are like scripts: both cause for and effect of our lives and practices. Being in lockdown, they wondered how the domestic could be a place of experimentation in that regard. They recorded this conversation on the following question: how to rewrite the spatial script?

DRIFTS OF DESIRE

Initiated by Breg Horemans
in conversation with Elke Van Campenhout

Drifts of Desire is a rough audio recording of a *drift* by Elke and Breg on April 20th, 2021 in Molenbeek and Anderlecht. The page visualizes a series of archival stepping-stones that shaped the "drift" as a discursive walking experience. The stepping-stones were gathered in records of previous drifts, set within the Research Center ecosystem. The initial spark was a memorable moment during the a.pass hike in Solwaster forest. On a sunny spring morning, Elke tenderly laid out the following question to Breg: "Wherein lies the desire for your research?" A powerful shortcut at the gut level of *doing what you do*, opening up essential viewpoints on *instituting our selves and others*.

FANS OF PARANOIA

Initiated by Lili M. Rampre and Pia Louwerens
conversation between Lili M. Rampre and Pia Louwerens

While working together, Pia recognized a shared interest in Lili's practice: the paranoid image of the ventriloquist. Their interest in "paranoia" formed questions concerning who is voicing, or what institutions or discourses are "behind" their own voice? After rereading the magnetizing essay "You're so Paranoid, You Probably Think This Essay Is About You," by Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, Pia and Lili recorded a conversation on the idea of what's "behind" or "beneath" an artistic practice. Sedgwick describes two ways of knowledge practice: paranoid and reparative reading. She left, however, the list of characteristics of reparative practices far more undefined than the paranoid ones, therefore the two researchers walk the tightrope between the former and the latter. In *Fans of Paranoia* they are tracing the Möbius tape of the two types of approaches in their own as well as each other's practices, to understand the alchemy that makes them shapeshift.

LOOKING FOR ANCHOVY PASTE

Initiated by Kristien Van den Brande
with the participation of Breg Horemans,
Davide Tidoni, Esteban Donoso, Kristien Van
den Brande, Lili M. Rampre, Pia Louwerens

Looking for anchovy paste was intended as a game for storytelling but it turned out to be more of an instrument for evaluation. It departs from the notion of camaraderie the researchers proposed as a concept to describe the mode of trans-professional interaction within a collective research environment. It made me wonder about the ambition of the term camaraderie: does it cover, prescribe or might it even prevent the making of friendly alliances? In the essay, "Scenography of friendship," Svetlana Boym writes that the majority of philosophical reflection about

friendship is made by men and describes male friendships entertained in relation to a public life. This bias created a conceptual map in which female friendships are much harder to understand, are devaluated to the private sphere and gradually imbued with negative connotations. Based on an anecdote around anchovy paste, she calls for "theoretical fables" and "rigorous storytelling" that stage affinities that would otherwise slip through the cracks of patriarchal conceptualization. *Looking for anchovy paste* is a card game that tries to uproot the minor stories that we shared. It also ties in with questions around bias, raised by Esteban's work. What bias is at work in how we narrate artistic research? What standards or whose authority do we speak towards when we describe artistic research processes? What is threatened to be silenced if we don't find proper means of transmission?

EXCERPT

HOW MUCH TALKING ABOUT THE OTHER IS TALKING ABOUT YOURSELF?

A q&a writing score, initiated by Davide Tidoni,
with the participation of Breg Horemans,
Davide Tidoni, Esteban Donoso, Kristien Van
den Brande, Lili M. Rampre, Pia Louwerens

The initial set-up of this contribution was an interview with Esteban on the 2nd of March, 2021 about his research and process of working with “informants.” The interview was based on questions like:

How do you choose the persons to interview/speak to? How do they choose you? What is at stake in the encounter with the other? How do answers make you question your beliefs? Do they empower/weaken you? Who is speaking in your research? Are the subjects of your research speaking through you or is it you speaking through them?

The interview served as a surface for an extended re-take in writing with the entire group. We used a writing score that was based on the conversation score *Relay Interview* by Jacob Wren.

Person 1 asks Person 2 a question. Person 2 answers. Person 3 steps in to ask a question to Person 1, who answers. Person 4... and so on. The sequence of the interviewers/interviewees was not chosen beforehand. Researchers decided to join in after having read the last q&a.

DAVIDE ASKS ESTEBAN ETHNOGRAPHY, A TROUBLED UNDERTAKING
KRISTIEN ASKS DAVIDE I SING AS MUCH AS THEY DO
BREG ASKS KRISTIEN FLEMISH IDENTITY
PIA ASKS BREG SELF-INSTITUTING
LILI ASKS PIA AFFECT THEORY IS LEGIT, EVERYONE
ESTEBAN ASKS LILI FANDOM

DAVIDE ASKS ESTEBAN

Hey Esteban,

Since the beginning of the Research Center I have felt a connection with your research since it shares similar methodological issues with some of my fieldwork-based projects.

Your research on heritage and memory of the dance group you studied in Ecuador, your home country, seems nourishing based on an intense exchange between you and the group. From what I've understood, you have developed a special relationship with them, something that goes beyond the intellectual curiosity of research on their dance practice.

I can say the same for my work on football chanting with the ultras of Brescia 1911. Brescia is the place I'm from, I have a strong emotional connection with the province and the ultras group Brescia 1911, which materializes from that connection.

When I decided to produce a work based on the audio recordings I've accumulated during 15 years of involvement with the group, I've had to determine my stance and how to position myself in relation to them. Specifically, I had to figure out how to cope with the position of my being both a partial insider and outsider: on one hand, participating sincerely in the chanting, on the other hand, approaching the culture of sound of the group, its uses, and its socio-political implications as a field of research.

So, what I would like to know from you is something about the distance between you and the subject of your research. For instance, in your research, how much talking about the dance group is actually talking about yourself? Maybe you can elaborate on this starting from what we already shared in our previous meeting where you spoke about the construction of the other, and the construction of the research subject.

RESPONSE

Hello Davide, thank you for your question! It comes to me in the right moment and I do find a very clear connection to your research process.

In our last conversation we talked about the need to construct another, in an ethnographic approach, so that it can be written about. This presupposes, among many other things, that the only way to produce history – or knowledge, more broadly – is through writing. We also discussed the weight of the word “ethnography,” coming from Science and Academia, and how that position of power is performative in the work. I mentioned a short story by Jorge Luis Borges in which an ethnographer decides to abandon the ethnography halfway through the work, he finds a job in the studied community, and becomes part of them. I think I brought this story up because it makes ethnography a troubled undertaking: you can only do it through a process of distancing yourself or becoming, at least partially, separate from the community.

I don't use the word ethnography – unless I'm under academic interrogation and I don't want to go into lengthy explanations about methodology – because it links me to a tradition of extraction and colonial assault. However, I do recognize this schism in the figure of the researcher in which you are “judge and part” (as we say in Spanish) of the situation you are approaching.

My link to the dance group I am working with in Ecuador is a close and personal connection. I studied with them, I have collaborated with them in different ways and I have witnessed the disbanding of their collective in 2010.

Actually, my interest in writing about them is an interest about writing myself into a dance history – the local dance history. That doesn't mean I do it out of self-interest. It is rather about looking at the collective implications we have in this (his)story – not entirely a (her)story, but more and more decidedly a (queer) story to be written.

For me, at the moment, it is important to acknowledge that I am doing the writing, I am filtering and coloring this writing. This filtering is not out of whim, but a way to recognize my own entanglement with them and our mutual dependency.

Since I am focusing on self-narration and re-narration, it is only now that I am able to see, through a detour via my own family story that the way we learn to narrate ourselves is, in itself, a way of forgetting. For instance, I have realized that I learned to narrate myself circumventing my father's silence about his own mother. I am the queer grandson of an indigenous, exploited woman and the grandson of an impossible love story with the owner of the hacienda in which she worked. I was misled through inheriting my grandfather's last name, which was my father's great achievement to escape poverty and illiteracy – clearly a way to survive – he/we inherited only the name, nothing else. Yet the silence around that impossible love story is precisely what has survived, and it survives in the form of silence about my own homosexuality in the fabric of the family narrative. I inherited the affective charge of this silence and the insidious ways in which you can negate your own life. It is true, however, that reiterated silences signal to the presence of ghosts, and when you see ghosts, they are there to ask something of you. My grandmother's ghost is here, in this very room, asking me to listen differently to that (his)story and to start a work of remembering, to make memory a working site.

You see, I don't feel like I need to study my grandmother – or myself, for that matter – rather, I need to listen to her ghostly presence and to acknowledge my participation in that other story, that other fabric we need to re-construct. Similarly, the generation of dancers I work with in Quito are mostly women, and their stories tend to be occluded by both the narratives of a would-be global dance (his)story and of local narratives that usually revolve around patriarchal figures (I am not even looking at indigenous dances which have yet another layer of occlusion, but this should be a footnote). Listening to them narrating themselves implicates my self-narration as a part of that shared history. I do realize that there is a power differential in that relationship since I will sign a dissertation.

But then the questions for me are about levels of participation in that writing. I also wonder about what comes back to them and how to create a process that travels back and forth between co-creation and a public outcome. Besides the writing there is a mobilization of affect and the transmissions of all types of knowledge that are circulating. How can writing about ghosts account for an affective, shared experience?

I would like to finish with a quote, something you normally shouldn't do in an academic paper – to end on a quote and let it linger – it comes from the text we read on *Affective Archives*, by Giulia Palladini and Mateo Pustianaz: “We are ‘implicated,’ not just involved but also enmeshed, entangled in so intimately that it is no longer possible to tell apart inside and outside, the cause and the effect. As a result, traumas cease to be our own, they become ‘each other’s.’ They are archived through the embodied linkage of affect.”

KRISTIEN ASKS DAVIDE

Hi Davide,

I'd like to start with a word of appreciation for proposing this writing score around fieldwork/ethnography. You mention “clarity, brevity and efficacy” as reasons for the written format, but I wonder, really, whether the relay will lend itself for the six of us to engage in a linear discursive production that will be “clear, brief and efficacious.” We'll see in the end. I have no doubt, however, that our writing will produce a relational precision, perhaps unattained in the other contributions of our common publication. Questions that pierce for answers: a differential tissue rather than vicinal inclinations, (ir)responsive positioning rather than (im)polite borrowing.

While I'm writing to you, a message from Pia comes in. My face-book alter ego Josephine Dallier (dilly-dallying) had sent her an announcement for a virtual event on “Autotheory as a feminist practice.” She asks whether it's me, Kristien.

We have a little chat about the virtual event's "codes of conduct" around harassment, its performativity, and then she waves goodbye:

- *Ok ik moet weer aan het werk* (ok, back to work)
 - *vandaag ben ik videokunstenaar* (today I'm a video artist)
 - *Die werken blijkbaar heel hard* (apparently they work very hard)
- Sent by Pia, 11.45

It leaves no doubt that we are with more than six identities (g)leaning over this writing pad.

The day after we did the rehearsal interview around field work/ethnography, I was attending a talk by Elizabeth Povinelli that resonated with our preliminary discussion. She said she is often asked about the difference between doing her anthropological work as an artist and as a scientist. It was interesting to see how she took the question seriously, as well as circumvented it – stumbled around it, as she said – by pointing out that disciplinary spaces (art vs. science) are not produced in the abstract, but often originate from and deploy a similar racial and colonial *imaginary*. Whether we do art, philosophy or science, racial presuppositions is a shared condition among them before they start to operate within different disciplines. She seemed to be saying that she is more interested in questioning these shared foundational imaginaries than in whether she does this as either/or artist-scientist. In the talk, she proposed an ethics of "showing up" to shared concerns, akin to your durational engagement as sound artist with football supporters and activists. Then she spoke about the agreed upon economy underpinning her collaboration, as the only white person, with the indigenous Australian-based Karrabing Film Collective. It made me wonder what type(s) of economy – monetary and non-monetary, implicit and explicit – surround your fieldwork, before and after production? How are you indebted to each other before, during and after showing up? What would constitute a betrayal of your relationship? Tangentially, I'm also interested to know how you see the "imaginaries" at play in your search to position yourself (as artist, as local, as person) in relation to "them." Probably not along racial lines, but maybe class?

Kristien

PS: You asked for some extra clarification to the last question. I'm using the word "imaginaries" like Elizabeth Povinelli. She's speaking about how, in the distinctions we make between "us" and "them" there are racial presuppositions or imaginaries at play. For example, "they" make cult objects, and "we" make art. Anthropology or ethnography is based on such "imaginaries." I was wondering if and how this was at play in your distinction of "you" and "them" during fieldwork. They chant, you make sound pieces. When you try to position yourself, what kind of (monetary and non-monetary) economies do you install or rely on? Based on what "imaginaries"? Could this be a class distinction? Class itself a complex and contested term. For example, it's a socio-economic division. In connection to art, art is historically connected to richer classes (how do the chanters and you see your place in the business of "art")? Class is also a pedagogical-political tool for contesting. Etc. But maybe it's unrelated to class, and there are other imaginaries you could point at that help to understand the divide between "you" and "them." Does this clarify?

RESPONSE

(A)

So far it has been more of a non-monetary economy. I've never been paid for doing the work. I received a fee once in 2018 for exhibiting the works I produced and this happened after 17 years of fluctuating periods of work.

I've never discussed this with the group but, in my understanding, other forms of economy involved in the research have been: 1) common objectives (does the research cover a topic that is valid not only for me but for both parties?) 2) personal engagement and exposure (how do I contribute to the group; is it only by doing my research or are there other ways?) 3) availability to meet and spend time together beyond everyone's role (what do the two parties share beyond the research?). I personally think that any imbalance of the above terms would constitute a betrayal.

This economy has to do more with the attempt to connect on a human level rather than on a level that is defined by roles (the roles of the researcher and the subject of the research). For me, it's not a matter of doing research, it's more about what kind of relationship I want to build with people. The research comes after. I've never been eager to achieve a particular result at any given time. What I've done has grown in conjunction with my involvement with the group.

Rather, as a researcher I've felt more like the odd one doing strange things.

The problem of how to situate myself came about when I decided to publish the recordings I made with the group. I felt the divide increased when I wanted to open the work to the public (the problem comes up when you want to present your work to an external eye). That was the moment when I felt I was responsible for how to represent the group. I have to say that by having spent so much time together with the supporters, I kind of internalized their ethics and value system, and I could filter what to keep and what to leave out. I knew what I could say and what was better not to say.

One of the most intense pleasures while doing the research happened when some of the supporters I feel close to responded positively to the book and the articles I produced. They recognized themselves in what I produced. That for me represented a new step of trust and proximity.

(B)

I sing as much as they do, if not more... So singing was not the difference on top of which I could build up my imaginary. Singing was actually what brought us together. I've always felt very close to collective chanting and the ecstasy it produces.

I think my imaginary has been quite the opposite of what you described. Not really about distinctions but more like searching for similarities.

My imaginary comes more from a personal existential question. I went to the stadium because I wanted to discover something more about the place where I come from. I wanted to understand how Brescia and its province shaped me as a person and if I could use that place as a resource for building up my own identity. My imaginary has been set in motion by questions such as: do I recognize myself in the place where I came from? How do I feel represented by it? What can I take from this place and make mine?

Retrospectively, I can say this was an anthropological search for belonging – the need to feel represented by something bigger than me – a place I could identify myself with. So you can say my imaginary has been more like, “I’m looking for something to represent me; to symbolically feel attached to.” After I checked the Brescia 1911 and saw how they thought, I decided they could “represent me” and I could “represent them.”

BREG ASKS KRISTIEN

Dear Kristien,

I'm very thankful to Davide for setting up this score. I chose to be in “position 4” within the score, and 4 happens to be my lucky number. That must mean something, right? It has been quite a journey to write and re-write a question for you, the person I probably know least within the RC (both on a research level and on a personal level). But then, where do the personal end and the research begin? In the rare moments when we spoke Flemish with each other, something of a shared (*his*)tory opened up. I wonder now, if *I moet verdergaan in het Nederlands, misschien?* Like in the text we read by GLORIA E. ANZALDÚA, as a speculation between our *personal tongue* and an equalizing English. I guess we could do something *grafisch interessant* with that in our common publication, no? (*Ik twijfel of ik nu alles in het Nederlands ga schrijven en deze 'jeu de mot' vol wil houden tot op het einde van deze vraag... het gaat ineens dan over de Vlaamse identiteit ofzo, en of dit de goede plaats is in deze setting van 'internationaal georiënteerd research', het is ook bijna een wat vuil idee, om zelfs maar in de buurt te komen van een verheerlijking van de Vlaamse canon... problematisch! Maar goed, ik hou'm er zo even in, schuingedrukt, als een nederig Vlaams zijspoor. Want laat dat toch nét onze troef zijn?*).

So anyway, this exercise took me through some “childhood” memories. You could have been part of them somehow. I'm imagining you and I as teenagers, going on a camping trip *in de Ardennen* or something. Playing *Waarheid, durven of doen after midnight at the bonfire...*

OMG, always a tricky moment, especially when alcohol is involved. And there were questions like “which girl would you French kiss within our group of friends.” Horrible. Where my (*his*)story becomes a (*queer*)story, I guess. I realize now that my own (*queer*)story – growing up as a middle class white gay boy in Flanders – is not present at all in my research. The four years of silence. The trauma that ceased to be my own – maybe? Yet I don’t feel an urge to make that very visible in “what I do.” Do you? I’m curious what kind of girl you were at the bonfire. Which traumas ceased to be your own? And did those traumas define you as a researcher today?

While reading Davide’s note on “entering the chanting group from a personal existential motive,” I suddenly remembered this: as a student I spent some months in Istanbul. One night I went to a football match. Galatasaray was beating Bursa big time. The crowds were chanting. The stadium was on fire, and so was I. I remember strongly feeling “one of them,” there and then, supporting a football team in a pretty gay-unfriendly country, performing my most masculine voice... But there was also the feeling of “being part of a community that was not mine.” A form of self-representation through this “otherness.” I wonder if you have similar memories, and I’m curious how your Flemish background is engrained there. How does that Flemish perspective shape what you do?

RESPONSE

Wow Breg – this is a trip to arrive at the bonfire!

I was raised in an extremely protective and closed environment that caused me claustrophobia for as long as I remember. My parents were born on the same street. Both were children of hard working farmers with medium-scale production, growing vegetables matrilineally^(M), and flowers patrilineally^(P). Medium-scale, i.e. manual labor; family-based distribution of chores, with an occasional farmhand aside; limited machine intervention and rusty making-do equipment; measuring pesticides and always adding a third more; no intermediaries between growth and sale. They – and really, I should write “we” – worked the

land on hands and knees, dragging a small, dusty, wireless radio along the acres of potato, leek, salad and shallot^(M). During the weekend, they – I joined a couple of times during lily-of-the-valley season^(P), more for experience’s sake – got up at around 2am to make their way to the *vroegmarkt* in Brussels. If anything, I inherited my grandmother’s^(M) love for Brussels and fantasy. At the first moment of respite, around 9am, she would sneak away from Place St-Catherine to admire the wedding dresses on Rue de Flandre. She was an extremely down-to-earth woman, I hardly ever saw her without her worn-out apron, and she was remarkably open-minded for her time, but – but? – the glittery dresses made her dream, as did the second-hand weeklies, about royalty she received from a visiting neighbor.

Both my parents were family eldest, and I think it was the priest who intervened on behalf of the school teacher who had assessed that they had brains, to let them study after the age of 12 or 14. My grandparents conceded and consciously decided against up-scaling the farm production. They too had brains. The world was changing. If they were to be the last in the farm-line, they might as well sustain what they had, refrain from further industrial investments and continue to work on all fours. This meant that, while insisting on study as a portal to a new life, the farm still made a claim on every minute of my parents spare time. It dissolved whatever concept of leisure and pleasure their careers should have offered: full-time labor, after-hour agriculture, two toddlers eventually turning adolescent, and upholding the simulacrum of a middle-class life they didn’t know how to enjoy. My grandmother’s^(M) *force* to sneak away from daily routines and indulge in injudicious dreams specked with *lovertjes* was lost on them. Their new life was deeply enmeshed with perpetuating the old, up until 20 years after the official retirement of my grandparents, when my mother finally admitted: I don’t like farming. By then she was close to her own retirement.

My grandparent’s reassessment of the future coincided with what was, I think, the first wave of *verkavelingen* in the ‘70s in Flanders, i.e. the parceling of agricultural districts into land destined for private housing.

They had a dozen or so of their plots repurposed for building, which meant that all but one of their children (the generation of my parents), and eventually almost all their grandchildren (my generation), continued to live on the same street. Can you imagine? The farcical repetition of “here lives...” when I invite a new partner to my birthplace – the closest I got to *lovertjes* – driving 30km/h to keep up with the speed of climbing the short-trunk family tree?

As inheritance questions become more pressing, I am increasingly aware that the family is still hoping for my return. I am creating problems by rejecting the land they made their sacrifices for (or accumulated value upon – I’m not sure how to phrase it best). This is what all the past struggles boil down to. Backed by rampant divorce in the rest of the family, and most of them finally easing into being well-off, my un-sacrificial profession, my sexual orientations and my lack of offspring are no longer the crux of the problem. I can queer whatever I like, as long as I don’t mess with the equal distribution of property they have in mind and apparently are legally bound to. None of this has ever been part of my research, but now I wonder, while writing to you, whether it should. Art or artistic research might be the only tools available to me to weigh into these deeply personal economies and to maintain integrity towards them. On the other hand, perhaps some preparatory work has already started. I’m thinking of the fable of *The Twelfth Camel*,¹ told by Isabel Stengers in *Women Who Make a Fuss: The Unfaithful Daughters of Virginia Woolf*, a book I keep returning to. I’m also thinking of *Retour à Reims*, by Didier Eribon, which helped me tremendously to take a more sociological stance towards the shame that surrounds right-wing family descent. I’m thinking of the preparation for the next post-master block at a pass where we will look into how the Western legal apparatus around property is bound up with the history of settler colonialism and racism. And I’m thinking of examples like PA-F and the speculation of how new legal structures around collective property can support work and friendships rather than bloodlines.

This leads me to your requested anecdote about bonfires. I wasn’t allowed to go out at night until I was 16, and even then, my father would pick me up at 1pm. When I was 14, my friends were making plans to go camping during the summer. Dreading another abstinence from fun-times, I decided to turn the tables and invite them all to come my way. I negotiated a piece of land with my grandparents, as well as access to the makeshift bathroom next to the shed where they worked on the flowers. While we were preparing the fire, of course my grandfather(P) came around and started chatting with one my classmates. Afterwards she said to me: “I’m sorry for you, no one gets to choose their family.” As usual, he had been telling stories about the war, and unlike me, she had listened and taken his words for what they said undisguised: he had collaborated. Me and everyone else I had seen interacting with him, had always pretended – for various reasons – he wasn’t saying what he was saying, meaning that I really didn’t know, until she repeated exactly what he himself was always saying. Perhaps Esteban will know the psycho-analytic term for this form of generational and even national silencing. (The canvas-documentary “*Kinderen van de collaboratie*” does excellent work to address the ongoing muted rift the collaboration produced in Flanders). Anyway, when I think of “retour,” pitching my tent as it were, or at least partaking in the problem of the land, it is with a conglomerate block of fear in my stomach. What if history is visible or audible for everyone but me? How do I mediate in this particular form of silencing, when I’m not aware and might even support its operation? How do I position myself if I were to bring in other forms of kinship? Is turning away from it, what I’ve done so far, really the best move towards repair? Again, it might be the professional tools of (collective) artistic research that create leverage for what I learned not to see, hear or understand as (unfaithful) daughter in a lineage of solutions. Not exactly the *waarheid-durven-doen* you asked for, but still, the bonfire might be a micro constellation for truth-dare-do in the future.

Kristien

PS on fieldwork: my back hurts from writing this, similar to spending a day in a potato-field.

PIA ASKS BREG

Hi Breg,

Wow, I had no idea about what was going on in this pad, this bonfire. I needed some time to sit and listen before joining in.

Already in the first conversation with Davide, which this is a “re-take” of, contours appeared of the story of someone who left, and now returns “home.” That home is not quite home anymore because he has changed (hence the feeling of difference from the ones who stayed). It’s like the ones who stayed are a parallel version of the protagonist. To talk about someone else but actually be talking about yourself creates a kind of double-speak, which fascinates me. It also connects to my interest in “embeddedness,” which is not so much the question, “what are the different institutions I move through?” but rather: “how can I think of myself both same and different from myself, changed by my own origin or institutional determination, through this idea of «embeddedness?»”

I would like to connect to the origin story, or emigration story (depending on which way you look) that resonates throughout the conversation. We’ve been talking about where we’re from, but it’s a story of arrival as well, even if it is a circular path. I would like to ask you about this other side, this desire, projection, and change. Perhaps you can sketch out part of this trajectory for yourself, trace (some of) these influences, institutions you’ve passed through that shaped your voice, and how you see that version of shaping.

For example, I vividly remember one of my first sessions at a pass where they were using the word “phenomenology.” I didn’t know what it meant and to me it was just a long list of syllables. I was so confused. It seemed to be one in the long list of adjectives that had suddenly become nouns: potentiality, relationality, liminality etc. In this moment occurred a clear split for me, from not knowing and then absorbing this language of “art theory.” It went so quickly that it feels like having watched a time-lapsed video. This newly learned language enabled me to smoothly write an application which got me the job, which got me the research that got me into

the research center writing this question.

This is one context that helped me arrive where I am now, although it’s not exactly what I want to ask you. I guess not knowing is what defines the question, right? I’m just very curious about which other (institution, person, lover, friend, animal, environment, colleague) has made you a different version of yourself. I’m curious about your move from architecture, to collaboration with theatre into artistic research (if I’m describing it well).

But let’s not remain in the origin story, because linear time is a fiction and everything is change: how does your voice change in relation to perhaps wanting to pursue a Ph.D., for example? Do you project yourself into that space as another version of yourself, is there a split? Do you perform different roles, or is it an integrated flow of change? Does moving through different contexts and relations allow you to learn what you already know (a mode of learning that Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick describes as “sounds true”) or does it feel like growing a new limb?

Thank you for thinking with me!

Pia

PS: I know that I’m always talking about institutions, but for me these are not limited to organizations. This is, for example, a story about the institution of labor, when following love: I come from a highly career-oriented background where your work is deeply connected to identity, and self-discipline is the main ethical scale by which you measure yourself. Some years ago, I fell in love with a seasonal worker. Every summer he worked as a cook in a beach club, for 6 or 7 months, sometimes 80 hours per week, largely overtime (off the books). On his one evening off he drank like a fish. His work wasn’t his passion, not at all. He always said it specifically: I’m not passionate about cooking. When summer was over he would relax for five months, take his girlfriend (me) to fancy restaurants, listen to records, watch soap operas, never cook. He also majorly shaped my taste in music, but that’s another story. I think that his guilt-free relation to not working, and unromantic, “passionless” relation to labor resonates in my research today (in eternal conflict with the other plot in my origin story).

RESPONSE

Dear Pia,

Get ready for a joyride into antiquity! It's bizarre how this text is leading the way for exciting excavations. To answer you, I would like to quote you. When asked the question, "wherein lies the desire for your research" (Molenbeek, March 2nd, 2021) you said something like, "the desire to be free, the desire to *found* your own institution." A paradoxical statement with a complex architectural program, which on the one hand engages the heroic architect in me, and on the other, raises questions of sovereignty towards our own desire. What does it mean to *found* your own institution, and are we able to *found* it without deconstructing the very desire that instigated it? It might sound like a detour, but it's the result of the journey towards answering your question, re-enacting "my moves" through some of the institutions I encountered.

While writing this I'm carrying the echoes of the voices that went before us with me, embedded on this virtual paper. In the "emigration stories" you refer to, "I'm reading a constant flux of de- and reconstruction of our personal narrative in relation to our "research lives." Are we peeling off old versions of ourselves for new versions to become visible? Or excavating the foundations on which we stand? In relation to my own research I discovered that this excavation is a big blind spot. How do the institutions I've built for myself relate to where I am now, and where I need to go? While finding a voice for this, I'm thinking of the Japanese *sengu* tradition, where traditional temples are "eternally reconstructed" (every 30-60 years), as a way to keep the "doing" – the tactile and ritual elements of the building as "institution" – alive. For me, different modes of the self – which you speak of in relation to institution in general – do not feel as extra limbs or split versions of myself, but as all part of one body that has a layered skin, getting thicker by time. Or even as some kind of a reversed fermenting process. Did you know that every seven years each cell in the body has replaced itself by a new one?

When I was fourteen – about the time when my voice dropped down – my parents and I visited the J. Paul Getty Museum in Malibu (USA), an exact reconstruction of the ancient Papyri Villa of Herculaneum (IT). Wandering through the different courtyards from colonnade to vestibule, I encountered the *Statue of a Victorious Youth*, 300-100 B.C.), the ancient Greek version of the 1999 Calvin Klein model I didn't allow myself to study too long... Perforating eyes and a slim torso. No hands or feet. One of the recurring moments in which the demand to conform to heteronormativity scared the hell out of me.

I like to think that this mode of "not allowing myself my own desire," was projected through the space that enveloped me there and then. Guiding me, framing me. The silence of these stones as a stage for the "not yet becoming." A recognition of a symmetric order, a mythic and masculine architecture that compensated the turmoil in my head. Actually, my first architectural drawings – in my early teens – greedily welcomed these steady classicist elements, after an obsession for Jugendstil facades and my "modernist period" a couple of years later. I'm realizing how strong this desire for order within chaos resulted in an architectural construction of a "symmetrical image" of my own future. The drawings I made were family homes with children's bedrooms, designing and constructing my own future life within the heteronormative institution. A desire for confirmation overshadowed by an expression of conformation.

I'm curious how "architecture as a construction of self-institution" is a blind spot in architectural theory or in the discipline as a whole. When I try to think of architects that prominently shared their work as "an expression to self-institutionalize," I can't get around the formal dogma that instigated the architectures of the (heroic) modernists as Carlo Ratti describes them in *Open Source Architectures*. Thinking about this opened a door for me to explore (just started) queer and feminist architectures – something I never engaged with before – and needs more space somewhere beyond this text. It's probably fair enough to say that the "institution of the architecture discipline" is built on a confirmation of the formal capacities of a building, and a disinterest in the intrinsic desires of its conceiver.

At least for me, the architecture discipline and its “steelglass-concrete” dogmas had an effacing effect on my personal entanglement with the world. Which is the point where leaps of faith come to the rescue – encounters that redirected my path.

My first steps into visual arts and theatre, were based on two encounters, two collaborations outside the “hierarchical” frame I was in at that time. In both of these collaborations I transported the “desire to frame and structure.” To offer the bare frame, as a space for interdisciplinary negotiations. In *Georgofili*, the installation/scenography for Eleni Kamma’s exposition at Villa Romana (Florence), an ancient plough was encapsulated in a wooden framework (a kind of shelf structure). Looking back at this work, it strangely relates to my family’s farming background (mother’s side, an echo of Kristien’s text) and at the same time it shows an attempt to “hold or encapsulate others” with the structures I design. I can also see myself through or inside the frame, in an attempt to “stay with the dogma” and to simultaneously question it. These encounters/collaborations literally offered a space for me to step into the frame I designed, something I hardly did before – a recognition of my own “coming to be.” The second encounter is the one with my TAAT-colleague Gert-Jan. I would like to go deeper into this another time.

As you suggest in your question, a good love story always helps too un-institutionalize oneself. Around 2015-16 I was in very unclear waters. I married in 2014. He was a theatre producer who helped me a lot in finding my voice into the theatre discipline. Then plans changed. I needed to get out of the institution I had built for myself. Again a process of confirming to conform, that for a very long time, I thought I wanted too. So there was a lot on the “institution of the self” I had to de- and re-construct at that time. I fell madly in love two times in a two-year period. The first one was blind, the last one profound. Around the same time I ran into a book by Alberto Pérez-Gómez called *Built Upon Love: A Review On Architecture* that “*responds to a desire for an eloquent place to dwell, one that lovingly provides a sense of order, resonant with our dreams.*”

In the introduction, the Roman notion of *daidala* (named after Daedalus, the first architect in the western tradition whose story has been preserved) is opened up. *Daidala* are constructions made of “*well-adjusted pieces, capable of inducing wonder and providing existential safety for a community.*” These structures embody the platonic idea of “chora” (a becoming space), or in other words: a spatial perspective on our spiritual development. Living a *vita voluptuaria*, a life that provides enough space to live desires, without getting caught up in them completely.

So, to come to an end, it’s often in the encounters with “Another,” that the impact of the institutions that I pass through “maieutically” comes into existence and becomes visible. Architecture for me has to generate relational spaces as “becoming spaces.” Since 2012, TAAT is the institution I work through and pass through myself. An institution that is at the same time the architecture that it produces. A vehicle, a temporary construction for encounters to happen, in which I, myself, and a lot of others are invited to pass through with me. A portable and shareable structure. A tender institution” built upon love (as Elke Van Campenhout referred to a pass when it was founded).

PS: for the Ph.D., I might have found the “right” angle through this exercise. Thanks for asking me!

LILI ASKS PIA

Dear Pia,

Reading you in various contexts and getting to know you through the last year of Research Center together, I have to say what always struck me the most was the ease and elegance with which you not only admit to not knowing or not being familiar with something, but how you turn it into a little creative construction site that others are invited to join, either through reading your texts or real-time co-thinking in a conversation.

Coming across the lines where you describe the memory of the first few a.pass sessions and getting familiar with its vocabulary, and getting swift and handsy with a particular word, tickled my interest in how we get introduced to a certain discourse. How we adopt it, how we either immerse ourselves in it or get indoctrinated, and consequentially how that changes us. Within my own research I'm fascinated by mechanisms and practices that shape and mold a particular discourse, also when resisting it – offering ourselves as a surface for friction against the “incoming wave of beliefs, system of thought, phrasings, clichés and whatnot.” We support the discursive-production even if we're not straightforwardly reaffirming it. It resonates well with one of Kristien's formulations on (non-) linearity of discursive practices, taken out of her question to Davide – “a differential tissue rather than vicinal inclinations, (ir)responsive positioning rather than (im)polite borrowing.”

I understand this as a reflection on our own research position, as well as position to our artistic research methods, traditions, legacies and philosophical loyalties surrounding it. What we need to borrow and take as ours, incorporate, how we position ourselves in a certain domain we want to belong to, based on our differences rather than similarities, and stretch or mark the domain's border.

Anyway, not to go into it too deeply, reading through all the questions-replies so far, my attention gets drawn mostly to the notion of mis-fitting. Not fitting into our own right wing-ish family, not fitting into a model of normative intimate attachments, not quite fitting into an institution or a group of football fans we follow for years, all these cases call for some accommodating – on both sides – the studious and the studied, the ethnographer and the football fans, family and the strayed daughter, European dance history and its obscured co-existing historiographies of the Americas.

Ill-fittedness seems to be the beginning of a process, the beginning of reworking of everyone involved in the encounter. Beginning instead from closure and resignation. The only difference is that the agents entangled now usually have different temporalities and scales of change. For example – in a case of fandom as an identity forming practice, as an alternative or imaginary support system for one's identity, the fan is generally far more affected or at least

faster in it, than the industry producing the object of adoration. In all the mentioned cases, as topics of our researches – the dominant force takes longer to be affected by this process than the minority that undertook it as a way to have agency over the lack of relatable imaginaries or overwhelmed by enforced ones.

It's a bit like asking what are the apple's choices if it wants to escape gravitational pull of a much larger object it is submitted to. Now, not to naturalize oppression dialectics here, I simply want to illustrate the imbalance or contrast that survival tactics of any group are up against, when we find ourselves dealing with oppressive and normalizing discourse of dominant ideologies.

Your lines and their enthusiasm on embedding yourself into/with a.pass also reminds me of something a fan would do, or I find it curious how different our approaches to merging with a bigger entity is.

Being busy with fandom as artistic methodology, I am very excited to read other researches as fannish products of a certain discourse.

I consider myself an artistic research fan. As my research goes alongside other work, just like fan production that reworks and imbues an object of fandom with love, effort and affection, an artistic researcher as well as a fan have different relationships towards economy. They also both engage with their subject matter affectively as well as critically, allowing for or even calling for excessive attachments to cultural objects that are crucial to self or community representation and formation, but are necessarily not in the mainstream culture. DIY approaches, the use of easily accessible technologies, mixing genres or disrespecting boundaries, oppositional qualities of such practices, ultimately make them transformational. We research to effectuate the current reality and/or experience a different one.

I like the fact that in my imagination the sliding scale between the figure of a fan and (an artistic) researcher is not that rough or extended anymore. The whole range of fannish affective intensities, from desire, obsession, craze, infatuation and anxiety is not only available to artistic approaches, but are sometimes the only generative models for innovative practices.

It reminds me of S. Tomkins affect theory and what I think is the gist of it – that certain cognitive models demand a certain affective model, like the pairing of critical thought, practices and paranoia. But we are free in engineering them.

Since we are collaboratively looking into reparative and paranoid readings and practices (according to Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, in her book *Touching Feeling* (2003), I thought this little intro and the following question might be a backdoor into our efforts to comprehend or draft what reparative practices are, or might entail. I'd like to ask you to elaborate on your own fannish inclinations, whether towards your own artistic research objects or some other artifact, and to look closely and perhaps touch upon the pairing of affective and cognitive compounds. What do certain affective attitudes you employ in artistic methods enable you to do or block you from doing or protect you from. For example, one very potent and invigorating strategy I see you use or rely on when performing is a state of slight embarrassment, confusion, along some kind of a failure, but it's not clear whose expectations you are not meeting. Nonetheless, it seems to give way to certain processes and cognitive occurrences, transmission between yourself and the audience. It appears to be a necessary condition in your staging, a part of your research and performance apparatus, for certain content to start performing itself instead of you only addressing and referring to it.

RESPONSE

Dear Lili,

Your question about fandom immediately makes me think of things that I'm a fan of, which makes me happy! Affect theory is legit, everyone.

My scope of fandom runs wide. I'm currently obsessed with the Canadian fantasy western Wynonna Earp (2016-2021), a slightly more progressive Buffy the Vampire Slayer (1997-2003), of which I'm also a big fan: I've seen every episode four times or more, and I believe there are 145 episodes. I love TV: I play

scenes over and over in my head, dream about the characters, come up with new narratives, read long and detailed recaps, and the same goes for good sci-fi and fantasy novels. Stories like that influence my mood and color my world. I often move through my day to get back to my TV show at night. I don't usually talk about this, because I'm quite ashamed of it, of its pop-trashiness, the addiction to it, the waste of time it represents.

Similarly though, I can be swept away by a world-coloring theory or line of thought, which I will then attempt to explain to unsuspecting friends, parents, audiences, not dissimilar to the way I describe convoluted fantasy plots. Again shameful, you can describe these interactions as "oversharing." Thinking about it now I realize that, with regards to my own research, I have a fannish attitude as well, the objects that I save are better described as keepsakes after a concert than as documentation. Even the way I tell anecdotes about former performances (inside other performances) resembles the rambling about theory or fantasy I describe above. Some performances are "recaps" of other performances, annotated versions of what happened. Described with fondness and critique.

I think that being an "artistic research fan" is a really beautiful expression. I once stated in a dating profile that I am an "enthusiastic amateur in feminist, queer and anti-capitalist critical theory." I think this non-identification has given me the liberty to admit to not know: I'm not supposed to be an expert, after all. The trick is that I'm an expert in nothing, I've never completely identified with any discipline so I can sort of dance back-and-forth between professional expectations. The only discipline that I am an "expert" on is my own research. This explicit not knowing allows me to navigate the world despite doubt and anxiety, but it also allows me to address bigger questions on authority and authorship.

The sense of embarrassment, confusion and failure that you mention is indeed a potent force in my performances and directly connected with the performance methodologies, narrative structures and theories that inform and fuel my work. I don't think about it too often though, so thank you for asking me to do so!

I stage my performances in such a way that they support these moments of awkwardness and confusion as they emerge. I usually tell something and the audience/participant is doing their listening/participating thing. I often say something like, “I’m very nervous,” which is also always true, as well as something like, “I didn’t have time to prepare very well,” or, “I didn’t prepare this very well,” which is also often true, but sometimes just something I say. Things like this cause everyone involved to become uncomfortable, because I get myself in this exposed position and then I give up my position of authority: I don’t know my lines, I keep switching registers – from professional to personal – I don’t give a clear presentation, and on top of that I share too much about myself.

The main affect activated here is shame, which Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick writes a lot about in *Touching Feeling* as well. She calls it “shame-humiliation,” as it is categorized in the affect scheme of Silvan Tomkins. Shame is a very contagious and relational affect, if you look at someone who is ashamed you will often become ashamed yourself. Sedgwick describes this affect as performative. I think this describes the awkward spell of self-consciousness that can sometimes bewitch an entire audience at once – together yet apart. Shame-humiliation, according to Sedgwick, already appears in very young infants, when the feedback loop between child and caretaker is broken: the child gives a smile and it isn’t mirrored back by the caretaker, for example. Or, think back to the deep feeling of shame when you took someone’s hand in the supermarket who turned out not to be your parent.

Operating this feedback loop in performance: examining the institutional frame and then, instead of mirroring back that frame, constructing and placing little cracks in the feedback loop (the practice of which I see as my job as an artist), causes a liminal space to appear. My work explores this invisible frame of art, invariably lifting up the skirts of art to show its inner workings. It’s very exciting, but humiliating at the same time.

This fracturing of the feedback loop connects to this idea of misfit that you address. The shame of not seeing oneself reflected in your work environment, for example, can be traced to the expression “impostor-syndrome,” (which I am ashamed of

experiencing because it’s such a girly thing, but then being a girl in general is terribly shameful, of course.) Sedgwick analyzes shame through the work of playwright Henry James, who makes regular use of the affective connections between narcissistic desire and shame-humiliation. Something similar happens in my performances, when I oscillate between driving up the narcissistic stakes, while disidentifying with the speaking persona, which makes everyone feel ashamed for investing in her. Either too close and personal, or too far away. Shame is the affect of failure, but it is erotically potent and pleasurable as well. Both failure and its antidote I think, if we can stay with it. Sedgwick cites James with something like shame painting the pink blush of life on the cheeks of his work.

ESTEBAN ASKS LILI

Dear Lili,

I’m very triggered by the notion of fandom, I guess my relationship to it has been very particular. I sense that the way fandom works happens a lot through the formation of a collective experience or a sense of collective agency. As you mention, fandom can ignite affective collective experiences faster than a given industry may start producing or engineering it.

I have a story of a lonely fan for you, which I would like to share because I feel it crisscrosses several lines. Growing up, not many music bands that I liked ever came to perform in Ecuador, bands that did come were more marginal or residual in the global market. For instance, Air Supply – this well-known American band from the 80s – kept coming back to perform in the beginning of the 2000s. I used to joke that by the time Madonna would come to Ecuador, she would be long dead and they would be touring her embalmed remains, the way they do with some catholic saints – creepy but true. This also suggests that conservative Ecuador would have a hard time welcoming what for them would be a transgressive figure like Madonna.

Later on, at some point in my 20s, I learned an exemplary story that really foregrounded a sense of cultural isolation. I'm not sure if it's all documented or if it is partly gossip. In the early XIX century, the then infamous dance company Les Ballet Russes goes to Latin America to perform in 1929 – this bit is true, – they start their tour in the south in Argentina, go up performing in every country up to Peru, skip Ecuador and go to Colombia, the next country up, to continue the tour. This skipping was the case for many music bands and all sorts of touring artists.

You can see how both pop and “highcultur” e objects of fandom became always distant and alluring at once, and as I see it now, our gazes were quite directed towards the distance and not so much towards the ones watching the distance.

So there is a sense of orphanage with regards to a global imagination, populated with shimmering distant stars and at the same time, with a certain cosmopolitanism that I grew up thinking everyone should be involved in but was impossible to attain. Interestingly enough, Ecuador is the center of the globe geographically, yet it is “not on the map.” It took me a while to realize that there could be other possible, closer stars, or even that we could be organizing our fandom towards big stars differently. There is, however, a lingering sensation that our fandom is one-directional. Perhaps it always is one-directional, but there is usually an illusion of reciprocity and my surely colonized imaginary could not handle feeling so extremely marginal and to use your words, ill-fitting, in relation to “the world.” We all know that by “the world” we only mean certain places.

To chip into the conversation with Pia about shame, I would like to continue talking about negative affects, in this case about melancholia. This affect is connected to grief and to a sort of perpetual impossibility in relation to its objects. Melancholia is something I have always recognized in myself. In *The Melancholy of Race*, Anne Anlin Cheng talks about the tendency to associate grief with racialized subjects and therefore the tendency to pathologize them. She talks about the constant envisioning of African-Americans as those who have to deal with their own historical grief. To counter this, she speaks about a “melancholy formation”: a particular way of dealing with loss and grief, and she defines it as an “administration of grief”:

a way of distributing affects in which we only perceive the racialized subject as the carrier of mourning. This tendency disregards the concomitant negative affects on the side of the racializing systems and institutions, which are also fraught by exclusion, resentment, guilt and shame. Enforcing and sustaining a racializing system necessarily implies dealing with these negative affects, but within this affective economy, we tend to locate them only on the side of the racialized subject as something s/he “has to deal with.” In actuality, a whole system sustains the melancholy formation.

I'm now interested in how to redistribute those negative affects and dislodge them from my own body. Rather than (only) dwelling in my body, they are floating all around in a racialized/colonized world system and should be returned to the sender. To return to our fan objects of adoration, returning to the sender might mean making my relationship to the West less tyrannical, to re-shuffle and re-assign different values and affects than the ones assigned by capitalist market and cosmopolitan imaginaries. I also realize that my proposition of a lonely fan resides in the fact that I'm seeing the relation as exclusively between fan and object of fandom, and that entirely oversees the relationships between fans. This of course brings me back to your emphasis on the encounters and entanglements that fandom can afford.

After this re-scaling of the idea of ill fitting, I feel like a listener of your fandom radio show, calling and seeking for advice. How would you look at this case of lonely fandom under a reparative lens? The whole thing about melancholia is a playground for a fan of paranoia. And conversely, is there something to be grasped about fandom by looking at cases like this one: across borders and in relation to the ebbs and flows between “centers” and “margins”?

RESPONSE

Dear Esteban

I feel compelled to answer your radio call with a single quote by Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick. In order to describe what queer reading means, she evokes an image of a queer child searching for themselves in the material they read.

She says: "Such a child – if she reads at all – is ready for important news about herself without knowing what form that news will take."

Queer reading is therefore at the heart of many fan practices: in an effort to orient oneself in a world where one finds themselves a clear minority subject, fandom provides different modes of desiring, and therefore tactics to perform oneself in resistance to the normalizing discourse of dominant ideology.

Such is the case with a (lonely) fan, where fandom is an attempt at identity formation, offering an alternative or the imaginary for one's identity or heritage.

The power of fandom lies in community, I believe. It can reach full potential when it's shared. Probably through a very simple fact: once we decide who we are, or who we (don't) want to be, it's desirable to be surrounded by support – people we trust and respect or simply feel we (would like to) belong with, to confirm that they too see what we want to see, and that we are, in fact, how we envision ourselves.

I guess a lonely fan practices fandom as an oppositional practice, whether through identifications or mis-, dis-identifications, or as José Esteban Muñoz calls them – "performative modes of tactical recognition." For fandom to become a transformative space, not only the relationship between the fan and her object of fandom is important, but also, as you say, the relationships between the fans." I think that to "redistribute those negative affects and dislodging them from my own body," as you say, is a thing of a community.

Catherine Grant and Kate Random Love present many cases of fandom as artistic methodology in their recent book on fandom. Many of them typically rely on providing or establishing intimacy between the fan and her object of fandom. Intimacy enables identification and the desire to collapse into one, which I assume creates a strong sense of new reality on the (inter)personal level, where we are most susceptible.

For the matrix of domination to change, the other domains – structural, disciplinary and hegemonic – need to be addressed too. Only a community can do that, especially a fan community that forms their own interpretation to fit their circumstances and support it with an explicit affective economy. Or, as Ashley Hinck defines characteristics of fan practices in her book *For the Love of Fandom*: affective ties, specialization of knowledge, community, and material productivity are what organizes such a crowd.

I'm starting to feel like I'm trying to deliver a paper on fandom, getting caught up in enthusiasm for fandom itself. In fact, the melancholy part stayed so strong with me, I set myself out to come to it in this writing and I guess I went a long way around.

You say: "enforcing and sustaining a racializing system necessarily implies dealing with these negative affects, but within this affective economy, we tend to locate them only on the side of the racialized subject as something s/he 'has to deal with.' In actuality, a whole system sustains the melancholy formation."

Mobilizing affective matrices entrenched along racial and other discriminatory lines seem to be the core of what needs moving in order to administer differently. I wonder how much in your work, also on affective archives, particular affects are also vehicles for archives. Archives of racialized subjects are granted visibility, as you say, only through a certain performative envelope of grief, melancholia, etc. In my own experience, to allow myself a short anecdote, I had difficulty learning German for a very long time because I felt that coupling the language of an occupier with refusal and disgust was a way to stay loyal to my ancestors.

Fandom is such an invigorating power, because it's a site where meanings don't align and we can re-invest ourselves with love and fascination, or at least affects connected to futurity, not keeping us in a suffocating alliance with posterity under the guise of paying respect.

The frivolity and childishness that fandom is often accused of is also the same power that grants fictions authority to affect political action (fandom civic practices). Which makes me wonder if fandom is one of the few artistic materials left, both ubiquitous and evocative, that one can still make a mark with and/or cause a stir?

I guess I am advocating for fandom, not only as a methodology to make fake archives and reshuffle meanings, ways of making sense of representations and coping with them with our own sense of self. But mostly because fannishness is overwhelming, working with strong or extreme affects, that can get channeled and reworked but if sincere, not toned down and kept proper!

PS: to speak directly to your lonely fan question - from the previously mentioned book on fandom as methodology when describing the entangled relation between text and reader:

"... a form of reading/writing that is not the cognitive decoding or processing of information, but an embodied (risking getting a few fingers caught), committed, act of copoiesis."

So I'd say, one is never alone as a fan!

Biographies

BREG HOREMANS is co-founder of TAAT (with Gert-Jan Stam, 2012), a liquid collective of artists working on the verge of performance, research and installation art. Since 2011, he renegotiates his relation to the architecture discipline through transdisciplinary collaborations. He holds a post-graduate degree in Curating (ZHK, 2016) and worked as a curator in Architecture and Urbanism at SCHUNCK in Heerlen (2016-18). As a spatial designer he collaborated with a.o. Eleni Kamma and Lotte van den Berg on projects at Villa Romana in Florence, NAK Aachen and Stadsschouwburg Rotterdam. The desire for his research-based practice lies in shaping the spatial conditions for “sites of encounter” that invite human and non-human entities to co-constitute each other. The projects initiated by TAAT generate spaces for co-activity and instigate fluid prototyping processes as “becoming spaces.” In the last two years, Horemans is co-developing the TAAT Live Archive, an online documentation database that enhances processes of open source writing, archiving and publishing. He is affiliated with the Architecture department of KULeuven as a practice-based-lecturer (LAB-O) and collaborates with educational partners at University of the Arts London: HOGENT, Aberystwyth University Wales and the Technical University of Vilnius. TAAT is structurally supported by SoAP Foundation in Maastricht and the Dutch Performing Arts Fund.

DAVIDE TIDONI is an artist and researcher working with sound and listening. With a particular focus on direct experience, observation, and action he creates live works of differing formats that include performance, intervention, walk, and workshop. Bound to the performativity of the recording act, he realizes videos and sound recordings that function as pieces and/or as documentation material. He uses text scoring as a way to write and conceptualize about his research on listening and expands it towards other potential applications in movement, sensory education, and dialogical practices. Tidoni has a strong interest in the use of sound and music in counter-culture and political struggles and has published sound-based field research on the Northern Italian ultras group Brescia 1911 (*The Sound of Normalisation*, 2018). Tidoni's work can be accessed at: davidetidoni.name

ESTEBAN DONOSO is a choreographer, researcher and Performance Studies fan living and working between Brussels, Quito and Toronto. Currently at the end of a Ph.D in Performance Studies, he is juggling to put together a practice-based methodology, his interest in feminist cinema and the writing of a dissertation about dance narratives and cultural memory in Quito-Ecuador. He researches the medium of film as a self-narrative device and as an interface for collective writing. In as much as it enables our appearance in a virtual space, it also allows us to create a third space in which we can look at our shared entanglements. Some interrogations to continue his research are about cinema as a methodological tool and as a mode of imagination. While it is certainly not an innocent, ahistorical tool, it is widespread yet personal in imagining one's self appear. How can the impregnations of a cinematic imagination help us re-construct our own situated histories?

Esteban studied a BA in clinical psychology and an MFA in dance; he did the artistic research post-master at a.pass and is currently a Ph.D-candidate in Performance Studies at York University, Toronto. In 2015-18 he collaborated with Fabian Barba to create the Performance/Installation *Slug's Garden*.

KRISTIEN VAN DEN BRANDE is an independent writer, editor, dramaturge and researcher based in Brussels. An ongoing interest in the (im)materiality, image and performativity of writing has characterized her work, which engages with a range of disciplines including literature, performance, expanded publishing, urbanism and sexuality. She does ongoing research about "Support de Fortune" (chance supports), i.e. forms of writing that take place on throwaway paper or in the margin of print. Together with Myriam Van Imschoot she set up *oralsite.be* and the supporting software *olga* (in collaboration with OSP). She is a performer and co-editor in the project *Time has fallen asleep in the afternoon sunshine* by Mette Edvardsen. She is affiliated with a.pass as mentor and curator.

LILIA MESTRE is a performing artist and researcher based in Brussels working mainly in collaboration with other artists. She is interested in art practice as a medial tool between several domains of semiotical existence. Mestre works with generative formats such as assemblages, scores and inter-subjective configurations as an artist, curator, dramaturge and teacher. She was co-founder and later artistic coordinator of the artist run laboratory Bains Connective (1997-2017) and she's currently co- curator and artistic coordinator of a.pass where she develops a research on scores – *Scorescapes* – as a potentially radical pedagogical tool. From 2019-2021 she has collaborated with Prof. Jill Halstead and Prof. Brandon LaBelle in *Social Acoustic* – a research project supported by the University of Bergen, Norway and continues to collaborate in several art projects.

LILI M. RAMPRE (Slovenia) received her BSc in Physics. She pursued dance education and moved to Germany, where she obtained an MA diploma at Academy for Music and Performing Arts in Frankfurt. Before rejoining a.pass as Associate Researcher, Rampre continued her choreographic practice in the Research Cycle at P.A.R.T.S. and in the post-graduate program of a.pass. Her artistic engagements as a choreographer and performer have been supported by various venues and institutions in Germany and wider, most currently by Work-space Brussels, WP Zimmer, Fonds Daku, Dachverband Tanz Deutschland and Pact Zollverein.

Rampre is researching strategies to highlight "off stage" processes, practices and actors behind, off, beneath or above the stage. Her focus lies on power relationships and the dynamics of disparities in cultural capital (audience-performer, fan-star, producer-artist). Her work has often a role-reversal in its core proposal, ventriloquism of a kind, or unreliable narration. Most recently Rampre is looking into fandom and fandom civic practices authorizing fiction to affect political action as an artistic methodology, to re-articulate essential parts of artistic production and circulation as fictional or factual aspects.

NICOLAS Y GALEAZZI studies performance as an act of re-search. With a background in theater making and performance art, he uses his interest in processing visions as a coach and dramaturge for productive misunderstandings.

Connected to a.pass since 2009 in different functions, he focuses on socio-economic and ecological discourses. This is articulated in workshops, performances and printed matter in forms of performative coaching, experimental commoning, artistic-political activism and a love for copying. Studying conditions of (artistic) labor and of other vital ecosystem made him an activist of the artistic-political platform State Of The Arts (SOTA). In 2019 he lead the collective editing of its Fair Art Almanac. He is part of the performance group GAST-STUBE° and resident Voice at WPZimmer in Antwerp.

PIA LOUWERENS is a performance artist and researcher from the Netherlands, living in Brussels. Her research revolves around the becoming of the artistic subject – the I who writes, speaks and makes – in relation to the (institutional) context. In order to understand this co-constituting of artist and institution, she thinks through the notion of a script: who is scripting whom? Where can we read the script, and how can we rewrite it? Her work takes the shape of performances or writings in which she addresses her audience directly, switching between speech registers of the actual, the possible, the professional and the anxious artist. By writing scripts that fall together with the speech acts they describe, “I, Pia, am writing this bio,” she tricks the about-ness of text, and introduces an uncanny overlaying or seeing double of reading-writing, speaking-writing and scripted-improvised modes of address.

From 2019-2020 Louwerens worked as embedded artistic researcher on a multi-institutional research project, for which she became embedded in an exhibition space. Through this research she attempted to perform or practice the artist, and thereby the institution, differently – or, in the words of “Research Cycle I” associate researcher Adrijana Gvozdenovic: “otherwise.” This resulted in her self-published debut: *I'm Not Sad, The World Is Sad*.

VLADIMIR MILLER is an artist researcher, scenographer and dramaturge. His practice aims at re-negotiating institutional modes of spatial production in collaborative research settings. He uses collective building processes to shift the relationship between practice and space towards commoning and self-organization within institutional environments.

Miller has been a frequent collaborator with the choreographers Philipp Gehmacher and Meg Stuart, Anne Juren and others. As scenographer, co-author, dramaturge and performer he co-created a number of performances and video installations. In 2018-19 he was Dramaturge in Residence at Decoratelier/Josef Wouters, co-creating with him “Underneath which Rivers Flow” and “The Soft Layer.”

His work in education is closely interwoven with his research. As program curator and mentor at a.pass in Brussels and other institutions, he facilitates collaborative environments and research trajectories. Miller is currently completing his doctoral thesis at the Ph.D in Practice at the Academy of Fine Arts, Vienna. He was lecturer in Scenography at the University of Hamburg and at KASK Ghent, and Guest Professor at the Institute for Applied Theatre Sciences at the JLU in Gießen.

Miller is the curator for Cycle III of the a.pass Research Center.

COLOPHON:

Published by Posthogeschool voor
Podiumkunsten vzw, a.pass - advanced
performance and scenography studies

Delaunoestraat 58-60 bus 17
1080 Brussels (Sint-Jans-Molenbeek)
Belgium

email: publications@apass.be
web order: apass.be

Editing: Kristien Van den Brande
Copy-editing: Sarah Cale
Design: Miriam Hempel
www.daretoknow.co.uk
Production coordination: Joke Liberge
Administration: Michèle Meesen
Printed by: Graphius

The Annex online: madewitholga.be

Contributions:
Breg Horemans
Davide Tidoni
Elke Van Campenhout (online)
Esteban Donoso
Kristien Van den Brande
Lili M. Rampre
Pia Louwerens
Vladimir Miller (online)

All image materials by
the contributors as stated.

Published in 2021

ISBN 9789490500146

Licensed under creative commons Attribution NonCommercial 4.0 International License



The Annex and all related publications
of the Artistic Research Center Cycle II
are published with the support of:



Flanders
State of the Art