

https://dspace.org/

Opening address: dynamics

Schwab, Michael

2020
Arts Research Africa (ARA)
https://hdl.handle.net/10539/29247

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

DOI: https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/4SR29

OPENING ADDRESS: DYNAMICS

MICHAEL SCHWAB



This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) licence:
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0

Section 1 in which we jump onto a moving train[1]

This first point has to do with the historical realities of what we call "science" or better still, in German, *Wissenschaft*—a general term for the making of knowledge that does not discriminate between natural science and the humanities. Imagine such science or *Wissenschaft* to be a moving train with a window of opportunity open somewhere at its side, and you, somewhat apart, also on a moving platform with a different speed and direction. How would you take aim? Would you try to hit what you already know of science, that is, its past that has travelled to you like light from distant galaxies pretending to be a trace of its presence, or, would you aim for a future, different point at which your window of opportunity might be, after you are already mid-air just before impact?

Of course, this is all too simplistic. We are living in what has been termed a "knowledge society" to various degrees, that is, an at least partially-shared environment in which we move. Train and platform are already interconnected, that is, how the train moves informs the movement of the platform and vice versa—artistic research, through its sheer existence, has already changed the fabric of knowledge and the epistemic trajectories within it, with or without explicit acknowledgement.

Furthermore, how do we know that it is us who are jumping? May it not be the window of opportunity that jumps onto and grabs hold of us so as to turn from virtual into actual reality?—We have to let go of this idea that we, humans, are the only subjects in this—or any—play, and allow things—windows, but also animals, body parts, instruments—to jump, too. So, you could imagine this movie where the camera is in, or better, "the window" as it looks onto you standing on a platform zooming by, waiting, jumping, capturing you in a new emergent reality.

Or, yet again, and perhaps even more complex: what if not only trains and platforms are seen as moving parts, but also people jumping off platforms and windows jumping off trains? That is, what if your jump—as well as the window's jump—likewise inform the play and the epistemic trajectories that it unfolds? Might it be that without anybody jumping, nothing would ever turn or change? Thus, let's imagine for a moment that in a jump, whose subject we cannot even identify, that what the world is and can be is determined anew, and that things become in an act of jumping, of doing, of daring, of trusting, and of caring.

Actually, the train is not only to be imagined as science or *Wissenschaft*. It is also the train of art and maybe, better still, trains of arts that we thus engage, for the arts, too, are moving along and we, even with the ticket we once bought, might find ourselves not as their passenger, in particular if we are not prepared to also make them, that is, jump and change them.

We are not alone. Look around, and you will see base jumpers and high jumpers and long jumpers of all types and in all contexts that interact, too, that are being pushed and pulled, and push and pull others in mid-air-jump in what may be called local moments of encounter, from which, suddenly we look up and see both trains and platforms disappear in irrelevance while people and concerns enter as if invited. Can those trains and platforms perhaps get lost in such moments of mid-air-trajectory-altering suspense, before—CRASH—we hit the ground again?

So, here we are. I lifted off, and we'll see how this will figure.

Section 2 in which we travel from being to becoming

Modern science is a distant development from antiquity, the birthplace of the logocentric western or northern way of doing things, as many believe. Of course, art, in

the way we think about it today, didn't exist back then, but from Plato, we know that activities of such artistic kind were highly suspicious, in particular with regard to their epistemic value.

Plato is unable to imagine a place for art within the category of truth that his philosophy imposes, despite the fact that a will towards locating an appropriate register for art is more than apparent in his writings. In *The Republic*, before declaring that "poetry has no serious value or claim to truth," Socrates in discussion with Glaucon offers art a possible line of defence if it is able to articulate its value.[2] However, being exclusively engaged in a world of appearances, art is seen as so far removed from the truth (i.e., the ideal forms) that a secondary process must be set in place through which art's claim can be supported.[3] This process would be carried out by "defenders, men who aren't poets themselves" who could speak on art's behalf.[4]

Knowledge, or more appropriate here, truth, is related to something stable, "eternal" even—anything that changes is at least once removed, like the growing and waning flower from the idea of the flower, or twice removed, like the painting of that growing and waning flower. We find residues of this need to ground knowledge in something stable in demands for replication in the sciences, for instance, or the reservation towards experiences as merely "subjective."

Still, art's "return" is dependent on art's ability to reflect on its own genuine and positive relationship to "truth," without which "her defenders" would remain in the same spot Socrates is in. To my mind it is only shortly after Immanuel Kant's three critiques at around 1800 that the most radical departure took place, when an interest in the formations of life started, suggesting a new, central role for art announcing "the end of the longest error" as Friedrich Nietzsche put it.[5] Here, a section from *The Novices at Sais* by Novalis, published posthumously in 1802:

> Mankind travels along manifold pathways. He who pursues and compares them will perceive the emergence of certain strange figures; figures that appear to be inscribed in that massive tome composed in cipher that one everywhere and in everything beholds: on wings, eggshells, in clouds, in the snow, in crystalline and stone formations, in freezing waters, on the skins and in the bowels of mountain-ranges, of plants, beasts, people, in the stars of the heavens, in contiguous and expansive panes of pitch and glass, in the clustering of iron filings around the magnet, in the extraordinary ebb and flow of contingency. In these, one may glimpse an intimation of the key to this wondrous text, its very grammar-book; and yet the intimation refuses to accommodate itself to fixed forms and appears to begrudge any translation into a higher key.[6]

And, in a different context:

> The world must be romanticized. In this way one finds again its original meaning … Insofar as I give the common an elevated meaning, the usual a secret perspective, the known the value of the unknown, the finite an infinite appearance—I romanticize.[7]

Section 3 in which we become quite specific

In terms of phenomena, eternal forms aren't very specific as they refer, for instance, to any and not this particular flower. More technically speaking, one would perhaps look at the absolute specificity of a really random number. Pseudo-random numbers of the kind that computers often generate are pretty random but show a pattern, which allows them to be expressed in an abbreviated way, lossless compressed, if you

will. Absolutely random numbers, on the other hand, that is very specific things, can only be arrived at through themselves and in no other way, compression—an attempt at a shortcut—will always introduce loss.[8]

Or, take this idea from Lewis Carroll, which is said to have inspired Jorge Luis Borges' famous story, *On Exactitude in Science*,[9]

> "What a useful thing a pocket-map is!" I remarked.
>
> "That's another thing we've learned from your Nation," said Mein Herr, "map-making. But we've carried it much further than you. What do you consider the largest map that would be really useful?"
>
> "About six inches to the mile."
>
> "Only six inches!" exclaimed Mein Herr. "We very soon got to six yards to the mile. Then we tried a hundred yards to the mile. And then came the grandest idea of all! We actually made a map of the country, on the scale of a mile to the mile!"
>
> "Have you used it much?" I enquired.
>
> "It has never been spread out, yet," said Mein Herr: "the farmers objected: they said it would cover the whole country, and shut out the sunlight! So we now use the country itself, as its own map, and I assure you it does nearly as well."[10]

I would suggest that rather than having moved to some form of integration of knowledge—a pocket-map, if you will—as science has progressed, we see more and more phenomena that, stubbornly, resist being explained. While knowledge surely has grown over the centuries, ignorance seems to have outgrown the growing knowledge.

Time for a step-change, perhaps, and another mode of "research" that lets phenomena be, that engages with them one at a time, accepting the endless labour of turning every stone—or of rolling it up the hill, as Sisyphus asks us to do—and not falling prey to the temptation that what I understand *here* may explain what happens *there*, despite the connections that things undoubtedly are said to have.

Section 4 where things are getting really fast

My friend and colleague, the pianist Paulo de Assis, has recently suggested that practitioners cannot, at the moment of making, afford time for contemplation of the kind that so strongly has influenced philosophical aesthetics. "In this particular moment, in the very last seconds before going onstage, the whole concerto—its overall form and all its pitches, rhythms, instrumental colours, dynamic ranges, tempi, pedalling, fingerings, gestures—is vividly present in the pianist's body and mind, being concretely felt as a huge field of *virtuality*… As soon as the pianist starts performing—physically touching the keyboard, attentively listening to the orchestra, punctually looking at the conductor—all those potentialities go through a process of synthesis, leading to the radical here-and-now of every single fraction of a second, which one-by-one, one-after-the-other, in closest vicinity and rapid pace, are producing concrete *actualisations* of forces and materials."[11] Although other disciplines seem to be moving at different speeds, the complexity that art seems to afford requires fast "thinking on one's feet," decision-making without having as yet understood (all) the

implications, risking, as it were, to miss the most obvious, but hoping also, to touch on the unprecedented.

In particular, the rate and speed of technical developments have meant that things are implemented—and often sold—before we really understand their implications. The best example for the current state of affairs may be the discussions around Artificial Intelligence. 'AI can predict if you'll die soon—but we've no idea how it works'[12] read a recent headline. Likewise, AI seems to be able to create art—or something that resembles art—but we are equally at a loss when it comes to this work's meaning.

More and more, understanding seems to lag behind the dynamic material reality of the world. Insisting on secured knowledge may still be very important, but it risks detaching knowledge from decision-making. In the face of this, unsecured knowledges that operate right at the point of life become perhaps the better options, not as no-knowledge and anything goes as orthodox fundamentalists want to make us believe, but as more varied but still specific epistemic engagements in concrete situations. Material and social bodies gain particular importance, but they are not the only means by which phenomena are being processed, in particular with respect to the futurity that is engrained in such fast presence.

Section 5 in which we demand better

Epistemologically speaking, those historical developments have led to various crises, regarding, for instance, the unity of knowledge. One lesson learnt is that historical factors matter and that at least a certain degree of dynamism is required since what counts as knowledge at any given time as well as the routes chosen to obtain it can be different. Historical epistemology tries to take account of this and also of the historicity of knowledge and the way it creates futures.[13] This is already a valid and valuable departure from more fixed notions of epistemology.

However, history itself has been problematised in art. For instance, in modernity, the challenge of artistic research could have been responded to in simpler ways. Institutions such as the Bauhaus or art movements such as Conceptual Art were very engaged in their historical relevance, sometimes explicitly politically but not necessarily so. From today's perspective, it seems comparatively easy to take historical problems and to research and deliver "solutions" to them, that is, to modernise practice by creating new templates (or artistic forms).

The teleology that comes with the need of making future—avant-gardism—over time has made this mode rather dated, and we have become fast in spotting and disapproving of this often-essential ingredient. From the perspective of contemporary art, historising knowledge is, thus, not enough, that is, moving from an eternal to a durational baseline still offers a ground that is not sufficiently part of developments *before* historical lines have been drawn and historical paradigms have taken hold. For this reason, artistic research must be valid even without historical demands.[14] However, which kind of epistemology would support this is very much open to debate. Without such epistemological engagement, research carried out within a more contemporary paradigm risks not being taken seriously in a wider context of research. Or, conversely, work carried out according to a historicising paradigm might find it hard to be recognised in the context of contemporary art.

At its most extreme, a radical epistemology must be proposed,[15] allowing for absolutely unprecedented knowledges not yet—or never—adapted into a shared fabric of knowledge. Untransferable items of knowledge must be possible for which finding

the right space or the right time remains a challenge. We may—with Nietzsche—call such knowledges "untimely."[16] In fact, clear epistemic phenomena that resist being absorbed into standardised and timely knowledge are of great importance, as they signal the shortcomings of our present knowledge systems vis-a-vis the world as it exists, be it as part of artistic sensibilities or cultural practices. Thus, epistemology should not be used to discriminate against knowledges outside its own territory; however, we also need a space to probe and contest lazy knowledge claims with no basis.

Section 6 where we have learnt a lesson

There is no point in setting up a Journal for Artistic Research if this journal aims at replacing concrete experiences with general statements: the kind of shortcuts mentioned before. While such statements may well be important and should feature in the journal, we need to take extra care with the way in which practice appears.

What researchers submit and how they arrange it is absolutely down to them.[17] We have neither a desired word count nor some other way of assessing the quantity of media that are used. All we ask for is that "a reader should be able to access all essential aspects of the exposition in the period of an hour of investigation."[18] This includes, for instance, the distinct possibility of non-textual submissions, such as, say, a single video.

Avoiding templates of any kind is important to us since the form of an article may be as relevant to its meaning as its content—and you wouldn't want to tell people what exactly to write in a text either, would you? Thus, we conceive of the pages of the journal also as sites of practice rather than just spaces to reflect upon it.

At the same time, the Journal for Artistic Research (JAR) is an online journal, so there are limits in what is technically possible. While the Research Catalogue—the software platform that we use—allows for rich-media, multimodal, and non-linear forms of "writing," for most people it is clearly not their usual artistic context.[19] For many, this may be problematic, but stepping into this also social environment can be very productive.

To take a more general example: an installation or a performance made again in a different context or space will, in most cases, affect my understanding of the work. I will also, in most cases, need to make compromises and adapt what I have brought to the table, that is, take on external challenges and find artistic responses to them. All of this changes and transforms the work, which is now not a singular object carried over from space to space but a multiplicity tangible only across those spaces. In each appearance, something will have been taken away, and something else will have been added.

While I accept that doing this also in the context of JAR can be a difficult task, when it artistically works, it has proven successful for everybody, including authors, reviewers, and readers. Importantly, though, when we are looking for art, we are not pointed to another space or another occasion, which I might have missed as the site for experience and meaning. I—as the reader—can expect it to happen here and now as I engage with it in JAR.

However, JAR is not an online art magazine but a peer-reviewed journal, which means that in its very specific context other than perhaps in different contexts, practice needs to be articulated—or *exposed* as we usually say—as research,[20] that is, as practice happens again, its epistemic implications have to become tangible. In effect, beyond simple technical structures, the institutions that we built and the credibility that they have solicited in the past creates precisely that: a space where research is

"natural" and needn't be argued for (again) from the ground up, as well as, a community that understands the difficulties involved, and appreciates and learns from achievements.[21] Technology is important, but successful articulation and communication are not about the technology that is used.

Such expositions of practice as research happen in JAR, but the operations of expositionality are so basic that other contexts can easily be imagined, in which due to their different affordances, different other aspects may be worked on. To give an example, for our 'Transposition [T^P]: Artistic Data Exploration' project (which was funded by the Austrian Science Fund),[22] Gerhard Eckel, David Pirrò and I specifically worked towards those contexts with their own respective histories and problematics: 1) the (music) performance setting, 2) the white cube art setting, 3) the conference setting, 4) the art catalogue setting, 5) the academic book setting, and 6) the project website setting.

Each of these settings allows for different types of engagements with different balances between discursive and non-discursive understandings, creating a richer experience of the project than any single setting could.

Section 7 where there is no time to rest

JAR and the Research Catalogue are also research projects in their own right. Over the past years, we discovered aspects that still require work. Here, I want to list just a few of those in order to indicate current concerns:

1. The notion of "artistic" in the journal's name is problematic in a number of ways. First, different creative disciplines relate to the concept of "art" differently. Some practitioners have reported that this can go as far as to reject the idea that their work may be "artistic" in any way. Second, in particular, when the making of "art" is not the aim, it has become increasingly difficult to distinguish research practices that are "artistic" from those that are not. And, third, notwithstanding my first point, for some positioned in fine art contexts, the notion of "artistic" does not sufficiently engage with high-art concerns,[23] mirroring to some degree issues with the institutionalisation of art that some see at play when notions of "research" enter the academy. Amongst others, these points make it hard to define a disciplinary position of the journal, which is not general enough to simply be "transdisciplinary" and yet wider than what usually counts as art.[23]
2. Strategically, JAR was set up to demonstrate the very possibility of traditional peer review processes in the field of artistic research. However, this has made many very specific discussions and dialogues necessary, adding value to a submission in the eyes of those involved in the review and editing process. This value, however, is largely hidden from our readership, since a JAR exposition may be seen as too much akin to a "work" to carry the various layers of negotiation, collaboration, interpretation, and reflection that allow for divergent readings. It is difficult to imagine how this could be represented; currently, those valuable layers remain largely hidden.
3. The way the Research Catalogue had been conceived prefers spatial over temporal modes of distribution, expressing a dominance of visual over auditory registers, for instance.[24] While it is possible to create temporal structures through the use of audio or video, the structure itself can very little be engaged with.[25] The implications of this bias, for instance, in regard to the peer review process, but also the kind of practices that JAR attracts, are not very well understood, but clear when we ask practitioners to "design" their submission.

4. To my mind, JAR has successfully tackled issues of multimodality, that is, the articulation of research across a variety of media, including written text. However, the language in which this is written is also not neutral, and it is only very recently that we have started to accept also submissions in Spanish, Portuguese, and German next to English. With this move, we have opened up the possibility of working across languages as well, but what impact this has with regard to our processes, as well as the understanding of art and research, is not yet clear. The distinct possibility exists that we may eventually encounter submissions that don't sit easily within global paradigms. How would assessment and editorial policies need to respond to more localised knowledges expressed in languages not accessible to most?

We aim to apply as few as possible external determinations creating a technical, conceptual, and structural framework that allows seeing specific choices rather than defaulting behaviours. This implies that an ongoing critical process is needed to learn from our observation and to see when expectations are merely satisfied or at what point new approaches enter the field. Processes of authorship, peer review, and reading can become very complex if one aims at responding on eye-level to all submissions that we receive, but this is part of our responsibility. In effect, we invite artists and researchers to work it out and to challenge us, reviewers, and readers with epistemic claims born out of specific practices.

Section 8 where we learn to walk (or ride a bicycle)

JAR has been working to free artistic research publishing—and, hence, artistic research as a whole—from as many presuppositions as possible. We do not operate with an understanding of what art is or what it is supposed to be, and neither do we apply definitions of research. However, we do require submissions to make those aspects tangible as part of their articulation so that we can learn how to read, listen, see a project, and understand what implications this has for art, science, or artistic research—platforms and trains—which through expositionality become moveable and not just moving objects.

With reference to Jean-Luc Nancy (and Martin Heidegger), the "sense" that an exposition makes is three-fold—it is perceptual, insofar as aesthetic objects are being experienced; it is signifying, insofar as knowledge is articulated; and it is directional, insofar as it operates an open-ended movement towards the reality and the unfolding of its world. More specifically, expositionality as the articulation of practice as research has a differential operator at its heart where the doubling and re-doubling of practice replace representational reference and provide a grounding in something other than what the articulation tables. This includes the notion of practice itself, which is equally not a given but—as research practice perhaps?—emergent from its exposition. The movement of the exposition, its momentum, if you will, creates just about enough stability to afford letting go of what is otherwise deemed necessary. This stability is, first of all, temporal and not historical; the engagement with material temporality need not be codified historically to gain its status as research.

In the best cases, I see artistic research articulations as self-grounding exercises that take away definitory power from existing institutions creating as it were with an exposition temporary or limited new institutions, as Esa Kirkkopelto so aptly put it.[26] Re-instituting, in this sense, is a founding exercise that has to go down deep enough to detangle a practice's operational order from existing orders that can do nothing but box art in, a risk that many rightly see associated with the field of artistic research

as a whole, where research captures, identifies, and makes available for use and abuse what otherwise may have had other, also epistemic, potentials.

Addressing you as artists—and, in particular, African artists—today, the question that is most concerning me, and which I hope to be able to talk to you about these coming days, is this: is the option of leaving "northern" definitions of art and research behind enough, in terms of decoloniality, or, is the need for, and perhaps the pressure to, self-ground another turn of the screw that promises a voice to those who are willing to, at least provisionally, suspend their place in their own history, while those who require history not as presupposition but as lived, interconnected reality might feel the opposite?

This question very much touches on notions of originality, which both art and research in my proposition—despite being moved from history to time—rely on perhaps too much. What about that researcher whose research focuses on the subtraction of originality so as to become the maker of what has already been made?

Section 9 is about strategy

Expositions of practice as research in JAR are dependent on a suitable peer-review process, where reviewers need to be found from within a context—or better, still, a world—that a submission engages. The selection process is a little hit-and-miss as we need to cast a net wide enough in order to not suggest very specific disciplinary contexts. We do this by also not focusing on disciplines, for instance, by involving artists primarily with experience of JAR and the Research Catalogue, but also by employing a comparatively high number of reviewers: on average 4.3 reviewers per submission (for the record, JAR's success rate is 20%), in addition to the currently ten-people-strong editorial board, which also looks at each submission.

Inside the process, the key strategic element is expressed in question three of the peer review form, which reads: "How does the submission expose practice as research?" with a checklist below asking to check, for instance, "Whether or not the submission is contextualised and the context is referenced, which may include social, artistic, and/or theoretical issues, and if not, if such an omission matters." In effect, a submission could not be according to any orthodox criterion for research and still be accepted, which could happen only if it was in full expositional operation. However, for the one or the other point, peer reviewers may see deficits and a need for standardised external scaffolds, which we are not principally objected to. Those hand- and footrests can, in fact, be quite powerful.

However, from experience, I would suggest this: the better an exposition works, the less dependent it is on criteria. Or, conversely, asking to respond explicitly to criteria for research during revisions is often a stopgap when, in fact, a more principled re-thinking could have made those demands disappear. However, it is comparatively easy to require, for instance, contextualisation; it is hard, if not impossible, to suggest new, suitable artistic solutions, which is the reason why the reviewing process unintentionally has an academic bias.

To my mind, while such openness is still strategically relevant, our own history might have created a sense of expectations—or a habit—that doesn't make it any more likely today to receive an expositionally challenging submission than it was nine years ago. This is also down to the often institutionally driven field of artistic research as a whole, which I don't see as being very experimental, perhaps missing a trick or two.

Section 10 that describes emergent concerns

There is no systematic analysis of the effects of all of this on intellectual or artistic investments, and I would say that broadly speaking concerns are largely shared with the wider context of contemporary art. However, below the surface, when discussing the effects of artistic research, I would look at those areas in particular as fields in which artistic research may offer different departures from both contemporary art and science:

1. Distributivity and fragmentarity

Distributivity is, of course, a concern in contemporary art as, for example, Peter Osborne remarks.[27] It also plays a role in the context of artistic research, most prominently perhaps described by Sean Lowry and Nancy de Freitas in relation to *Project Anywhere*.[28] What is striking to me, however, is that those notions of distribution are not (yet) radical enough, both on the side of the makers and on the side of the audiences, that is, I see artistic research as being in the process of integrating more diverse practices and audiences, breaching in the process notions of art but also conceptions of knowledge. In this respect, I see expositions as microcosms in which distributions are enacted that may be and often are developed from there to a global scale, connecting, for instance, audiences that would otherwise not have seen a shared ground. Artistic research projects are, in this sense, also integration exercises with the caveat that there is no simple and single representation of the distributed whole of the project. Work concepts may need to refer to notions of "fragment," "assemblage," or "multitude" in order to describe the kinds of objects and identities that are still afforded.

2. Inter- and transdisciplinarity

Related to this is the importance of interdisciplinarity, an area in which artistic researchers are already seen as leaders.[29] Beyond this, and potentially more interesting, are the developing notions of transdisciplinarity in which, despite the critical voices,[30] I see real departures. The most important of these are not so much particular relations of disciplines and not even the relationship between academic and professional research, but the increased epistemic role of amateurs, tourists, or lay people—their knowledge on their own terms is fast becoming as relevant as that of experts rooted in historically developed disciplines. And, yes, many artistic researchers venture out precisely on those terms to engage in makeshift ways with difficult issues for which it would take a long time to develop the appropriate apparatus.

3. Collaboration, authorship and subjectivity

The inter- and transdisciplinary setting is not one that ever works for a single person. In artistic research, groups of people integrate and develop protocols for authorship and distributions of knowledge, often reaching out to voices that don't (yet) matter, which is the reason why artistic research projects are often activist in nature. Those collaborative networks of distributed authorship are part of the creative processes themselves. They may also include non-human acteurs, indicating how subjectivity itself can be seen as distributed and fluctuating across a complex set of relations.

4. Minor forms

A further development from this, on the artistic production side, is the role that minor practices and forms play in artistic research, which contemporary art criticism and the art market would have weeded out. Without my experiences in artistic

research—as a simple gallery- or museum-goer—I don't think that I would have seen quite how manifold artists' trajectories can be, and what kind of inspiration can be gained from things judged badly by the standard discourse. (As an aside, I continue to get comments about the "artistic quality" represented in JAR, which to me is an indication of the hierarchies still very much at play in art and the ethical implications that result from those kinds of judgements, including access to people and capital).

5. Intermediality

Media—and also the medium of art—are, in this sense, major forms that control what is possible to say. Rather than feeding those channels, according to the idea of distributivity, many artistic research projects work across media in order to create or assemble new temporary media, that is, modes of communication beyond the control of a single medium (often text, but also the more artistic media of photography, painting, etc.) with very different affordances. Hence, what I seek when I look at those is not a cluster of fixed media but a sense of emergent, invented media and the kinds of articulations that become possible in those. Here, then, it doesn't really matter what media are used; what matters is that the effects of intermediality are embraced—

6. Locality

—which is to say that the enacted distributivity is always local and not transferable in the way orthodox knowledge is assumed to be. In effect, it is precisely the possibility of creating such local (inter-)media that allows for research to engage much closer with the material, social, and cultural specificities of its objects. In other words, the only way that local knowledges can feature as local in a global setting is by affecting the very fabric of the global. As I have suggested elsewhere, "the globe"[31] as this unified object seen from space may not exist, at least not as a material, social, and cultural reality.

7. Materiality of articulation

This may, in turn, lead us to an appreciation of any articulation as materially thick rather than informationally transparent, which implies that aesthetics—and, in fact, also politics—can never be taken out of the epistemological equation. Whole new skill sets are required, and (expensive) infrastructures (archives and libraries) needed that embrace the provisionality and partiality of whatever they may hold.

8. Complexity and complication

Due to these and other aspects, artistic research projects deal not only with complex sets of materials, requiring complex architectures, they themselves cannot be clearly distinguished and separated from what one might call the material, social, and cultural background noise. The whole idea of "project" needs to be complicated—we idealise projects, but the projective structure of research, which makes it so manageable, is also in the way of different knowledge relations.

Michael is an artist and artistic researcher based in London. He is the founding Editor-in-Chief of the Journal for Artistic Research (JAR); michael.schwab@jar-online.net

Notes

1 In the notes that I supplied for this revised version of the lecture I aim to make explicit links to my underlying work carried out over the last decade or so. Most texts are available on my profile on the Research Catalogue.

2 Plato, *The Republic*, 608a.

3 Plato, *The Republic*, 597e.

4 In Schwab, 'First, the Second, Walter Benjamin's Theory of Reflection and the Question of Artistic Research,' I explain this in more detail; note that the notion of "exposition" has in large parts replaced the concept of reflection that I was working on at the time. Still, Walter Benjamin's work on early German Romanticism remains influential to my thinking.

5 Nietzsche, *Twilight of the Idols*.

6 *"Mannichfache Wege gehen die Menschen. Wer sie verfolgt und vergleicht, wird wunderliche Figuren entstehen sehn; Figuren, die zu jener großen Chiffernschrift zu gehören scheinen, die man überall, auf Flügeln, Eierschalen, in Wolken, im Schnee, in Krystallen und in Steinbildungen, auf gefrierenden Wassern, im Innern und Äußern der Gebirge, der Pflanzen, der Thiere, der Menschen, in den Lichtern des Himmels, auf berührten und gestrichenen Scheiben von Pech und Glas, in den Feilspänen um den Magnet her, und sonderbaren Conjuncturen des Zufalls, erblickt. In ihnen ahndet man den Schlüssel dieser Wunderschrift, die Sprachlehre derselben; allein die Ahndung will sich selbst in keine feste Formen fügen, und scheint kein höherer Schlüssel werden zu wollen";* Novalis*, Werke, Tagebücher und Briefe Friedrich von Hardenbergs. Band 1: Das Dichterische Werk, Tagebücher Und Briefe*, 201. The English translation is taken from Robertson, 'A Translation of "Die Lehrlinge Zu Sais" by Novalis'.

7 *"Die Welt muß romantisirt werden. So findet man den ursprünglichen Sinn wieder. … Indem ich dem Gemeinen einen hohen Sinn, dem Gewöhnlichen ein geheimnisvolles Ansehn, dem Bekannten die Würde des Unbekannten, dem Endlichen einen unendlichen Schein gebe so romantisire ich es"*; Novalis, Werke, Tagebücher und Briefe Friedrich von Hardenbergs. Band 2: Das Philosophisch-Theoretische Werk, 334, aphorism, 105.

8 I have, of late, been thinking again about a self-published text written in the first year of my doctorate, which, although not used again in my successive work, is in hindsight not irrelevant to the idea of exposition as information and its relationship to data; Schwab, 'Early Computer Art and the Meaning of Information.'

9 "… In that Empire, the Art of Cartography attained such Perfection that the map of a single Province occupied the entirety of a City, and the map of the Empire, the entirety of a Province. In time, those Unconscionable Maps no longer satisfied, and the Cartographers Guilds struck a Map of the Empire whose size was that of the Empire, and which coincided point for point with it. The following Generations, who were not so fond of the Study of Cartography as their Forebears had been, saw that that vast Map was Useless, and not without some Pitilessness was it, that they delivered it up to the Inclemencies of Sun and Winters. In the Deserts of the West, still today, there are Tattered Ruins of that Map, inhabited by Animals and Beggars; in all the Land there is no other Relic of the Disciplines of Geography—Suárez Miranda, *Viajes de varones prudentes, Libro* IV, Cap. XLV, Lérida, 1658" Borges, *Collected Fictions*, 325.

10 Carroll, *Sylvie and Bruno Concluded*, 169.

11 de Assis, 'Transduction and Ensembles of Transducers. Relaying Flows of Intensity', 246.

12 Lu, 'AI Can Predict If You'll Die Soon—but We've No Idea How It Works'.

13 I have been working with and against Hans-Jörg Rheinberger's understanding of historical epistemology (Rheinberger, *Toward a History of Epistemic Things*) in a number of texts around his notion of "experimental system" (cf. Schwab, 'Introduction'; Schwab, 'Artistic Research and Experimental Systems'; Schwab, 'The Exposition of Practice as Research as Experimental System'). A more specific critique on questions of history in this respect can be found in my work from 2013–2018.

14 This approach is developed in Schwab, 'Transpositionality and Artistic Research' around the notion of "transposition."

15 The idea of a radical epistemology was first developed in the context of the research project *MusicExperiment21* (PI: Paulo de Assis) during a case study on Nietzsche's compositions. See Schwab and de Assis, 'Nietzsche 6+1: The Weight of Music' for video documentation of the performance of Nietzsche 6, The Weight of Music, at the Tanzquartier in Vienna on 28 November 2015, which includes my lectures within it.

16 See Schwab, 'Experimental Systems' for my use of the untimely against notions of the contemporary counter to what, for instance, Giorgio Agamben suggests in 'What Is the Contemporary?'.

17 See the JAR submission guide.

18 See the JAR submission guide.

19 The Research Catalogue is constantly evolving. See Schwab, 'Expositions in the Research Catalogue' for a description of what is now called the "graphical editor." See Döbereiner, 'The Research Catalogue Exposition as a Digital Object: Challenges and Future' for more on the current developments. Regarding questions of academia, written in the context of the Research Catalogue, see Schwab, 'The Research Catalogue: A Model for Dissertations and Theses in Art and Design'.

20 The notion of exposition—or better—to expose practice as research is central to JAR's conceptual makeup. See Schwab, 'Expositionality' for a detailed description of the term and its implications and also Schwab, 'Exposition Writing' for its relation to art.

21 I highlight the importance of institution here in reference to Kirkkopelto, 'Artistic Research as Institutional Practice'.

22 Eckel, Schwab, and Pirrò, 'Transpositions [TP]: Artistic Data Exploration'.

23 According to Ann Bermingham, "the accomplished woman was understood to be 'artistic' but not an artist. She was not an artist because she was neither original nor a paid professional. Unlike the artist who was a creator and producer of culture, she was a consumer and reproducer of culture. The word 'artistic' inscribes art onto the body and into the personality of the subject who makes art. 'Artistic types' are works of art themselves, embodying art without necessarily mastering it," in Badger and Upitis, 'On the Research Paradigm in Contemporary Art Discourse: A Dialogue', 258.

24 Schwab, 'Expositions in the Research Catalogue'.

25 Döbereiner, 'The Research Catalogue Exposition as a Digital Object: Challenges and Future'.

26 Kirkkopelto, 'Artistic Research as Institutional Practice'.

27 Osborne, *Anywhere or Not at All*.

28 Lowry and de Freitas, 'The Frontiers of Artistic Research'.

29 Quinn, 'Auditing Research in the Arts'.

30 See, for example, Barry, Born, and Weszkalnys, 'Logics of Interdisciplinarity'.

31 Schwab, 'Experimental Systems. Contemporaneity, Untimeliness, and Artistic Research', 171.

References

Agamben, Giorgio. 'What Is the Contemporary?' In *What Is an Apparatus?: And Other Essays*, translated by David Kishik and Stefan Pedatella, 39–54. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009.

Assis, Paulo de. 'Transduction and Ensembles of Transducers. Relaying Flows of Intensity'. In *Transpotitions: Aesthetico-Epistemic Operators in Artistic Research*, edited by Michael Schwab, 245–65. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2018.

Badger, Gina, and Alise Upitis. 'On the Research Paradigm in Contemporary Art Discourse: A Dialogue'. In *Intellectual Birdhouse: Artistic Practice as Research*, edited by Florian Dombois, Ute Meta Bauer, Claudia Mareis, and Michael Schwab, 257–69. London: Koenig Books, 2012.

Barry, Andrew, Georgina Born, and Gisa Weszkalnys. 'Logics of Interdisciplinarity'. *Economy and Society* 37, no. 1 (2008): 20–49.

Borges, Jorge Luis. *Collected Fictions*. Translated by Andrew Hurley. London: Allen Lane, 1998.

Carroll, Lewis. *Sylvie and Bruno Concluded*. London; New York, NY: Macmillan, 1893.

Döbereiner, Luc. 'The Research Catalogue Exposition as a Digital Object: Challenges and Future'. In *Artistic Research: Charting a Field in Expansion*, edited by Paulo de Assis and Lucia D'Errico, 46–57. London: Rowman and Littlefield, 2019.

Eckel, Gerhard, Michael Schwab, and David Pirrò. 'Transpositions [T²]: Artistic Data Exploration'. Research Project, A cooperation between the University of Music and Performing Arts Graz and the University of Applied Arts Vienna. Funded by the Austrian Science Fund FWF, PEEK, AR 257-G21, April 2014—December 2017.

Kirkkopelto, Esa. 'Artistic Research as Institutional Practice'. In *Artistic Research Yearbook 2015: From Arts College to University*, edited by Torbjörn Lind, 48–53. Stockholm: Swedish Research Council, 2015.

Lowry, Sean, and Nancy de Freitas. 'The Frontiers of Artistic Research: The Challenge of Critique, Peer Review and Validation at the Outermost Limits of Location-Specificity'. *Critique: 2013 Conference Proceedings 26–28 November 2013 Adelaide, South Australia*, 2013, 137–151.

Lu, Donna. 'AI Can Predict If You'll Die Soon—but We've No Idea How It Works'. *New Scientist*, no. 3256 (16 November 2019).

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Twilight of the Idols*. New York, NY: Penguin, 1888.

Novalis. *Werke, Tagebücher und Briefe Friedrich von Hardenbergs. Band 1: Das Dichterische Werk, Tagebücher Und Briefe*. Edited by Hans-Jochen Mähl and Richard Samuel. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1999.

———. *Werke, Tagebücher und Briefe Friedrich von Hardenbergs. Band 2: Das Philosophisch-Theoretische Werk*. Edited by Hans-Jochen Mähl and Richard Samuel. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1999.

Osborne, Peter. *Anywhere or Not at All: Philosophy of Contemporary Art*. London; New York, NY: Verso, 2013.

Plato. *The Republic*. Translated by Henry Desmond Pritchard Lee. London: Penguin Books, 2003.

Quinn, Malcolm. 'Auditing Research in the Arts'. Presented at *Unconditional Love: The Society for Artistic Research Spring Event*, Chelsea College of Art, London, 2015.

Rheinberger, Hans-Jörg. *Toward a History of Epistemic Things: Synthesizing Proteins in the Test Tube*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997.

Robertson, Douglas. 'A Translation of "Die Lehrlinge Zu Sais" by Novalis'. *The Philosophical Worldview Artist* (online), 13 June 2008.

Schwab, Michael, and Paulo de Assis. 'Nietzsche 6+1: The Weight of Music'. One hour long two-screen documentation of the performance of *Nietzsche 6: The Weight of Music*, Tanzquartier Wien, 28 November 2018.

Schwab, Michael. 'Artistic Research and Experimental Systems: The Rheinberger Questionnaire and Study-Day - A Report'. In *Artistic Experimentation in Music: An Anthology*, edited by Darla Crispin and Bob Gilmore, 111–23. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2014.

———. 'Early Computer Art and the Meaning of Information'. Research Catalogue: An International Database for Artistic Research, April 2003.

———. 'Experimental Systems. Contemporaneity, Untimeliness, and Artistic Research'. In *Futures of the Contemporary: Contemporaneity, Untimeliness, and Artistic Research*, edited by Paulo de Assis and Michael Schwab, 159–77. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2019.

———. 'Exposition Writing'. In *Yearbook for Artistic Research & Development*, 16–26. Stockholm: Swedish Research Council, 2012.

———. 'Expositionality'. In *Artistic Research: Charting a Field in Expansion*, edited by Paulo de Assis and Lucia D'Errico, 27–45. London: Rowman and Littlefield, 2019.

———. 'Expositions in the Research Catalogue'. In *The Exposition of Artistic Research: Publishing Art in Academia*, edited by Michael Schwab and Henk Borgdorff, 92–104. Leiden: Leiden University Press, 2014.

———. 'Introduction'. In *Experimental Systems: Future Knowledge in Artistic Research*, edited by Michael Schwab, 5–14. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2013.

———. 'The Exposition of Practice as Research as Experimental System'. In *Artistic Experimentation in Music: An Anthology*, edited by Darla Crispin and Bob Gilmore, 31–40. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2014.

———. 'The Research Catalogue: A Model for Dissertations and Theses in Art and Design'. In *The SAGE Handbook of Digital Dissertations and Theses*, edited by Richard Andrews, Erik Borg, Stephen Boyd Davis, Myrrh Domingo, and Jude England, 339–54. London: Sage; Thousand Oaks, 2012.

———. 'Transpositionality and Artistic Research'. In *Transpositions: Aesthetico-Epistemic Operators in Artistic Research*, edited by Michael Schwab, 191–213. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2018.

———. 'First, the Second: Walter Benjamin's Theory of Reflection and the Question of Artistic Research'. *Journal of Visual Art Practice* 7, no. 3 (1 January 2008): 213–23.