

## Appendix \_OS 14 EGL Prep online edit frozen

Title: FROZEN 21STOCT artefact A complicated being together

Event: Evacuation of Great Learning Instal 10 @ Tramway

Type: Online Editable document

Category: Discussion/ Open propositions/ Preparation

Date: 14- 21/10/10

- Contributors:
- ORGANISERS (original) <-- looks like this
  - ▪ tc <-- looks like this. Visits: [Oct14th 14-15:35]
  - ▪ **M <-- looks like this (Oct 14th 14:20 - 15:35)**
  - ▪ EM is purple, has been here: Oct14 14:23-15:39
  - ▪ st<< is sky blue
  - ▪ ey. .... is green

- NB: Comments are from members not always stefa, this is formatted by MS Word as stefa owns the document.

# OPEN SCHOOL

possible by Google Corporation, Microsoft Corporation, Apple Inc.,  
University of Glasgow IT Department, Glasgow City Council, The Scottish  
Executive, **The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland**, The EEC, the  
UN, a series of small tragedies and triumphs ,

**Commented [stef2]:** Deleted: tragedies and triumphs



**REMEMBER THAT THERE IS A CHAT ROOM TO THE RIGHT -->**

- ■ ORGANISERS (original) <-- looks like this
- ■ tc <-- looks like this. Visits: [Oct14th 14-15:35]
- ■ **M <-- looks like this (Oct 14th 14:20 - 15:35)**
- ■ EM is purple, has been here: Oct14 14:23-15:39
- ■ st << is sky blue
- ■ ev. .... is green

**NOTE: DOCUMENT CURRENTLY IN “DO-WHATever-THE-HELL-YOU-WANT-TO-TO-IT”  
MODE DOCUMENT TEXT BEGINS AFTER THIS BREAK:**

## A simple, but complicated, being together.

is this just pithy, or is there more to it? it certainly is pithy, it has that going for it. I don't think we should reject slogans simply because they **are** slogans, i suppose the problem is that slogans run the risk of being "just empty rhetoric" - rhetoric is good, but empty not so good - i wonder if it just extends the views some people might have about the "sort" of people that run this festival/performance - i suppose it fits in with the "intellectual not emotional" thing that Ben was talking about., a problem with "its complicated" is that it makes it easy to reject as too difficult, too 'un-pragmatic' to succeed. "its complicated" means "don't ask! shush!"

for me, the important thing about this 'slogan' or whatever you want to call it is the 'being together' (every thing of value, and of destruction, is based on the collaboration of individuals) . . .

Image is a difficult thing to try to unpick: how do we present ourselves 'honestly' when 'honesty' seems to connect with naivete, should we submit to considering our own image-projection (I would contend we always do) in a slightly a cynical and manipulative way. E.g.: People always feel betrayed when 'anti-war campaigners' turn out to be Trotskyists.

## According to ORGANISERS:

"\_Open School is an autonomous and ongoing, open and critical situation for shared learning, run by/ for/ with self-organizing young artists and thinkers."

### 0. MUSIC / Evacuation of the Great Learning / A Simple, But Complicated, Being Together

1. Music is never just about music. We may like to think otherwise, or choose to ignore the wider, specific structural and social, philosophical and ideological factors that produce any and all music. But: to do this is to refuse our obligation to think and to cut short any possibility of a music of consequence. This assumes that art can make things happen, if only indirectly, and assumes that music isn't capable of doing all of that until we make a conscious effort to MAKE it make it do it - music does it without being thought about.- (isn't this an important part of the experience of making and experiencing music/art ? that it can affect us without being 'thought' about - - and that isn't to say unconsciously -- )

it also separates music from all those factors that produce it - isn't it less a case of the factors HERE and the music HERE and more that the factors are in the music

and the music in the factors. this type of causal explanation seems to me slightly simplistic. Music is already acting socially, philosophically, ideologically: it is simply that currently they are not our ideas of soc. phil. ideology. they=music? or the social/philosophical factors? do you mean we do not share the current musical ideas?

I guess I mean that we do not control the framing (soc/phil/ideo) of the circumstances in which we make music: its connected, I think to the unconscious thing, music is always doing more, but it is a useful lie to suggest it isn't backing up the rest of the society's assumptions.

who does/should control it? the artists? the producers? the music magazines? this thing called the 'public'? All these things: in a way the ideas control themselves, and perpetuate themselves: look at 'memetics', in the sense of Dawkin's selfish gene, an idea (here more properly the shape of thinking that is possible) is like a virus, it replicates to fill up all available space and make use of all available resources. Perhaps this is true of any ideology (that it attempts to recontextualize all actions and creations into something that can be used to support itself.). There is a huge amount of inertia built in that means that changing even a small set of ideas (see racism, sexism) is a century-long task (and not even complete today) -- I'd argue impossible, as these sorts of inequalities will arise for some constituency, as long as the idea of segregation persists there will be segregationings.. To really change a group consciousness (to have a consequence) is difficult, but not impossible.

2. If experimental music abstracts itself from it's wider situation, then it can have nothing to offer back to it. That is to say, if we deal in sound-as-sound, then we produce music that has nothing to say about our wider social situation. 'Man is less than human if he is not functioning in a unit larger than himself.' - Aristotle. this is the "art for art's sake" argument. is it still possible these days to talk about art as including the same oppositions (art for art, or art as somehow politically engaged) or do they need tailoring for "our times"? I would want to argue that everything occurs in a political opaqueness, art can never be totally for its own sake, i would say the same, but that doesn't stop people arguing for it, nor totally politically engaged (just as the 'political animal' doesn't exist), there is a continuum. The people that argue for art-for-art **have a point**, that is the perspective with which they choose to frame the argument, much as mine is a Marxist argument about social / artistic production. However they cannot deny that the art world as it currently exists is an art-industry and art-market, and therefore the frame that is being applied, the dominant ideology so to speak, which is capable of conferring power or value upon artefacts people and processes does think in terms of an interconnected system of economic judgments and forces. true - perhaps to argue for art-for-art's-sake now is **INCREDIBLY NAIVE**. Naivete **does** perhaps have a value, because the naive can ignore some of the structures which are thought of as 'common sense'. Although those in the 1850s/60s doing the same - were they any less naive? Probably not. One might say that those who argue for it (art for arts sake) have an implicit **POLITICAL** reason for doing so - the very ignoring of the social/political conditions in which art is produced - is there a correlation between "art-for-art's-sake" and right-wing/conservatism? Is this too simplistic? I

Commented [stef3]: Naivete, ungovernable  
st 07/07/2020, 14:17

would say that it is going a **long** way to suggest that this correlation is at all conscious, but yes, the primacy of the individual and the singularity of the artwork has the effect of depoliticising generally. It is not necessary (or necessarily true) that these impetuses come from the same place. (It is always and necessarily too simplistic) You can ignore the 'political economy' of the situation, but others are orientating themselves, and more importantly, **you, and your existence**, on these bas[is/es]. I think this boils down to the 'necessary inaccuracies' of all action; that the system appears complete and smooth, there are no cracks, no ways in. But this is the perception of the problem from the inside, the gaps and fissures exist, but we can (perhaps) only enter them by cultivating a certain sort of ignorance, or freakthinking, or alter-process -- a useful stupidity (i like this phrase) that allows us to act -- is this what shock does? What obscenity opens up? Can we act around ideas of love, of hate, of refusing to compromise? Awkwardness, tactlessness etc.

3. By embracing this abstraction into sound, a **great deal** (can we identify any that doesn't?) ((We should be able to, shouldn't we, or perhaps it is not a matter of does/doesn't, but does(to what extent))) of experimental music reinforces the status quo, which we might agree is defined by a prevailing false notion of freedom, and of a possessive individualism. Experimental music all too often is the practice of **perceived** unique individual expressive subjects trading in sound-as-sound; a (meaningless) process of stylistic innovation. **To some degree it is perceived so by conditioning, but if we take a step back, it could be the articulation of a voice in search of a new mode of operation** - Michael Albert's "Parecon: Life after capitalism" seeks for means to enable more to participate in new more equitable forms of engagement beyond the package experience curated and contained in a ticketed evening but a wonderfully potential extended conversation, learning a new language, using what tools we have. I wonder how viable in fact is this "extended conversation" might be: people walk away from their entertainment situations and back to some sort of 'normality', do they have the time (or inclination) to be experts in creating their own experiences? Without a re-constitution of society where this mixture of productivity and entertainment is embedded into our social conditioning, do people really have the time (apart from those in privileged situations) to 'indulge' in such whimsy? does point 3 betray another simplification? - it is a question (to which i don't know the answer) whether the social situation in the western world requires a new type of thinking of the binary individual/collective - a question of how much can we take from marx and others, or how much we have to invent ourselves. a certain promiscuousness with the canonical thinkers? It is the challenge put down by Badiou and Harvey, we need to stop refusing infinitude, the struggles to understand how we can regain mastery of time as is demonstrated above is a sign we are a step in the right direction. It is not whimsy, experimental music/film/art is the pied piper calling us to redress dues denied our longstanding latent creativity -reserved not for the "school" artist alone but to all who feel so inclined, Parapolity is a demand to reconsider how we perceive what shapes politics, culture and communal living to redress the notion that entertainment is a consumerable instead of a fundamental

Commented [stef4]: Case for Sinema and Blochestra  
turn st 07/07/2020, 14:18

communal act hijacked by cheap tee shirts, posters and album sales.  
Bootleggers driven by fan hood share the wealth and get it- share the experience  
by any means necessary.

4. These tendencies can be seen in the recuperation of first radical, then venerable but now ruined cultural edifices, into homogenised and occulted stylistic bonds that hold scenes together. i find this slightly hard to unpick/understand. i guess what i meant by this is that: most radical musics that i can think of initially start out as the produce of a specific cultural/ political/ philosophical/ etc situation (to which they either make an implicit of explicit demand of/ appeal for/ etc), they create a specific set of actions, informed by their position. over time those actions become all that remains of the music, as the wider context is stripped of it. these actions become the stylistic bonds that are then all that defines the music - of which you can then be more or less 'tasteful' in your using of.

Which is interesting, because all "great art" (*what the hell do I mean by this.*) movements (and music, and literature) have defined themselves not only in opposition to the existing regime, but as a direct overthrow.

(There is this conflict between message and aesthetic, always: can an aesthetic be political, can a tactic have a favourite ideology. I see 'occulted stylistic bonds' as being basically a synonym for 'dogmatic aesthetic'. agreed)

yeah, but as they are recuperated they are stripped of this appeal to a direct overthrow: my problem with e;'experimental music' is that very few people look at this structural issue - musicians assume that what they are doing is political in and of itself, ( maybe it once was) when what they are actually doing (as it see it)when they engage in empty, dogmatic, stylistic actions (acting as unique expressive subjects - being all they can be....etc), is compounding the status quo, not overthrowing it.

I see, so people are comfortable that they have achieved a nirvana, a plateau (like every self-satisfied movement)? I was reading a great book earlier today (Whatever Happened to Modernism?)<sup>1</sup> in which the author pointed out that in his entire career Haydn wrote over 200+ works of music, Beethoven managed a few dozen. Why is that? His answer was that Haydn didn't believe we had to start from scratch every time we wanted to create something. Is this the obsession of the 'Modern Era' (note for Josipovici this is a *mistake*, we should always start from scratch, I think its a little more complex than this): novelty (the novel being our pre-eminent art form for the past 300 years) which isn't really 'new', merely 'novel'... the changing 'articulated features' (i.e., introducing a new instrument, colour, brush shape, language) to a stable unchanging 'scene' 'artworld' etc. I'd argue that rather than a problem merely with the last 30 years of music production, what has to be considered eventually is the last 300 years of individualistic obsession (one that desires to change what it touches, but never anything further away than that from itself, a narrowed hemisphere of perception or self-conception). Of course I would say this, because by 'last 300 years' I mean

Commented [stef5]: this resonates with the art school alternatives discussions maybe it is a plateau: that doesn't mean their aren't more heights (though I think these analogies of high/low past/future, worse/better are always hugely problematic yes. but/and you may have highlighted a potential problem of the simulatenity of things in the aesthetically parallel styles of the 'high' and 'low': it becomes almost impossible to differentiate 'you' from 'it' or see your enemies (sic) ... is this a problem?

Commented [stef6]: i am interested in this in relation to the postmodern ideas of pastiche, collage, multiplicity, esp. in relation to musical movements of sampling. (this is widely written about though)

Commented [stef7]: `individuation /individualist st  
07/07/2020, 14:25

<sup>1</sup> Gabriel Josipoviv)

"since the victory of the bourgeoisie": this is where I pick up on "tasteful", because if we just focus on aesthetics, we can ignore the structural issues, and obsess over the 'taste' 'tact', the 'glaze' features rather than the functions.

(something on 'tasteful' - from a doc i wrote a while back trying to understand Bourdieu:) "Social status involves practices which emphasize and exhibit cultural distinctions and differences which are a crucial feature of all social stratification...Status may be conceptualized therefore as lifestyle; that is, as the totality of cultural practices such as dress, speech, outlook and bodily dispositions...While status is about political entitlement and legal location within civil society, status also involves and to a certain extent is, style. Taste arises out of struggles for social recognition or status."

i.e. taste is a sociological locus and practice of consumption for the production of status: how culture is used and to what ends it is put, by whom, in order to create and defend cultural categories. To perceive something aesthetically in a certain way, is something one learns, depending on all kinds of social characteristics.

- "social-status quo"

Its worrying, because these symbols of status are not simply gradations within society, they are cut-off points. During the C18th you had a very definite 'popular culture' and 'aristocratic culture', now we have 'low' and 'high'. Sometimes it seems that, say in fashion, the top and the bottom (financially) are in tune: you get catwalk-type fashion in Primark (it just doesn't last as long)... there is no high and low cultural or structural features, I wonder about all this (whether its true or not). (but there is definitely a split between 'academy' and 'society': i.e. the monkish qualities of 'real' politics and 'real' literature studies ). -what about 'real' art/music? Well, this IS a huge problem suddenly.

class/ classification / genre. I am making/assuming associations.

## Noise Music

5. For example: I would argue that the power<sup>[1]</sup> of Noise music as it was developed in the 70's stems from the conceptual propositions it made; ones of super-abundance, a focus on the unwanted in a situation, the practice of exceeding normative limits and so on...

- 5.1. This force of thought (if allowed to direct your action), obliged people to act in a certain way. It is this obligation to act that produces actions that included extreme (unwanted) volume, bodily risk and behavior traditionally considered unacceptable by the prevailing society, (it's language, laws and symbolic order) and so on.
- 5.2. From this radical (immanently political, philosophical, social) proposition, how have we ended up with a conservative and occulted Noise music of

<sup>2</sup> [1] The philosopher François Laruelle would call this it's 'force of thought': the point at which Noise is boiled down to a radical core concept; the unique point at which it meets and offers something to reality.

**Commented [stef8]:** How important are aesthetic distinctions between 'high' and 'low'  
There are certainly important differences in access to resources and 'privilege' between 'high' and 'low' classes - monetarily

**Commented [stef9]:** these headings were added by \_OS as a way of organising the discussions better - tomcoles

**Commented [stef10]:** power is a big problem for me, what is this the power to do, what is this power capable of. If it is merely the power to offend, the power to understand, then perhaps it is no enough. It needs to be the power to seize, power to take and to give freely... without patronage etc. Idealistic. sorry.- tomcoles

standardised aesthetic values (extreme volume, stasis...) and macho posturing?[2]<sup>3</sup>

— **This sort of stuff happens to artistic movements/ideas/forms all the time - it is certainly unwelcome, but doesn't blaming music risk letting "late capitalist society" "get away with it"?** This is exactly it, there needs to be less inwardly directed anger about 'betrayal', and a real outwardly expressed anger against the greater betrayals -- the betrayals by those that were supposed to be fellow humans, rather than those that were supposed to be fellow [political partyists]. The problem is without a virile (small) community, where all energies need to be directed in order to achieve **anything**, the misdirected energy is incredibly destructive. How do we equate this with the need for **considered action / direction / creation / music making?**

Commented [stef11]: Size and energies of collective action st 07/07/2020, 14:39

## Improvisation

6. Or how about UK (free) Improvisation: I'd put it to you that what we can recognise as the force of thought of **Improvisation**, as it was developed in the UK in the 60's, is a clear proposal based around notions of; the possibility for **alternative modes for the construction of social space**,

via a learned process of immanence, and in its widest cultural context, insisting on our obligation to think and to consider the consequences of our actions.

- 6.1. I don't think there was anything 'free' about this, to engage in this kind of production requires an awareness of power relations and ability to encourage, enforce or choose preferred ones, of normative social conditions and their alternatives, of modes of listening (or not), enquiry or interaction[3].<sup>4</sup> it's not so much that the artists involved are no longer "aware", it's that their awareness has been co-opted - apple/starbucks/amazon et al selling stuff to us particularly targeting our "awareness" of "ethical" and "political" issues - see that RED American express card - let capitalism donate FOR YOU! (every transaction a prayer!) and in the process cancel out your donation by making money off it! This is the confidence inherent in this ideology, that it can use the term 'red' when flying in the face of any socialist concepts.

- 6.2. It is a pedagogical stance, and it's insulting to say that it can be adopted

Commented [stef12]: I'm not sure this isn't a later re-conception from the current position. Is this what Improv always was? - tomcoles

<sup>3</sup> [2] There seems to be a striking resemblance between this reactive process of recuperation back into the mainstream and the kind of normalisation and reintegration into a predominant field that typifies reactionary politics -- the kind of ideological conservatism that wants to return to a real or imagined old order of things, not out of nostalgia but out of self-interest. I.e. Conservatism incorporates new ideas by divesting them of their political content so that they palatably reinforce the status quo; this seems to happen to radical music too, the sad thing is that people don't seem to notice/ mind.

<sup>4</sup> [3] Here's a good quote from Esther Ferrer, it's not explicitly about improvisation, but it's apt in it's proposing of a different (anarchist) notion of freedom: "Our liberty is only limited by the personal decision to employ liberty intelligently, that is, to consider others as beings who practice liberty too...To follow a way of thinking that does not demand anything, that simply proposes the possibility that you have the courage to assume the decision and the consequences of your own acts, without protecting yourself in the imperatives of an ideology, a religion, or an authority, which convert you into an irresponsible person, first in regard to yourself, and then in regard to society"



freely – it's not difficult or specialist and it can be popular, but it does take time and a (political) **commitment**. What is commitment -- how far does it extent, is it measurable? Is it the only thing that can produce **authenticity**? awareness is a pedagogical stance? a self-conscious awareness? - "this class is going to be aware!"

- 6.3. It is very rare to come across anybody practicing (free) improvisation today who has not implicitly and reactively transposed the perceived notion of freedom and improvisation into a self-satisfying practice of stylistic and tasteful handling of sounds and an enquiry into their purely sonic qualities, and more often than not 'a pretty weak willed' idea of **consensual** interaction: the idea of consensus is perhaps a false start; it is a rhetoric used to replace other ideas (also problematic) of democracy etc. What would a wholly 'consensual' interaction look like? Are we talking about between 'players' or audience and performers? Is this lazy? Ben Knight would be good on this - this is not how he conceives the music he makes at all. Others too - there are wide-ranging investigations into collective learning practices etc.

## Consensus

6.4 Consensus: what is it? Is it a valuable concept?

Consensus: is an agreement of opinion,

Solidarity: uniting interests, sympathies, aspirations

## Authenticity

6.5 Authenticity: what is it? Is it a valuable concept? **No**.

In regards to 'ownership' or 'originality' probably not.

ic making?

Authenticity as aware of where our influences are?

## Honesty

6.6 Honesty: what is it? **An impossible - and useless - dream**. Is it a valuable concept? **No**. Except as a dream, a 'useful lie'. (Though if we go down this route, how do we shed the lies we create, if we are currently trying to shed the lies imposed upon us?) **Some things are useful lies, other things are useless. I think this is useless. It's like a red rag to a particular type of bull - a certain mindset that micromanages, that ignores the big picture in favour of accusations of dishonesty. The same goes for authenticity. But then, that is the triumph of dominant ideologies, the present themselves as consistent, but they are flexible enough to shed dearly-held beliefs if they threaten them in a time of crisis. Do we not need to at least be consistent in our inconsistencies (and if we were trying to put together a method of living, does it not need to persist? Are we breaking down common**

understandings in order to put up our own systems (and doubtless we do have alternatives already in mind), or merely to create chaos? [badly thought out]

What is the relationship between honesty and trust? Is this important? Is this relevant to our practice?

Is there such a thing as 'collective honesty'? Interesting, yes I believe Badiou agrees with this, perhaps we need to interrogate the concept of truth as this exercise shows philosophy as democratic and an agitation to seeking truth through a composite of conclusions, we must wrestle with the urge for one truth to dominate another, for like the music Akira longs to hear, it resides in the extended conversation set the deck to long play.

Is honesty in art/music different from honesty in conversation/social relationships?

Commented [stef13]: Or is honesty a term that implies subjectivity in the most extreme sense?

## Fidelity

### 6.7 Fidelity: what is it? Is it a valuable concept?

Fidelity as loyalty, consistency, commitment, responsibility? More as seeing something through, as something that encompasses loyalty, commitment and responsibility - and perhaps a degree of honesty - but (ideally, this is idealistic (?)) without the negative connotations that come with the others. Not consistency, though. A fidelity that understands that remaining "true to something" might include lying to it, ignoring it, etc... Fidelity used as a word to carve out a new space in which to think through ideas.

## Self-delusion

7. Both of these examples[4]<sup>5</sup> depict self-deluding movements in music that today still adopt postures of radical otherness to the mainstream while at the same time stripping away any relation to concrete everyday life, reducing their outlook to considerations of style, and to all intents and purposes embodying as values exactly the individualistic credo insisted by that same capitalist mainstream. Is it really them doing it, or the very same capitalist mainstream forcing/marketing/co-opting them to?

7.1. The prevalent notion of freedom I see in use in Free Improvisation or Noise right now is no freedom at all; do whatever you want, right now, in any way you see fit: this is the injunction of the Super Ego (I can! I will! I must!), which is of course also the injunction of modern capitalist society (Be all you can be! Have it now! Enjoy! Be free to choose!). The point - as with a lot of this stuff - is to wrestle these injunctions away from "modern capitalist society", not do away with them all together. SO OFTEN things/states/beings that aren't INHERENTLY capitalist but have been co-opted by capitalism are

<sup>5</sup> [4] And countless others I could give.

MISTAKEN for being a capitalist invention. It is **the VERSION of enjoyment, of freedom** etc that capitalism promotes that we need to change, not the notion itself. I'd stick the question 'in who's name are we doing this' onto this concept, along with "Why is this lying bastard lying to me?" - J. Paxman.

8. All of that is to say: radical propositions obliged people to act in certain ways. Those ways of making and doing, saying and interacting have slowly been stripped of their context and transmuted into stylistic and empty gestures. The Noise or Improvisation scenes in experimental music today seem to me to have little to no fidelity to the original conceptual (political, philosophical, social) propositions or force of thought those movements once mobilised.
9. These notes are not some vague nostalgia for a (perceived) more radical past. But maybe they're a plea to take seriously what we find to be genuinely radical in a movement or idea, and to act as that idea obliges us to.

### Radical Change (the need for, the possibility of?)

10. So: I would rather promote a qualitatively different step, to not just add a few more styles, but to do something of consequence; a practice that recognises and names something as a force of thought of music, even after the fact. **A practice that excavates radical ideas and asks how we can think them now. I would argue that this 'excavation' is one of the most important things we can consider: we are not looking so much for the 'next big idea', as for 'what has returned to us'.** Radicalism may mean **new**, but it may equally mean **what has been forgotten, or submerged. yes.** letting go of the division between new/old would/might be the best starting point for all of us. yes.

I consider this an act of fidelity, a process led by rational obligation to an idea, which allows us to clearly measure success in stark terms, in relation to how that idea requires us to act. In this way new ideas and practices are generated, situated specifically within their current wider social context.

"rational obligation", "clearly measure success" - these terms worry me. it's like it turns it into one of those "outcome based operations" - i suppose that's what's being called for here, but the wording is worrying. can't the process itself be a political act, one that has real consequences? do we need to plan/theorise everything we (want to) do?

**Past examples of possible extrication from this predicament:** this is disingenuous - i think more is being claimed here than a "possibility".

11. At our Kill Your Timid Notion festival in Dundee this February, E. H, Anthony Iles, O1 and Howard Slater initiated a short collective process involving a changing group of about 20 local artists and art workers, education workers and some of our festival audience members, culminating in a performance. Titled **UNSTABLE, FRAGILE BUT DARING TOGETHER**, it proposed 'a simple, but complicated, being together'. Over 2 day-long sessions and subsequent shorter meetings it opened up ideas of noise and improvisation and collectively investigated those in relation to how members of the group found purchase on those ideas from their own personal experience or learning. Without a predetermined hierarchy or structure, this immanent process collectively produced explorations of language, vulnerability, subjectivity, of ungrounding oneself, of the body and expressiveness; it attempted to create a collective environment for this exploration in full cognizance of the groups extended situation, as strangers working together, and; it took the material of specific artistic practices, treated them as symptoms of the problem, disorganised them and tried to find some new arrangement of core ideas that might have some relevance today.

12. As the very final action of the festival, members of this collective group (E., Ant, O1, Howard, **L.**<sup>6</sup> and **La Pt**)<sup>7</sup> staged a performance. The large gallery space had been rearranged so that small groups of audience members were unevenly clustered throughout it. A 'house of safety' had been constructed in one corner (to which performers could retreat at any time).<sup>8</sup> Each of the 6 performers had a microphone, connected to a speaker some way from where they were sat, together, in the gallery. In response to our normal practice of documenting each performance at our festivals, Vilte Vaitkute (one of the filmmakers we were working with at the festival) was asked to move about the space and record what happened, at times interacting with (in particular) E.. Within a strict timeframe of 60 minutes, each member spoke; initially they each 'checked in' (a process from counselling in which people introduce themselves to a group and how they are feeling at that moment in time) and hesitantly started to develop a kind of phenomenological conversation about how they were experiencing the situation as it developed, unscripted and improvised. Everybody was hesitant, considered and careful, but also clearly

---

<sup>6</sup> uhuh

<sup>7</sup> uhuh huh

<sup>8</sup> What is the status of 'a house of safety'?

-a blanketfort

-

-

do we have such places in reality?

what is the importance of these (notions of) places in art/music / ... education/  
...conversation?

exposed within a musical context with apparently nothing musical to offer. As the performance developed, members of the audience started to ask questions, pose problems and react: the power dynamic in the room shifted and several of the audience members positions started to become clear (from cheery consensualism, passive enjoyment, to irritation, boredom, a sense of 'creepiness'). After a predetermined period (an hour) of (increasingly **uneasy**) dialogue, I brought the performance to a close. [Reminds me a little of the reactions to the School of Echoes procedures Ultra Red presented at the CCA session with ORGANISERS last year.](#)  
[www.ultrared.org](http://www.ultrared.org)

13. The more I think back to this performance, the more I feel it has consequence. I've spoken to people who found it relaxing and open, and to others who found it to be unlike music at all. One person told me it felt like a group therapy session. I'd like to argue that it was all of these things, but also, in its radical fidelity to the force of thought of both Noise and Improvisation,<sup>9</sup> entirely musical. It seems to me ([in retrospect? or clear at the time?](#)) that an attempt was made to collectively investigate the radical core concepts of Noise and Improvised music; to rethink both in terms of today's situation and from the specific situations of the people taking part. A genuine fidelity to those ideas was established, which took little regard of how those kinds of music are supposed to be created today, but which instead rationally obliged a certain kind of action in the performance.

14. It was Improvised music in that:

- • it created a social space
- • which was produced as a process of mediation
- • between all the people invested in that space
- • (importantly, this started out seemingly as the construction of the performers, but over time, as the audience asserted their investment in the situation, this social space was explicitly modified by more and more actors),
- • and it's means of production
- • via a rethinking of specifically musical ones (improvisation),
- • filtered through the experiences and additional context (both brought to it and immanent in it) of the people involved.

Commented [stef14]: I broke this point down into bullets  
- TCs

It took the force of thought of Improvisation seriously, and applied it afresh.

## TAKING IT SERIOUSLY.

<sup>9</sup> [5] In it's apparent un-musical nature.

14.5. What do we mean? Peril?

15. It produced a Noise concert in that: it engendered **a sense of peril** – people were genuinely nervous, hesitant and affected by the situation, and made uneasy by it (which is to say that a self-created situation obliged them to act in ways that put them at risk) and; the group presented something within a specific context (a music festival, to which people had paid to come, with certain expectation – for entertainment, for provocation, who knows...) which was in stark contrast to what was expected and which focused on the all too often overlooked and unwanted remainder of music today – it's foundational ideology, it's social mechanics, it's relationship to it's situation. **It took the force of thought of Noise seriously, and applied it afresh.**

#### **Suggesting Change: TAKING IT SERIOUSLY? / TAKING IT PLAYFULLY?**

16. Their obligation didn't produce **some finished article**. I don't think it drew any conclusions, or was a perfect realisation of some form or music to set in stone, or indeed a perfect process to be repeated unchanged. It didn't change music in its entirety. But it did make a modest, but significant addition and contribution: a collectively developed (initial, emergent) mode of being together, and a process of critical consciousness building leading to public action. I felt it to be a concrete strategy for effecting (real, however modest) change, **suggesting** another set of cultural arrangements, other topographies and other mappings. And however unlikely and unmusical it might have seemed, (and I found to be almost unrecognizable as Noise, or as Improvisation as we hear it today), it was radically, immanently and exactly that; it was a noise concert, it was improvisation, and it was music.

-dialogue as experimental music? uneasiness as noise?

17. Something was put at stake, and I've not felt that in music for some time. Threat and peril: risk and - not so much 'failure' but - enough conviction to push into places where failure is immanent is important. Indeed an antidote perhaps to a gripping fear of failure/error in our crippling overinstitutionalisation: the nervousness and anxiety as solvent: symptoms of budgeoning emancipation or conscientisation at work

**Must we also be e/affecting ✓, making these accomplishments spill out into the rest of our lives.**

∞. Change is dead politics. When we hear the word change today we know it means

its opposite: the continuation of the world before. || Instead can we think of a re-mediation of the processes that we are using: we do not want a change of government, we do not want to position ourselves in the same institutions, or even to collapse those institutions, perhaps we want to act as squatters? the problem (and opportunity) is that “politics”, “institutions” etc do not act/are not as singularities - the problem/opportunity is to find what’s good about them and what’s bad - to identify the two and encourage/work with one and fight the other. the problem is that what is good and what is bad is not static - things change, places/people/institutions/actions/the meaning of those actions change - which means that it is difficult to construct some sort of temporal plan, difficult to say that because such-and-such worked/was “good” in the past, we can use it/do it again, but also difficult to say the opposite. one finds oneself boxed into acting only in the context of the moment, which is of course a very late capitalist thing (end of history, time in loops, self-referencing etc etc). how do we conceptualise a way of continuation/disjunction that encompasses all of this?

Commented [stef15]: like a dichotomous see-saw of the past and future?  
its a problem, the future and the past collapse back towards and into the now, resulting in a static present.

do you need a nuclear (runaway) chenobyl style event (the russian revolution), you need a run-away global climate change in order to shock people into action (unlike the to bourgeoisie revolution ).

#### MORE SLOGANS

We need to be still and listen to what we want or have been denied - not rush to invent new cleverer masters, we need to listen to sit with those our institutional habits have complicitly enslaved - those forced to work to service institutions instead of being free to create - we have a duty to listen to what the grumblings are, detect the hidden/buried truths then change towards recovering from systemic failure can emerge authentically, truthfully and the march of the empowered in the key of noise will be thunderous.

# ‘by’

B.E, ORGANISERS, Sept 10.

plus **\_OPEN SCHOOL**

beginning October 11th,

**GROUP EDITING #1 14th Oct 2pm**

**GROUP EDITING #2 21st Oct 4pm**