

Regarding the first area (A), the researcher obliges to follow acknowledged norms of research ethics. With so many questions open to interpretations in this project, we acknowledge there is plenty of room for our bias. We are open to the possibility that our methods and approaches are different than the ones historians would operate with, and we may have blind spots affecting the research. This, together with the concern for the potential exposure of the identity of the man whose information we build on (B), are the two aspects that were taken into consideration. However, researchers and their research institutions also have a responsibility to secure professional freedom and independent research (D), especially if the topic is controversial, or if strategic or commercial considerations may come to influence the direction of the research (Ringdal, 2018, p.60). Contact with Z's family began with laying out the ambition of disseminating the multi-cultural history of the place, as well as the expected progression of the research, asking consent from the family to use the information retrieved, which was granted. The family never tried to stop the project but were uncomfortable with the idea of exposure in national media or the performance being played on a local stage. These requests have been respected (F). The project receives external funding from NARP (E) However, this argument has not been regarded as a factor that could influence the research.

Darla Crispin suggests that artistic research begins in and with us, as seen in the diagram to the right. As practitioners we must take ownership of both its creative and its self-critical aspects. It is our duty to be clear why we are doing what we do, what our mission is. It is necessary to balancing risk with responsibility; and to situate our activity within an ecology for which we ourselves must take a certain responsibility in terms of its maintenance and growth. Finally, in locating ourselves within such an ecology, we also establish a relationship between ourselves and our community – we share, we learn, we re-absorb from others into our creative and scholarly selves. This is a cyclic practice.

Let us look at some artistic works that have been discussed in recent years in context to artistic responsibility and ethics. There is a thin wall between fiction and reality in Karl Ove Knausgård's novel *My struggle* (2009-2011), something that has been discussed in context of artistic freedom versus right to privacy. Kristen Ringdal refers to Åsne Seierstad's documentary novel, *The Bookseller in Kabul* (2003) based on her observations of a family with who she lived in Kabul (p.65). The author was sued by the bookseller's wife for violating the family's right to privacy. The case was dismissed by Norwegian court. The court ruled the book to have a high artistic standard building on a thorough journalistic method. What can we learn from these examples? There are certain parallels to our work in both cases. Knausgård received negative response from family members, both for the representation of his father and grandmother, that was by some conceived as problematic. Others, like former partners reacted to unwillingly becoming characters in a 'novel'. The bookseller and his family felt their hospitality had been misused, and claimed to suffer economic loss due to the negative publicity. Regarding *Music from Siberia*, the family of Z has reacted more with caution than rejection of the artistic result. The biggest difference between our project and the two examples, is the institutional framing; MfS is a result of artistic research developed within a university.

*This obliges to strive for ethical conduct in all parts of the project, but there is also an obligation both from the institution's side, as well as the researcher to withstand pressure if the cause is just. It is my belief, that the historical findings in the project justifies the choice of performing the work, as well as publishing this exposition.*