

WHAT IF WE LET GO OF BEING (WE, THE ONES)

N.0 Choreography: a problem to practice 20th November 2012

The problem of the subject

In modern Western societies the word "WE" does not name a reality but a problem. It's the problem that has been built throughout our history of construction and destruction. We might even say that Western modernity, even today, is the ambitious and bloody history of the problem of WE.

Within this history, we may say that, on the one hand, we have lost some of the terms we had conquered to appoint the emancipatory force of the collective, furthermore, we have regained the strength of separation, defensiveness and confrontational aggregation: "we the Americans", "we Muslims", "we Democrats", "we the Artists", "we the Germans". Thus the name WE is offered to us, as a refuge and a defence rather than as a horizon for effectiveness.

In the global world, not only I, but also WE has been privatized, locked in the logic of value, competence and identity. Here a simple thought concerning this paraphernalia: a human life is never enough to herself. It is impossible to be just an individual. It says it our bodies, the mark on its belly bottom. It tells it our voice, with all the accents and tonalities of our incorporated surroundings. It tells it our imagination, able to build itself with known and unknown realities to sense by sensing, other senses and other realities.

In conclusion, our modern history has been built on the denial of this simple principle: that while our history is that of a continuous creation-solution of new "WE'S", yet the truth (?) is that "human beings can not say I without saying meanwhile WE".

Towards practices without subject

Departing from the choreographic cultures that emerged over the 70's in NY we can observe an interesting phenomenon: The context of those cultures was given by the revolution of May 68, the emergence of the hippie movement in the '70s, the emergence of the feminist and gay movements (and many others). Nevertheless, for the ones mentioned, meant "a series of movements" that claimed other ways of understanding the concept of equality (through becoming visibly legitimized and acknowledged) in the democratic societies of the time.

This group of choreographers formed a collective namely The Grand Union in New York that sought to incorporate the collective daily life through the body, addressing the ordinary into the stage. and resulting on a "improvised socialization" through which it was intended to set a collective experience as an event staged in between everybody involved.

What interest us, is how they soon encountered the problem of how this "collective-improvised" situation was still the place to survive each other's representational models. How at the end of the day these choreographers dealt with "the collective exposure" as group of "authors": names competing with each other, with their own stiles, their single interests, creating a dialogic experience of identity.

During the same time, there was this technique namely "Contact Improvisation". Which was based on a physical relation of weight and gravity, with which to support and sustain one-another through a map of possibles with fixed coordinates about how the encounter should be. This type of contact-improvisation resulted in the production of an expression based on affirmation and acknowledgement of the involved parts, consequently on a ruled negotiation on how to be together.

The choreography that “WE” proposes today is actually none, and of nobody, yet it is undoubtedly continuously “choreographing” its co(i)mplication. “To be nobody in order to be what one is” (not what one wants, projects). This assumption departs and, it is held upon the same principles that occurred then, but in turn, questions and empties out the meaning of what is visibly legitimized, bringing some awareness about the game that then WE will be playing (if so) in the so call current market democracies:

How could we experience the question "what, why, who, where, what for, how we live the tension between individuation and the necessity of collectivity?"

What are the conditions that make WE a problem to sustain rather than a problem to solve?

How to distract and to unproject the totalizing image and/or sometimes self/co imposed project of the concept of “WE”?

Which would be the conditions and the necessary practices that could liberate its sense?

How can we dispose “WE” in a plural and co-implicated way?

Is it possible to sustain a coherent WE (is) in plurality?

How can we address such a question assuming that the sites where the sensible, the corporeal and unspeakable are the battlefield where to challenge our existence?

How could we do so without addressing pre-existent models and protocols?

Could we experience (the) body as the very battlefield where the "somatic" prime on the "cognitive" where "creation" prime on the "creative" where “tacit experience” primes over “negotiation and responsibility” and where softness, empathy and dispersion prime over self-representation, self-management and self-control?

How can we dispose the body and *its senses* in sharable ways (without the predominance of the I/eye)?

What does being “democratically in contact means today” as a performative and experienciable gesture?

What could mean today such a gesture, when historically "(contact) improvisation" began as an emancipatory practice and ended up fixing a model of communication under the basis of recognition, negotiation and understanding?

What if we are not each other but the world we share?

Could we disarticulate and deactivate choreographic languages from the hyper-controlled mess we live in?

Could we make of choreography a “*sensible- weapon*” by leaving its movements and its personalised languages out of any utility?

Could we go for *the adventure* and get lost in the desert of the generic, and the impersonal?

What would be the fictions, conditions and consequences of such a *vital-deadly* gesture?

WHAT IF WE LET GO OF BEING (VISIBLE)

N.0 Gerry, a gerry, gerried, gerrying 20th November 2012

"Gerry" is the name of a Gus Van Sant in which two friends who call themselves the same, "gerry", go for an excursion to the desert and get lost in a land that gradually becomes debilitating and deadly: A simple adventure becomes a complex reflection on the meaning of life, of being with an other, to lose (one-self) in another and lose (one-self) in itself. They will name all around them Gerry, intensifying, blending, diffuminating the boundary that separates them with the outside.

From Gerry, which has been our practice since 2010, we consider processes of blurring, dissipation, camouflage and appearance in the midst of a choreographing scenario. An individual sub-cellular present-ness with a clear intention to comeback into the realm of visibility through a "collective micro-anonymity", whose result comes across by emptying the processes and its concrete presentations of specific work, in favour of the creation of "ambiguous, uncertain experiences" that facilitate the indistinctive appearance of the bodies and the gazes of what/whom/ever, in an open process of continuous experimentation.

Proposes

A contextual practice which, poses bodies, gazes and actions de-subjectivized and disinterested, undoing their own.

Deconstructing what it should be (by opinion and private-interest) through continuing others *while* it is continued by *what* is already involving-evolving.

Whatever operates within the parameters of ownership, it is emptied (emptied of the power of ownership, of aesthetic power and of the power of knowledge) in order to gradually be filled again with an emancipatory (un)power.

The involved *bodies* perform as mere "figurants". There is no "horizontal protagonism or co-authorship", thus they appear as mere "whatever secondaries of whatever is around and in between them".

It doesn't propose a crisis, yet it practices it, with the goal of returning (crisis) as an experience-event of abandonment, desertion, and dissidence (of one-it-self).

It proposes a practice whose displacement of identity, results in a crisis of learned identities posing itself as an "interrupting gesture of learnt capacities". From there, it is proposed from (and) as a social choreography, choreographing its very crisis of presence.

And since it calls into question what it knows; now that is not as it should be or claims, what and how does as choreographing?

Because

We sense that gerry (IS and is-not necessary) and therefore, operates in between (brackets).

(gerry) has long assumed to be nobody (more and less than artists; more and less than public...etc) condition whereby, it suggests "means without ends" in order to be able to survive and experience whatever (humans, things, concepts, situations, environments...etc) without the name's attachments. It senses that reality is not only capitalist and distrusts the I-ness of the contemporary artist.

GERRY might be a name camouflaged into a multitudinary and anonymous experience of bodies mingling with other(s) bodies.

Because g e r r y knows that there is no group or community in which to shelter and / or to identify with.

Because it intends to suspend, blend, blur, diffuminate those aspects that ties the subject up, in order to facilitate (a) movement toward nothing.

Gerry has assumed a while ago that is vitally disfigured, dislocated, lost and co(i)mplicated in a complex set of conditions way beyond its own rational comprehension; therefore it senses that there's no style or form worth the effort to keep on fitting and fighting with anymore.

For

The 99% of people, you, anyone who came up till here and read this.

So, it is time for us to jump toward nothing and surf with the precarious reality in which we live, because we sense that under these conditions, our fragility may be antidote and else, vulnerable force...

WHAT IF WE LET GO OF BEING (ECONOMICS)

N.O Meanwhile with no purpose
20th November 2012

Let's approach the body as political challenge. We think that the sensible, the corporeal and unspeakable are the battlefields where to challenge our existence. This relationship with the sensible has to do with the sensibilization of the corporeal sphere in its material sense and thus as an experienciabile, shareable living-material.

From this assumption, we propose to experience (the) body as a battleground where the "somatic" prime over the "cognitive", where "creation" primes over "the creative" and where softness, empathy and dispersion prime over self-representation, self-management and self-control.

Can we differentiate "style" (understanding this one as all identitarian forms that intend to conquer pre-existent systems of beliefs) displaced from the sensible "adventure" of opening (the) body? How can we sensibilized (the) body to make of this adventure a conquest of its own vulnerability? How (us, dancers, choreographers, spectators?) may invent forms of desertion from our usual interpretive modes of perception, in favour of a simple, yet intense and (always at lost) interpelative experience? How to move from/with what is "disrupting"? Can we disarm (the) bodies, (the) choreographic languages and (the) artistic models we work with off its officialness? Could we go for *the adventure* and get lost in the desert of the generic, the impersonal and the minor? What if we leave movement out of any economical bond?

What if we let go being

- (Information processing
- Communicativeness
- Psycho-normality
- Belonging (no matter what in order to exists)
- Numbers choreography
- Rationality and mathematic understanding
- Objectification of live experience
- Property
- Competence
- Control devices
- Incentives
- Valorisation
- Servitude
- Distrust
- Repression
- Representation
- Visibility
- Go(o)dness
- Self-interest

Opinionism
We-onism
Manipulation
Instrumentalization
efficiency
Belief
Identity
Safety)

Meanwhile

It may insist on actively engaging on an existential practice: a practice without subject (be that this body, this dancer, this movement, this choreography...etc),

It may be a practice of abandonment to the unfolding of its own process.

It may consist on diffuminate a great number of elements, which constitutes our system of beliefs (be them personal, social or collective).

It may suspend, empty, deoccupy, desinterest all those aspects that ties the subject in order to *facilitate a movement of nothing for nothing*.

It may position itself *before and beyond* the frame of (artistic) process, (artistic) piece, (artistic) research, approaching itself as a procesual and existential practice.

It may not be a socio-political project, yet if it would identify with something that would be, with a kind of "dissident thought", rejecting certain aspects that conform the "so call social", inviting others to engage in a disobedient practices.

It may be a call to be detached from the subject form (by-ing) to (be) sustain(ed) with others in an "outdoor" where experimentation, and as such, the recovery of ones sensing-capacity is possible.

From there it may put into doubt everything that pretends to be something, creating situations with no purpose.

The so call enemy is not outside. The enemy are the relationships that tie ourselves hardly; the ones that make us to be someone, nor whatever.

Treats what's going on, not as a possibility, nor as an option-menu to keep on going with the illusory game, but as potential.

Practice a certain "transiting" in the middle of a desert.

Could be about making the sensible word our material force. In that respect choreography today is not political, its commitment is pre-political since it attends and touches, sensibilizes what IS with no other purpose than awaking how it feels.

When everything is catastrophe, impotence and desert, only the attention to the pre-political may have some strength.

Its logics are purely and promiscuily sensual.

As much as it gives notice of itself, it gives notice of the spaces, the places, and the world it inhabits.

It may not be slow movement. Though it is soft, emphatic with life itself. Patient.

It makes of "attentiveness" a discipline. For instance: be attentive to your own life, what is around; a kind of "hope" without structure base.

That's why it doesn't matter what we want to achieve, since what makes us live and keep on moving is the very pathway that we decide to begin.

It needs some kind of incoherence in order to exist unfixed.

It is radical, precisely because it embraces incoherence.

It is not worried about making sense. Neither "common sense". It is just sensing.

It intensifies "present ness" within catastrophe. It is not transcendental.

It is a corporal immediacy.

It needs to improvise. But it is not *this or that* improvisation model. We do not know how, what improvisation is, since IS all time.

It does make tangible the situations it inhabits, and learns by discovering itself in situation of/with. It is not vertical (the "I" control freak). Cannot be. It is always inclined in/with what is going, happening.

It may not be engaged with BMC and its dancerly-exploratory aesthetics.

There is nothing to explore. There is nothing to search beyond what is going, what is happening.

It approaches somatics, but in its infra-ordinary facilitation.

Facilitates practicing with what is practicing.

It works in between decision and event.

It is sub-cellular. It is only in plus/minus 0 degree of tonality

Sensation explains nothing. It is intuitive. at sensing. Once it touches it is at the same time touched by/with

Everything involved is a peripheral artefact. Your body as well.

The more in touch, the more dispersed, dispersing itself.

The more it says, the more it blurs.

The more *informs* *deforms*.

Without intending to be "spiritual", it processes a WE (not only among humans, but with materiality around, now that we have learnt that we are as (un) necessary- (i) relevant as those around us)...so a WE during and after an "incipient process" in between those that have seen the desert, even have resuscitated.

WE IS zombie-ing.

The dispositifs, "the valorised and valorisable forms of life", the uniformed spaces, and the cotidian-relational-mediatic violence we cannot escape: We may be in war with all that. But it is too soon and too early for us to come up with a solution. Another idea ah! Nap. We may only use the logics of sensation, and due to that, use the logics of trans-doing, trans-dressing with the skin's materials of the world in/around us; just by entering in touch with its infra-ordinary language (texture, weight, shape, volume, functionality...).

Remember we are too much culturised in our way of looking and the ways we touch.

Make a plan on how to ex-culturised those aspects.

Which is the difference in between doing what you know, than just doing?

We suspect that an "embryonic practices" may do: We think of kids before they enter into verbal language, so into the world of representation. They don't make difference in between subject and object; they enter into the world by entering into the sensing capacity of their bodies touching the very world. That world is not other but "experience", pure creation without being creative.

The scenario is simply the body. Entering into the scene, it is entering into the body

The PRE-FORMance. Movement IS. Plurality of the senses.

It enters into the scene by existing all the time.

Movement IS. Communicates existentially.

We should start to make tiny wars or war machines against sintetization. War-ing as a mode of choreographing the desidentification of the protagonists:

The syndicalist told me

The independents informed me

The ecologist, the poet, the artist, warn me

All, market's social democrats, do impose it "democratically".

How to be a dancer without being a waiter? How to create "apartness" without being apart from the inside? How to amplify the limit without limiting oneself?

WHAT IF WE LET GO OF BEING (SELF-INTERESTED)

N.0 A response
20th November 2012

Dears,

As once a friend told me: "we must learn to fuck with the problem": I'm afraid that to rationalize, think, communicate, give information "on being-doing radical or not" is another way of working. I do not want to work. We certainly know that work is not only what works, but its communication. So, I sense that there is nothing further to do rather than what is already happening.

In the same way I do not say who I am and what I do, I do not mean what is radical or what this one does. There aren't ways of being (or not) radical, as there are no ways to be something, and less, of being a reason for this and that.

How to tackle the problem? In times of absolute dispersion, "dispersing more, with less" may be perhaps the weapon (for we, we know that everything thinks, everything is opinionated and self-interested, everything communicates, and because of this, everything is expendable, a market ... although it is called black).

Don't you hear the background noise that over-flies?: anyone can do it. Because that is how things work. No need to Be or "to be nobody". We're noone. Radical IS nothing. And that, can do everything. So, let's take it very seriously, but with all its livianity, and above-all, making sure that matters, nothing.

yours,

gerry

WHAT IF WE LET GO OF BEING (ARTISTS)

N.0 Because we let it go, yet we don't leave 20th November 2012

“What if we let go of being (artists)?” proposes a series of experiential environments that will take place in different spaces (institutional / non-institutional) in the city of Madrid during the first half of 2013, and whose first phase will result at Casa Encendida (Madrid), between the 6th and 16th of June, 2013.

With the title “what if we let go of being (artists)?” we propose a co vivencial and practicable space where to facilitate ourselves and other(s) with modes of experimentation based on artistic and social practices that may displace ourselves out of the current economical bond with life and artistic modes of production.

The term “(artists)” (in brackets) suggests a starting point, an invitation / (ex) citation, and finally an experiment on the open, which does not try to answer questions, but rather to hold them together and without certainties: is it possible (if only a bit) to displace ourselves of the current economic rules, which as we know, are causing us harm?.

From the i-logics that are smothering us, the space that is proposed is facilitated as much as facilitating from/by/with any subject of representation (be that artists, citizens, spectators etc) so that it may experience itself as an object of interpellation and common experience: what if we empty ourselves and other(s) from the power of representation, from the power of knowledge? Perceiving ourselves as “secondaries” in the great movie we are living today? What if we appear in *a seem-what* situation as the subsidiaries of ideas that are inappropriate? What could be the practices that allow us to incorporate into our individual and social relationships uncertainty and ambiguity?

As an interpelative experience, we propose the concrete elaboration of tactics and techniques to maintain (fr)agile our bodies and to liberate its senses: Can we think performance/artistic/choreographic situations that may venture us toward certain desertions from where to practice without author, in multi-sensible environments, in spaces in which to ask and experience what appears, who meets, what for?

Our intention is to propose a series of basic conditions to all contributors, through which, to keep on generating positions and mobilizing others. Public sessions will be organized, experiments, discussions, debates and workshops of free and open access. Structured in certain “figures” or lines of work, which will operate as tension- triggers or approximations in between the different contributions with which to focus and discuss with local and international contributors, and general public(s) alike; we’ll create a continuous plot sequence in one single space during 10 days, with the aim of generating space and time for the experimentation and discussion of the consequences and implications of a crisis visible at the core of the so call social experience.

WHAT IF WE LET GO OF BEING (DANCERS)

N.0 Yet, even the ballet fights...
20th November 2012



We sense that this figure may be soon, a stranger whose occupation is to deeply employ itself on an employment impossible to identify. This stranger proposes an alien movement that promiscuously and selflessly IS as much touchable as it is touching whatever is going: if democracy is today for everyone and of everyone s, how may this figure sustain itself between all struggles to exist?

(it may lose “equilibrium”...)

WHAT IF WE LET GO OF BEING (PROTAGONISTS)

N.O "YES, WE CANNOT"
15th May 2011

WE realized that is irreparably collaborating with a situation entirely superfluous.

If WE does this absurd occupation is to make of itself a complete zero.

WE feels it.

WE feel the weight's nervousity of "zero".

Kafka said that instead of climbing a mountain (and WE adds: to conquer the top, put the flag, applaud yourself and lower back) WE should "get through on the inside." So maybe this occasion is like a little great passage ...

Before arriving here, WE had too many ideas about itself, its life was a kind of searcher-solutions, in order to believe that WE lived and exists because it created something concrete.

So now and for once WE is trying to put itself at work, on the condition of emptying itself of all that, that over-under-stand it.

In doing so, WE prefers to take all this very seriously to the condition that it cares nothing about it, just in order to be the eternal secondary character and to stay at the backstage....like this...half neutral

WE knows that it can only be the character that the narrator forgets when arrives the outcome of the story, especially when time arrives and he makes the characters "*to live happily ever after*"

Half blind, WE feels like an emotional athlete venturing into action. Always ready to give in to all temptations., WE is continued by whatever, up to a situation selfishly compatible with the moods of the bodies that compose it; considering that that is is not a question of style, or judgment or formality. It is purely and simply a matter of practice,

WE "relax its senses to revolt themselves with themselves".

WE does not speak of revolution yet, but about the capacity to move.

WE is determined not to turn away from what impresses it and of course ... It'd like to have a bit of control (at least a little) ... but that would only create a *new variation* on what is understood by common sense.

WE inclines towards what bodies do with all its implications.

WE accepts with great pleasure that this doesn't give any solution or image reference, but a mess of confusing complications.

The problem is that WE, keeps on living.

Somehow, WE keeps on trying to be the exciter of its own life, experiencing the collapse it chooses to attend and, though it knows it is temporary, perhaps WE is preparing for an awaking...

WHAT IF WE LET GO OF BEING (LOSERS)

N.0 From Madrid to Stockholm 20th November 2012

what surrounds me is fascinating
/ What is around me IS, because I built it while has been going
I care for my space / I mime it / as one who prepares his home for the winter
/ that it is not just my human environment / it's me: what I do / what I think / what I (not) say

...

I was ready /
but to be decisived is having taken a decision and to assume what comes after
/ However
/ Whatever
as if everything done, broke / had to leave / the aesthetic processes: the writing: the objectual: the actions

...

we are going through a unique time /
I suspect it is a coherence in between the subjective and the historical /
that is not time itself /
but by the truss of one / its perception / the love / the thought / the language /
the individual inside the colective/
history in the word / the one of the daily act / the action proximity /

...

I get, winning, out of life /
I feel a social loser and a winner in me
I can not avoid saying the word loser without irony,
because the one that says loser, it does it on the parameters of the conquest
who resists wins
/ I resist
/ NO resists / I also built with others the resistance
that is no defense /
or strategy against /
or anti /
or outside /
but a silent-sinker fall in the heart of the system /
when it'll realize / it'll be late

...

everytime less of my expropriated body
everytime less of my expropriated time
everytime less of my sold capacity

...

in structures for the human / our spaces
what I am
for others to use /
and not as a good
but as a touchable surface-skin that facilitates a vital process /