

YUTRA

bulletin #2/vol 1

The group can be:
All about bullshit
A little about bullshit
Not at all about bullshit

Hito Steyerl – In defence of the poor image as a starting point for conversation with Pierre Bourdieu's *On TV* as an overlap. These are important texts as they approach and question the status of the image, and as artists it is important to understand and be aware of the contemporary status and role of images in society.

Image making as a dilemma □ The dilemma as a symptom.

What are images for in contemporary society? How are they considered? How do they exist? Are images thought of as art first? In the everyday do we think about images being art, or not?

Everything can be art (?). But how is it possible to make an image in the contemporary situation where we find a saturation of images? What is the basis for the knowledge of image making?

(The Group – how much text are we able to take in and process)

Latour and Guattari – symmetry, and the capitalist semiotic turn.

The mode of production □ Friedrich Kittler □ discourse networks, tech, material defines a text's meaning.

Interface – affect – hate – frustration

The sustenance of free market capital. (is there a sustenance? – or is it all just inflation?)

Back to discourse networks and resulting financial output leading onto and from economic calculations, leading onto and from neoliberalism

What are the modes of production of the poor image? What role does originality play in this production line / network of dissemination and sharing.

What social structures are in place to maintain and continue producing these images, and why are we as a society obsessed with them? What role do they play in our lives?

Have artists, or those who 'consider' the making of the image prior to actually making it, become 'alternative', alt-creators. (alt-modern, alt-right, alt-left). What causes them to need to adhere to the 'crisp and fancy', the analogue, the original, the material. A fetishization of the 35mm. A fetishised absurdity.

Image dilution – less power and strength? Or the reverse? With degraded imagery, pirated material, copied, shared, encoded, decrypted, interpolated, what happens to the images' 'essence'? Do more images equal less quality? Can all the images in the world be considered as equal in quality, despite their medium, their mode or their levels of production. Does the abundance of imagery lead to a lowering of perception, a numbing of the visual sense, and resulting in a softening of the brain's resistance to the messages that the imagery holds, thus completing a loop which actually intensifies the strength of the image, or its ability to manipulate becomes more effective. Does the 'power' each individual image holds become weaker, but due to the overabundance of images in general, the accumulated effect becomes much greater?

Is it possible to make 1 powerful image, or do we need to make 300,000?

VIEWPOINTS > Take your photo here! Photo

opportunities dictated on road signs. Have road signs had to be changed to say 'photo spot' rather than 'viewpoint'? Transport infrastructure is adapting to the changing landscape of human perception and memory.

Images saturate more than anything else, but no longer arrive with the subtitle of 'one-of-a-kind'.

Everyone has a camera, how do you know which images are the 'good' ones? – 'You will see it'. But can you really distinguish? What actually dictates our perception of the good?

The tendency would be to look at the poor image and improve upon – Art photography is not as it used to be, its possible it is intentionally getting poorer. What benefit is to be gained from the approach/campaign?

□ Why do we have/use/still use this idea of a good or a bad image? Why is poor imagery so popular? What do people want or need from these images?

A fight against the arrogance of image making. 'This is art because I said so'.

□ Steyerl text does not problematise this notion of the making.

A high-tech and artist produced tendency – the contemporary artist will be thinking about; 'he/she is an artist'. The image will be different in the end. The content would be different if you're contemplating.

'All Hollywood is shit' – then why do most people go to watch Hollywood films?

B-films, shit but exciting. – who do 'we' make art for?

Hollywood perpetuates shit.

Whilst

The intelligentsia is customarily attracted to attacking Hollywood. – but there is simply too much content to just throw it all out. It satisfies the needs of the masses – what is this need? Where does this 'need' come from? Who creates this 'need'?

The 'masses' and the 'elite' watch films for different reasons (???)

Elites becoming partners in the art world

□ pairing up □ Marina Abramovich + Jay-Z

Artist is Present

Picasso Baby – a performance art film

Calling art art by association.

The icons of art – Art crossover, Art legitimization. Picasso Baby, Abramovich was loving it. □ Performance Art Film

□ Talent show

□ Validation show (YBA)

Does capitalism parasite on the discourse of art?

Broadcasting to the world.

Production value

The umbrella definition of art – what are the categories, what is the understanding, how do we know what we are talking about?

Artistic forms

--- how do we define ourselves (as artists)?

'Over-invested hobbyist'

Examples of 'artists of life' – those who have nothing to do with the arts, but bring artistry to the living of life.

Con artists.

Entering the elite – leaving the elite

After, for, of and by the masses

The poor image as a phenomenon of art.

Why do we reject Jay-Z?

Why do we reject Instagram as an artistic force? - art movements.

You cannot ignore the phenomenon of the image. Social media revolutionising the world.

The distinction of art. How to distinguish the good from the bad? Should we continue to categorise into good or bad? Is it simply a hankering for the elitist notion of 'better than'?

Education and the arts. To educate, to be educated, to share, to change, to understand, to be understood, or to adapt to others understanding.

notes from the first meeting:

17th August 2016