

Response to Ruukku editors DRAFT

Roumagnac Vincent

Thu 16/05/2019 12:41

To: Roumagnac Vincent <vincent.roumagnac@uniarts.fi>;

Dear Maiju, Mari and Eija, Editors of Ruukku n13 on *Peripheries*

I am glad that you accepted my proposition of exposition to move forward to the second phase of the editorial process. Thank you.

In your review you made this interesting suggestion: (...) *we want to point out that your exposition demands a true willingness to really play along and a reasonable amount of understanding of RC architectonics – therefore, we ask you to consider whether one more round of careful consideration, or fine tuning, of the navigation parameters would even better support the (non-)argumentative architectonics of the exposition and clarify (yet still not reveal too much) of the linkages between the fragments (for example, as intriguing as it is to consider leaving the "Abstract box" plain empty and/or proceeding by way of "Extroduction" instead of Introduction – it might better clarify and support the (intended?) purpose if the concept of extroduction was introduced... perhaps in the "Abstract box"?)*

Thank you for this comment and for the suggestion. I hope that the following argumentation will respond constructively to it and open a space-time for a joyful discussion.

For the last four years, since I started my artistic research project in 2015 in the Performing Arts Research Centre (Uniarts Helsinki), I have been permanently, and increasingly, pondering the question of writing (in artistic research). Contemplating simultaneously the capacity, the validity, the economy and the temporality of artists-researchers to write exegetically (scholarly) about their artworks and artistic practices, I have been personally surprised by the surrounding reproduction of a known and normative academic logic of writing, that is to say the dominant maintenance of the dichotomy between art and theory in the very context of artistic research. Hence, in order to offer a constructive alternative, I have been continuously doubling my artistic experiments in the framework of the research project with the display of expositional crash tests based on the redistribution of these experiments through what I call “narriteratives”, i.e., *iterative narratives*, that is to say compositional, experimental redoubling/supplementing avatars of the art itself; these variations intending to disclose the art as research through sense-opening (aesthetic experience in the context of research realm) more than meaning-making/knowledge-producing (i.e. theoretical texts engaging with objective criticality in the context of the academy).

In this sense I have been following the path of 'exposition' activists, claiming the urge to find an alter-mode of research articulation, away from both the agency of the art, per se, that lie within art scenes and academic art exegesis within the academic realm. From the early stages of my research, I have thus tried to apply my artistry (the “skills”) to the research presentations themselves in order to activate them, I would say, on a 'meta-level of communication', through my artistic strategies themselves (i.e. queering normative temporalities of presentations and hauntological destabilization of the metaphysics of the scenic presence/presentation). The “writing” hence produced through these strategic dynamics is no more “produced” merely for and through its verbal, symbolic (still dominantly required), interpretative function but rather critically, or, maybe, postcritically, “used” as materiality, as a medium among others, as a tool and as a deconstructively playful component. This mode of presenting the research is speculating on the possibility to shift from art direct agency to art as a research agent. The shift leans on the activation of artistic skills in the research presentations; through implementing this shift I wish to participate in the movement of the emergence of aesthetic thinking in artistic research within the academic required epistemic dimension and obligation.

This position has been inspired not only by the above-mentioned defenders for the expositional turn in the field but also, and simultaneously, by the recent line of thought that speculates on the possibility of a paradigm shift from critical to postcritical thinking. I have no space and time to develop here – and I better not replace a theoretical explanation by another one explaining theoretically why I would prefer not theoretically explain the art) but, and to put it shortly, my interest grew for the shift between the critical double dichotomy practice/writing and object of study/subject of interpretation, and the correlative academic promotion of the seizing (of the process and of the results) through a mastered, clear and convincing epistemic capture, and the displacement of the critique to a creative zone of aesthetic experience, in which intentionally-left-opened affordances are proposed as a supplement for the art. In French there would be a nice homonymic trick to use from *raisonnant* (reasoning - from

outside) to *résonant* (resonant - from inside), as in music resonance would be the intensification and enriching of a musical tone by a supplementary, therefore postcritical, vibration than by a complementary rhetorical explanation.

My proposal of exposition for Ruuku 13th edition follows, therefore, this logic. The reasons above are why I have proposed that my exposition would start in medias res, like a "jump" in the (almost) void without pedagogic bridging, but few Mallarmé-like sensing triggers, and thus would not be introduced by a critical normative abstract, but rather by a gesture of what I call *extroduction*, i.e. a first movement of decentering from the expected critical, synthetic and pedagogic form that is the abstract. Extroducing is always elsewhere and elsewhere, not seizable, having no body, except, perhaps, its own enunciation through this very note (which is thus already a failure of avoiding the critical exterior contemplation and its correlative argumentation, which "just" displaced to another subject of study and argumentation, the exposition itself – I am doomed...). I indeed see the abstract (interestingly the antonym of *concrete*) as a symptom, not to say symbol, of good-old critical thinking, that is to say, the proof of the capacity to master, seize, center and disseminate the core of a research in a fast, easy, seducing and synthetic way (for.. consumption?... The academy isn't it also another competitive market?...).

I would hence be very happy if you consider that my proposal for Ruukku, following same direction (redirection), offers the same personal perspective on writing in artistic research, at the same time it entangles with the topic of the edition « peripheries ». In this redirection it seeks:

- to avoid the centripetal and safe introduction through conventional bridging (abstract) and orienting (introduction) already the experience
- it rather invites to jump into the exposition architectonics, as one jumps in the sea, rawly, almost naked but willing to swim (or to learn from within)
- to manifest through the topic of the edition itself: peripheries on a meta-level of communication
- to claim exposition to be an epistemic experiential zone of redistribution/recontextualization of the artistic practice through performing documentation, rather than a space for clarification and easy-access.
- to promote writing in artistic research as compositional gesture of re-display of the art, within a specific community/context (the call)/interface (RC), rather than verbally and theoretically provide an exegesis (writing about the practice/clarification/articulation) based on the dominant mode of academic « research results » presentation.
- to offer an experiment on research alternative modes of opening senses rather than disclosing meanings, and, definitely, rather than producing knowledge.
- to generate an archipelagic assemblage of artworks through peripheral strategies of presentation generates about the topic itself, at the same time conveying, as a peculiar mode of writing/assembling, the dynamics of my specific research on stage/staging, also in relation with the topic
- to trigger the important question of the access: who is reading? who is ready to train other modes of (hyper)reading, non-centripetal, non-linear, non-facilitated modes of engaging with artistic research contributions that matter elsewhere and elsewhere the scholarly oriented narratives?
- to question the temporal ecology of the reading: How much time does a RC reader spend with (how long one spends with a theatre performance? with a 15 pages intro of a theory book?) To avoid the publicity-like hook of the abstract.
- to extroduce the research, the way to lead out of the centripetally and synthesis-oriented of the introduction, to already consider the tangent towards the peripheral experience, towards the out-of-stage as an alter-stage to begin with

But this is obviously already a failure, too much justification, too much of verbal precautions and explanations, too much of glamorous negotiations with the editors and reviewers...

I am very happy about having the possibility to discuss with you about all this further on. An edition on peripheries is for me the ideal locus for such an experiment... offering the possibility to redistribute the art practice focusing on this topic, but also addressing the same topic through the form of the exposition itself. I hope that this revised version of the exposition will be relevant enough for you to make it through and be sent to peer-reviewing for publication.

Kind regards,

Vincent

Vincent Roumagnac
 Tohtorikoulutettava / Doctoral Researcher
 Taideyliopiston Teatterikorkeakoulu / University of the Arts -Theatre Academy Helsinki
 Esittävien taiteiden tutkimuskeskus / Performing Arts Research Centre

vincent.roumagnac@uniarts.fi

Vincent Roumagnac

Tohtorikoulutettava / Doctoral Researcher

Taideyliopiston Teatterikorkeakoulu / University of the Arts -Theatre Academy Helsinki

Esittävien taiteiden tutkimuskeskus / Performing Arts Research Centre

vincent.roumagnac@uniarts.fi