Research "history"

Wiki example:
Department of Defense
Pentagon
using P. to refer to department of defense.
part referring to whole / whole to part
is a synecdoche.

Research "history"
Pia Louwerens at a.pass, July 2017 to February 2019, approximately.

Pia Louwerens, January, Brussels

* Starting with an artistic practice that asks questions about autonomy, the separation (and unseparability) of the artist and the artwork, and questions of liveness and documentation — the separation (and unseparability) of the performance from the context which constituted it.

* Excursion, moving my work outside of myself and into "we" — the body of researchers and also the perogative of a.pass. ~~It came to the conception of "sharing" in terms of sharing the research, instead~~ Coming to understand doing research as a more collective activity than making art. Excursion led me to the notion of the parasite: I respond to a context, what if I shape the context?

* Queer phenomenology — "feeling" or "experiencing" the context to come to a work (phenomenological approach). Work in relation to a big, abundant even, moment. Queering through the script — all being in the same house, creating doubles. Being a parasite — using someone else's paths. ⊛ Sarah Ahmed

* ~~What if~~ What if your work would be an institution? Research facility on the edge of a weird ⊛ area, which is even fictional. Obsessed with 1:1 scale art, positioning myself in opposition to "autonomous art". Problem with institutional framework, in my case the edges of the event. Culminating in "The Event", a performance in a.pass. Pattern language — the part as the whole, the whole as a part. (Institutional critique, don't know how). Causality, affecting the past & the future.

* Lectureperformance in Academie Antwerpen. Autodestructivity, critically reading two lectureperformances which are them —
   Mark Fisher ⊛ Jeff vandermeer
   kate ⊛ Gustav Metzger

Hello everyone,

Where do I start? Do I start at the beginning and end at the end, or in a circle? Do I write about how my research developed at a.pass, because then I write about the people I met and the energy they contributed to my project, the theories and books I met and encountered as vividly as the people who shape the program.

a.pass is a transdisciplinary and transindividual research platform. It, they and we are open to researchers from many different disciplines and carefully curate programs that facilitate exchange, discourse, friction and feedback. The postmaster trajectory takes one year, divided into three blocks of four months. There is a possibility to extend the process by skipping one block, which I did. I followed a.pass from Sept. 2017 - Dec. 2018, with a last presentation on the 1st and 2nd of February 2019, for which I am making this portfolio.

Taking into account the results of my research, it is clear that I cannot write about my practice as if it is something that develops in one direction only, using certain "sources" to do this. During the program I felt more like I was at sea, being carried my many things outside of myself and in many directions. However, I accepted the challenge that a portfolio poses, and tried to keep it as clear as possible. I only included things that I produced myself, and I kept a chronological order.

As evidence for this trajectory I have scanned the archived physical remains of my research, which are scripts and presentations in various states of decay. By way of contextualisation I have superimposed information on these artefacts, concerning the state of my research at that time.

My research at a.pass was directly and indirectly co-authored, informed and supported by the following, wonderful, people:

Lilia Mestre, Vladimir Miller, Nicolas Galeazzi, Adva Zakai, Pierre Rubio, Heike Langsdorf, Philippine Hoegen, Kate Rich, Femke Snelting, Christophe Meierhans, Caroline Godart, Kate Briggs, Michele Meesen, Joke Liberge, Steven Jouwersma, Adrijana Gvozdenovic, Eleanor Ivory Weber, Katinka van Gorkum, Luisa Fillitz, Esther Rodriguez-Barbero Granado, Eunkyung Jeong, Marialena Marouda, Ekaterina Kaplunova, Goda Palekaite, Nassia Fourtouni, Shervin Kiarnesi Haghighi, Zoumana Meïté, Sven Dehens, Leo Kay, Elen Braga, Eszter Némethi, Geert Vaes, Hoda Siahtiri, Deborah Birch, Maurice Meeuwisse, Diego Echegoyen, Caterina Mora, Laura Pante, Lucia Palladino & Piero Ramella
and others.

* First I conceptualized the weird as something outside of ... shapes a state, but always with the possibility to encounter something, or to understand something about the ... is fundamentally ... not-understandable and ... Harman's ... speculative realism, past T. Mortons conception of nature, time and the weird. ... Freuds unheimlich (uncanny — which is always something repeated, repressed, something inside of us. ... clear theory on how thing works ... co-constitute, every moment, the weirdness which is outside of us, and how it is this entanglement ... outside, this ... non-determined ... the weirdness itself.

In my last presentation within a.pass itself, Soft for the institution I made ... inventory" of techniques, dividing them into three parts: seeing double, decentralization and Softness/I am ... No I.

Trying to explain my position within institutions, ... the way that I try to both challenge and use the institutional "cut-out shape" that art provides.

Institution is inside of us* Andrea Fraser

Application to a.pass
The Story of I and It

The story of I and it

I came to a.pass with an artistic practice that concerns itself with questions on autonomy, the separation (and inseparability) of the artist and the artwork, and questions of liveness and documentation - the separation (and inseparability) of the performance from the context which constitutes it.

In my art practice I research the possibilities and limitations of language in the production of art. My work consists of performances and temporary installations, and is always context-specific. This context includes the psychological and philosophical relations between artist, artwork and audience. Because language plays a big role in my practice, my works tend to hover over the world rather than taking a physical shape, fantasising about what could be and what should be. In my work I address my own position as a maker, and my possibilities and limitations in my attempt to make "something".

I would like to participate in the post-master program of a.pass to execute my research proposal, which centers on the basic theme in art, and in performance in particular: the relation between the "I" of the self and the "it" of the (autonomous) artwork. With this project I hope to get more insight into and knowledge about my work, as well as to get in contact with minds different from my own, thereby increasing the width and depth of my practice. Before introducing my research proposal I would like to start by giving some insight in my working process. Although I work as an artist, my main practice consists of writing. The proposal that I am writing now is already part of this process: this is exactly how I work. This also means that this proposal is unfinished, since it can not be finished before it is executed. Thereby it is a work-in-progress, and it will change.

My central research question goes as follows: **Where do "I" stop and where does "it" begin?**
The "it" in this question refers to the autonomous artwork. The "I" can refer to the maker, as well as to the audience of the work.

My research centers on the alternating attachment and detachment of the work, "it", to the "I". This starts when "it" is being produced, and it is almost completely dependent on the possibilities and limitations of the artist (the "I" that is writing). After the production follows the presentation of the work. In the case of my work I am the performer, so it and I share a body. Nevertheless there is unmistakably an artwork present. This artwork-"it" is supposedly autonomous, but its autonomy or detachment from the artist/performer is short-lived as it immediately re-attaches itself to the beholder - the new "I" (the "I" that is listening). I see the work and it becomes part of my experiences, and of my memories.

The question "Where do "I" stop and where does "it" begin?" is about the borders between the large, subjective, "I" inside and the perceived "it", which is outside, the "other". All of my works center on two questions: How can I translate "I" into it? and How can I make an autonomous artwork? These two questions are conflicting: the first question wants contact between the "I" and "it", while the second question mentions autonomy, something independent and detached. In my practice these questions are visualised in the shape of performances in which I try to find the voice of the artwork, while remaining very close to my own voice. My work hardly takes a real external shape, it is alway "just me". The idea of a shape that the work could take to become an "it" is a subject that fascinates me, and which recurred in projects like *Het Vormgeven* (2015) and *Untitled (Prospects & Concepts)* (2016). Although I am fascinated by the idea of making an object, my perspective is always directed towards "the process of making" itself. As a result I always end up making a performance, even when it is a static object. My goal is to make something that is outside of me, but I want it to be as large and complex as the "I" that is inside. This tension (one could call it the impossibility to make an artwork), is constantly present in my work, and is something I would like to deconstruct.

For my research I want to split up the central question into several smaller subjects, representing the different sides of the project. One of these sides is the aspect of performance and documentation. I am fascinated by performance because it is the most alive discipline, it is literally *live*. In my work the relation between artwork and maker is as tight as can be: I am physically attached to my own work. One thing that fascinates me is the part that is not-me when I am performing. How can you even see the difference between me and my work? In my graduation work at KABK, *Graduation Work (the things that dreams are made of)* (2012), I researched the possibility to detach myself from the artwork by saying things that I (the artist) didn't want to say. Then the thing that was speaking had to be the autonomous (not-attached) artwork. But then another question follows: If the artwork cannot survive without the artist present, is it then an autonomous artwork?

First presentation of Block I
   How to make something?

She is sitting behind the television, drinking beer.
She doubts about getting another beer
but she is too drunk.
Then suddenly she knows what to do: she imagines she is not thirsty anymore.

The punchline is that you think you are getting closer to the center, but you aren't.

***

An artist sits behind her computer, doubting what to do.
She wants to write a performance
But she doesn't know how
So she writes a performance about how she is a bad artist.

***

A performance artist, who only makes invisible and temporary work, is asked to present and promote her
work on an art fair for promising young artists which will last four days.
She starts to work, and decides that she has to make some object, to promote herself*
Only her work consists only of invisible, temporary works
Then she knows: she will make objects that represent performances that have past, or serve as sketches for
the installation itself.

*A performance artist wants to make an object
She doesn't know how to r

So she makes objects

***

Reality, virtual reality and imagination walk into a bar.
Reality tries to order,
but virtual reality is shouting all the time.
Imagination is grinning, ghehe, you don't even exist.

   a,pass Block I - Notes from workshop Forged Theory *led by Peter Stamer & Vladimir Miller. Writing
   research as a joke.*

(handwritten notes overlaid across the page:)

How to make something?
What to make something?

My artistic practice has consisted mostly of performances, because I am fascinated by this "moment" of the art work, what happens (the expectations surrounding it), reality, how the "object" itself. Furthermore I wanted to make something that is inside of reality, that actually messes with the reality itself. My brain summarised... worked with describing reality through language. My "methodology" is working with an impossible question: can I make a performance in the now that only constitutes of the past and the future? Can I reconstruct the "now" while it is happening? Can I show my work without showing my work? These... often have a magical element. They are also often ... This makes... not... theoretical... They are writing reality experiments rather than theatrical experiments.

→ How to make an atonomous artwork?
When I started out with performance I worked with scripts, and control played a big part in my work. Ethical questions. Work as a gift for an unknown recipient.

Moving towards objects. From I to it. Documentation, but what is there to document? What is the work and what is I? Anecdotes as documentation, practice as an organic system.

Covers, illustrations, the now, copies, scale models, representations

Documentation on excursion/performance
From I to we - Excavating reality together, at home

The concept of excursion, which came from the Vladimir Miller, the curator of Block I, for me meant moving my work outside of myself and into "we" - the body of researchers. I came to understand research as a practice which broadens my horizon from the I to the we: understanding the questions that I dealt with connected me to a body of research extending beyond artistic domain, and this again meant that I could contribute to these discourses. To experiment with a performative shape that embodies this change of perspective from the artist "I" to the research "we" I scripted the performance *From I to we - Excavating reality together, at home*.

"From I to we" was a completely scripted performance-excursion, which took place in my house. The first part of the script consisted of a "regular" performance in which the audience listens and the artist speaks. The script spoke about working as a parasite, and multiple instances of parasite practices (the house mouse being one of them, or the consequences of a chameleon choosing wallpaper). For the second part of the script I invited the audience to walk in my footsteps and to become me, taking over my (often parasitic) artistic practice. Meanwhile I would cook boerenkool, while they were be invited to become me and rewrite the script, or write a new one. I told them that while there were here they might change the past, the present, write the future, or simply do nothing at all. During the performance the different "Pia's" wore my clothes, slept in my bed, edited my scripts and wrote in my notebook. After the performance we all shared a meal together.

Next to this performance I was reading Queer Phenomenology by Sarah Ahmed[1]. At this point was to make work in relation to a big, abundant moment, of which our consciousness it only a limited part. The goal was to feel or experience this moment of performance, for which phenomenology was a useful theory. The script would queer this experience - all being in the same house as doubles, or being a parasite and using someone else's paths, being guided by strange objects.

"when they enter the people are already dressed.
They only eat bananas because that's all that
is left. The music is changed every fifteen minutes, on
average. Vladimir exclaims "everyone is John Malkovich
and they are all slightly insane.".
Three people are wearing dark, dark blue lipstick,
several rifle through the bookcase.
Right now, Mike Kelley serves as a knee-desk.
One, Elen, sings along to the record.
I decide to serve myself a glass of wine.
Banana peels lie everywhere. The three books
near me include Kelly, Lispector and Serres.
Vladimir and Leo are sculpting clay. Sven put on
a new record. Even continues to sing, dance
and drink. I text and send/read emails, in
between Serres sentences. Q.E.D.
"What is a parasite?" A deviation, minimal to
begin with, that can remain so until it
disappears or that can grow until it transforms
a physiological order into a new order." - MS"
a.pass Block I - Note from anonymous participant From I to we -
Excavating reality together, at home.

---

[1] Queer Phenomenology, Sarah Ahmed, 2006 by Duke University Press Books.

= ga
worder
n?
ion
sites,

I find exciting this moving
back and forth from
states of attention. The
hyper scene I would call
it. When life and observation
of it plus the creative
change of it are together.
Like reality and imagination
are together. Companions
of a the same moment.
And exciting is that the
moment can be penetrated
without having to think to
much about. I think a
very important part of it
is that things are not
~~dissociated~~ dissociated but
ambivalent." Continuity is
then there because all
layers can be present =
so an inclusive method
I would say. Have to
think about this part a
bit more.
What am I looking for?

→ Potlach just came back to
my mind while ~~see~~ re-reading
the notes on the Mauss book.
We are in a situation of acceptan
and obligation of reciprocations
no matter how much one engages

Setting: living room - au naturel, nothing is particularly cleaned. There are no extra chairs (aside from two folded chairs in the hallway. The house, usually inhabited by just two people, feels very full with more. The coat rack in the small vestibule is empty, ready for everyone to dispose of their coats and bags. They don't need to bring anything - shoes are optional. Katinka and I make everybody coffee. I'm dressed like I would at home: in pink satin pyjama pants, a big blouse, socks, and no shoes. The table is full with print-outs of this script, old scripts and, some working materials (clay, coloured pencils, paper), ingredients for boerenkool (boerenkool, potatoes), and a computer behind which Katinka is sat. Katinka types the script with me, adding or changing things when I stray from the script. The door to my bedroom is open, the door to Katinka's bedroom is closed. Katinka is invited to intervene whenever she wants.

Around 15:45 - When people begin to enter, I turn on a record [Don Raphael and the Mexican Brass]. Free chitchat ensues. When it's finished one side in about 17 minutes I start the performance.

[Pia stands in the middle of the room and speaks]: Welcome to the house of Katinka and I. It's not very big, as you can see; Katinka's bedroom is over there, and mine over here, with a toilet to the left. That's the tour. To the right, there is a shower; you could say that the entire place is one big bathroom. That, over there, is the kitchen, and at the table here is where I usually eat, with a small desk in my bedroom where I base myself to work (usually Katinka and her computer occupy this one). So to start immediately: this afternoon will proceed in accordance with a script. The performance begins with my performance of a text that I have written. After this performance, I will cook boerenkool for you, the recipe of which may also be found in this script. While I cook, I would like to invite you to rewrite the script or write your own. To introduce you to my practice, I have attempted to translate it into a manual that you can follow – which itself you could also say is part of the script. While here you might change the past, the present, write the future, or simply do nothing at all.

Thank you for coming and visiting me and my practice. I don't usually perform at home, usually I work in the context of an exhibition or even an exhibition space. Sorry I'm very nervous. I live here, I used to and I will. The house of the chameleon, I was calling it in my head. That's an interesting concept, don't you think? What does the house of the chameleon look like? The chameleon can decide how to define itself. There is a circle. But with all these subconscious influences going on, you could ask yourself whether the chameleon, in fact, has any voice left on the matter. It is so used to being green all the time, that it didn't stand a chance. I'm usually the chameleon in the exhibition space, it is fun to dress up like other artworks in text. It's a cheap trick, to refer to someone else's work, to use its energy like that. Some painter dude once called me a parasite, which is completely true. I don't have to make the space to use it, I feed off of energies that are already present: I need a host, I admit it. So of course this book *[points at "Parasite" by Michel Serres]* really fascinated me, *[looks at Sven]* which you recommended to me. We also have some parasites in the house, such as a mouse. The first time we saw it enter, Katinka and I were sitting on the couch and it just walked through the front door. Mice come out of their holes at night to walk all across the house - into my room, over my desk. One of them took a shit on the Trouble on Triton. We can't stop them, there are no barriers for mice. This particular mouse scares me, though. I'm not scared of mice in general, it's really just this one, perhaps because the house is so small. I imagine its little claws in my pants, its little mouse-weight on me. I feel its presence at night, and I feel frustrated that I don't know when it will show up again. Katinka, we still need to send a message to the landlady. She is very odd, her husband too.

Second presentation/performance of Block II
The Event

If your research would be an institution, what kind of institution would it be?[2] My institution would be a research facility on the edge of a weird[3] area, where reality and fiction are intertwined. The institution would be infected by the weirdness[4], and would become (is already) fictional itself.

During Block II, curated by Nicolas Galeazzi, I got obsessed with the idea of *1:1 scale art* [5]. Instead of autonomous art, isolated in white cube exhibition spaces, 1:1 scale art would takes place on the same level as other things. Shops as a art, conversations as art, presentations as art, administration as art. The only thing standing between the performance and the moment itself are the edges of the event, so I thought. This thinking culminated in "The Event', a performance in a.pass in which I tried to blur the edges of the event, during a week of presentations.

A description.

The performance starts with the audience in a spectator-like, seated position, the performer standing in front of them. I address the idea that objecthood in art has been silently replaced by eventhood, as capitalist-art market's response to non-physical art, which has been described by Stephen Wright in the book "Toward a Lexicon of Usership". I explain how I want to critique this "Event", that the event puts too much pressure on me to function, and how I want to hollow it out from the inside. On the other hand I need the event to make a performance, and I guide the audience toward my working table which shows notes that explain this given, making them leave their chairs. Arrived at the table I tell the group how I got the idea to use other's practices and presentations surrounding this Event, parasitising them and pulling them in - they said they wanted to share their practice, after all - to form the content of this event. While speaking I borrow words from others; from others presentations as well as from personal conversations, up to a sentence that was spoken in the presentation only just before mine.

I continue with that I actually need friends more than colleagues, and that when conceiving of this performance I got the idea to invite the group as shareholders - formalised friends that would hug me at given times and ask me how I was doing. This leads me to the concept of oversharing, which I demonstrate by sharing information on the breakup with my boyfriend and my friends their problems with mental illness. By oversharing personal information, and simultaneously taking "too much" of others' shared practices I attempted to blur the edges of the event, or so I say.

The event gradually turns into a feedback session, it is unclear when it ends. When we see the next presentation, by another researcher, we recognise images, words and ideas that I formulated just before, feeding the paranoia forward.

---

[2] Kate Rich, workshop *Critical Administration, shaking down the entrepreneur,* a.pass Block II

[3] The weird and the eerie, Mark Fisher, 2016. London: Repeater Books.

[4] Area X, Jeff VanderMeer, 2014. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

[5] Toward a lexicon of usership, Nick Aitkens and Stephen Wright. Eindhoven: Van Abbemuseum.

A performative lecture on two lecture-performances (2018)

<u>Medium:</u> Performance - red suit, black shoes, glass of water, scripts of own performances *Introduction: The Anatomy of Performance (2015)* and *Punt Contrapunt (voor Bernice) (2017)*.
<u>Context:</u> Performing Knowledge. Lecture-Performances in Perspective - seminar program in ARIA (Antwerp Research Insitute for the Arts) / University of Antwerp.
<u>Duration:</u> approx. 60 min.

Live reenactment and/or critical reading of two scripts of performances, from 2015 and 2017, that can be described as lecture performances. In an introduction I propose to see these performances as two auto-destructive machines - that destroy themselves on stage - as they both attempt to destroy "the self" on stage.

I wrote the script of the first performance *Introduction: The Anatomy of Performance (2015)* for students of an masters-level art history class at Leiden University titled "The Force of Art". The script starts with an pseudo psychoanalytical introduction of myself according to six sides, which I describe with esoteric titles such as "The Mother" "The Writer" and "The Silver Child". The script rapidly becomes (even) more complex when I mention *The Anatomy Lesson of dr. Nicolaes Tulp* by Rembrandt and start relating the characters in this painting to my different "sides". The script ends with a imagined tableau vivant in which the six sides interact and reenact *The Anatomy Lesson*, parallel to a professional introduction of myself (in 2015), using some former projects as examples, amongst which *Recollecting Pia Louwerens* (2015), which is a rehearsal of the now through the past and the future.

The second script is from *Punt Contrapunt (voor Bernice) (2017)*. In *Punt Contrapunt* I speak about Pia Louwerens as "the other Pia Louwerens" who tries to get rid of herself through the creation of a work of art. The original script ends in an almost complete quoting of another lecture-performance, *Yuri / The Constellation Approach (2016)*, which treats the subject of constellation therapy and the embodiment of an artwork in the shape of the performer.

In 1 performative lecture on 2 lecture-performances I critically read and reenact the two performances. I intervene regularly with footnotes or annotations which respond to the text ("this is a really bad part") describe certain images or objects that are absent, such as the paper maché object in *Punt Contrapunt* or a whiteboard in *Introduction: The Anatomy of Performance*, or tell anecdotes about the work. During the original *Punt Contrapunt* I had a blackout, for example, which was now mentioned as "and now I have a blackout… which lasts about two minutes" and was followed by a description of the experience of having a blackout, and temporarily walking out of your own performance. I live-translated some parts of *Punt Contrapunt*, and I skipped some unnecessary parts. While performing I would also critique my own performance, I thought that I laughed too much, for example.

---

[6] Image: drawing by Nicolas Galeazzi, made during the performance.

Hello everyone,

I hope everybody is not too tired from this full and inspiring day. I'm a bit nervous, I had actually only two weeks to prepare this lecture, and I was preoccupied with writing a review about this seminar on Gustav Metzger, who developed autodestructive art, which is basically art that destroys itself while it is on stage. In a way you could say that this is also what my practice is about, building machines that pick me apart while I'm on the stage. I would like to elaborate on that through the example of some past performances. My first and last lecture performance I did in Leiden, for an art history class, in 2015. I introduced myself: Who are you? I have six sides. My first side is the writer, who is about sixty-one years old. You could relate this side to Anna Enquist, who you possible haven't heard of but who is a Dutch writer. She doesn't eat a lot but she smokes all the time, she has lost a child, she writes intelligent psychological novels and next to her writing she kept working as a psychoanalyst. The Writer is the kind of person that knows a lot. In this case her research subject would probably be The Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Nicolaes Tulp by Rembrandt. Not only a relevant piece of art history, which I very seldom encounter in my work, but even relevant in several ways: Rembrandt is in Leiden and the dissection also took place in Leiden. The Writer would write a beautiful lecture which would be called "The Anatomy of Art". I this lecture she would explain how in The Anatomy Lesson of Rembrandt in the low right corner it shows a huge textbook, possibly De Humani Corporis Fabrica (Fabric of the Human Body) by Andrea Vesalius. This hands-on magnum opus presents a careful examination of the organs and the complete structure of a human body in seven books. In the lecture she would keep connecting this human body to art, explaining the dissection while simultaneously dissecting the painting itself, and my art practice. Next to intelligent she

Chutes and Ladders or a performative lecture on two lecture-performances

"Hello?"

"Maybe you can just… it's really strange to talk to a centre that's empty. It's not for you, it's for me you know."

"We're presented with a picture of a man climbing a slope, in profile, one leg in front of the other as he progresses, marking motion, walking up the incline, facing the top, eyes directed at the top, all the standard climbing association stuff. Et cetera et cetera. So it's a picture of a man walking up a hill. But then remember Gramma Lenore's own Dr. Wittgenstein says hold on now, pardner, because the picture could just as clearly and exactly and easily represent the man sliding *down* the slope, with one leg higher than the other, backwards, et cetera. Just as exactly."

"Shit," said Lenore.

"Yeah. I just realised that maybe doing a lecture performance on an evening like this might not be the best moment, because during opening night, everyone wants to have a beer. So I will try to keep it a bit short, try to skip, like, the worst parts, and maybe it will stay around half an hour."

(…)

"It's not so easy for me to respond to a book, because I am also a writer, especially this book which is about…

LaVache continued, "See, maybe Lenore isn't gone at all. Maybe you're who's gone, when all is said and done. Maybe… this one I particularly like… maybe Dad's gone, spiralled into the industrial void. Maybe he's taken us with him. Maybe Lenore's *found*. Maybe instead of her sliding away from you, you've slid away from her. Or climbed away from her. Maybe it's all a sliding-and-climbing *game*! Chutes and Ladders, risen from the dead!"[7]

…language itself as being itself a character. This is something I too speak about a lot in my practice. Defining the self by words or being defined by others through words. You could see my performances as really long introductions of myself, all the time. So rehearsing the introduction, 'my name is Pia Louwerens…my name is Pia Louwerens… hello hello.'"

"So hello welcome, the title of this work is called Chutes and Ladders or a performative lecture on two lecture-performances. It's an adaptation of a performance I did a couple of weeks ago in Antwerp called 'A performative lecture on two lecture-performances'. Now the other part is 'Chutes and Ladders'. This part comes from the book 'The Broom of the System'. It's actually a board game that we also know in the Netherlands. (I should speak more slowly). I think it's kind of cross-cultural. It's a board game that has chutes or glijbanen or ladders: ladders. You can climb up or you can suddenly slide down. This sliding and climbing practice. So it's an adaptation of a performance I did in Antwerp."

"Hello everyone, I hope everyone is not too tired of this full and inspiring day. I'm a bit nervous."

"Really. It's a bit hot here, as well."

"I had only two weeks to prepare this performance because I was working on a review. I'm also a writer and an art critic. I was writing a review on the work of Gustav Metzger, who makes *really* interesting works. They are autodestructive, so they destroy themselves on stage. They are machines that destroy themselves. I found this very interesting, since you could also see my work as being autodestructive machines, but then of the self. So I constantly destroy myself while on stage. This is why I am doing this performative lecture on two lecture-performances. One I performed in Leiden, for students of art history, and one I performed in The Hague in an art space there."

"The one in Leiden I did in 2015, and the one in The Hague in 2017."

"Dear audience, thank you for inviting me. Allow me to introduce myself and my work. Who are you?"

"I write this down on this board, Who Are You? underscored. You can imagine, it's kind of a whiteboard, like a lecture-hall place, and there is also a slideshow behind me, like a screen for projections."

"Ehm, let me introduce myself. I have six sides, I tried to photograph them yesterday but it didn't really work out, but I will show them to you anyway. You can see them behind me."

"So while I'm talking I turn on the slideshow like you do when you're giving a lecture. And there are these photo's of me."

"My first side is the Writer. The Writer is around 61 years old, you could relate this side to Anna Enquist, I don't know if you know her, she is a Dutch writer. She doesn't eat so much but she smokes all the time. She has lost a child, she writes intelligent, psychological novels and next to her writing practice she has continued to work as a psycho-analyst."

"Actually when I did this performance it was quite hard because I didn't know the text yet, I have

7 The Broom of the System, David Foster Wallace, 2012. London: Abacus.

Application to Critical Making research project
Who am I and how do I do?
Pia Louwerens — Critical Making research consortium
/Artistic Researcher - Application

I had went to a symposium on Gustav Metzger, the artist and inventor of both autodestructive and autocreative art, organised in The Hague. Metzger made it his lifework to fight the institutionalisation and commodification of his work. Autodestruction - works that destroyed themselves during performances (or demonstrations, as he called them) - was one of the ways he answered to the capitalist demands of the art market. The speakers in the symposium attempted to stabilize and historicize his work, which I criticised quite sharply in a review on the symposium for art magazine Tubelight. I proposed the birth of an anti-institutional art history. Instead of being offended, the organiser of the symposium invited me to apply for an open call. The Critical Making research consortium, of which she was part, was looking for an Embedded Artistic Researcher. I wrote for the call and got the job, and from 2019 - 2021 I will be employed as embedded artistic researcher at the Critical Making research consortium.

I consider the research application to be embedded (to stay with the term) in Block II of my research at a.pass. Critical Making comes from a context of Maker Culture, Fablabs and OpenSource design, and concerns itself with the reinvigoration of making practices with criticality, especially those subjected to "the industry".

Because of Nicolas Galeazzi and Kate Rich their question: "How to institute your research?" I spent as lot of time considering the political implications of my methodology and to consider my practice as something more than useful to create my own performances with. Since I had just discovered that I make weird situations - as described by Mark Fisher - and used weird techniques (the sliding through ontological levels, for example), I thought about making an open source inventory of strategies to create all this weirdness. By systematising my approach it might be possible to share methodologies with other people.

In the end I wrote a research question that was twofold: "How can loophole strategies from the digital domain be adapted into narrative and/or performative techniques that create the weird?" and "What performative techniques that create the weird can be used to deconstruct subjectivities, thereby creating space to speculate on other, possibly posthuman, subjectivities?" I gave my research proposal the awkward title *Who am I and how do I do? Performing the weird to experience posthuman subjectivities, or the other way around.*

* University of Leiden
* Hogeschool Rotterdam
- Nieuwe Instituut — e-culture
  Rotterdam   architecture
               design
- Waag Society
  Amsterdam — maker culture
             DIY
→ West Den Haag — my bed (embedded)
                  contemporary art

When is the work being made, and who makes it? What happens in between? Two days ahead of this presentation I recorded the original performance, which was executed in an empty house in Utrecht, in front of an empty table. I made a literal transcript of this slightly depressing recording, which served as the script for So Yeah... - Scripted Glitch. De original performance was completely improvised, so the script was filled with uhh… and So yeah….'s. It was a lecture-performance about improvisation and rehearsal, about the world as reproduction of a script and the possibility to escape from this predetermination. I mention performances, by "That Person" as executed by the artist Matt Mullican, the research of Femke Snelting on rehearsal, and the Blind Brain Hypothesis, a philosophical theory. I performed the script completely, reading and even speedreading some parts, being fed up with it but being stuck in its scripted, glitching tracks.

…uuuuuuhm my name is Pia Louwerens. I am… yeah I'm not super well prepared … ehm… I was asked to do this performance two weeks ago I didn't have so much time to prepare so I'm actually quite unprepared. I'm at the moment interested in water, which is nice because…

[welcome]

…in a way… the same and with making performance … at least in my case I make performances.. aah……I don't know what I… it doesn't… jeahh…. you shouldn't take me too seriously at the moment. But the performances that I make are always one time, and they're always… unique, and they're always, eeeh, so ehm yeah so yeah [sigh] it's basically this, ehm this antici ppp pation, on the moment itself. So I'm now anticipating, for example, on this moment, I should have filmed this by the way. But I'm currently. Yeah. So: I'm anticipating on this moment, you're here, eeeh, well so this is also a condition because you're not actually here. I'm standing in front of an empty table. In a space. Aaaam… yeah I'm leaning now, because I'm not filming. I'm looking forward to it, I'm looking forward to meeting you all. I think it will be really… I think it's really fun here. I guess. So what I'm anticipating on…

[improvisation & anticipation]

I mean it is a nice space. It's superbig and I feel powerful here. I guess I'm on the stage. So yeah. So there are these conditions but I don't know how.. how they really info… how do they inf/ like what am I making right now? The…mmmm.. kind of monster? That you build, the kind of machine you put stuff in and stuff comes out. So these.. yeah… so these..so yeah… so these… so this space where I'm in right now it's yeah… it's weird… it's…

[now Arena]

I'm in Utrecht, I don't really like Utrecht so much, although it's very beautiful where I am. I'm in the house of a friend, and there are so many houses like this around… and they are all exactly the same…they even have the same… so I really like my friend, the're even like my friend, they're like, kind of the same people, with the same kind of tables, with the same… so then what I am saying is quite cynical actually. Which is not what you really… what I really want to say.

[Utrecht the same] *[Utrecht]*

Maybe this is it, when you're not prepared, you're not rehearsed and you say things that you don't want to say. It like… yeah like a nice researcher that I know, she ehm.. she is now working on.. eeehm… so she's this feminist researcher, supercool, busy with technology, mostly, and with computers and programming and stuff, open source stuff, and she's now busy with… that how, how in a revolution, when there is a revolution, when there's like a moment of… of.. demodemonstration, or like, like squatting a place, like in a… pffft… political action I don't know man it's like, you know, it's like my parents speaking about drugs I [mumbling] political revolution, but ehm… but I guess that people get in a revolution they have the tendency to forget their.. actually their values in a way. So they have all these ideas about… eee when…ee you know.. about I think.. guess… gender dynamics, and they have all these ideas, and all these notions and all these values and then suddenly when it's like, trouble, you kind of have the tendency to forget, and suddenly the women are in the kitchen again and the men are like, eeeh … talking about the revolution, it's kind of you have the tendency to when you are in alarm mode, to kind of [snips fingers] fall back on stuff that you know, kind of the norm, and it's kind of these conservative tendencies. So I guess I also so with me these conservative tendencies might be this kind of low voice, nah not low, but like… kind of.. you know… one dimensional voice I guess, and it's this kind of self-doubting thing, and a bit cynical… it's not so nice actually. It's not what I want to make.

[rehearsed & revolution]

It's so difficult to keep the energy when you guys are not here! [sniggers] where are you? I would love… talking to you. But you're not here. I makes me so low. Hmmm. How to get me up? So, there's also fun things. It's not all bad. I'm a bit tired. I had to work today, I was surv.. surveilling? I guess like moderating or paying attention in exams for uns.. how do you call it… schools for Speciaal Onderwijs so for…uhm… for kids with disabilities somehow so with learning disability or like physical disabilities but also mental aff disabilities or autism for example, they are now doing their exams and I was there supervising the exams…

[you're not here]

So yeah so pffft [waving arms clapping] how to get myself up? Here so maybe I should make my imagination much stronger, because my imagination is really lacking at the moment. I'm in a space with you guys! Raising my arms, yeaaaarg, I'm heeere! Anticipppppationnnn! Yeahyeahyeahyeah gogogogoconversation anticiippppppationnnn yeah so I only recently heard about Matt Mullican who, so he does these amazing performances! With about "that person" so he is another person, he becomes hypnotised and then he does all kind of shiiit, that's not him of course because he's hypnotised so he's like completely out of it! He's like completely... so his gallerist and friends and colleagues told him to stop it because it's really embarrassing because he really... he shouts at his audience and then he gets supermean, and... really... inappropriate.. and like... shitting on stage.. really going for it. It's so interesting! I mean he's just not there! And here is there. So these are performances by That Person. He calls it that person. And that person also makes drawings and... yeah. So in a way I guess I'm also now a bit That Person, although that bridge might be too obvious. But hey... that's how the brain works. Because I'm not here, you know, I'm not here. Like.. stuff changed, you know? Apparently. I mean I'm not the person who is telling this now, anymore. I've changed. I don't even understand in what way.

Oh... [moans] I heard something so depressing last week, it was really the most depressing thing. It was a philosophy, I don't know even if I should tell you because I really got in a panic attack when I read this. It's this theory... so clearly I'm going to tell you anyways... about this... that people are really... so they call it the blind brain that they actually... so we kind of de-mythologized everything around us, with our science, you know we killed god, that's clear, everything is now without reason, so the sun is shining not because there's some god making the sun shine, because he's happy, or she's happy and wanted to share her happiness with us, but now we know the cause, we don't know the reason. There is not a reason that the sun is here, it's a cause. You know because there is a big flaming ball of gas somewhere far away... burning... super nice idea btw but whatever, so yeah so we kind of de- de-mythologized and in a way de-psychologized our environment, so we are the last thing that we haven't de-psychologized yet. People are still... we still have the idea that people actually have a reason for doing stuff. So this theory is actually from a science fiction book that in the future they would have... this book is called Neuropath, this science fiction book. Oh yeah, blind brain. So actually we are all, we all have chemicals in our brain doing stuff so we don't have reasons for doing things, our brains do things. And then afterwards we kind of stick a meaning to it. It's just a chemical reaction and this is just an outcome, our conciousness, what we call, which is actually proven because when you, there has been an experiment where you stop the clock, and actually your brain stops it before you stop it. So you think like: now I want to do it, but actually your brain already prepared, and said Now, and then your consciousness is like... doing it. So actually your consciousness is only an executing part of a physical thing in your brain... Yeaaah it's already getting difficult so what's free will, you know? But... the most depressing part was you know we always think that our consciousness is very complex because we see things and and and experience things that are too complex to explain. So for every time I'm like uuuuuh bluuuuh this is really and imperfect representation of what I had in mind, clearly, but, ... what was I saying what was I saying.. imperfect representation... oh yeah so we think we're Soo complex and we're so smart and like wuuu that It's like too much for us to even start to explain, but actually, it's because we are just too stupid. We cannot understand what's going on. So we have the idea that it's a very complex world, but actually it's our brains, they can't really keep up, so this is why they stick all these kind of imperfect weird fragmented realities on it. like chronology, or psychology, or the way that you experience the world. Actually we just cannot paste it together. Like we have a computer but it's glitching. And these glitches we think of as whoohoo the world. But we're just, glitching...
Sooo this was the happy hour, after the sunshine, and I really look forward to having a drink with you all later. [rubbing hands] Thank you for listening! Yay!

Yeah! That Person

Blind Brain Glitch

Context: Block III, School of Love, curator Adva Zakai.
Performance including, tears, laughter, choking on water, drinking breaks, intervention (salt in water) by Vladimir Miller, intervention (explanation on salted water) by Deborah Birch, red eyes, short lecture on eros and aporia, essay *Poiein*[8] by Thomas Schestag, essay *Beyond Aporia?*[9] by Sarah Kofman.

Because of its improvisational nature the performance was to a large extent held or appropriated by the audience, for which I am grateful. I call this phenomenon (the emphatic sharing of "expressive agency" during a performance, either through appropriation, being appropriated or other techniques) decentralization[10].

"For discourses are forces which are no less disturbing and no less dangerous than the sea and its depths: like the sea and like Tartarus, the aporia of discourse are endless; they are *apeirania*, not because there is no limit to their number, but because they cannot be crossed.
(…)
Love gives neither wealth nor wisdom. He neither keeps nor owns anything. He offers only the possibility of incessant and imperishable generation. Acting as a midwife to should does not mean delivering them of a wisdom, a poros which they possess without knowing it. It means creating within them an aporetic vacuum, a vacuum of plenitude which gives them an infinite desire to give birth to that with which they are always-already pregnant: Love."

Beyond Aporia? by Sarah Kofman

2

Beyond Aporia?

SARAH KOFMAN

Translated by David Macey from *Comment s' en sortir?*, Paris, Galilée, 1983

Translator's note

The *Republic*, *The Symposium*, *Phaedrus*, *Charmides* and *Euthydemeus* are cited in Benjamin Jowett's translation; in the case of *The Symposium*, W. Hamilton's translation has also been consulted (Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1951). *Parmenides*, *Theaitetos* and *The Sophist* are cited in John Warrington's translation, London, Everyman's Library, 1961. *Meno* and *Protagoras* are cited in W. K. C. Guthrie's translation, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1956; *Philebus* in Robin A. H. Waterfield's translation, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1982; *Phaedo* in Hugh Tredennick's translation (in *The Last Days of Socrates*, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1954). *Menexeneus* and *The Laws* are cited in R. G. Bury's translation, London, Heinemann, Loeb Classical Library, 1929 and 1926.
Existing translations have occasionally been modified to take into account discrepancies between the French and English versions.

---

[8] Poiein, Thomas Schestag in Poiesis, Nathan Brown & Petar Milat (ed.), 2017. Zagreb: Multimedijalni institut.

[9] Beyond Aporia? Sarah Kofman in Post-structuralist Classics, Andrew Benjamin (ed.), 1988. London & New York: Routledge.

[10] Inspired by Femke Snelting, who mentioned this concept in relation to networks and computational infrastructures.

Hello everyone.
        Soft for the institution

I took up the challenge to write a stable text about my research. So right now I am not the unreliable narrator that you know me as, but I am reliable Pia Louwerens, the researcher. I looked deep into the abyss of what I do and this text is meant to share my findings with you. It turns out that I have made quite a machine, in which many things are entangled and make strange circles, so bear with me. I was especially interested in what this method or machine does in the context it is presented in, which is the hard part of course.

I tried writing an introduction but it became as long as the presentation itself, so I will just start. I would like to start with the main tool in my work, the problem of the script. A script is in itself a problem, because it has another time but can be parallel to this one. This script can say: I am writing this right now", which it actually does, but it's a problem because I follow the script to my best intentions and the script is not lying, I'm actually writing right now. But who is saying this, and when? So with the script it splits, there are two voices speaking at the same time. This principle I call **Presentation: Seeing double.** Seeing double because of the two voices, and Presentation because it is actualized only through presentation.

In my work I use many kinds of these techniques that may cause you to see double. I use overlay storylines for example, in which there is another possibility that might have happened (an artwork right here, that I might have made), also the combination of acting and confession might cause you to see double, where the acting of a script makes me artificial, but the element of confession brings it back to "actually just me". You see how these are all related to the script. There is also Frankenstein, which is a collage body, a stitched body from separate elements coming or not to life together. For example: an attempt to create the now by combining the past and the future. Or the work "Retrospectief (Bellen met mijn Werk)" in which I called all my performances to introduce Pia Louwerens to a new audience. Which was a 30-minute long videoperformance. In practice this means that a work or script consists of separate parts, which are combined both succesfully and unsuccesfully to create something else. This both alive and dead at the same time is very important here.

I said that this is actualised only through presentation, and I suspect that you can bring this problem back to the idea of both something and it's representation, which is a very fine art thing to do. Adrijana pointed out to me that the context of fine art, so the making of art objects, is still very much the frame of reference I respond to. And when I talk about presentation this is where the context of **the institution** comes in. My context are pre-existing performative situations within institutions, including art itself as an institution. Institutions are structures of repetition. They create habits and expectations. The expectations serve as a cut-out shape, a space of a certain size or shape that is held by the audience, in collaboration with the institution. I use this space to present my work, which is also myself. The space which is created by the institution, for example the space of the artwork, is a space where things are made and actualized. In my perspective the things don't get made in the studio, but at the moment of exhibition. You can imagine the Frankenstein who was constructed in the studio getting a shock of life. At the moment I'm in a bit of a theoretical crossroads, where I don't know which visions to follow and not, but I found the way that Timothy Morton describes the entanglement of being and appearing very useful.
He explains appearance of something connected directly to the essence of something, but always on the other side as a Mobius strip, which is also the same side. Here is where I think *presenting* - the thing appearing and *making/becoming* are closely connected. This might be the reason why I feel the desire to inhabit that space.

[handwritten margin notes:]
all ways of making
But not just any body... any elements
the place of the cut is in-titiuted

how to read this through in Barad? → that the making makes both me's as a subject and the work
tell it do these things the institution what is this?

↳ So to present something is to make/became something
But there is also always a gap. The way that something appears is always slightly different from the essence of that thing, but is always fundamentally connected to that thing of course this is a question of the "beholder"