



# TECTONIC FRIENDSHIP



# contents

## Typology of Questions

<b>Introduction</b> MEDIUM SCORE - BLOCK 2017/II SCORESCAPES - Thinking Scores as a pedagogical tool	<b>4</b>
---	----------

<b>Medium Score Instructions:</b> M&M MEDIUM & METHODOLOGY	<b>7</b>
---	----------

<b>Tectonic Friendship</b>	<b>10</b>
----------------------------	-----------

<b>Medium Score keywords</b>	<b>22</b>
------------------------------	-----------

## Typology of Questions

## Medium Score - Block 2017/II

### SCORESCAPES - Thinking scores as pedagogical tool

Lilia Mestre

*Scores here refer to weekly encounters where the participants engage in a question and answer process. The material of the score is the participant's research and can be expressed in several forms such as writing, performance, situations, objects...*

The a.pass Post-master Program summer block 2017, titled *The Problem of the Score* focused and questioned how 'formal structures' predetermine outcomes and imply relationality. "The Medium Score," serving this question, was the fourth iteration of SCORESCAPES, research by Block Curator Lilia Mestre on collaborative tools for production, pedagogy and discourse.

Score in this framework is seen as a dispositive of collaboration, tying together a plurality of concerns of a.pass researchers. As such, it is a learning-through-practice that proposes to address the discursiveness of art practice by proposing a dialogue through different aesthetic formats (not just language).

SCORESCAPES bears witness to affective relationships for understanding the self and the collective through acts of gathering and attending to varied modes of being with their respective backgrounds, moods, sensibilities, political concerns, and theories. Acting as a system that establishes questions and answers set in time and place, the scores propose regular encounters as conditions for intensive exchange. They propose a system of interaction where varied aesthetic experiences coexist, complement, challenge and inspire otherness with the potential to trace it. The Score wishes to underline the importance of the experiential aspect of things as a thinking-partner.

If artistic research actively searches for ways to maintain viability of our relationship with the world, how can scores mediate this search? If artistic research engages processes of awakening unseen phenomenological relations with our surroundings, how do we then compose materials and thought? What is the performativity at stake in the sharing of materials/thoughts we make? What is the relationship between individuality and collectivity? How does this impact our individual practices and relationships to the collective?

The score engenders the importance of art practice and research as a discursive tool. It pushes an assemblage of layers – philosophical, emotional, aesthetic, economic, critical, social – forms of reflection on the world and the role of art within it. Because every artwork is constructed on multiple layers of meaning, the context of artistic research is always variable and singular and therefore a contribution to a plural approach of relations and potential worlds.

Through the practice of the Medium Score we experienced and problematized the fact every system is a network, and the way a system functions defines forms of relating that reveal ideological standpoints. In other words: ways of interacting are forces that format and construct worlds. If we consider this, what kind of problems do our research structures provoke? If we can think as a polyphonic world constituted by multiple models, how do we consider our own structure as a relational one? What kind of technologies do we put into place? What kind of invitation are we making? To whom? To open these questions further we practiced the Medium Score during the three months of the summer block.

Through the weekly questions and answers that dismantle and rebuild the propositions, the spectrum of relationality comes to the fore: creating links of different consistencies with other fields. Like arms reaching out to other concerns that would have potentially remained unseen. This process also helped delineate what systems of governance is at stake in each of the participants research by positioning them as operational structures. Notions of “apparatus” and “tentacular thinking” were key to understanding and experiencing the problems of the score in each of the researchers’ propositions. The problem here is not an obstacle but a question worth addressing to make tangible the liaison between this research and the world. On the one hand “apparatuses,” as coined by Foucault and Agamben, are systems of governance that enable relationships between beings and structures through which the subject is constructed. Alternatively, Donna Haraway introduces tentacular thinking as a place from which one can build relations to economical, biological, philosophical, productional, and institutional orders. Together with the a.pass researchers, workshop-organizers and guests, we reflected on this and challenged our methods in relation to other authors and artists to situate our practices and research questions.

To think the medium through which each research articulates, composes and exposes their concepts enabled a reflection upon the conditions any medium entails. It was a way to make visible the inherent authority of each medium and its relation to the content of the proposals.

# 6

The transversal use of media causes the confrontation between several systems of governance inducing other approaches into the understanding of affective relations. *The problem of score* manifested itself in these relations and the politics they propose.

This publication serves the SCORESCAPES research and the End-Communications of six a.pass researchers. It builds on the previous iterations of scores as tools to practice dialogue and intersubjective formats for exchange in artistic research.

The following text, “Tectonic Friendship”, was made through the Medium Score and it serves as an expansion to this introduction.

Additionally, we produced a poster with a Typology of Questions reviewing all kind of questions launched from the practice of the Medium Score.

Before finishing the a.pass program in May 2018, the six researchers Luisa Fillitz, Esther Rodríguez-Barbero Granado, Eunkyung Jeong, Marialena Marouda, Ekaterina Kaplunova, Shervin Kiarnesi Haghghi worked for a month and a half in an adapted score to produce this publication. More information can be found in the following pages.

The scores’ instructions in this booklet are copy left and to be used as pleased.

Together with the a.pass researchers (mentioned opposite), workshop-organizers (Jennifer Lacey, Vladimir Miller, Anouk Llaurens) and guests (Alex Arteaga), we reflected on this and challenged our methods in relation to other authors and artists to situate our practices and research questions. With Sofia Caesar we organised the seminar *The document Transformed* in La Bellone (House of performing arts), Brussels with Kobe Matthys, Vincent Meessen, Femke Snelting and Olga de Soto, in an attempt to give sight to the power relations engendered by apparatuses of documentation.

# MEDIUM SCORE INSTRUCTIONS :

## M&M – Medium & Methodology

### MEDIUM

→ Choose a medium.

### METHODOLOGY

→ Always answer questions with the same medium. Be aware the medium can change only once and will require an explanation why..

→ Through the practice of the score, the methodological approach of singular researchers will emerge by the way participants compose their replies. The score allows for the cognition of individual methodological approaches.

### INSTRUCTIONS

→ Meet every week on the same day for four hours.

→ Bring food to share.

→ Work only with the people present. It is not possible to participate remotely by email or other means.

→ There is no public. The participants of the score are their own audience.

→ If there is no work to present skip a session.

→ Dinner and keywords: at the end of each session use keywords to have general discussion about the session. Share your dinner!

**TO START:**

## The gift

Upon first meeting, participants will present a five-minute sample of their research question. The sample is communicated as performance, text, object, and dissertation. It will manifest the content of the research and the medium through which the research is taking place.

## The questions

- **Chance:** After attending each presentation, the assignment of who will be asking questions to whom by chance procedure will occur.
- **Time:** Each participant has two days to formulate a question and send it to the person s/he is assigned to. Questions are sent by email.
- The questions are a tool to engage in the discursiveness of artistic practice and research. They aim to argue what is at stake, what are the implications and further relations in the artistic research environment. They are the indicators of the dialogical potential of each research project. They are the motor of a process of sharing, contaminating, contradicting, thinking, and making together.
- Questions are an intrinsic and important component of the score. Think them, contextualize them, offer them.

## The replies

- After receiving the question, participants will have five days to develop an answer with the chosen medium. A reply will be presented the following session within a five-minute time frame.
- After all replies have been presented, questions are then reassigned again by chance procedure. This process recommences every week until a pre-established end date.

**MEDIUMS:**

**ESTHER RODRÍGUEZ-BARBERO  
GRANADO:** performance

**SHERVIN KIANERSI HAGHIGHI:**  
small action on a concept (cards)

**XIRI NOIR:** text

**SVEN DEHENS:** text

**LEO KAY:** being together  
(collaborative performance)

**ESTA MATKOVIC:** applied text  
(documentation)

**MARIALENA MAROUDA:** telling  
and listening (conversation)

**ELEN BRAGA:** mixed body >  
antropo-morphic adaptation  
(practical demonstration)

**LUISA FILLITZ:** sound as a medi-  
um for space sensing ( installation /  
movement )

**SINA SEIFEE:** hypertext

**HODA SIAHTIRI:** recital

**ESZTER NEMETHI:** automated  
performance

**LILIA MESTRE:** text > performative  
text (forms of writing and using lan-  
guage) ( performance)

**VLADIMIR MILLER:** lecture  
performance

**EKATERINA KAPLUNOVA:** collecting  
stories and transforming them

**MAARTEN VAN DEN BUSSCHE:**  
written or printed on paper (text)

**ZOUMANA MÉITÉ:** Sony microcas-  
sette-corder M-475 (Recorder)

**KRISTIEN VAN DEN BRANDE:** letter

# Tectonic Friendship

Lilia Mestre

1. They arrive here, coming from different places and times. They come with ideas, stories, feelings, relations and holes. They don't know where they are going. Each of them knows what kind of language they will use to communicate with each other. They don't know how they will be understood. They have a bag full of goodies. They decide to spend some time together. They think poetics are a form of knowledge and they need to put these poetics in contact with others. They take themselves as vehicles and containers. They use art processes to expose sensibles as guidelines for the future. They want to create potential for the unforeseen. To play. To redistribute values and create utopias. To put into motion the models they have and challenge them. They are fervent. Serious. Caring. Critical. Emancipated. Beautiful. Difficult. They are young and old. Human and animal. Thing and thought. Movement and stillness. Together and apart. From here and there. They gather often. They make things happen from which they learn about themselves and the world around them. They collect information: newspaper clippings, smells, theories, hard science equations, dances, fictions, historical facts... They prioritize modes of relation as a political force. They meet to understand how to relate, think, and move. They are obsessed with detail. They are careless. Something about them is ungraspable. They are consistent. They listen. They look. They feel.

2. "To disindividuate Relation is to relate the theory to the lived experience of every form of humanity in its singularity. This means returning to the opacities, which produce every exception, are propelled by every divergence, and live through becoming involved not with projects but with the reflected density of existences." E. Glissant

3. *Imagine we are bodies of affect. Imagine we react, interact every second of our existence with the existence of everything we encounter. Imagine we are aware of an infinitesimal part of that interaction. Imagine there is a universe of exploration possible. Imagine we like it and we are not afraid. Imagine this excites potential. Imagine play.*

4. This score proposes a form of sociability. It is an artificial organism seeking its own survival, its own sustainability. It is a venture to articulate our artificial nature through the recreation of a time-space relational environment. Where are we? In a laboratory set-up we study the performativity inherent in the gesture, the word, the line, the eye, the mind, the guts and anywhere else. We are in a

constructed framework exhibiting an ecology of affects between the ruling system, the players, and the viewers. We are all part of it and we all contribute in one way or another to the life-ability of this observatory with the knowledge we have gathered so far. At the end, this microlandscape searching for its borders wants to create an interface of awareness for the sensible.

5. "Friendship is a fundamental aspect of personal support, a condition for doing things together; I'd like to address it as a specific model of relationship in the large question of how to live and work together – and autonomously – towards change, as a way to act in the world. Friendship, like support, is considered here as an essentially political relationship, one of allegiance and responsibility. Being a friend entails a commitment, a decision, and encompasses the implied positionings that any activity in culture entails. In relation to my practice, friendship is, at its most relevant, in relation to a labor process: as a way of working together. The line of thought that threads through the following material therefore, is that of friendship as a form of solidarity: friends in action." C. Condorelli

6. A central concern here is the development of modes of being together with our individual backgrounds, moods, and sensibilities. All visitors of the practice are invited to observe and play. The score manifests the way the researchers envisage a life-art laboratory for multidisciplinary practices and multifocal presences. It is an attempt to shift from an art-to-look-at to an art-to-experience.

*7. Imagine life transpires through under currents. One moves through space alone together like in an apartment building, like in the forest.*

8. And we are not alone. The score is a control device, it is a perverse partner. It dictates ways of functioning, modes of presence. It is a self-regulator, a self-dictator. It makes one be here and now in an extreme state of alertness. The stricter the score, the more it frames its reading and interpretation, but consequently provokes trouble and friction. Creating boundaries to break and wanting to test out parameters can imply a form of resistance. The eternal quest to understand and the eternal impossibility of achieving this understanding, leaves us with the wonderful possibility of experimentation.

*9. Imagine the becoming of the subject takes place in experiences of interiorization and exteriorization of the world. Imagine the subject as an agent of change through which its own transformation in the collective terrain participates actively in the collective. Imagine the arts as a manifestation of that transformation and that transformation as a form of political engagement.*

10. "I don't propose a political theory because what I'm saying, specifically on friendship and hospitality, on what friendship is and what hospitality is, exceeds, precisely, knowledge. In its extreme and more essential form it has to do with something which cannot become a theorem, it is something which simply has to be known, there is some type of experience, of political experience in friendship and hospitality which cannot be simply the object of a theory."  
J. Derrida

11. The unexpected and unforeseen event is always a surprise. It's a call to pay attention to the performative aspect of art, to the condition of its existence as experiential and ephemeral event. The score as a poetic machine presents a paradox: between its extreme precision on the one hand and the unpredictability of the events that it can produce on the other. This formal paradox allows for the emergence of aesthetic and ethical concerns giving place to imagining possible worlds. The emerging events have an autonomy of their own because they are in relation to conditions that are not subjective but producing subjectivities. Something is happening in relation to another thing and another thing and another thing. The poetic machine also has its agency beyond the visible and in a heightened sense of presence beyond ownership.

12. I reply: Conceptually I call the score a perverse partner. I create rules to understand its limits. I'm interested in creating a pressure system based on friendship that makes me do and think around it. It's a working tool. I'm seeing the score has a proposition to organize time, space and interpretation through a form of reciprocity that can be repeated. What happens when I practice the practice? It's definitely a disciplinary system for undisciplined people.

13. *Imagine the now is the condition of the present in presence and where things happen. There is no time after all. At this moment we are all here.*

14. I'm sad today. I'm referring to poetics as aesthetic experience. The bringing into form to process the world. I'm thinking poetics as propositions, as frames that are not conclusive or universal to interpret what we perceive.

I'm positioning art making as knowledge processing, as phenomena that attaches us to how we construct potential realities. The complexity inherent to these experiences opens space to relate to what we don't know yet, to create networks of connections that embrace different realms. These experiences make us feel, think, and act as critical beings. They expose us to forces that enable us to become subjects individually and collectively. They orient, position, and narrate situations.

15. *They came along again. It's hot. It's like in a dream. People are hanging around alone or in groups. Standing. Kneeling. Sleeping. Talking. Standing. Standing still. There are plants, paper pillows, plexiglass colored plates, pens, bicycles, rests of food, wooden structures, a scaffolder, a disco ball, a long red tube, glue, lamps, strings, electric cables, trolleys, coffee cups, a hammer, shoes, a microwave, a red cloth, a yellow plastic, a mirror, styrofoam, a yellow beanbag, a cube made of wooden sticks, a string shiny curtain, wooden plates, words, colored string, an electric saw, meditation pillows and hidden yoga mats, a printer, pots and pans, garbage bags. All is suspended in the heat. Here and there, floating. It's almost time.*

16. I agree with you when you say one should be on the look out for the negotiable and nonnegotiable parts of a given system. I wouldn't want to play otherwise.

17. This score is a practice, it's not a one time go. It's not a place to visit; it's not interesting to look at from the outside. What is interesting is to

practice it and to see in the doing where the limits are that it instigates. To challenge the limits of critical engagement, politeness, authority, interest, contamination, mimicry, subject matter, authorship, deconstruction, aesthetics, generosity, in the frame of it's limits. But again scores are moldable. They are made of parameters that can be changed, erased, added. Like any law.

*18. They could have decided to stay mute, to make a humming choir, or to have live interviews with one another to unleash the questions. But they decided to write because that's what they were working on. After the practice of reading the questions out loud, there is nothing settled any longer. Except maybe the invitation to hang out and eat together. They hung out for hours in diverse places. They were together alone. They created and dismantled senses and feelings. They got drunk.*

19. Back to the place where the machine can be tweaked. How is this done? I don't know. The only way to question is to ask questions that take the time to vocalize potential transformations.

20. We are all responsible for space through the engagement to play the game, through the challenge of the mediums into restrictions, to the formulation of possibilities and impossibilities by doing and realizing something. It's like squeezing a pimple. One can unfold and challenge the parameters of one's own predictability. It needs persistence.

21. I wrote it. I deleted it. I wrote it. I'm interested in seeing how I can bring other realms of my life to the experience of the score. Maybe it will become a diary. A dear friend's confession. The process is on the process. I don't know yet. For the moment I'm answering your question with a lot of voices around me trying to understand what the intention of it is and how I can take the best out of it.

22. “What is an apparatus?” G. Agamben

23. If it is an apparatus? Yes in my understanding of it. I apply this term in the sense that it is a constructed system interdependent of others systems. It is a structure created to respond to the environment of a pass, to the environment of art production, and art process as a starting point. Then I can speak about it as a system that proposes to manifest what criticality is, what is part of the whole, what is the inquiry of artwork, discursiveness, intersubjective environment, and authorship.

24. “In the beginning I believed you were writing letters. An epistolary correspondence. You start with ‘Dear V’ and my imagination starts flowing in a specific genre.

I really appreciate the mix between the personal and the manifesto... Or a courrier du lecteur as if you own a magazine. Yes I get sparked and I liked it. It's funny because I fit in this way of writing as if your presentation was an invitation to correspond. Easy to take time to select my purpose but not easy to choose my words. Or just to express the optimal reaction. I read from the beginning of the google doc and discovered it is not an addressed letter.

But I like to feel as a purloined element of your performance. Purloined and close enough to feel privilege in continued correspondence. I am jealous of the bound you create with V. Not in a lovers way but in the sense of intellectual affinity." Z. Meite

25. I like the idea of the *courier du lecteur* (mail of the reader). Already on the limits of the public and the private. How do you imagine writers? Where do they sit when they are writing? At what time do they write? What is their view? Are they alone? Who are they addressing? They are addressing the reader. You. Are you already here? An individual togetherness takes place. Curiosity and investment in the other. This engagement starts by being artificial but ends up close enough, on the edge of the intimate. I started writing by spurts because I was having dinner. It was calm and I was just hearing the sound of my teeth chewing.

26. "The fact you could not finish the reading of your letter in five minutes frustrates me. Even if I know the possibility to read your text after the presentation (which is a great opportunity to fill my English gap) I still have the sensation to be abused by the sustainability of this medium and its agency to avoid or cheat the time frame..."

maybe the rules. Do you consider it as a way to reveal the limit of the medium score apparatus?

The context of the sustainability of your medium is structured by computer and particularly google drive, which is an important collaborator of the medium score. I wonder how it changes something in the production and the reception of your performance.

For my reception I can say that I use the same computer to correspond with other people in singular context, to write notes, to organize my daily life, to watch movies, to answer in a hurry to certain mails, to get information, news, pokes, likes, etc... Now I am writing outside. Thanks to my portable PC." Z. Meite

27. The incompleteness, the not completely done, the expectation of the fulfillment of the answer, the five minute time frame, the absence of the replier, are all conditions for the unfulfillment of the expectations the score promises. They are the conditions to make attempts about something. They are provocations. Rules are provocations. The complete understanding of the whatever relation that is there with the rules will always be the one of dissatisfaction even if one does it right, whatever that means. These

artificial conditions are a way to reveal borders, liminal spaces, ways of functioning, but maybe more so they are tools to persevere in establishing relations with semi-strangers. To go over the borders of one self in terms of engagement with the other.

28. "The score contains common context; the computer, personal context. What is the relation between time framed performance in semipublic and google drive framed performance in individuality? Is it possible to question/challenge google drive (your source of sustainability) through what you design as your medium (performative text, correspondence)?" Z. Meite

29. Dear reader, what happens when one knows that everyone reads the questions? That this seemingly intimate relation is actually public? What happens when you stay with the "performance" of another during some days and with the question of another for others? This relation between you and another is not just for you and the other but also for others. Like a gift without return. Maybe this score is a public love affair.

30. It fits google.

31. I write. I stop. I check the meaning of a word. The spelling. Look for texts. Get distracted. Focus again. My capacity of writing is embedded in the technologic tool I'm using. Makes me think about what an analogue score would do. What

if we used letter writing and sent them by post instead of using email and google drive? Paper instead of screens? What would handwriting look like? It would be a beautiful project I think. But where would we gather the common? How often do we need to be in each other's presence?

32. Shall we try Framasoft? Interfaces of shareability and communication through portable devices are inherent to our ways of processing information, our ways of thinking.

*33. They continued meeting. They changed the hour of the meeting so they could be more awake. Their eyes were shiny. Music was playing. They arranged themselves around the tables slowly. Music was playing. There were some bananas and a box of dates. They started late. They always did. They were adjusting to the new schedule. Someone closed the door. They were suddenly quiet, the air was thick around them. It was hot, very hot. It seemed they had to hold their breath for a while. Or rather breathe slowly like through a straw. A continuous in and out of air. Fading pace, finding peace. They were lizards. Attentive, alert, opening their pores as much as they could. On hold like nature. And then the good news arrived and they relaxed. They looked into each other eyes. They were in love.*

34. I think we are becoming friends through collaboration. There is an agreement to engage in each other's work, to support, to be honest, to be loyal, to be understanding, to consent, to betray, to excuse, to let go... friendship. Sometimes I think it is about practicing life in terms of practicing relations and contents. Practicing being alone together. Cohabiting.

35. There is the question of the audience that we are to each other. The observation of the relations that we are having to each other and how they spill to the group, how are they perceived outside of the intimate weekly combinations? Is this then community, collectivity? Or family? A constructed family.

36. “On the fact that audiences produce meaning not simply through the subjectivities they project on artworks whose circuits of meanings they complete, but they produce meaning through relations with one another and through the temporality of the event of the exhibition or the display.” E. Rogoff

37. I’m thinking about the space of utopia and its relation to the guts. A large space of indeterminacy. A space that is protected by belief and by action. Auto-sustained and fragile. I keep thinking about the soft ball eyes that S brought into his presentation- not as things to pay attention to. It’s here, don’t pay attention to it. What are those things we don’t pay attention to? And what is the set up that makes that possible? How do we open the spectrum of relationality?

38. “The opaque is not the obscure, though it is possible for it to be so and be accepted as such. It is that which cannot be reduced, which is the most perennial guarantee of participation and continuance.” E. Glissant

39. But we are not friends. We agreed to be friends and maybe in that way we can construct possible worlds. And in this sense yes it is like E’s contracts. Through this we share the responsibility of sustaining or not sustaining the contract, of investigating its conditions and outcomes. The score is a research project as much as friendship is a research project. Once friendship stops being a research project what does it become? Is it still friendship? We might become friends or not, that’s not the focus of the score.

40. “To speak of collectivities is to denaturize community, to argue it away from the numerous essential roots of place and race and kinship structures that have for so long been the glue that has held it together. Equally, to speak of mutualities is to think against the grain of ideological mobilizations that are grounded in the pursuit of an end, of a conclusion, of a resolution. To replace that ideologi-

cal imperative with the ongoing processes of low-key participations that ebbs and flows at a barely conscious level.” E. Rogoff

41. *They were blind for a given amount of time. They volunteered. I kept my eyes opened not following what was suggested. I saw people’s fingers embedded in objects as if they were searching for connection. A form of eroticism without sex. Seeking substance, nothing more than substance. A modernist idea. I will write about this. About the attempt to eroticize the world. The knowledge was empirical and couldn’t be proved. They sustain and practice the ability to stay connected without aim. They followed. They became. They silenced something. But what? The here and now became intense. Time extended beyond frames.*

42. *Imagine they sit around a table. A large table. Imagine they have a task and they agree to pursue it. Imagine trust. Imagine two of them are on top and middle of the table. One is still and the other is caressing her. Imagine the proposition is to draw the center figures with eyes closed. Imagine they can open their eyes several times but just for one second.*

## LEGEND

| *Fiction*

| Quotations of myself (previous publications), or of others

| *Fiction addressing the reader*

| Replies to questions I received  
in the Medium Score practice

| Questions I received  
in the Medium Score  
practice

## Medium Score keywords

### SESSION

# 1

autobiography -to be back in a sec - how to write - rhetoric of pronouns - poetry - mix body - recitation - self made medium - voice

### SESSION

# 2

reflection - surface - participation - voice of a witness - synchronicity / asynchronicity - co-dependence - the beast - silence - conversation - interface - water - to be wet on both ends - architecture -rig - messiness - putting things together - absence

### SESSION

# 3

medium - narrative - structure - liquidity (linked to water / spitting words) - suspension (anti gravity / expectation) - assemblage -

### SESSION

# 4

intimacy - intimatization - diving - playback (re) - instructed collaboration ( guinea pig; maintenance; facilitator,) volunteers - dependency - love as medium - friendship as score violence - clustering - (circular) social scenographies = modes of reception - structures of sharing ( failure/success) physical (inclusion / exclusion)

### SESSION

# 7

Autonomy of the artwork, when does such entity appear? \ empiricism (all pretty practice based) \ Haptic \ NO SHAMAN / discursive sensoriality :

sens-so-real : sens-surreal \ proprioception, maybe not as aim, but as tool, appropioception? \ experience-iental / even less alphabet >< heavy articulated questions / the making visible of the mechanics \ RE-WINDing -

### SESSION

# 8

the question of the question (without) \?/ space created (held together) by sound /-> soundspacement ; sonic space / Transcoding - Delating - F(out)iguring \ disp(l)acing perception (dis-pacing, changing speed, waiting \ di-spacing -> two perceptions) / [HANDLING WITH CARE] \ NO SKELETON \ cadence\*\*\* / exposure! (dragon)

### SESSION

# 9

conversational mode leaking in - papy/papered stuff holding answers and questions- Geographies, a notion of this-that-place in the narrative, localing- operative media, 'saying it' -"Look at this" or "look inside" or "look from" or "look..."- preparatory spill (from last week to this week)

### SESSION

# 10

Pattern of unreliable questions - Document- Borrowed materials (third party material; place of the reference; via voice)- Para-presence (invoking; Channeling men) - Delay- Having the cake - Particigazing / spect-actor-Confession-Meta-narrative; contextualisation-Transportation



# MEDIUM SCORE

---

## TECTONIC FRIENDSHIP

**This publication presents the SCORESCAPES research-scores as a pedagogical tool - by Lilia Mestre as well as the End-Communications of six a.pass researchers.**

Medium Score builds on the previous iterations of scores as tools to practice dialogue and intersubjective formats for exchange in artistic research. Before finishing the a.pass program in May 2018, the six researchers Luisa Fil-litz, Esther Rodriguez-Barbero Granado, Eunkyung Jeong, Marialena Marouda, Ekaterina Kaplunova and Shervin Kiarnesi Haghighi worked for a month and a half in an adapted Writing Score to produce this publication.

---

Every four months, each time at a different venue, a different group of a.pass researchers conclude their trajectory with an End-Communication.

a.pass is an international platform for artistic research practices, based on the principles of self-organization, collaboration and trans-disciplinarity.

Out of the notions of performativity and performative space, a.pass offers researchers the possibility to critically develop their knowledge as independent artistic researchers in a collective learning environment, constructing their individualized curriculum in constant dialogue with the other participants.