

Preparatory notes, May 30, 2024, 19:00–21:00, di volta in volta, 18 rue Volta, 75003 Paris¹

P1) Does it make sense (good life for all, social justice) to differentiate between useful (good life for all, social justice) and non-useful parts of the art field?

Does the idea of differentiating between the practice and the field of art in general make sense, and is it possible to think of usable fields of discourse at all? Do usable fields exist?

P2) Is the field of art (and its forms) too mined to create useful concepts and chains of equivalence through reinterpretation and to use these in a practical ways?

The art field is characterized by corporatist and formalist emancipation strategies and resists evaluation through regimes of representation and irrational leaps of faith.

P3) Creating the 'We' or rejecting the 'We'?

We = I. In the field of visual arts and the context of possessive individuation, as well as corrupt-familial communities of solidarity, alliances are initially to be rejected. Does that make any sense? For example: Naive realism of possessive attribution automatically assigns authorship.

P4) How to prevent relationality from becoming relativity?

If we assume that overcoming a traditional subject status (unity of voice, body and social status) through speaker positions in the relational field is desirable, there is a danger of losing materialisms (ideas as results of material conditions) through its theoretical/semantic articulation?

–

V1) How to construct alternative modes of the institutionalization of art ?

There is problematic relationship between the rationality of construction, as the building up of an object through a combination of pre-existent parts, and art's functionlessness or 'unplanned arbitrariness'. How can new artistic materials and forms of construction express the latest forms of social rationalization, autonomously, while at the same time being critical of the social limitations imposed by the institutionalization of autonomy itself?

V2) How does the collective subvert the individualistic assumptions behind the conception of autonomous art?

If the notion of autonomy continues to pertain to individual subjects, thus autonomous art would provide no more than an immanent criticism of liberal capitalist societies, through which figures the possibility of a free individual praxis, to the extent to which it can generate the appearance or illusion of autonomy, as a set of institutional and social conditions reflectively incorporated.

V3) How to produce new social protocols that do not answer the economical imperatives of innovation and adaptation ?

In evolutionary economy, the introduction of new techniques are comparable to "mutations" in a darwinian field of competition where innovations apply a selective pressure on strategies of adaptation. This process of renewal of means of productions make growth possible. It relies on a constant production and exploitation of new informations, while creating an environment of ignorance and uncertainty.

V4) How to avoid the formal subsumption of experimental social practices into art and its exhibition?

Formal subsumption, or the subsumption of an existing labour process to the social relations of the production of value, has a temporal-cultural version: the modern as the abstractly new, or the 'everself same', becomes the social form through which the avant-garde as the qualitatively historically new achieves a generalized social appearance, in the wake of its failure to be actualized politically.

¹ Preparatory notes P1 to P4 by Program – 23 and V1 to V4 by Jean Bourgois at di volta in volta, on the occasion of a talk by and a discussion with SdA – Strategien der Aufstandsbekämpfung / Counterinsurgency Strategies (present: Julia Eichler and Fabian Ginsberg).