THE NEW COMMERCIALIST

(a review)

NO. 3

1981

On Methodology



| | 185504 | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--------|------------------|--|---------|---------|-------|--|
| FRAN NOW (ve) | NAMES | B (parts) | The Making of Mass Mentality The City: Urbanity as Method | 1-9 | (pages) | DATES | 1980 |
| BRAD LAPIN | MES | C | The City: Urbanity as Method | 10-18 | | S | 1979 |
| CHAUNCEY HARE | | D | Art, Technology and the Environment | 19-34 | | | 1979-1980 |
| GEOFFREY COOK | | E | Letters of Inquiry | 35-55 | | | 1978-1980 |
| PETER D'AGOSTINO | | F | Proposal for Qube | 56-60 | | | 1978-1980 |
| ED MYCUE | | G | Methodology as a Theory of Sequence | 61-81 | | | 1978 |
| MEYER HIRSCH | | Н | Aspiration (part 1) | 82-87 | | | 1979 |
| MARK GILLILAND | | 1 | Syntax of Thought | 88-94 | | | 1978 |
| DONNA-LEE PHILLIPS | | J | The Abdomen (from Anatomical Insights) | 95–107 | | | 1978 |
| LAWRENCE FIXEL | | K | Glimmers | 108-118 | | | 1979 |
| GEORGE WESCOTT | | L | Fay's Holiday | 119-133 | | | 1979 |
| STEVE ABBOTT | | M | Manifesto Methodology in Relation to Art | 134–139 | | | 1979 |
| LUTZ BACHER | | N | I Am 36 Exposures: An Analysis | 140–167 | | | 1979 |
| RICHARD IRWIN | | 0 | The Working Class Hero Stripped Bare by His Bosses Even | 168-179 | | | 1980 |
| IRENE BORGER | | P | Stopping the World: Photograph as Myth | 180-190 | | | 1980 |
| CARTER RATCLIFF | | Q | Richard Misrach: Words and Images | 191–197 | | | 1980 |
| GEORGE MYERS, JR. | | R | Lew Thomas: Culture and Anarchy | 198-200 | | | 1979 |
| JANE BOWERS | | S | Language as Theater: The Plays of Gertrude Stein | 201–214 | | | 1980 |
| KRISTINE STILES | | T | Description of an aggression-action | 215–220 | | | 1980 |
| LYNNE HOLYOKE (inside cov | ers) | | 28th Street, San Diego 1942 | | | | (1979) |
| | | CAL THE # 4 6 CO | | | | | The state of the s |

KRISTINE STILES

Description of an aggression-action

1980

On the night of July 19, 1980 at JETWAVE, Bruce Gluck and I, working with a pre-determined score, realized the following improvisation.

While individuals waited during a ten minute intermission between a "performance" which preceded our own, we gradually removed all chairs or benches from the room, at times taking them directly from people who remained seated as they waited. Once we had begun to get people to their feet, they bought beer, talked and became social with one another. Prior to the removal of seats, a respectful hush and low toned conversation suggested that these individuals felt themselves to be an "audience". This removal procedure began our attempt to alter, interrupt, even to destroy the proscenium arrangement thus far established by the "acts" before us. We object to the theatrical setting which has come to represent most activities using live medium. What was once an experimental arena of art, live action, has become degraded and commercialized encouraging the very passivity which its original invention had sought to explode.

Once the theatrical seating arrangement had been destroyed and the room returned to its socializing function, people became engaged again in natural conversation. As they stood talking, a pre-recorded tape-loop began to project into the room, above this conversation. At first quietly, just barely audible then louder and louder until it interrupted conversation.

The tape was structured as follows: We recorded a series of questions, alternating between the man's voice (Bruce) and the woman's voice (my own) asking question with thirty-second intervals of silence between the questions. The questions were:

Are you isolated?
Did you make a choice to be here?
Are your fears real?
What were your expectations when coming here?
Do you own a toaster?
Do you want entertainment?
Are you bored?
Are you deceptive?
Do you have a choice?
Do you have an alterior motive?
Could you recognize change?
Would you instigate change?
Is this making you vulnerable?
What are your chances of survival?

At first these individuals did not pay attention to the questions or their

meaning and implications.

When the first loop of the twelve-minute tape had finished, we turned off the lights in the room. People were standing in their conversation circles.

The room was very dark. Each of us had a small spot-light attached to a long cord so that we could walk around the room holding the light with ease. The tape-loop began again but this time, as the questions came up, we alternately shone the spot light directly at someone in the room while describing his or her physical reaction to the light. For example: After the question, "Are you isolated?", one of us would shine our spot-light on a person and in the thirty-second gap before the next question, describe: "eyes blinking, arms crossed, fingers fumbling, immobile, shoulders slouching." All descriptions were to be entirely judgment free, only descriptive. This procedure was intended to heighten people's awareness of their physical presence in the room, of the context in which they had placed themselves and of the relationships engendered within this context. While one of us shone the light and described the physical response of a person, the other of us would turn our light out. Each time an individual became illuminated in that dark room, they became a moment of concentration, self and social awareness. After the tape-loop had played one full cycle, twelve minutes, we turned out our lights. The room became black again.

At this time, the individuals, now highly self-conscious of the enforced participation, the refusal of anonymity, and their active role as audience, began to clap. I thought this was very strange and seemed to suggest that they wished the conclusion of our aggression. I am deeply impressed by their self-conscious demonstration of relief.

The next section however, followed immediately. Alternately illuminating each other, we read from the following text. As one of us read, the other shone the light on him or her. We broke up the text arbitrarily just stipulating an alteration. When the questions imbedded in the text came up, we alternately chose a person and shined the light on them, asking the question and waiting for a response, a forced participation. We hoped to engage these individuals in a conversation which might heighten their awareness of the sociological context of their own activity, their own choices and their prescence and social relations both to individuals but to their philosophical position with regards to art. Why were they present that evening at JETWAVE?

MANIFESTO OF THE USES OF BELIEF

The interaction between action/reaction is corrupted and degraded by social confusion. We call into question the complacent. Isolation, pacification. The replacement of the need to identify individual necessities with easily accessible alternatives, for example, buying a Cuisinart rather than chopping directly distances morality. Isolation. Contradiction requires alternative possibilities. Closed systems remain vulnerable to manipulations. We encourage a vitalization of the idealistic potential of sociological functioning. Abstract boundaries allow for the moral and intellectual edge, the uncomfortable region of contradiction. One may survive the regions of a potentless world, but there, in the stiltifying atmosphere, where interaction outside the known is impossible, patterns permeate.

We would align our functions with others whose projections aim toward the development of human activity and who embrace aggressive identities. Symptoms: urbanization, the family, feminism, crime in the streets, destruction in the home, poverty, population explosion, education, health care, deviant behaviour and drugs, alcohol, justice, violence, business, sexuality, the media, capitalism and communism and in the regions of art - art itself or any other category listed in classical text books on human activity. We participate in these symptoms but reject attaching significance to the possibility of change within these structures of activity. In full recognition of twenty active years of investigation, we embrace the confrontation with individuals as the baiss for human understanding.**

Conversations are impenetrable: words, gestures, facial expressions, intonation. Signification without understanding. Attempts to determine meaning are dark searching interpretations. In a contracted context, each one fabricates an interpretation. We assume we agree. Isolation agreement. Subversive conversation implantation.

How do people isolate themselves?
What do you choose to express?
Is discussion your intention or is observation your discussion?

History is only an awareness that something came before you in order to move your mind to this moment. The lag is never overcome.

Can sincerity and morality have a factual ground? What are your social expectations? Upon what have they been established? Do you come here to be seen? Do you come to see? Why?

Supermarket self-satisfaction allows you to shop in comfort.

Are you choosing a cheese?
Are you safe?
Do you want to be?
Are you looking for light?
What do you contribute to the electricity of the waves that generate?

Light makes vision possible: bright luminosity, candle light, daylight, enlightenment, window/being of small specific gravity, dizzy, giddy, disordered, loose, porous, instable.

Are you light/or light?

Theatre, ritual, performance, magic or real-time. Entertainment has long been recognized as pacification.

What are you doing here?
How did you come?
What are you wearing? Why?
Who are you sitting by?
Do you know them? Why?
Do you like them or do you want to please?

We wish to violate the protection isolation. War against complacency, separatism. The isolation which results from this moment with you is the knowledge that you share nothing with us. You see. We do. You see. We play. You play. We see you do.

Do you understand our intention? Do you see our intention? Are you participating? Is there a heirarchy of situation?

In translations, via language and/or movement, whether it be towards communication, or for the chance of extending one's knowledge, there is the dilemma of corruption and degradation of the intention, then manipulation of understanding the individual's private motives. The physical paradox of translation leads us to isolation, as resistant organism cultures, where we each practice our own methods of survival. It is in each individual's translation of their specific decision that a whole is created. The ensuing difficulty

which the human being has in translating specific material as presented via the private individual is cause to the degradation and corruption of an individual's intentions leading to the common practice of adhering an action, activity or belief to an incorrect structure. There is incentive to begin with the whole and progress to the parts. The kind of participation that becomes receptive to a specific individual's talents sanctions performance entertainment. A certain sensation of passivity which, even in recognizing and understanding motives, leaves no possibility of investigation, instigation nor "alteration." The necessity for alterations is refuted by human kind because of paranoia. Fear of expression-emotion is being translated and regulated to a structure separated from your motive. The method is not in control.

Can there be a freedom from self-consciousness?

Personal acceptances/public rejections. Entertainment with no repercussions.

Why do you just stand there?
Can you see the magic we have in private?
Strain issues. [spoken simultaneously]
Have you ever exposed yourself? [spoken simultaneously]

The action ended and we turned off both of our lights. Our ending actually came before the end of this manifesto text. It came at a moment when there was an understanding that we, ourselves, had completed what we came to do there at JETWAVE. There was a second of quiet after we had turned off the lights and left the room. Then there was applause. Again these individuals expressed themselves with respect, although throughout the aggression they were hostile, accusatory, embarrassed and generally repressed and intimidated.

It was impossible to get a conversation going although we had organized the text in such a way that we allowed ourselves the freedom to improvise if the opportunity for discussion ensued from the questions and the action was opened up to a more natural social situation. It did not occur. The entire sociological situation was metaphorically summed up when Mark Hasencamp answered my question, "How did you come here?", with the answer, "In the bathroom with my hand." His allusion to masterbation clearly linked the socio-sexual, human isolation which our work had meant to explore.

change is the quickest and surest means to survival.

**I am personally referring at this point in the text to the insight and work of Hervé Fisher (Ecole sociologique interrogative, 143 Bd. de Charonne, 75011 Paris, France) and to the work of Jean-Pierre Giovanelli (St. Jeannet, France) whose sociological art is the most humane approach to working with social culture that I have ever experienced.

^{*}Aggression-action, for me personally means to seek to force reaction. Whereas a "performance" allows for passive observation and an "action" creates the possibility of personal catharsis, aggression-action requires response. Ex-

| NAMES | (parts) | |
|--------------------------------------|---------|--|
| FRAN NOW (ve) BRAD LAPIN | В | Assistant Editor—Creep Magazine, S.F. |
| | C | Editor—Damage Magazine, S.F. |
| CHAUNCEY HARE | D | see page 34 |
| GEOFFREY COOK | E | Selection of letters were excerpted from approximately 1000 correspondence (including artists, various organizations, and similarly interested people) |
| PETER D'AGOSTINO | F | "Proposal for Qube" has been included in a recent book published by Peter—titled Telequide (available N.F.S. Press, S.F.) |
| ED MYCUE | G | Recently published—The Singing Man My Father Gave Me— Menard Press—London, England |
| MEYER HIRSCH | Н | Originally shown as a sound-text installation (with 69 Polaroids) at Washington Project for the Arts, Wash., D.C. in May of 1979. (group show including Donna-Lee Phillips and Hal Fisher) |
| MARK GILLILAND DONNA-LEE PHILLIPS | 1 | Recently moved to New York |
| | J | Originally shown at Camerawork Gallery, S.F. in May 1978 (Contemporary California Photography-group show) |
| LAWRENCE FIXEL | K | Excerpted from The Book of Glimmers (Menard Press, London, England) |
| GEORGE WESCOTT | L | Regular photo-contributor to Damage, Vacation—Bass player for Naked City |
| STEVE ABBOT | M | Editor and publisher of Soup Magazine—Co. editor of Poetry Flash (S.F.) |
| LUTZ BACHER | N | Originally shown in group show at Washington Project for the Arts 1979 as 18 x 24 B&W Prints |
| RICHARD IRWIN | 0 | "Straight from the heart" |
| IRENE BORGER | P | Degree from U.C.L.A. in Dance Anthropology - presently teaching a class on ritual at the Art Center, Pasadena, CA. |
| CARTER RATCLIFF | Q | Reprinted with special permission (Print collectors Newsletter, Inc., 1979) |
| GEORGE MYERS, JR. | R | Publisher of Cumberland Journal (a quarterly)—Harrisburg, Penn. |
| JAME BOWERS | S | 1st chapter of dissertation for Ph.d English Dept., U.C. Berkeley |
| KRISTINE STILES | T | "General Practitioner of Art" |
| LYNNE HOLYOKE | | Video Documentation for Hire |

MEYER HIRSCH editor, designer 1156 A, Howard St., San Francisco, CA. 94103 telephone (415) 621-3839 ISBN 0-934092-00-1 © Meyer Hirsch THE NEW COMMERCIALIST Press