



## Discussion transcript

**Lauren:** Firstly, can I say “thank you” to everybody for doing this [participating in the directed performance-experiment], and especially as it might have felt quite uncomfortable. Now Rachel Gomme is going to chair the discussion part of this workshop.

**Rachel:** This will be quite informal. First I will say a little about how the performance-experiment relates to my interests. The performance I'm going to do tomorrow is called *Audience* and is about an encounter in silence – a couple of people here have already had experience of it. Basically, in a way, it's almost a similar face-to-face one-to-one thing, but where the audience remain in silence with me. Various things interest me there: one is the intimacy that comes out of the encounter with somebody where you are not actually exchanging what often socially appear to be intimacies in the form of words, but you are actually exchanging something – just through a different kind of contact not attempting communication. I'm interested in what comes across in that space and, also, in how that experience can drop us into a detail. I think this partly relates to slowness and stillness, how it can make us really receptive to noticing detail. I'd be really interested to hear peoples experience of detail in today's performance-experiment. When Helen said 'was that piece half an hour?' I remembered another aspect that is often remarked upon regarding *Audience* and this is peoples experience of time. In our discussion here, I'd also be really interested to know how people felt that the time was, as they went through the experiment: did you have a sense of time; did you completely lose track; or, did your sense of time alter and how? I think that what this performance-experiment and *Audience* have in common is that they both realise meditative practices which can drop one into a completely different sense of time. What the sense of your own presence is in that – in your interaction with another – is of interest to me, and because it's obviously different from a personal meditation where you are sitting, standing or walking on your own.

Hence, I've now introduced some of my questions, and I thought to begin the discussion, if everyone feels comfortable with this, that we could each just share a few words about how we experienced viewing or being part of this performance... which [as an onlooker], I can say, was extremely beautiful to watch – I know the point of the exercise was not to watch it, particularly, but for me it was really beautiful to watch, so, thank you.

**Lauren:** Thank you.

**Anna:** It was a lovely performance and experience, but, also, with moments that I found difficult at times. When you were talking about the performance-experiment beforehand I hadn't connected meditative practice with it. I hadn't really thought about this piece within this context or of creating a moving meditative state in relation to someone-else in a relatively public space. Some experiences that I have had when meditating arose for me, but during the experiment this other person was there as well and a part of those experiences in a very direct way. Moments which particularly interested me were when I was becoming distracted. I had a sense of my awareness leaving my body in a way, just kind of going off into a space, and then it was interesting to observe how that space was. How it affected mine and our movement and rhythm. There were then other moments when I just felt very natural and at ease in the movement, as if its rhythm was guiding us, rather than there being any sense of 'we were having to do it'...

**Louisa:** I felt a difference from meditation because when I meditate I'm normally very still and it's quiet. I felt like I was constantly moving and that it was like going to a slightly different

## About the Workshop *Intimacy as event*

A workshop devised to explore aspects of intimacy, involving participation in a directed performance-experiment and followed by a discussion.

Workshop participants and guest artists: **Ines Carrasco, Anna Casey, Helene Cooper, Léo Geoffriau, Mariella Greil, Fabrizio Manco** (live sound interventions), **Louisa Martin, Helen Palmer, Maddy Shrimpton, Sarah-Louise Spies, Jillian Wallis;** and **Rachel Gomme** (discussion chair). Performance-experiment devised and directed by **Lauren Goode** (workshop leader).

8 December 2007. 14:00 – 18:00 hrs.  
Goldsmiths College, University of London.

The workshop was part of the **INTIMACY Across Visceral and Digital Performance** event programme, co-directed by **Maria Chatzichristodoulou** and **Rachel Zerihan**.

mental state, but through movement, which is quite new to me. When we stopped I noticed how different things were to beforehand. During the experiment I hadn't noticed a transformation. Something happened during the 20 minutes that has made me feel completely comfortable being [makes a gesture that illustrates close proximity, as per movement device]. It's weird, as I started off feeling a bit like this [signals feeling uncomfortable through a gesture in relation to proximity] and then...

**Mariella:** [Responding to Louisa] My experience is very similar really... this strange feeling. I also noticed, because we were one of the pairs to change direction [makes gesture]... and that was quite moving. It was like [makes another gesture]. I was quite tired too, and so more open in a way and, in this state, could just shut out... but I definitely felt some sort of bordered understanding of what was going on... [makes a gesture to indicate the movement of only looking forward, not to the side etc]. I could watch people pass or listen... [Mariella continued speaking here but, unfortunately, is inaudible on the recording]

**Helene:** I think detail is definitely a major part of what's going on in the confrontation with each other – identifying the detailed in each others faces. But it is also the opposite of that. Because we were so close we were unable to focus and so there were moments when it was quite humorous, as it looked like we had about three, or four, eyes and the nose blended into the eyes. This lack of focus didn't pull me out of a meditative state, but it became more lighthearted rather than intense.

**Jillian:** I really noticed the smells as well as the acoustics. At some point there was this cheese and onion world going on and then there was that particular guy on the phone and his language. I couldn't help but make up little stories that were coming to mind, as to what his conversation was about... Yet, at the same time, there were many other stories going on as we walked, including those arising as we passed the notice-boards... Karl Marx... etc [referring to a range of disciplines and histories referenced by event posters]. This became an incredibly strong, emotional, slow journey with the other person. There was a feeling that builds... almost as if you love them or something...

**Helene:** Yeah

**Jillian:** It was *fluid* [with emphasis]... and yet, also, there were moments when it was very [makes a sound gesture of conveying frustration and claustrophobia]. You're going along and you are always going to be going along. I thought of that thing in Dr. Who where they were stuck underground in a weird vehicle, and they had been there for years and years and you knew they would never get out. A bit of that feeling came in – that you would always be in that moment.

**Helene:** Yeah, yeah

**Jillian:** Stuck in that moment, but also loving it...so it's quite...rare

**Helen:** Yeah, yeah, it's a funny old business, I found that it helped...like what you were saying about seeing the one eye and the two noses, because it stopped you thinking too much. In fact, I didn't feel like you (referring to her partner) were another person at all, I felt like it was 'us against the world'. You do feel a kind of... like you said ...it was ...I mean...not love, but I know exactly what you mean. I guess, maybe, because the only time you are really this close to someone is if you are about to kiss them or something. It's funny because it's you as one body moving and feeling that very strongly, but then you have your individual narrative going through your head the whole time which you know isn't part of that; and it's like you are some canvas for fleeting thoughts and images, isn't it? ...but it was... I liked it, it was a good experience. I had no idea what the time was at all.

**Fabrizio:** I find it interesting the reference to a canvas. I immediately have in my mind the image of a wall – coming from Soto Zen's zazen practice, where one sits in meditation facing a wall, but the eyes are not closed, they are neither open, so they are mid-way, so, therefore, I guess, one doesn't lose contact with the moment and relate to the other. The way we are experiencing time is, in a Bergsonian sense, as duration, where things pass and nothing is ever the same again and performance has its own time, a ceaseless present. I find that quite interesting, that ultimately all comes down to experience as, for example, in pedestrian meditation – walking and directional walking. Another image could be that of driving at night, one can see as far as the light goes, so to speak, always a deference. So, yes, this paradoxical aspect is interesting, but more than that, being on the other side of the... [experiment – Fabrizio participated through making live sound interventions rather than performing the movement], producing sound, listening and silence: how they are very much abstract, if they are dis-embodied.

'Listening' and 'silence': how do they play their importance? My experience of chronic tinnitus, makes me question this aspect, the impossibility of (pure) silence and the nature of silence. There's a lot to say about it, but I also find it interesting how you could relate to one another and by, as some of you mentioned, leaving the body. I feel it's very much like sitting in one's body instead, and working with the body, within the bottomless well of the body, as body, but I'm sure that it's about the perspective from which one looks at things. In my experience of meditational performance, so to speak, one can never escape the embodied aspect, the non-dualistic one. So, for me, that's a revelation – 'there's no escape' – [laughter]. Also, the eyes: what they do; where do you look and at what; and what happens if you lower them, or look somewhere else? Do you lose the reference to what's happening or not? I don't know, that's another aspect and... Slowness and stillness: how, also, they are paradoxical.

**Ines:** I relate to what Fabrizio said about the road image. I had a similar experience of the moment arriving again and again through the image. We were both sliding along together and it was as if time was 'Cut. Cut. Cut. Cut'. The same image would arrive again and again. It was like a cinematic effect. Also, about the sense of self that was generated...I felt this had a lot to do with the eyes, gaze and intention. Sometimes I focussed on detail and then I realised that all my intention was here, right in the front of my face. I guess that is how I normally look if I'm looking at something – I focus and it's here, in the front. Instead, with this technique, I let my eyes feel as if they were looking backwards. This opened my body in a different way and held it in a kind of moment. Sometimes it felt as if we were united in a kind of intensity from this, and while, like you [Helen] said 'we were in our individual narratives', there was a harmony too, as if we understood something together.

**Helen:** Yes, it's true. You find that you suddenly breath together or swallow together or something...

**Maddy:** Yes, you feel like your bodies are suddenly just in tune...

**Helen:** Yes, 'click' and then it...

**Maddy:** Click and then it kind of moves on. That's what I felt. It was like a cycle. At the beginning it was partly about conflict, because two forces were trying to work together when they didn't know each other, almost fighting each other a little and then reaching an understanding. After this, I felt aware of thinking about my own body and, maybe, where I was holding tension and what it would look like from the outside. And then going back and around the same things over and over again... It became more intense, definitely, maybe towards the middle. When the video camera was close to us I started thinking 'I'm being filmed', and the sense of intensity weakened. No, it was okay, [referring to being filmed], but it definitely distracted me at times. I then felt watched and it became less natural. Being recorded disturbs... although I was trying to make my attention just go with it [the movement].

**Innes:** But like that? [makes gesture]

**Maddy:** Yeah, it was quite beautiful, no very...

**Ines:** That togetherness is somehow synchronicity: we were creating a rhythm, but we were not going automatically. It's as if we were really sensing each movement of the other; and that's how it was possible, because we were still attentive.

**Fabrizio:** Important to that is being the distance and proximity. I think it was in-between a social proximity state or situation. The intimate distance is 15-45 cms, that in-between of the social distance and the situation. Yes, it's social, but not in the sense that you are entertaining a conversation with someone...in-between... gap

**Maddy:** There was a nice point when the other people passed us where I felt the balancing. I don't know if anyone else felt that...?

**Helen:** Yes, I felt kind of reassured by...

**Maddy:** There was this going on [makes gesture] and then there were these other people, it was like we were all balancing each other out. I could feel our energies bouncing off each other...

**Jillian:** We overtook two couples!

**Helen:** Yeah, you were speedy.

**Sarah-Louise:** For me, it was like a tango.

**Fabrizio:** Takes two to tango!

**Sarah-Louise:** I also felt – Helene said about this too – that the visual field was very interesting. I loved to just dive into this – the many eyes, strange noses and morphing of two images that my eyes couldn't make sense of. Yes, and those little actions – I realised that we were breathing together, we were swallowing together, we were seeing etc. I noticed many details, for instance, of the neck and other, little things. Also, that we were going along a bit like this [makes a swaying movement] like being on a ship.

**Léo:** It's difficult for me to speak about as I felt that it lasted for a very long time and was a bit boring; and because I felt unsure of the direction. You [to Lauren] have talked about meditation, but, for me, it was a closed meditation, because of a sense in which we couldn't go away in the meditation with each other: we had to respect the rules of the work. It's not just [an issue about] intensity – I did not feel any link between the 'looking' and the work. For me it was gesture that was constrained too strongly. I don't know if it was too complicated... I'm unsure as to whether it was an experience for us and others, or for camera...Is it for people walking down the corridor or is it using the corridor? It was not very intense for me because too many things were not definite.

**Rachel:** Maybe you [to Lauren] want to say a bit more about the ideas behind this experiment, what your intentions were, particularly with this experiment, who it was directed at...

**Lauren:** I see this experiment as practice that is working towards finding the resolve that I would expect of a final work. The realisation today is a middle stepping-stone along the way and aiding development of the ideas. When I'm presenting the final work it will be more 'controlled' – even more so! I knew in this

situation, with the set-up today, certain parameters were possible and I'd need to work within these, whereas ideally I'd have much more time to introduce the exercise and there would also be sessions to try it out differently and at least several times with those participating. Today it was like throwing everybody in. I deliberately didn't announce that there was going to be a performance in the corridor space and arrange that its normal use was paused. I wanted chance to play a part in what would take place. I intend that the work in its 'final' form, would also enable a-chancing-upon-it scenario, but the piece would have to be very carefully situated so that this worked and did not destroy what was happening. I'm also interested in sculptural costumes, and in relation to site-specific work. Hence, I would envisage a later version to have costumes that both relate to the site and to the ideas.

I'm pursuing two sorts of potential outcomes. The piece could be developed for performance, for the audience encountering it in specific space; and/or then it could be worked on for an endpoint being a film-work.

I'm particularly interested in how and what the image does on film and that's what I was more interested in testing out today, however, my intentions, for this afternoon, were mixed in that I expected some people to experience it as a performance and so devised the experiment to be accessible in this way too. The contrasting movement and attention of an audience chancing upon the movement work is necessary to the work itself. However, today I was certainly more focussed on testing out what I could get on film.

It is of much interest hearing you all talk about aspects of your experience today, although I feel aware that focussing on these particular experiences draws out potential directions that won't necessarily transfer to film – or even all be relevant to the film-work as I intend it – whilst other additional aspects emerge within the camera's eye. There's a problematic mix and filtering of intentions that goes on when this kind of minimal durational movement work in real-time is realised differently in film where it is resumed by way of a further milieu opening.

You asked me more about my intentions... I see the work as about shifting into film specific zones of experience and trying to amplify aspects of these. As opposed to normal so-called social interactions, my interest is to amplify other presences/absences that accompany us daily, no continually really, in a way, and at the same time as the socio-cultural kind of interaction...

**Rachel:** Do you mean the presence of surveillance?

**Lauren:** No, I mean to do with identity and subjectivity; and the moment of when we are not speaking to each other in conversation [or, perhaps, it's the kind of moment that is both outside of and simultaneous to either when we are socially speaking/interacting or not]. Language obviously has a grammar that reinforces – often, although this depends also on how it's used – the 'I' and the 'me', this concept of the author... whereas when we are in these meditative zone-space-dimensions, maybe thoughts fly into our head just out of nowhere – or perhaps it's preferable to focus on these simply as 'arising' – and it's that kind of live invisible process that I wish to both frame and amplify.

[Here I'd like to mention and refer you to John Cussan's inspiring writing, '*Phantom Muse*' (published in *Frozen Tears III*, Ed John Russell), and with reference to both writing and thinking processes, but also to the many other relevant complexities that this text impressively opens up.] [See an extract below].

I will do a worksheet with some short extracts from this and other texts and email it round.

[In one part of the text/narrative there is a figure in a cafe and the figure is at times on the cusp of writing.]

[It's possible to connect from ideas here relating to writing/thinking as process and more specifically from ideas about the non-authored aspect of this process to ideas relating to the

pornographic (and so there's a link here with one of the INTIMACY conference themes, the pornographic)].

[John writes of a 'phantom muse' but it's relevant to link in here ideas of writing/thinking as a kind of pornographic process too. (I thought I recalled a direct reference to this in John's text, but on a re-scanning/re-reading/reading, aptly, strangely and annoyingly, I now can't seem to find this!) (Later... after a further slow reading: see the part 'Sketch for a video-play, Location two...' on page 423).]

However, I'm saying this facing-each-other [in the performance-experiment], both disrupting [a registration of subjectivity] and creating a mutual image of separate subjectivity can be considered as relating to a pornographic image in such a way of understanding...also, thoughts flying into the head, not necessarily 'authored' but just landing. It's these territories that this particular movement operation can open up and focus attention on, but whether and how they will transfer to film... [With this work] I think what clearly transfers to film is an image of the disruption of a socially (representational) symbolic movement [eg two people walking along together in the way one would generally expect, ie not sideways as in the experiment] and this 'other' movement. Whilst the intentions of the film and performance work overlap the range of what is amplified in the performance and vice versa, takes the work in both different and related directions... but, we should open the discussion up here.

**Fabrizio:** Coming back to what you say Lauren. it makes me think about the autopoietic that Varela talks about, it's something that is self-generating – well, if I can talk about that in non-biological terms – but, ...also when you mention the pornographic, I don't know if you mean it in the Deleuzian sense, but I ended up thinking about a sort of onanistic aspect, a self-referential masturbatory aspect, but, of course, there is always a referent/viewer and the person who is being viewed/ and the viewed... but here somehow you are in a loop of de-stabilizing 'the self' and mind and body all the time and so a constant loop, but it could be seen also as a sort of looped way of self-origination and machine-like, but at the same time there is a relation, correspondence and a facing-the-other ... this relational aspect goes beyond the self-referential, if you see what I mean...and, how can that be used as a device?

**Léo:** And it's also interesting because in the eye of the person you can see your own reflection, you see your face.

**Louisa:** For me it was less about looking and, I think, maybe because I'm quite tall, it set off a different level of problems. For me knowing that we didn't have to be looking at each other meant that we felt free enough to just wander with our eyes. But I did find the communication, although I was expecting it to be in the eyes, definitely in the fact that we were doing something together physically. It was a bodily communication. I think we also went in cycles of even looking very directly or looking somewhere else with our eyes.

**Helen:** I think what you say about the height thing is really interesting as well. How it would change the exercise if you knew the person very well, crossed my mind. I wondered at one point, if this was my sister, would I be able to not giggle? Or, say, if I hated this person. Like you said, about the constraints, what if you enforce these rules and the person that you are this close to is someone you really don't like, or what if they are quite offensive, I mean, what if they smell...like cheese and onion crisps or something! ...It sounds like we were all quite lucky and everybody was alright. The height thing is kind of nice too and those physical differences...

Continued on page 5

**Extract from 'Phantom Muse'. John Cussans.**  
Published in *Frozen Tears III*. Ed. John Russell. Pg 408.

### Sketch for video play. Two locations/One figure

Location one: Cafe, morning sunlight, indoors.

A figure sits at a table. It has before it a cup of coffee, a notebook, a pen and the remains of a Danish pastry. Sunlight enters the space from outside. The passing traffic cuts exquisite crystalline shadows across the tables and walls. On the back wall there is the face of a lion. The figure sits and stares at the patterns, motionless. An interior monologue begins on the audio-track.

"...ranting repetitive refusal...ranting repetitive refusal...ranting repetitive refusal..."

There is a pause. Light passes over the tables and walls. Cut to the open notebook. Shadows pass over it. Nothing is written.

" ranting repetitive refusal...ranting repetitive refusal...ranting repetitive refusal..."

Close up on the back of the figures head. Cut to the lion's face.

"ranting, repetitive refusal...ranting repetitive refusal"

Another pause. Shot of figure in medium profile.

"Ranting repetitive refusal ranting repetitive refusal... [pause]...nice rhythm...ranting...repetitive...nice just thinking...ranting repeating...[pause] ...light...moving images...and just thinking...that's it...maybe that's it... Why should I record any of this? Who says I have to put this into words...that it has to take form? Is this not enough? Just thinking...I'm here...I've found the place and the time...why should I do anything other than be here...just thinking what I'm thinking, feeling what I'm feeling...the warmth of the sun, the pleasure of the light images passing through my eyes, the thought of sight, the feeling of seeing, now, seeing this,...and the taste of the coffee...and this thinking...yes, this thinking...just this thinking...these words in my head...just me here, thinking...seeing...not doing...no, not doing...no need to do...all these sounds...chatter...cars passing...drones of all kinds...crackles, hisses and clicks...I have it all here... I have my own personal art inside...it's all here...my imaginary art...all here, in me, now...the best art anyone could have... Why would anyone need to make anything? It's all here...this is it...as real as anything...as good as... no, BETTER than all that artifice...All you need is to know how to find the time and the space to think, to just let yourself be inside itself, let yourself be your own art, here and now...if they knew this they would never have to make art again..."

A hand strokes the surface of a page.

"I could write 'The light passes over the tables and walls'...I could write 'If they knew this they would never have to make art again'...or I could just watch the light passing over the tables and wall..."

**Extract from '3. Phantasm and Modern Literature'. Gilles Deleuze.** Published in the Appendix of *The Logic of Sense*. Gilles Deleuze. Pl. Continuum

[It was quite difficult to pull an extract out of this chapter, especially for readers who may not be familiar with the work of Giles Deleuze or Klossowski, although I have done so here. I'm interested in how intensities from operative movement devices can impact upon our sense of thinking and aspects of meditative reality, but as reading in relation to other topics/issues raised at the Intimacy events/symposia, this chapter appears to me as very relevant reading.]

pg 298: [...] This is to say that there is in Klossowski an entire "phenomenology," which borrows from scholastic philosophy as much as Husserl did, but which traces its own paths. As for the passage from intensity to intentionality, it is the passage from sign to sense. In a fine analysis of Nietzsche, Klossowski interprets the "sign" as the trace of a fluctuation, of an intensity, and "sense" as the movement by which intensity aims at itself in aiming at the other, modifies itself in modifying the other, and returns finally onto its own trace. The dissolved self opens up to a series of roles, since it gives rise to an intensity which already comprehends difference in itself, the unequal in itself, and which penetrates all others, across and within multiple bodies. There is always another breath in my breath, another thought in my thought, another possession in what I possess, a thousand things and a thousand beings implicated in my complications: every true thought is an aggression. It is not a question of our undergoing influences, but of being "insufflations" and fluctuations, or merging with them. That everything is so "complicated," that I may be an other, that something else thinks in us in an aggression which is the aggression of thought, in a multiplication which is the multiplication of the body, or in a violence which is the violence of language – this is the joyful message. For we are so sure of living again (without resurrection) only because so many beings and things think in us: because "we still do not know exactly if it is not others who continue to think within us (but who are these others who form the outside in relation to this inside which we believe ourselves to be?) – everything is brought back to a single discourse, to fluctuations of intensity, for instance, which correspond to the thought of everyone and no one." At the same time that bodies lose their unity and the self its identity, language loses its denoting function (its distinct sort of integrity) in order to discover a value that is purely expressive or, as Klossowski says, "emotional." It discovers this value, not with respect to someone who expresses himself and who would be moved, but with respect to something that is purely expressed, pure motion or pure "spirit" – sense as a pre-individual singularity, or an intensity which comes back to itself through others.

**Extract from 'Intensive Science and Virtual Philosophy'. Manuel De Landa. Pl. Continuum. Pg 107-108. Chpt. 'The actualisation of the virtual in time'. [Reference keywords/phrases: 'Aion' and 'Time itself unfolds...instead of things unfolding within it {time}' (Deleuze); and 'the virtual' 'populated exclusively by 'pure becomings without being']].**

'Deleuze finds inspiration for this conception of [virtual] time in phase transitions, or more exactly, in the critical events defining unactualised transitions. When seen as pure becoming, the critical point of temperature of 0 degree C, for example, marks neither a melting nor a freezing of water, both of which are actual becomings (becoming liquid or solid) occurring as the critical threshold is crossed in a definite direction. A pure becoming, on the other hand, would involve both directions at once, a melting-freezing event which never actually occurs, but is 'always forthcoming and already past.'

The events involved in the construction of virtual space, the progressive unfolding of virtual multiplicities as well as the stretching of their singularities into series of ordinary points, need to be thought as pure becomings in this sense. In this construction, as Deleuze says, 'Time itself unfolds...instead of things unfolding within it...[Time] ceases to be cardinal and becomes ordinal, a pure order of time.' Unlike actual time, which is made exclusively out of presents (what is past and future relative to one times scale is still the living present of a cycle of greater duration), a pure becoming would imply a temporality which always sidesteps the present, since to exist in the present is to be, no longer to become. This temporality must be conceived as an ordinal continuum unfolding into past and future, a time where nothing ever occurs but where everything is endlessly becoming in both unlimited directions at once, always 'already happened' (in the past direction) and always 'about to happen' (in the future direction). And unlike actual time which is asymmetric relative to the direction of relative pasts and futures, a pure becoming would imply a temporality which is perfectly symmetric in this respect, the direction of the arrow of time emerging as a broken symmetry only as the virtual is actualized.'

[...]

In what sense would a temporality characterised by an instant which unfolds itself into past and future be nonmetric? Actual time, as I said, may be seen as the product of a metrization or quantization performed by a nested set of presents with characteristic times scales. Whether one views the latter in terms of relaxation times or in terms of the intrinsic period of nonlinear oscillations, the processes occurring in actual time always have a time scale of limited duration and yet are potentially infinite, in the sense that a particular sequence of cycles may go on pulsing for ever. Virtual time, on the other hand, would be nonmetric in the sense that it is unlimited in the past and future directions in which it unfolds, but always finite like the instant without thickness that performs the unfolding. The time of the virtual would be constituted entirely by what, from the point of view of metric time, cannot be but singularities: a maximum and a minimum, events of unlimited duration (the unfolding of multiplicities) and events of zero duration (the operation of the quasi-cause).'

**Continued from page 3**

**Lauren:** I thought that people would maybe sense temperature, because you are standing quite close...?

**Helen:** Yes, I did, yes

**Fabrizio:** The temperature changes

**Jillian:** ...and when other people were near one could sense them. When we were passing each other it was interesting how much one could bodily sense others, including heat...

**Fabrizio:** As well as the hearing sense, the sensing middle ear becomes heightened.

**Jillian:** ...all those senses were much more heightened, it felt quite powerful to be able to do that.

**Maddy:** May I ask a question: why do you call it a device or a movement operation?

**Lauren:** Yes. I suppose because I don't see it as an expressive movement. I call it an operation because it's set up to achieve something else, so, in that sense. For instance, in contrast, if I used gesture that would suggest something expressive of a subject. So with a 'device' or an 'operation' I'm seeking to produce an affect, rather than represent expression.

**Lauren:** ...in terms of intentions, I am interested in this work as a filmic outcome, [...] and in a creative process that is not really about capturing. When something transfers to film it produces something else, there's potential for something else. Whereas with Rachel's work, she is recording it and taking it...

**Rachel:** Yes, I'm recording it – only the sound. I think it makes a difference in terms of how self-conscious people might feel about the encounter, and then that sound is used for a specific purpose. I make a cd and participants will get the cd. It has now become a sound installation as well. The material is used and it's completely transformed from the actual experience, which is what I was originally interested in. It's interesting how that process of recording and documenting can take something further than you expected it to go, but I am still primarily interested in, like Fabrizio says, the embodied being of that moment and how that is. And, like you say [Fabrizio] how it is necessarily always present.

**Fabrizio:** Yes, it's always... everything is always embodied

**Louisa:** Yes, I felt it was like an extended moment rather than an expanse of time. It was almost the same moment and then you go...the way of moving makes you go deeper into the moment.

**Lauren:** Yes, that's really great, because I'm really influenced by Deleuzian concepts of Aion and Chronos [...]. When I refer to movement operations, actually there are a set of them that I have been experimenting with in recent work and all of them are strongly influenced by an understanding of the Aion. And so, to try and introduce this. I like idea that the corridor space in a way produces a timeline...

**Fabrizio:** Chronological, would you say chronological?

**Lauren:** You can think of chronos or chronicity as an embedded set, a nested set of times that resonate together. However, you can think of two kinds of time with reference to reality:

(i) Chronos, the time of the actual. You have season after season after season, but it's also embedded time, so when something has happened and it's in the past, like, say, for us yesterday, in this embedded-ness at the cosmic scale 'it' – 'that' whatever 'it' was – might still be happening, or would still be happening, so it's an odd embedded presence; and

(ii) Aion which Deleuze distinguishes as part of the real too, but it refers to a 'virtual' reality and it's more about this sense of... Well, I should read here the quote on this... 'Time itself unfolds instead of things unfolding within time' [Deleuze]. So, with this image – of you going down the corridor facing-each-other,

instead of walking together how we normally walk down a corridor, which seems to me to reflect a very linear journey (timeline) and that you are disrupting by this image of 'facing' – you are, perhaps, staying in that cusp bit, or within this proximity the image of a lasting cusp point is made manifest. Hence, through the work one gets more in touch with that other moment sense which, perhaps, relates to the aion...

**Lauren:** I could read it [the quote] or email it later...?

**Ines:** Could you read a bit?

**Lauren:** Okay. [Lauren looking very pleased]. Didn't take much encouragement there – I love Deleuze! There's terms in here that can sound like jargon, but they are not when they are within context. This is Manuel DeLanda speaking of Deleuze's ontology – it's from DeLanda's book: *'Intensive Science and Virtual Philosophy'*. [Reads extract – see above].

**Lauren:** So, [in the performance-experiment] that aspect of having that sense of time [the aion], when you are facing and facing also some kind of impossible awareness of the moment's instant, is almost as if you are getting to that cut of, or getting close to a sense of the 'becoming', you're more aware of the...

**Rachel:** I'm particularly just thinking about what Ines was saying about this succession of exactly the same, and exactly the same over and over again [...] and how that's a kind of melting point which is kind of going both ways

**Lauren:** Yes and, instead of being a kind of experience where, perhaps, a sense of authority is reinforced, like the 'I'm this identity on the corridor journey', one is confronting a more fluid [experience corresponding to 'becoming']...

**Helen:** It's kind of what you [Fabrizio] are saying about the cinema, and the cinema rupting...

**Fabrizio:** Yes, it's a continuous destabilisation, it's anti-dichotomising. So, would you say that 'becoming' [...] [recording device breaks here and unfortunately there's a small gap before recording begins on the other camera].

**Jillian:** [...] durational time and becoming temperature, Deleuze talks about temperature and intensities ...of energies really [...].

**Jillian:** I think that it would be very worthwhile – I would like to see it happen – to do the performance where some people are watching – or they chance upon it – but then are allowed to take part. (I don't know whether that would be possible, but it would be fascinating). ...Because I felt very privileged to be 'in' that piece and kind of trusting this moment, like 'I'm in this, I'm in this, I'm in this...' and this really... [feeling] fantastic. And then people go, 'Oy, what are you doing?'. There is such a huge void, between what's going on for us [performing] and someone chancing upon it.

**Rachel:** Although it wasn't only interesting [for us]. A lot of people were very respectful: they tip-toed through, they checked whether they were allowed to go through and I don't think it was only the fact that they recognised it was a performance. Also they recognised something about the nature of the space that was created.

**Anna:** I think that was a really important part of it for me. When you [turning to Lauren] were talking about being more in control of that, through introducing clearer boundaries or rules, I felt a bit sad. Because actually, a big part of the experience for me were these moments that were uncomfortable (when there were loads of people all around us and they were uncomfortable about it and I was uncomfortable). This experience and the undirected nature of it was quite special; there were people who were really respectful and then other people who were just on their path and not prepared to deviate from it. So moments where we had to navigate through in order to avoid collision. But without speaking...for me that was a really gorgeous element of it. To constrain it more – it might lose something vital.

**Maddy:** In terms of film, I'd like to see it in lots of different places and, maybe, those which would be even more confrontational, for instance, situating it in the street would be really interesting.

**Rachel:** I'd say that I have some experience of that. I've worked with a walking artist called Christine [?] in France quite a lot and one of the projects that I did with her involved spending at least four hours every day walking. We were walking in a forward direction, but extremely slowly, and it's certainly true that some people found that very disturbing.

**Fabrizio:** Or walking (also backwards) in any landscape, for a long duration, it's like a way of walking within and with the landscape; in any environment – how this structuring can make other things look and feel differently...experiencing space differently, as the environment moves you.

**Closing remarks:** [Thanks to all and announcement regarding Rachel's performance – 'Audience' – taking place the next day]

**This discussion is also available to listen to online:**  
<http://www.liveartgardeninitiative.org.uk/Movies.html>

© Live Art Garden Initiative and *Intimacy as Event* workshop participants. December 2007.