

What is the meaning of contemporary?

Mårten Spångberg

At an opening party of a top of the line bookstore in Berlin the following situation unfolded. Walls covered with bookshelves, bursting with art, architecture and philosophy fresh from the print house, not to mention a plethora of innovative subjects mixed like cocktails and baptized through charming neologisms. The DJ supported the wall-to-wall this-is-so-now-feeling with spicy beats and samples from tomorrow. Perhaps a hundred of us, packed together to celebrate urban lifestyle flavoured with a little bit of that well behaving leftism, drinking Becks from the bottle convinced that this *is* moment.

A few hours past and the conversation stayed the same until the free supply of Becks dried up and the only alcohol available was the latest innovation from the German beer legend. The golden drops from Bremen were interchanged with the same companies fruit flavoured beer: Green Lemon, Chilled Orange and the special brew mixing beer with energy support: Becks and Red Bull in holy matrimony. Suddenly the conversation changed into a compact murmur of complains about how absolutely outrageous the new drinks were and how Becks drew shame on Germany, beer culture and more of less everything in the entire universe.

Academics, intellectuals, artists, graphic designers univocally agreed that Green Lemon was bad and that Fresh Orange qualified for eternal disqualification. At that moment the question struck me, what is the meaning of contemporary? What is the consequence performed by me and some hundred people in a book-store insisting on the latest new, fresh fashion and thinking from the most innovative minds, that simultaneously goes ballistic when their 800 year old favourite beverage is swapped for something just released from Becks science centre?

Let's inverse the image and consider that the bookshelves would be stuffed with the literature that was contemporary in "The Name Of The Rose" and Thomas Aquinas was what Gnarls Barkley is for us today and that we'd all salute Becks Green Lemon?

What is contemporary in contemporary performance? What is contemporary in the festivals and venues that present contemporary performances?

From time to time the sensation is that contemporary simply means that something is newly produced or fresh from the shelf, but does not contemporary precisely ask for consistency in relationship to the world around us, its discourses, modes of production and its general and specific epistemologies. Only through a methodical address to art-works, its discourses and their relationship to the world can festivals and venues, as well as museums, justify themselves as contemporary. Most of that that calls itself contemporary is in fact an insult to the concepts inner being. Contemporary is not an easy issue, not something that arrives with DHL but something that needs thorough consideration and hell of lot of ambition to pursue, and it is evident that the easiest way around is to spice up something existing with a

bit of exotic flavour. It is a small task to produce a variation, a new combination but that is nothing more than to flip the image in the mirror continuing to do the same. To change the ways things change is something slightly more resistant and something that implies to jeopardize oneself.

The collective refusal performed in the bookstore was nothing else than a cry for security, the possibility for identification and the sustainability of the self. To say yes to Green Lemon implied to jeopardize one's own identity, one's own stability within a landscape that in fact isn't at all interested in change but only in variation, variations that function as an insurance for participation in an industry, or economical territory, which is built upon defensive strategies and a minimum of risk investment. Only when the cultural sector offers itself to jeopardy, only when it paves the way for actual blue sky projects can it claim itself as contemporary.

What about complexity? Everybody knows that Coca Cola is the real thing, but what more than something in the line of the original, way-back and tasty does the real thing mean. For something to be real it must necessarily be static. Someone like Pythagoras would say only numbers are real. Coca Cola didn't change the ingredients, the recipe, but to be real further implies that there are no parts. The real thing is always one, a whole. The real thing cannot be divided and is continuous, like the universe. The real thing depends on the extinction of relations, almost like a hysterical person: it cannot be interpreted but it simply *is*. The real thing is in other words the very opposite of creativity and becoming. On second thought what is it that Coke actually is marketing? A two feet on the ground incomplex, not only highly, but ultimately conservative drink built on a foundation of immobility.

Coke Light is based on artificial sweetener. If Coca Cola is the real thing, then Coke Light is nothing disguised into something. It professes the taste of sugar without its effects, the question, however, is if it is a simulacra or pure and simple potentiality. If Coca Cola is the real thing it necessarily must be organic and natural which implies that its movement is one towards an equalization of energies and forces. Coca Cola strives for entropy. Coke Light on the other hand is artificial and assembled through weak and forced, inorganic relations, which in their struggle towards equalization of forces produce further complexity. Coke Light isn't at all, it is becoming. It is creativity.

A simulacrum is based on some level of resemblance, some kind of interchangeability. Potentiality on the contrary is based on an absence of resemblance and is functional in and through its emergence into representation. Coke Light perhaps was, but isn't any longer an attempt to create resemblance but rather an emancipated product, and therefore Coke Light is not simulacrum but potentiality.

If your choice is Coke Light you also choose for artificiality, complexity and becoming, against the natural and continuous, and instead for the fabricated and interrupted. Coke Light is the choice of the progressive, the choice of an individual

that say yes to change and to the opportunity to jeopardize the self.

Over the last 20 years the fields of visual art has been occupied with a multiplicity of perspectives onto the curatorial practices. The position of the curator from a facilitator of institutional opportunities changed in an escalating manner throughout the 90s into a short era where positions were reversed and it occurred that the artist was facilitating the curator with parts to be assembled into a larger work. A significant part of those independent authors have over the last five years been assimilated by larger institutions, or has themselves turned to institutions to maintain particular levels of mobility. The mobility that curators and artists experienced in the 90s has changed particularly relating to altered economical circumstances which seems to imply that the curator can maintain larger mobility in the institution.

Within the field of dance and performance curatorial practices has to a much lesser degree been subject to critical discourses and theoretical mapping. There exists no writing on the subject and established positions are quite reluctant to promote necessary discussion hence it involves possible threats to a hegemonic regime. The absence of discussion is clearly related to the homogeneity of economy, public funding being the only big player dominating research, process and production as well as presentation, distribution and authorization. The independence implicit in public funding from the early 70s have regrettably imploded and is now forcing venues, festival and other players to issue increasingly defensive productions and programs. Paradoxically, or not, the lack and postponing of critical discourses in respect of curatorial practices in fact has promoted this current situation and it is only through a strong shift in attention that dance and performance practices can reconfigure the situation and acquire new territories, new mobility.

It is necessary that the field of dance and performance emancipate itself from the firm grip of instrumentalization, from the repressive regimes of public subsidy and this can only be done through a change of policy on all levels, not only looking for the new cool performance but firmly considering what actually is contemporary in the field and more over to further to examine what kind of complexity we produce. It is impossible to escape conventions but through a thorough and sincere process it is possible to complexity conditions and modes of production and it is through processes of complexification that the ways things change can be changed.

“A program should make sense”, but what does to make sense actually mean. Isn't it exactly when something appears to make sense that one should examine the situation again? What makes sense is exactly like Coke. What makes sense is diminishing complexity and appear natural, organic and continuous. A program that makes sense in other words produces a 'pleased' and passive audience. A program that makes sense is one that stupefies the audience for dance and performance. On a conceptual level an organic whole is counter productive to a curious audience and is on a long-term basis a guarantee for a conservative climate.

Instead we should follow the proposal of Talking Heads and stop making sense, even considering that it is impossible. It is certainly not easy and far more complicated than to make sense to pursue production and programming with the intension of not making sense however not simply using chance, but it is never the less through the introduction of complexification and interruption, through insisting on fabrication and the inorganic that a field can expand and address change. It is through pro-active resistance and through insisting on the inorganic, the artificial that the possibility for potentiality can be produced. Similar to Coke Light, to stop making sense, the artificial feeling is not a replica of the natural feeling, but the access to a different feeling, a different sensation no longer centered on the identity of consciousness but overflowing and excessive. This process allow the self to become extraneous, foreign to itself and to de-subjectivize experience, and hence emancipate itself from processes of identification. To argue for the artificial equals to insist on becoming, to insist on the possibility for the production of thinking different and at the end of the day it implies to make life hard for our selves whatever position we are in: producer, distributor, authorizer, spectator or even subsidizer.

It is intricate to realize that more radical approaches to programs and festival organization, which is not the case with production of performances, take place in the margins of Europe. The exiting and unconventional programs that appeared in central Europe in the 90s today shine with its absence, and it is instead taking place in smaller and, sometimes over looked contexts. It is in Estonia, Croatia, Slovenia, Spain and to an extent Portugal that positions and perspectives are advancing equally relating to program, season and festival, as well as curatorial concepts, organization and participation. Curators and organizers such as Priit Raud, Sergej, Pristas, Emil Hrvatin, Juan Dominguez, Blanca Calvo and Ion Munduate have taken up and furthered the progressive attitude of the 80s and 90s and in a positive way strengthened the position of the curator as author.

It is precisely through the absence of an author position that seasons and festival programming or curation is doomed to remain general, to reproduce sense and be stuck to present the latest news whatever it is without any conceptual fundament and hence cancel out any other discourses than those of taste and audience members.

A significant difference from more conventional situations is how e.g. festivals such as In-Presentable produce autonomy differently. Instead of understanding *festival* as a neutral envelope around a series of “autonomous” performances, the different events in the program function as segments in a larger composition that uses its inevitable political charge as a resistance and opportunity for discourse production. This shift plays out a new dynamic where represented politic, charge or ideological frame of a performance is exchanged for a situation in which political differentiation is under production.

One important reason why this politicization, this activation of the festival as a

particular production of meaning, occurs earlier can be traced to the absence of independent curators and the reluctance of directors of institutions and festivals to approach external expertise or divide a frame of presentation into smaller parts. It is obviously impossible to at the same time produce a good and sustainable relation to local politicians etc. and curate critical festivals and events. The festival director that is also the curator and programmer is working on an impossible task, similar to the one of being friends with ones father: it's hopeless as long as dependence is present. In order to make dance and performance practices in any respect critical it is necessary to change the organization of organizations and institutions on structural level. It is no enough to invite a guest curator to organize a lecture program, it is not enough to invite an external force to create a groovy evening program. It is the central program policies that need to change and be outsourced in order for the field to gain any emancipation both as an art form but most of all from the concessional half-nelson of public funding.

The point is not to do something better or differently, but to engage in fundamentally other modes of production. The emergence of the independent curator is only one small shift hopefully paving the way for further change and some healthy competitive attitude. Nepotism is over, its time for kick ass methods and to reclaim capital. Currently larger institutions are assimilating larger and larger part of our territory through inclusive arguments and the short-term notion of audience numbers.

Structures cannot be escaped but will always precede action. Structures emerge from preverbal, affectual states and are coming into representation. Action is the repetition of activation, yet it is only possible to articulate the meaning of a situation in relation to an action undertaken to transform it. To propose a different territory of programs and festivals implies new modes of subjectification, which is both political and existential. A model that shifts perspectives from defensive tendencies of structural allocation to benevolent heterogeneous allocation in dynamic resources is one that emphasizes opportunities for new modes of subjectification for all participants as well as for festival and curators.

The festival, as well as the season program, as we know it today is based on models emerging out of on the one hand the emancipation of culture via the 68 movement followed up by the stabilization of cultural production and funding systems in Europe in the mid 70s, and on the other a generation of young artists and organizers that in the early 80s proposed the need for guest performance venues and programs that were not political in respect of content. This came as an evident response to venues that hosted ensembles and were political biased, combined with the experience that so called workers theatre had failed when institutionalized becoming instrumental and, not seldom, dogmatic. This younger generation did not lack political conviction but emphasized the art-work's and the performance's formal and technical qualities. Organizers and curators such as Ritseart ten Cate, Theo Van Rompay, Nele Hertling, Trevor Davies and a few years later Tom Stromberg struggled intensely to expand the field of theatre, dance and performance

to an international circuit and for the autonomy of the art-work or piece. This was a time when the American performance scene was particularly strong and progressive. Groups and artists such as Wooster Group, Robert Wilson, Laurie Anderson, Richard Foreman and others being presented often for the first time in Europe came to play an important role in the development in Europe much due to the rigorous work of some of those curators. The emancipation from a rigid, long-term and disciplinary city theatre system and venues with a national commission where the identity of the 'house' was central, though had consequences – positive and negative – in short-term production models, weak sustainability, control and in particular precarisation of the producer, worker and artist as well as technicians and administration.

A valid question is to consider the benevolent response from local, regional and state politics to establish new performance venues and festival. Did these initiatives promise a new notion of the individual precisely at a time when social democratic hegemony and the post WWII utopian projections were failing? Did these initiatives, so to say, perform a symptom of the neo-liberal global economies that we experience today?

It is evident that the venue or festival changed its status from being of the state, i.e. the theatre understood as a machine that distributes and authorizes its population and police itself: a disciplinary system that precisely, because of these properties offer its 'inhabitants' alternative modes of navigation and participation. Now transforming into, what appeared, to be a more open and lateral system in which a multiplicity of activities were granted permission, i.e. into a modern democracy governed through control and inclusive modes of production, which through its lack of clear ethical outposts on a long-term basis homogenizes and become defensive.

Self-precarious and alternatively organized festivals from the mid 60s - we don't need to mention Woodstock but should recall the performance related festivals organized by Solvogn in Christiania, the alternative community outside Copenhagen, and the music festivals in Darmstadt, Germany, as well as the contemporary electronic music festival in the village Skinskatteberg in Sweden and after the stagnation of political theatre and performance a series of festivals popping up in several urban context in Europe in the early 80s, once radical and convictional have today been entirely assimilated into governing neo-liberal modes of production. The precarious individual, as well as the festival as enterprise, is today a creative asset that offer additional license to a society of control, i.e. hyper dynamic, short-term, opaque, global and operating through difference of degree.

The once necessary departure away from disciplinary, i.e. static, long-term, transparent, local and enabling emancipation, operating through difference in kind, festival and programming models towards models of control, coincided with shifts in society away from a political paradigm revolving around cold-war and continuous negotiations between super powers, and, what one could call, a economical paradigm revolving around wall-street and negotiations resolving

around the individual arriving at identity politics in the first years of the 90s. This shift is symptomatic to post-Fordist economies and imperative for the development of artistic practices, but must today be scrutinized in order for performance as a field of expression not to stagnate and wither away into annals of a time that passed, and more importantly to allow performance to venture into all and every corner of its vast potentialities.

The voice acquired by self-precarious movements especially during the 60s, has to the same extent been integrated by global market economies, performing a catchy edge of neo liberalism. Regimes of control produce momentum precisely through incorporation, illusions of emancipation, the pretence of lateralization and offer its citizens, artists and organizers, at best, the opportunity of a murmur, but never the agonistic intensity of a voice.

This murmur is the inarticulate sound of complaint, consolidating the police, whereas a voice performs the promise of a politics. The murmurs expression is further dependency towards an *allowing* authority, reproducing ad infinitum neurotic offspring. Control is a univocal machine without any prospect for lines of flight, but is productive of an endless stream of differences given sanction through tolerance.

This machine, which is able to measure a time of presence, a time of social engagement by the subject, but are unable to measure the subject's contribution, and offers no opportunities to function transversally, must be substituted with a series of constructed devices producing machinic empowerment. While subjection concern social selves or global persons, machinic empowerment consists of mobilizing and modulating pre-individual, pre-cognitive and pre-verbal components of subjectivity, causing affects, perceptions and sensations unassigned to a subject. Machinic empowerment, contrary to the molar economy of the machine of control, connects infra-personal and infra-social elements thanks to a molecular economy of desire, difficult to maintain within stratified social relationships. Yet the machinic does not consist of smooth absences, but must be constructed as a multitude of particulars, incompatible and superimposed, therefore disciplinary and functioning transversally, linking material and semiotic elements, from non-discursive, un-nameable, unrepeatable sets of entry-points, in order to construct political, economic and aesthetic devices where existential transformation can be tested. This implies a politics of experimentation, inscribed in a disciplinary regime of particulars critical precisely because it produces the outside as an inside, because of its insistence on the separation between power and knowledge, simultaneously a place of alienation and of a new happiness.

More concretely this implies that the notion of a neutral, transparent festival or venues performing the illusion of innocence must become subject to research and interrogation – as we know research has been a strong term in the field of performance since approximately 1997 but has exclusively been applied to the performance and its modes of production and rarely to organization, net-working,

economical models or curatorial practices – and be transformed to coincide not with the desire of performance artists, dance companies or theatre directors but to out time here and now.

It is today ten years ago since Hotmail was released globally. In 2006 Hotmail has approximately one billion hits per week. It is also ten years since SMS appeared in conventional private user mobile phones. The worldwide volume of SMS was in 2005 estimated to more than three hundred billion messages. That has in 2007 increased to 1.000.000.000 messages every day. Amazon and Ebay were similarly created in 1995. Google was released in September 1999 from a garage in Palo Alto. In the spring 2006 Google CEO's mentioned 150 million queries per day, or more than 50 billion per year. Skype was registered as a domain name exactly three years ago, 23 April 2003. At this very moment there is close to 10 million users on line, out of more than 200 million downloads. Today, in the spring 2007, the most visited territory of the internet is pages where you customize your myspace domain.

Considering for a moment that the contemporary performance festivals have the same history as the personal computer and that it ten years ago had established international net-works and sustainable economies, and that Skype was invented two-thirds into that brief history, is quite easy to conclude that adjustments might be small in perspective but enormous in proliferation. To rush to the next base and forget the kids in the shopping mall is of course a danger, but new modes of communication and production does not imply a homogenization of results nor an arrogant relation to the history, but there is certainly no reasons to evaluate festivals and programs that jump over classical resources as less prominent, on the contrary if festival and programs in the performing arts nourish a desire to be something more than a tiny field for the already engaged it is obvious that all opportunities must be explored.

The organization of festival and programs in performing arts are based on modes of distribution and circulation that today is largely outdated. Ten years ago is basically closer to J.S. Bach walking to Lübeck to listen to Buxtehude in 1705, than the ease with which we move over Europe today. So why is it still important to organize festival on the basis of the city (Tanzherbst Bremen), established and conventional venues/spaces (Stuk) and the tendays format (Kunsten Festival des Arts), when time and economy allow us to meet in the sushi bar of the Ryan air terminal somewhere, and that is for those of us that don't communicate over digital platforms or group chats. The answers will not be discussed here as they are a little bit too simple to answer: *power, economy and authorship*.

The communicational tools that the field utilizes naturally influence the result of its endeavours, and it is precisely in producing distance between e.g. new communicational tools and the position of the body and movement that conventional dialectics are maintained and further consolidated. If the body and its movement is in one or other way fundamental to human life and consciousness, it is

not likely that Skype, PDF or PSP (Play Station Portable) will effect it anymore than central perspective, combustion engines or moving images, but on the contrary could offer the potentiality to understand and utilize the body and its movements in new and alternative ways. These are certainly issues that directly concern research in the field, also this publication that I hope will be available on the net to download for free, so that interested persons that has different opportunities of accessibility can take part of the adventures and research initiated by In-Presentable.

If festivals around Europe want to produce discourse and renew the field of performing arts one can wonder why Merce Cunningham ends up on the cover page of the program and Rosas on the centre fold and the theory program is announced on a half a page with an internet address. If festivals wish to promote young and different choreographies it is simply mystical why promotion and marketing focus on the good old bestsellers? I would give my right arm to presenter that proposes that the reasons is something else than convention and/or economy, which always is acceptable but then say it straight and we all know how the game is played? Festivals today exist in order to survive not to make a difference.

Corporate economies are by default inclusive, its job description involve to incorporate and control every kind of outside. The last few decades have been one glorious tour de force and at present day it is with utter difficulty that we can name something existing outside global market economy. The pessimist could even argue that an outside is rendered impossible because what governs the world is precisely corporate interests.

It is not longer the state that governs our lives but economical interests without a face, which furthermore suggest that critique as we know is castrated, or simply transformed into an other cushion in the corporate bedroom. If this is the case then festivals, however critical they aspire to be, is plain and simple vehicles for the same forces, and the content of a piece however provocative is just not enough to produce a critical position.

So what can we do? We can, of course, give up, lie down and die, but before we kick the bucket collectively let's think positive for a moment?

In 1990 two important books appeared. Judith Butler published "Gender Trouble" which became the volcanic starting point for the popular interest in identity politics. What Butler proposes is that our identities, following J.L. Austin and Jacques Derrida, is performative and that life is a stage. The same year Pine and Gilmore presented their book "The Experience Economy" with the sub-title "Work is theatre, every business is a stage", where they propose that it is not what you sell but *how*. Work and business isn't about commodities, goods, products or service: it is all about performance. From having been a marginal and bourgeois pleasant bagatelle performance all of a sudden moved into the centre court of both theory and academic studies, including big business and the whole management sector. And isn't one of the strongest characteristics of the 90's in fact a case of street

performance, namely activism. What is remarkable is merely how it comes that we are still insisting on jumping around on stage or pretending to be somebody else when the whole world is our potential playground?

The curious conclusion of those opportunities however is that it is not the performances, placed like any other production in the program and the marketing campaign, that should attract our interest but instead the performance of festival itself. Because what is festival if not precisely a magnificent show, comparable to religious plays of the middle ages in e.g. Lord lasting for couple of weeks and engaging the entire city.

Viewed from this perspective the festival is a potential vehicle for the production of politics. A festival or any other event naturally represents a certain ideology or political position – usually the attempt is to stay neutral and conventional – but it is also always producing some kind of political horizon and possibility for engagement. Can the festival today and in the future empower groups and individuals in our local, regional and global contexts to act and live differently? The quest of the festival cannot be to tell its audience “What is good for you”, but it can give permission to an individual or group to take a decision, to raise his or her voice and speak an opinion.

The French philosopher Felix Guattari argued at the end of his life for what he called a proto-aesthetics. His proposal was that an art-work, something that can be subject for aesthetic pleasure will always, sooner or later, be included in corporate economies. Even if an artist makes performances that are completely improvised, because if it is not the work that can be valued economically, then it is the artist’s name that can be subject to economical value. There is one thing, argues Guattari, that cannot be absorbed by corporate interests and that is creativity, or better, the act of creating. And this opens for a backdoor, a way out for the artist: to assemble works, or organize situations, that is incomplete, that is not fulfilled when a spectator is encountering them, but has to continue the creative process, i.e. to become a creating agent him/herself.

The underlying question, or has it become an assumption, is if, or to what extent, a festival and, possibly, a season program can be understood as a proto-aesthetic proposal, and if so what limits it from becoming important in our local, regional or even national political landscape, always taking place on the level of the person and precisely because of that being a force hard to control.

Concepts of proto-aesthetics does not propose that a festival is becoming a political vehicle repeating notions of political theatre but rather that it gives permission to particular modes of active spectatorship. Spectating understood as a generally passive mode of perception confirms the spectators’ perspective, either positively or negatively, and is therefore functioning through modes of identification. Proto-aesthetics instead engage its spectator in an act of filling-in one or other missing link, to co-create an utterance or statement or better to fulfil it. This act of filling-in evacuates the audience understood as *one*: the public or audience, in favour of a set

of individuals provoked to fill-in in their own specific manner due their particular social and cultural context and conditioning. The need to fill-in emerge at a moment when the symbolic order, the opportunity for identification, in some or other way is pressured, exaggerated, abundant or otherwise asymmetrical which implicitly mean that the filling-in takes place on the outskirts of representation, i.e. is a production outside identity and thus can be understood as a process of individuation, or in other words a production that is changing the way thing can change, what identity can be. Proto-aesthetics thus propose the opportunity for radical becoming. It does not propose this or that but carries the permission to experience one self as foreign.

Proto-aesthetics therefore engage in some kind of approximation. It evades the proposition “about” – a fundamentally didactic notion -, as well as self-referentiality, or “aboutness” - a self-professing and lastly cynical notion - and proposes instead a kind of “just about”, or “almost there”, which yet again engage the spectator to take part, to fill-in, which is to say that a proto-aesthetic festival announces it self as inautonomous.

A festival or program that poses notions of proto-aesthetics therefore can be considered, not only as producer of alternative, temporary spaces and opportunities of producing voice but also as, in themselves, performances, where notions of presence and absence can be exchange for immateriality.

Immaterial performance suggests that performance consists of particular scripts that engage, involve, and empower individuals, groups or even objects to perform their existence as becoming. Performance thus is constituted by engagements in defined typologies of scripting and contexts, and not by anything engaged in the action of performing. Performance appears through a precision in naming a context, in accounting an environment or a frame, and through those processes manifests something as performance. Performance in this sense is manifested in relationship to intention rather than through conventions of recognition.

Immaterial performance, following George Dickies, claims that the existence of the work as “performance” is due to its being appointed to the status as a “candidate for performance” by agents who are situated inside the “performance world”. What performance is can therefore no longer be understood on the basis of traditional aesthetics, or through any idea of an experience of form, sense, etc. The question is not: *what* is performance, but: *when* is performance.

This shift implies a passage that can open the stage to capacities of performance emerging through performance intensive, however foreign discourses such as marketing, management, economics, postcolonialism, architecture, geopolitics etc. Immaterial performance pro-actively suggests that anything can be performance, but is not by definition, independent of its ontology and sustained by capacities of activation.

Immaterial performance proposes a shift towards performance as activity, shared

through multiplicities of relations, rather than performance as representation. Immaterial performance engages through activation, not in performance, i.e. participation, but as an emancipated spectator *through* intensities of performance. Immaterial performance expands the notion of the stage towards being able to frame situations where the performer and the audience can merge into one entity, not through conventions of participation, but through the opportunity to charge social interaction and thus politicize everyday behavior.

Immaterial performance performs the performance of the already there, through minimal reconfigurations of the spatio-temporal coordination. Immaterial performance implies a prolific expansive modality of the theatre's framework, detached from deconstruction or *detournement*, as a plug-in of radical enthusiasm into existing frames of social production.

Immaterial performance bypasses narrative, plot or dramatic consistency, in favor of an open heterogeneous production of narratives, and a complexification produced by user interaction and the canceling of drama towards production and actualization processes.

Immaterial performance expands the understanding of the stage which production is contractual, emphasizing multiplicity and identitarian regimes, into processes of individuation and multitude, and is productive of conventions set into motion. Immaterial performance short-circuits illusion through an affirmative gesture where illusion is no longer an issue. Immaterial performance performs the illusions of everyday life, between individuals and individuals and spatial-temporal frames in a manner where the production of illusion becomes visible in a dynamic and heterogeneous manner. Illusion instead of being the unfaithful veiling of theatre, becomes a possibility of the production of event.

Immaterial performance is a salutation of theatre come situation, where the lights have been turned on, the doors opened and the actors work in the bar. What is there is a performance that cannot be seen or interpreted, but must be experienced, a performance in which performing and spectating are interchangeable.

A performance that dissolves skill and perfection (generality), and emphasizes difference and precision (specificity), as a set of terms that are necessarily producing an emancipated spectator. This performance passes from concepts of action to time-image -in cinematic terms.

Immaterial performance announces as a first instance in order to pass from "what is being said in what is being said" to what can be said here and now and only through the particular frame offered. It is theatre as ready made, however not in the sense of staging the everyday as peculiar but staging the peculiar as everyday, or better the everyday as *everyday*, and it is in this minimal addition, that withdraws from the position of "telling", i.e. cancelling a conventional concept of outside, that immaterial performance produces criticality, and where its topography always is

contemporaneity.