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Abstract

This practice-led research is a methodological enquiry into my community-based art practice A Non-Predefined Outcome (ANPO). This was originally developed as a participatory art project to generate culturally safe spaces for people to engage in artistic and critical thinking. It was by generating these spaces of interaction (to challenge mainstream or personal cultural prejudices) that the practice became more defined and led to the development of ANPO as a methodology. The final presentation of this thesis contains two units: Unit One offers an overview of the theoretical framework that helped inform the practice and Unit Two represents the practice as methodology of this research and includes a handbook and four appendices that explain how the methodology works.

The methodology is based on dialectical games where participants interact with each other as a means of developing connection and the potential for mutual understanding. The methodological enquiry consists of four task-propositions, where every task has a specific function and generates a sequence that connects participants with language and its expression through the senses in an artistic way. The first task is ‘This is not a chair’, a warm-up exercise informed by Gottlob Frege’s theory on sense and denotation. The second is ‘The Topic’, informed by Paulo Freire’s concept of generative themes and which is the proposal of the theme that will be explored during the experience. The next task, ‘Vis-á-Vis-á-Vis’, is a dialectical game designed from the three-dimensional dialectic of ‘Definition – Dialectic – Hidden Message’. This game is informed by Hegel’s dialectic, and the structuralist language theory of Saussure and Michel Foucault. The potential of overcoming the contradiction with ‘Hidden Message’ offers a critical reflexivity in three different forms, depending on the participants’ enquiry: through the exploration of the senses; through the generation of a new discourse; or through a psychological reflexivity. In the final task, ‘Dialectical Representations’, participants reflect on different possibilities to comprehend the ‘Hidden Message’ employing visual, aural, performative and gustatory tools, informed by sensory ethnography methodology.
Drawing on the reflexivity of Doreen Massey’s *For Space* philosophy it was possible to conclude that the ANPO methodology generates spaces of interactions that are the product of interrelations wherein multiplicities and heterogeneities are negotiated. These spaces are open and constantly under construction due to their interrelations.
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I am originally from Venezuela and I came to Australia for political reasons in 2009. My father has remained a political refugee in Panama since that time. In addition to this, the Venezuelan Government took illegal action against my family, which has resulted in my sister being unable to ever leave Venezuela. My brother and I cannot return: if we do, the government will imprison us. This drastic situation has placed my family in a broken space where each of us has been forced to survive, no matter how hard the circumstances have been. Five people from one family live in four different countries. Each one of us deals with different interactions, languages, accents and cultures. No matter who remained in Venezuela or who left, we are exiled from our familiar spaces, the common places that built our memories. To be an exile is to miss your land and your family, the food that you know and the friends whom you love. We have promised as a family to overcome the pain of being apart and use our experience to support and understand people who have been through similar situations. The word ‘migration’ is not just a word for us; it is something that defines who we are and it will remain carved into our personal history forever.

It is through reflecting upon the experience of being an exile and after years developing cultural community projects that the first enquiry of this research arose: How can projects be more representative of a community and its multiplicity? Considering these experiences and their link to cultural community projects, certain ‘common places’ that art practitioners tend to repeat were found. Arising from the need to help and understand the community better, many practitioners tried to connect to communities in order to generate awareness, provide support or create a safe space where community members could interact freely. Most of these initiatives presented problems due to issues such as budget constraints, lack of interest from community members or disconnection with the community needs. Even though the art practitioners had indeed the best intentions, their projects seemed not to be accurately representative of the community.

Another interesting observation was that arts practitioners often attempted to approach a broad sector within the community, including participants with different backgrounds and those who did not have any connection to the arts. Other projects, however, attracted community members who were conscious of the value of the arts
while ignoring those who do not participate in these kinds of projects. This generated initial questions about why it is important to reach a broader segment of the community and whether or not the artist should be responsible for attracting those who are not interested in the arts. This further raised a related issue around the artist respecting people’s spaces so he or she does not contest the multicultural space.

The need for answers and to understand the premise of generating spaces of interaction led the researcher to an initial analysis of the Australian social landscape and its history, the context of the European settlement in 1788 and the constant flow of migrants to this country. One of the interesting indicators was that migration is expected to rise substantially in the near future, even though migration policy remains controversial¹.

The idea that migration is considered an ‘issue’ led to researching what has been done in Australia in terms of this topic. From this others indicators arose. The first was that in a globalised world there is a much freer movement of people which impacts on civilians in different countries, in response to migratory controls. The second indicator was that while there are public debates aimed at altering federal government multicultural policies², there is a lack of discussion around the active participation of the arts in these policies.

As a consequence of these indicators this research investigated how cultural community projects can help to better understand multicultural policies and how multiculturalism is assumed: as a diaspora of communities developing their own culture or an integration of all of them. Additionally, there was a necessity to consider how the cultural community projects challenge and reduce the gap between communities and their multiplicities, and the methodology that art practitioners use to approach those with doubts about the role of migration in Australia. In the quest for a different perspective of how we understand cultural space an enquiry emerged: What are the spaces of interaction between all of us?

² Ibid.
One of the ways to understand this cultural space was in the analysis of Doreen Massey’s *For Space*\(^3\) where Massey gives two examples of how we historically and socially understand space. Firstly, we read about Hernán Cortes and the conquering of the city of the Aztecs, which Massey describes as the Aztecs being ‘immobilised’, as if they were waiting for Cortes without having their own trajectories:

Hernán, active, a maker of history, journeys across this surface and finds Tenochtitlán upon it. It is an unthought[sic] cosmology, in the gentlest sense of that term, but it carries with it social and political effects. So easily this way of imagining space can lead us to conceive of other places, peoples, cultures simply as phenomena ‘on’ this surface.\(^4\)

Instead of conceiving space as a story of the tales of voyages of discovery, Massey suggests that we conceive this space as a ‘meeting-up of histories’\(^5\), a time that never stopped but rather was constantly in a process of change and the product of interrelations.

In the second example, Massey writes about the governments of the UK and USA and their discourse of the inevitability of globalisation. This discourse does not consider the historical and social multiplicities but rather produces a cosmology of only one narrative. For Massey, this only narrative ‘obliterates the multiplicities, the contemporaneous heterogeneities of space. It reduces simultaneous coexistence to place in the historical queue’\(^6\). Massey then suggests leaving behind this idea of ‘only one narrative’ and working for a space wherein there is recognition of multiplicity and heterogeneity.

---


\(^4\) Ibid., 4.

\(^5\) Ibid.

\(^6\) Ibid., 5.
It is in the context of these reflections on Massey’s redefinition of space as a social product of interrelations, never closed and always in process, as well as space as the result of multiplicity and heterogeneity⁷, that the arguments for my research began to evolve. A constant questioning of creative practice pushed these reflections further and the arguments started taking shape, theoretically and creatively, until the main enquiry became focused on how to transform my creative practice into a methodology that could generate spaces of interaction. It was in looking for ways to generate these spaces (to challenge mainstream or personal cultural prejudices) that the practice became more defined and ultimately led to the development of A Non-Predefined Outcome (ANPO) as a methodology for ‘socially engaged art’⁸, to create spaces of ‘anti-structure’⁹.

The ‘reflective analysis and critical reflexive questioning’¹⁰ of my own practice took on an important role, especially the understanding of the processes and how they were delivered using art as an instrument. In order to develop the ANPO methodology my previous community projects were studied and considered as objects to reflect upon. Through this study theoretical connections were made with literature of social science and arts and from there it was possible to see the ANPO methodology through a different theoretical perspective: what Schön defines as ‘a process in which we make connections and construct understanding of a situation by testing intuitive understanding of experienced phenomena’¹¹.

In the research there was always the intention to avoid a binary relationship between theory and practice and to create a double articulation of thought. Therefore, the methodology used constituted a process of critical reflexivity on the research enquiry. That is, as Robin Nelson states, ‘a double articulation between theory and practice,

---

⁷ Massey, For Space, 10-11  
⁸ Pablo Helguera, Education for Socially Engaged Art(Jorge Pinto Books, 2011).  
whereby theory emerges from a reflexive practice at the same time as practice is informed by theory\textsuperscript{12}.

The reflexivity moulded the research into a practice as methodology. This created an initial conflict, since the practice component of the ‘practice as research’\textsuperscript{13} did not seem to be clear. The idea of using ANPO to generate an artwork at the expense of community interaction did not seem to be ethical, especially because of the tensions between authorship and experience. Hence, as the result of this tension and the reflexive questioning, the creative writing of the methodology became the practice itself as a means of expressing complex thoughts in words.

When the ANPO methodology was being developed, connections with theoretical bases arose and some of them became the core structure and starting point of the theoretical framework. As the result of this, the research contains two units: a theoretical framework and a practical part. The practical part is a ‘practice as methodology’\textsuperscript{14} and the theoretical part is the explanation of how this methodology was developed, as informed by Hegel’s dialectic\textsuperscript{15} and the structuralist theories of Saussure\textsuperscript{16} and Foucault\textsuperscript{17}.

Unit One contains three sections and a conclusion. The first section is related to ANPO and its connection with language theories. It explains how the ANPO methodology started and how its further development was linked to concepts such as


\textsuperscript{13} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{14} The concept of practice as methodology is referred to the creative writing that led to the development of the ANPO methodology, in which case, the methodology itself is the practical part.


\textsuperscript{17} Michel Foucault, \textit{Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977} (Harvester Press, 1980).
Hegel’s three-dimensional dialectic\textsuperscript{18}, Saussure’s semiotics\textsuperscript{19}, Focault’s ‘power/knowledge’, and\textsuperscript{20} and Lacan’s ‘Seminars\textsuperscript{21}'. The second section conceives ANPO as a way to un-fix ideas through the tension that exists when ANPO is considered a workshop versus ANPO as an experience. The exploration of the theme drew on such works as \textit{Art as Experience} by John Dewey\textsuperscript{22} and \textit{Essays On The Blurring Of Art And Life} by Alan Kaprow\textsuperscript{23}. It also explores the artist-participants relationship in regard to authorship and the anti-structured environment that ANPO proposes informed by theories such as Victor Turner’s \textit{‘liminality’\textsuperscript{24}} and Jon McKenzie’s \textit{liminal-norm\textsuperscript{25}}.

Finally, the third section was developed taking into account the definition of space by Doreen Massey\textsuperscript{26} and posits ANPO into the context of Helguera’s \textit{Education for Socially Engaged Art}\textsuperscript{27} and the role of the artist in this kind of project. In order to illustrate the applied value of the ANPO methodology, some examples are taken into consideration such as my personal experience as a migrant, the SBS program \textit{Living with the Enemy}\textsuperscript{28} and contemporary art examples from the point of view of Claire Bishop\textsuperscript{29}. The first example compared ANPO with the art methodology that my sister

\textsuperscript{18} Spencer, Krause, and Appignanesi, \textit{Hegel for Beginners}
\textsuperscript{19} Anderson, Hughes, and Sharrock, \textit{Philosophy and the Human Sciences}
\textsuperscript{20} Foucault, \textit{Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977}.
\textsuperscript{22} John Dewey, \textit{Art as Experience}(Penguin Group, 2005).
\textsuperscript{24} Bjørn Thomassen, ”The Uses and Meanings of Liminality,” \textit{International Political Anthropology} 2, no. 1 (2009).
\textsuperscript{25} Bial, \textit{The Performance Studies Reader}
\textsuperscript{26} Massey, \textit{For Space}.
\textsuperscript{27} Helguera, \textit{Education for Socially Engaged Art}.
Dira Martinez has developed to generate a process of engagement and reflexivity with people with different backgrounds and political ideologies. The second reflects on a reality television show that uses radical dialogue as a space of interaction, in comparison to ANPO, which sidesteps social conflict to make the most of heterogeneities. Finally, the work of Pawel Athamer and Thomas Hirschhor are analysed as ideas that go beyond audiences and participation.

Unit Two contains the practice as methodology of this research and includes a handbook and four appendices that theorise how the methodology works, since no trial has been done yet. All the examples used in the appendices are hypothetical scenarios that aim to aid people attempting to apply the ANPO methodology. The methodology was partly informed by my creative practice related to community projects over the last five years via the support of government institutions.

The reflexive analysis of the projects often drew on traditional assumptions constructed through theories of language and participatory art. There was always the need for reflexive questioning of the social scope of the methodology and how it could contribute to the construction of social and organisational realities. Cunliffe says that ‘critically reflexive practitioners question the ways in which they act and develop knowledge about their actions’.\(^{30}\) This means highlighting ideologies and exploring how our actions and ways of making sense create our reality.\(^{31}\)

The development of knowledge in relation to the critical questioning of these projects offered the opportunity to develop four task-propositions within ANPO. The following list and Figure 1 show these propositions. Every task has a specific function and generates a sequence that allows participants to connect language with its expression through senses in an artistic way.

1. This is not a chair
2. The Topic
3. Vis-á-Vis-á-Vis

\(^{31}\) Ibid.
4. Dialectical Representations

4.1 Visual Dialectics
4.2 Aural Dialectics
4.3 Body Dialectics
4.4 Gustatory Dialectics

The first task ‘This is not a chair’ is used as a warm-up exercise to connect participants in a communal understanding of an object within its philosophical, sociocultural, environmental and political contexts. At the end of the activity participants are able to perceive an object, in this case a ‘chair’ as something more than a seat. The artist/facilitator places a wooden chair on top of the table and asks ‘What is this?’ From there on sets of questions are used to encourage participants’ analytical skills. This task is connected to Gottlob Frege’s theories relating to sense and denotation\(^ {32}\), where ‘sense’ gives a cognitive significance to the word/name and ‘denotation’ is the way the word/name is expressed in language\(^ {33}\); for example, ‘chair’. However, the sense and denotation of an object is essentially related to the discourse that we, as a society, have learned about the object. Therefore, the denotation of the word/name is related to a discourse that has been ‘historically located and individually shaped’\(^ {34}\) and has been validated by society and expressed via discourse (for an expanded explanation of this refer to Unit Two – Chapter One).


\(^{33}\) Ibid.

The second task ‘The Topic’ is an important part of the methodology, since it forms the basis of the ideas that are further explored along the ANPO experience. There are two different ways to approach the theme selection. The first option is ‘Decoded Theme’ and it is a process in which the artist/facilitator engages previously with community in order to preselect the topic that will be developed during the experience. The pre-selection of this topic consists of a previous investigation readapting the idea of Freire’s ‘generative theme’\(^{35}\). The second option is ‘Free Election’, an interactive process where participants have complete freedom to decide the topic. The artist/facilitator asks a single question: What is the topic that we are going to work with today? The participants have the option to propose and select the theme that they want to develop (see Unit Two – Chapter Two). In both, Decoded Theme and Free Election, the system of voting avoids the binary dynamic of choosing between one and another option. Instead, participants can vote for as many options as they like. The most voted option is the one selected.

The third task ‘Vis-á-Vis-á-Vis’, hereinafter called ‘VaVaV’, is a dialectical game where participants describe opposite meanings of keywords. The participants are asked to describe the topic utilizing words that are associated with it. This initial step is called ‘Definition’ and it is related to the concept of the ‘thesis’ as proposed within Hegellian triad. After that, participants give the opposite meaning of every keyword already mentioned. This second step is called ‘Dialectic’ and it is informed by Hegel’s ‘antithesis’. Finally, the third step is to overcome the contradiction that ‘Definition – Dialect’ has created. To overcome this contradiction, participants are asked to define the opposite word to each keyword defined in the ‘Dialectic’ without repeating the keywords used in the ‘Definition’. This last part is called ‘Hidden Message’ and it is related to Hegel’s ‘synthesis’ (see Unit One - Section One, and Unit Two – Chapter Three for an extended explanation of this). In VaVaV the Hegel three-dimensional dialectic is reinterpreted as ‘Definition – Dialect - Hidden Message’: Definition is then what the participants understand about the topic in terms of social categorizations; ‘Dialectic’ is the contradiction always present in every

definition; and the ‘Hidden Message’ is the ‘overcoming’ of the contradiction and represents how the participants truly feel about the topic.

The final task, ‘Dialectical Representations’, is directly connected to the keywords that define the topic in the last part of VaVaV, ‘Hidden Message’, and are used to understand the topic through visual, aural, body and gustatory representations. The task suggests a process to create a new discourse validated by the participants through sensory ethnographic methodology. The different representations interconnect research and exploration in terms of how participants understand and represent their ideas and cultural differences through their senses and become a way of learning about the topic, about others and about themselves. In addition, participants express their culture and knowledge in a non-written form, in which case the researcher, as well as participants, require reflexivity beyond words. This enables an exploration of the relationship between the topic and participants’ sensory perceptions with regard to their culture, and engages with questions concerning the status of language and its relationship to the senses 36 (see Unit Two – Chapter Four for an expanded explanation of this).

The first proposition for ‘Dialectical Representation’ is ‘Visual Dialectics’ (see Unit Two - Appendix IV.1). This task looks for a representation that escapes from figurative forms and requires participants to create a visual representation of the topic that allows abstract forms. This ignites the creative potentialities in participants and prepares the field for the next dialectical representation, which will demand higher levels of abstraction. The second representation ‘Aural Dialectics’ (see Unit Two-Appendix IV.2) is used to generate independent sounds for each keyword that defines a topic. The idea of producing the sound of the topic is to use the aural senses to connect participants with each other through the generation of a collective sound. The third task ‘Body Dialectics’ (see Unit Two - Appendix IV.3) creates a connection with aural dialectics, allowing participants to move their body and suspend for a moment the mental pressure that the previous tasks might have caused, and finally, to change the role of the artist/facilitator to ‘participant observer’ 37.

36 Sarah Pink, Doing Sensory Ethnography (Los Angeles, [Calif.] ; London  SAGE, 2009), 15.
37 Karen O’Reilly, Ethnographic Methods, (Abingdon, Oxon; NY: Routledge, 2012), 86-115
The last dialectical representation is ‘Gustatory Dialectics’ (see Unit Two-Appendix IV.4). Its role is to enclose and create an activity that combines association, playfulness and intellectuality, and which generates an outcome that might or might not be possible to eat. The first challenge that participants have to go through is to associate the topic’s keywords with ingredients. The second challenge is to invent a recipe utilising the ingredients. Gustatory dialectics produces a multisensory experience that enhances communication in the act of cooking and eating.

The propositions aforementioned need to be understood in terms of human perception and representation of discourses in an unfixed form. In all the activities the artist/facilitator becomes an instrument that produces participation and new understanding via the senses. Therefore, the anti-structured spaces that the ANPO methodology unfolds offer opportunities for participants to remove themselves from the dominant surrounding society and express their identities in ways that may not be possible in their permanent communities, as well as to open spaces for engagement and reflexivity depending on participants’ enquiries.
UNIT ONE
SECTION ONE

This section expands the critical reflexivity and questioning of the community project ‘Cubeless Diversity’ and how this reflexivity led to further development of the idea of the ANPO methodology and its connection to the theory of language. The dialectical game that was initially proposed to the project’s participants was related to Hegel’s dialectic\(^1\) and the structuralist theory of Saussure’s semiotics\(^2\). This reflexivity helped develop a three-dimensional dialectic adapted to the ANPO methodology: ‘Definition – Dialectic – Hidden Message’. In this triad, ‘Definition’ becomes that which a community understands about the topic in terms of social categorizations and its connection to Foucault’s theory of discourse\(^3\). ‘Dialectic’ is the contradiction always present in every definition and understood through Saussure’s theory of the part-within-the-whole\(^4\). Finally, the ‘Hidden Message’ is the overcoming of the dialectical relationship between ‘Definition - Dialectic’. This represents a new discourse that allows the artist to understand how the participants truly feel about the topic. This proposition places the ANPO methodology as an instrument to generate spaces of interaction that are the product of interrelations wherein multiplicities and heterogeneities are negotiated.

\(^1\) Spencer, Krause, and Appignanesi, *Hegel for Beginners*
\(^2\) Anderson, Hughes, and Sharrock, *Philosophy and the Human Sciences*
\(^3\) Foucault, *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977.*
\(^4\) Anderson, Hughes, and Sharrock, *Philosophy and the Human Sciences*
ANPO and its connection with language theories

A Non-Predefined Outcome (ANPO) started after a reflexive and questioning analysis of a ‘socially engaged art’\(^5\) project titled ‘Cubeless Diversity’, developed for the Australian National Youth Mental Health Foundation\(^6\). The community was a group of same-sex attracted teenagers who were facing bullying and discrimination in a suburb located 41 km south east of the Melbourne city centre\(^7\). Some of the teenagers had been attacked on the street for being ‘too feminine’ and others had had to hide their sexuality from their families, siblings and friends. The final outcome of the project was to be an installation in celebration of International Day Against Homophobia (IDAHO)\(^8\). My role in this project was to hear participants’ ideas in

---

\(^5\) Helguera, *Education for Socially Engaged Art.*

\(^6\) Australian National Youth Mental Health Foundation, "Who We Are," http://www.headspace.org.au/about-headspace/who-we-are/who-we-are. Headspace, is the National Youth Mental Health Foundation. Their aims is to help young people aged 12-25 who are going through a tough time, providing support for problems like depression, anxiety, bullying and body image. With more than 60 centres around Australia, headspace support with general health, mental health and counselling, education, employment and other services, alcohol and other drug services.

\(^7\) Frankston represent the so-called ‘white area’ where 72.6% of people were born in Australia, and the most common countries of birth are England 6.3%, New Zealand 2.3%, Scotland 1.2%, India 1.0% and Philippines 0.7%. In addition, 85.1% of people only speak English at home and the majority of the population reports being in the labour force. This statistics show a demographic behaviour where the multiculturalism and ‘outsiders’ behaviours struggle to find approval and respect from the gross part of the population. Reason why, the young people from the projects faced discrimination and bulling issues, due to their condition as same-same attracted teenagers. Australian Bureau of Statistics, "Abs Census," http://www.censusdata.abs.gov.au/census_services/getproduct/census/2011/quickstat/21401.

\(^8\) ‘May 17, 2004, is symbolic due to its significance in the improvement of the status of gays and lesbians. IDAHO proposed this date for annually holding a day set aside to fight homophobia. In removing homosexuality from its list of mental illness on May 17 the World Health Organization (WHO) put an end to over a century of homophobia in the medical field. Borne out of the International Conference on LGBT Community Human Rights held in Montréal from July 26 to 29, 2006, prior to the opening of the first World Outgames, the Declaration of Montréal included a recommendation to have an International Day Against Homophobia on May 17 of each year.’ Gai Écoute, "International Day Against Homophobia,” http://www.homophobiaday.org/default.aspx?scheme=3176.
order to assist them in defining their sexual identity. The participants’ intention was to create an installation as a response to the bullying and discrimination issues they were facing and show themselves as human beings free of labels such as LGBT\textsuperscript{9}.

In order to facilitate the activity, every participant was asked to disclose the worst insult that they had received with regard to their sexual orientation. The list of derogatory words was then written on a white board. ‘Faggot’ and ‘dyke’ were the ones that stood out the most. After that, the participants and myself decided to find the opposites of those insults. For instance: ‘straight’ was the opposite of ‘faggot’ and ‘feminine’ the opposite of ‘dyke’. This opened the possibility of dialogue in which participants complained that the words ‘straight’ and ‘feminine’ seemed positive while ‘faggot’ and ‘dyke’ were completely negative. At this point, there were four extremes with no apparent reconciliation.

The young participants argued that they would like to be represented outside of those derogatory and sexist words. One person, a young girl, drew a cross and wrote the keywords in each quadrant, as shown in Figure 2:

![Diagram](image)

*Figure 2. The definition of the opposites*

A participant then went online and searched for a diagram that described the four extremes in the LGBT community: exclusively male, exclusively female, exclusively sexual and exclusively romantic. The participants decided to substitute the words ‘faggot’ for ‘sexual’, ‘straight’ for ‘male’, ‘feminine’ for ‘female’ and ‘dyke’ for ‘romantic’. The adverb ‘exclusively’ was added before every adjective (see Figure 3).

\textsuperscript{9} LGBT stands for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender and has been used since the 1990s.
In these four extremes the participants concluded that they could locate themselves without compromising their integrity.

![Diagram of four extremes: Exclusively Male, Exclusively Female, Exclusively Sexual, Exclusively Romantic]

The figure created gave them the possibility to think about same-sex attraction from a different point of view and led to the question: Where would they place themselves in those four extremes? Then, the participants started to play with their location within the graphic.

The first task within this activity was to create, from scraps of fabric, four figures that could represent the concept of exclusively male, exclusively female, exclusively sexual and exclusively romantic. The room was split into four groups and each group was in charge of a specific shape.

The forms were defined in the following way:

- Exclusively Male: a kind of organic vertical phallus
- Exclusively Female: a flower
- Exclusively Sexual: tension between two extremes. One extreme was made out of pink fabric and the other extreme in black fabric.
- Exclusively Romantic: a big red heart.

The last task was to define the participants’ identities through the location of a dot or point between the four extremes. This redefinition of their identity would make them feel completely separated from labels such as gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender.
and would help them to connect the definition of the four extremes with a visual representation.

In further conversations with the participants, the possibility of representing their individuality via making a fabric shape of their choosing was suggested. This was done employing a cooperative dance, similar to the Maypole dance, wherein they intertwined straps of fabric in order to create a sculpture. Finally, the extremes mentioned in Figure 3 were hung on the exhibition room and their ‘identities’ were located in between these extremes. After that, weekly sessions were scheduled where the participants and myself worked together to develop these forms.

Figure 4 refers to the day before the IDAHO celebration. In this, the four extremes and some of the individual constructs were exhibited. The participants in the pictures are young volunteers from the Head Space program.

In Figure 5, a flower depicts one of the extremes, exclusively female. Figure 6, represents the identity of a girl who placed herself close to ‘exclusively romantic’ and ‘exclusively female’.

Finally, Figure 7 represents the final installation on the opening night where spectators were invited to intervene in the installation, play with it and add straps.

The best way to understand the final outcome of this project is to watch the following link: Ramon Martinez M, "Cubeless Diversities,” http://ramonmartinezmendoza.com/cubeless-identities/.

---

Figure 4. Sculptures representing the four extremes of Figure 3.
from the fabric scattered on the floor and help connect everything in a single integrated structure.

The empirical and organic process, in which ‘Cubeless Diversities’ was created, as well as the final result of the project, led to a re-evaluation of how to use the participants’ capacities and skills and transform them into a methodology that would explore participation in different ways.

The first step was to frame the process and simplify it in terms of the activities that were held and developed during the project:

1. Step 1. Definition of the topic. How participants responded to the task of ‘defining their sexuality’.
3. Step 3. From definition to representation. How the participants interacted with the fabric.
4. Step 4. The final exhibition. What was the aesthetic of the final exhibition?
5. Step 5. Evaluation of the process. The process of creation and elaboration of the project was done in conjunction with collaborators (teenagers and young people) considering their personal inputs, ideas and feedback. Who, then, owned the authorship and what was the role of the artist in this project?
None of these questions were answered immediately and some of them were related to a different research enquiry. Hence, the focus on the research was to outline a methodology that could use this experience as a starting point and how it could generate an art practice set apart from the traditional role of the artist. This required a deep reflexivity on my creative practice and an understanding of the core concepts that needed to be explored.

One of these core concepts was the ‘dialectic’\textsuperscript{11}. The use of the word dialectic appeared in the research when I was trying to understand the reason why participants redefined the topic, in this case same-sex attraction, through opposite contradictions.

These opposites did not seem to have any possible reconciliation but rather an increment in their contradiction. During the dialectic analysis important questions arose: How could these contradictions be overcome in terms of language? And, more important, how they could be represented? Further reading in terms of dialectics and discourse\textsuperscript{12} were the inspiration to the further development of the ANPO methodology and to a better understanding of its conceptual basis, as it is explained in this section.

Another core concept was the ‘anti-structure’\textsuperscript{13} generated when participants had to represent the topic in a visual form. Participants seemed to struggle to find a connection between words and materiality. However, their final representations were non-figurative forms and this allowed participants to see the definition of same-sex attraction in a different dimension. The use of the fabric in this project was not accidental; this had been the material used by me for more than ten years. The material seemed to ignite creative potentialities in participants. They could only tie, scatter and hang the fabric in any way decided. They had freedom of representing forms that did not require any particular expertise. So, it seemed that breaking the structure of the representation of the topic allowed participants to experiment with a sense of freedom. This anti-structure led to questioning on how the topic could be represented in other ways.

In addition, the whole process of the project was developed with no previous agenda since the idea was to encourage young people to create their own process of participation. My role was a mix between that of the artist and the facilitator. This generated a positive interaction between participants and myself and freed us from the constraints of a final outcome. The name of the project (ANPO) emerged in relation to this reflexion, as a way to develop a methodology wherein the artist would be able to interact with communities without previously defining the results.

\textsuperscript{12} Foucault, \textit{Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977.}

\textsuperscript{13} Bial, \textit{The Performance Studies Reader}
Hegel’s dialectic and the structuralist theory behind ANPO

The game generated in Figure 2 helped to research and develop one of the tasks proposed for ANPO, ‘Vis-á-Vis-á-Vis’ (VaVaV). The idea that participants had to find the opposite words of the definitions that they had selected generated the enquiry of how this opposition could be overcome, and moreover, what ‘overcome’ exactly meant.

The ‘thesis – antithesis – synthesis’\textsuperscript{14} dialectic attributed to Hegel is the result of terms that negate and contradict each other. The core of this dialectical thinking is based on the German concept of ‘\textit{das Aufheben des Widerspruchs}’ (the sublation of the contradiction)\textsuperscript{15}. ‘\textit{Aufheben}’ signifies, on the one hand, negation and overcoming; on the other hand, preservation and placing on a higher level. This ambiguity is completely lost in most translations for example …English (transcend or sublate).\textsuperscript{16}

Based on the \textit{Aufheben}, Hegel defines as ‘thesis’ any intellectual proposition that is unsatisfactory and incomplete. This unsatisfactory proposition entails the negation of the thesis, producing the ‘antithesis’, which is also, on reflection, inadequate. So, the third term ‘synthesis’ sets apart the contradictions and generates a new stage that overcomes and preserves (or sublates) the prior stages of thesis – antithesis and arises as a higher rational unity\textsuperscript{17}.

According to Lefebvre, Hegel’s dialectic is mainly conceptual, i.e. only in thought, and it cannot be applied to reality. For Lefebvre, as Schmid argues, it is more important to grab real life with all its contradictions:

\textsuperscript{14} ‘Although this model is often named after Hegel, he himself never used that specific formulation. Hegel ascribed that terminology to Kant’ Fox, \textit{The Accessible Hegel}, 43.


\textsuperscript{17} Spencer, Krause, and Appignanesi, \textit{Hegel for Beginners} 86.
Hence, Lefebvre follows Marx who stood Hegel’s dialectic on its feet and gave precedence not only to the idea but also to the material process of social production\textsuperscript{18}. In the dialectical materialism of Marx, thesis and antithesis are not just contrary but are a stage of no reconciliation. This entails the triadic dialectic of Marx as Affirmation – Negation - Negation of the Negation.\textsuperscript{19}

The reflexivity of the three-dimensional dialectic and the search for a higher rational unity helped to shape the concept of ‘overcoming’ proposed in ANPO, which transcends contradictions through the negotiation of multiplicities and heterogeneities wherein spaces of interaction are generated. Therefore, the word ‘overcome’ in the ANPO methodology relates to the possibility to perceive a contradiction and then conceive it in a different way; hence rather than solving the contradiction per se, social spaces are negotiated where multiplicities are recognised and produce unexpected outcomes.

Using the example in Figure 2, the word ‘faggot’ would represent the ‘thesis’ in the Hegel dialectic and ‘affirmation’ in the Marxist dialectic. The opposite word ‘straight’ would be therefore the ‘antithesis’ or ‘negation’ respectively. The resolution of this dialectic was the ‘synthesis’ for Hegel or the ‘negation of the negation’ for Marx, but how could these concepts be understood?

If in both cases the idea was to overcome the contradiction, the resolution of this contradiction had to emerge from the same dialectical problem ‘faggot – straight’. And it had to generate a space of interrelation and multiplicity.

For Lefebvre, Hegelian and Marxian dialectics are based on contraries. In response, as outlined by Schmid, Lefebvre defines:

‘Three moments that are left distinct from each other, without reconciling them in a synthesis – three moments that exist in interaction, in conflict

\textsuperscript{18} Schmid, Space, Difference, Everyday Life : Reading Henri Lefebvre 30.

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., 302.
or alliance with each other’. The three terms or moments assume thus equal importance, and each takes up a similar position in relation to the other. In this way a three-dimensional or triadic version of the dialectic emerges.20

In the triadic version of Lefebvre, every idea/moment is independent from the other but shares parts. Lefebvre readapted his spatial dialectic of ‘form – structure – function’ 21 into an innovative triadic construction of ‘syntagmatic dimension – paradigmatic dimension – symbolic dimension’22 related to the theory of language, as shown in Figure 8.

Again, every part is independent from the other and shares points of encounter with each other. In his dialectic, the syntagmatic dimension is the classic dimension of language and grammar and deals with the relation between signs, combinations, sentence structures and others. On the other hand, the paradigmatic dimension23 is a metaphorical process related to a system of meanings, where one term can be substituted for another that shares similarities in some aspects but differs in others when analysed in different contexts. The last dimension, the symbolic dimension, aims to relate symbol and society through instinctive, emotional and irrational facts. The symbol thus forms part of a social structure and ‘serves as a pillar for allegory and fetish. It constitutes the basis of the social imaginary that is different from the individual imaginary …symbols are inexhaustible…and their formalization is not possible’.24

20 Schmid, Space, Difference, Everyday life: Reading Henri Lefebvre, 30
21 Ibid.
22 Ibid.
23 Roman Jakobson, “Selected Writings II,” (The Hague: Mouton, 1971), 239-59. ‘This concept refers to Roman Jakobson, who developed a two-dimensional theory of language, distinguish between two kinds of classifications of a linguistic sign’. Schmid states that ‘the first is the combination or context where every sign is the result of a combination of signs and the second is the selection or substitution, which consists in the substitution of one term for another’. Schmid, Space, Difference, Everyday Life : Reading Henri Lefebvre 30.

24 Space, Difference, Everyday Life : Reading Henri Lefebvre 34-36.
There were then three different ways to critically reflect on the contradiction:

I. Thesis – antithesis, where one is the opposite of the other and can find a resolution in a synthesis

II. Affirmation – negation, where the tension always persists and it is never resolved

III. Syntagmatic dimension – paradigmatic dimension, where each one was independent from the other

Reflecting on the contradiction ‘faggot – straight’ it was also found that the contradiction bears social contexts. To overcome this contradiction it was important to find a word that could release the tension and generate a different standpoint. This contradiction was overcome by finding a word that was opposite to ‘straight’ that was not ‘faggot’ but a synonym; for instance, queer or homosexual. Even though both words related to a same definition they had different meanings to the word faggot. This was clarified when the words were compared in the *Oxford English Dictionary*:\(^\text{25}\):

‘a) Faggot: “offensive a male homosexual” b) Homosexual: “sexually attracted to people of one’s own sex” c) Queer: “informal a homosexual man.’

The idea that the same synonyms of the word ‘faggot’ did not have the same social implication, led to the concept that in order to find a new definition of the word ‘faggot’ it was important to find a word that was opposite of the word ‘faggot’ and a word opposite to the opposite definition of ‘faggot’. This critical reflexivity was the beginning of the VaVaV task and its relation to dialectic and structuralist theory (see Unit Two - Chapter Three).

In the structure generated there were three components:

1. A keyword that defined a topic
2. The opposite to that keyword
3. The opposite of the opposite (or the overcoming of the contradiction).

This structure helped to give a reinterpretation of the triad proposed by Hegel, Marx and Lefebvre and it became: ‘Definition – Dialectic – Hidden Message’ as represented in Figure 9. The ‘Definition’ then becomes that which participants understand about the topic in terms of social categorizations and its connection to
Foucault’s theory of the discourse. ‘Dialectic’ is the contradiction always present in every definition and understood through Saussure’s part-within-the-whole. Finally, the ‘Hidden Message’ is the overcoming of the dialectical relationship between ‘Definition – Dialectic’ and represents a new discourse while at the same time representing how the participants truly feel about the topic.

**The part-within-the-whole**

Saussure was interested in how a word earns its particular meaning. His answer to this puzzle is the systematic differentiation of one word and another, due to their distinctive form. ‘Mother’ is different in sound from ‘lake’ and ‘house’ and so on. The differences that distinguish a word from another word are what give a word an identity. Words are differentiated in sound and concept. As Saussure declares:

> A difference generally implies positive terms between which the difference is set up; but in language there are only differences without positive terms …a linguistic system is a series of differences of sound combined with a series of differences of ideas.

This involves a differential structure in the language that Saussure defines as a ‘part-within-the-whole’, a definition that becomes an important pillar in the structuralist theory in which there is unity and diversity.

---


27 Anderson, Hughes, and Sharrock, *Philosophy and the Human Sciences*

28 What Saussure defines as form is a relation of four factors involved in each word. These factors are the form and matter of the signifier and the form and matter of the signified. Where signifier is, in linguistic terms, related to the sound or the power of communicating through voice, and the signified is the concept that this word intends to transmit. Philip Pettit, *The Concept of Structuralism: A Critical Analysis* (Berkeley University of California Press, 1975), 7.


To understand this unity within diversity it is enough to give an example, such as a man who declares ‘I’m happy’. The part-within-the-whole is ‘happy’. The whole is the relationship between the opposite of the word happy, which is sad. Thus, the whole is happy-sad. When he claims that he is happy, he is directly affirming that he is not sad. This opposite affiliation is what makes the language a constant system of contradictions and oppositions, where, for any word to exist the word must reaffirm its opposite. It is this opposition that defines VaVaV, since participants associate a topic with keywords. Every keyword mentioned is immediately affirming its opposite, generating a concept of space that overcomes the dialectical understanding of the topic.

In Unit Two - Appendix III, a hypothetical example of how VaVaV works is outlined. The topic selected by the participants is ‘work’. Using keywords, participants define what ‘work’ means to them. However, for the participants, the initial definition of work is framed in parameters related to social categorization and linked to natural instinct to define the topic ‘work’ within these parameters.

Following the theory of Saussure, the definition of work can only be completed if the dialectical relationship of work prevails. This means that when the participants define what work is, they are immediately defining what work is not. It is in these opposites where the systematic differentiation of language occurs as well as the beginning of the dialectical thinking. Participants have been encouraged to see the topic through a system of contradictions, in which one word does not exist without the other. However, this does not guarantee the whole definition of the topic but leaves the topic in a kind of contradictory space where it can be defined by keywords and their opposites. Hence, to overcome the contradiction, a third space of analysis is produced wherein the topic meanders over the contradictions and lands in unknown ground. This is what is identified as the opposite of the opposite, or VaVaV.

When participants overcome the dialectic of ‘what work is – what work is not’, and are asked to reflect again ‘what work is not’, a three-dimensional dialectic is generated in relation to the topic on:
‘What work is – What work is not – What (work is not) is’

In this third space of analysis it is possible to infer what the participants consider the actual definition of the topic. In this space, a ‘Hidden Message’\(^3\) overcomes the dialectic giving the artist/facilitator a tool to better understand the interest and emotion of the participants.

In the Appendix III example, work is defined as a stressful activity, one that produces difficulties and is framed into a measured parameter; but at the same time ‘work’ generates firmness, salary and a feeling of reward.

This definition yields questions such as, why is work stressful and difficult? Is this because participants struggle to find a job or because they are working in something that they do not enjoy? Why firm? Is this because they feel rootless or because others depend on their salary? In summary, what is the job/work situation for the participants?

With this information, the artist/facilitator has the opportunity to engage in a conversation with the participants to understand how the topic is affecting their lives, as well as reflecting about what the participants are facing in their daily lives. It is through this dialectical thinking that VaVaV generates a connection between opposites and social implications within the community. Dialectical thinking is ‘the recognition that social reality is marked by contradictions and can be understood only through the comprehension of these contradictions’\(^3\).

---

\(^3\) This is explored further in the last part of this section.

From ‘Definition – Dialectic’ to the creation of a ‘Hidden Message’

In the same way that Hegel defines the ‘thesis – antithesis’, VaVaV defines ‘definition – dialectic’ and looks to overcome the contradiction through the creation of a new way to define the topic. Hence, in this case, the overcoming is called ‘Hidden Message’ in VaVaV (Hegel defines ‘synthesis’).  

Therefore, the triadic ‘Definition – Dialectic – Hidden Message’ is solved in its last part, ‘Hidden Message’. The way the topic is redefined in this part generates a new discourse and non-fixed codification of power. This non-fixed codification sets apart from what society, institutions and others have defined about the topic (or have expected it to be defined). In this last part participants are encouraged to perceive the topic in an unexpected and innovative way. The keywords that define the topic distance themselves from the ‘true definition’ of the topic that generates a different level of conscience.

Appendix III explains how participants work as a team to develop the keywords of the topic. The initial keywords that participants suggest are associated with definitions that they have learned through a historical use of the words. When participants are asked to proceed with the next task, which is to define the opposite of the keywords that have initially defined the topic, they are taking the first step to set aside the discourse they have unconsciously learned about the topic. In this part of the triad ‘Dialectic’, participants answer logically to the opposite of each keyword, and their answers are related to the ‘only possible truth’ about the opposite word. An example of this is when participants define in Appendix III the opposite of effort as relaxation, the opposite of income as expenditure, the opposite of rewarding as penalty and so on. Might there be any possibility that the opposite of income was not expenditure, or the opposite of rewarding was not penalty?

---

33 Fox, *The Accessible Hegel*, 86.
34 This is based on the Appendix III from Chapter Three.
Michel Foucault states, ‘each society has its regime of truth, its general politics of truth’\textsuperscript{35}. This ‘truth’ develops ‘mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statement, the means by which each is sanctioned… the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true’\textsuperscript{36}.

Foucault also characterises truth by five important traits:

a) Truth centred on the form of scientific discourse and the institution that produces it
b) Truth is the subject of political and economic incitements (the demand of truth and political power)
c) Truth is the object, with diverse forms, by which the truth is diffused and consumed
d) Truth is produced and transmitted under control of political and economic apparatuses (universities, army, writing, media), and finally
e) Truth is the issue of a whole political debate and social confrontation\textsuperscript{37}.

When participants are asked initially to define the topic, the way they characterise it depends on a definition of truth in relation to what they have socially and historically learned about the topic. When participants define ‘work’ they do it employing keywords that are related to a discourse of ‘work’\textsuperscript{38}.

In Appendix III the main keywords suggested by the participants are:

1. Effort
2. Challenging
3. Income
4. Time

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{37} Foucault, \textit{Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977}, 131-132
\textsuperscript{38} The use of the word ‘work’ is related to the topic selected for the participants in Appendix II of the Unit Two – Chapter Two.
5. Rewarding

When these keywords are compared to the definition of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, which in this case is the institution that certifies and verifies the truth about ‘work’, it is possible to perceive similarities to the definition that participants have given, as highlighted thus:

Activity involving mental or physical **effort** done in order to achieve a result. Work as means of earning **income**; employment. The period of **time** one spends in paid employment.

In both definitions (Oxford English Dictionary and participants’ keywords) there are words that are repeated, such as effort, income and time. The rest of the words, like challenging, rewarding and stability, are tacitly suggested in the Oxford’s definition and are synonyms of it. ‘Challenging’ is related to ‘effort’ as ‘rewarding’ is to ‘income’ and ‘stability’ over time. In addition, these keywords could be a consequence of the way that ‘society-regime’ constructs its own truth. For instance, getting an income is the reward that one receives for the sacrifice that one has made to challenge oneself in order to achieve social stability.

In the ‘Hidden Message’, the topic is defined for a group of words that may have some similarities with the ‘true’ definition of the topic. However, some keywords would have never appeared if the participants had not been asked to define the opposite of the dialectical definition of the topic, which is the Hidden Message. In Appendix III, when participants finally find the opposite of the opposites, they define ‘work’ as:

---

Keywords such as ‘firm’, ‘difficult’ and ‘stressful’ would have never appeared if the participants had not been asked to find the opposite of the opposite. Therefore, the process entailed a definition of the topic that connected words and sets aside the normal discourse that would have been expected when defining the topic, in this case: ‘work’.

The new discourse generated about the topic produces a different sense of power among participants. This sense of power is not an institution, a structure or a certain force, with which participants have been endowed, but rather it is a complex strategic relation in the given space that ANPO creates. Participants have the power to reject what societal institutions render about the topic and redefine it in as much as that dislocates the ‘truth of the topic’.

This dislocation allows spaces of representation that go beyond the norms and the ordered system of production of truth and power. As a consequence, informed by the philosophy of Foucault, participants have the power to produce and validate their own truth, which generates a new discourse about the topic that it is certified and authenticated only by them, with no political or external economic apparatuses interfering, since, the apparatus of power/knowledge is mastered by the participants.

At this point the methodology becomes active and generates spaces for engagement and reflexivity through overcoming the contradiction: ‘Hidden Message’. Therefore, this space is open to critical reflection upon different forms, depending on the participants’ inquiry:

• Through the exploration of the senses, as it is suggested in Appendix IV, where participants reflect on different possibilities to comprehend the ‘Hidden Message’ employing visual, aural, performative and gustatory tools, informed by sensory ethnography methodology. As part of this new discourse, participants have the chance to experiment with the topic in a realm beyond words. Therefore, the topic does not become an abstract definition chained to keywords, but a relationship between keywords and senses, and this produces unusual ways to understand and represent the topic.

These representations allow participants to generate their own regime of truth and knowledge at the same time that it helps them to explore ways of perceiving and analysing realities in ‘unconventional’ forms. Hence, participants generate their own ‘regime of truth’. This new regime of truth expresses culture with no words and at the same time transfers a hidden message to the realm of the senses.

• Through the generation of a new discourse, informed by the theory of Michael Foucault, participants have the possibility to critically reflect upon the meaning behind the definition of the topic that they have come up with. This generates space for the engagement and dialogue about the ‘Hidden Message’ and it may produce assumptions as the result of the collective process of reflexion. Participants may explore the contradictions, doubts, dilemmas, questions and possibilities of this reflexion and the social implications in their

41 The unconventional forms that these representations take are reference to more than the facts that connect language and sensory expressions of a definition than to an actual validation of the art form. Hence, the word ‘unconventional’ is not suggesting that the artwork produced by participants is, in any way, avant garde or different to any artwork done before in the history of the arts but the unconventionality of interconnecting keywords and their representations as a substitution of the academic understanding of the keywords.

42 Foucault, Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977, 131..

ANPO and its connection with language theories

reality in regards to what the definition of the topic tells them and what the hidden message that they have to decode is.

- **Through a psychological reflexivity.** In relation to this part, it is important to explain that the ANPO methodology has not been developed to produce psychological reflexivity; however, the active space that is generated through the dialectical game proposed in VaVaV allows this approach. The theory explored in this regard was connected to Jacques Lacan’s theory of the unconscious. For Lacan, the unconscious is created by language and expressed by syntax; a body of rules that build patterns of behaviours. The acquisition of speech works through a symbolic order and is ‘the primary element in the acquisition of culture, that is in the submission of free ranging instinctive drives to that symbolic order. By acquiring language, we allow our instinctive energies to be canalised and organised’. By acquiring language, human beings integrate instinct and channel it via words.

---


45 Ibid.,112.

46 This is what Lacan defines as the law of the signifier. In the law of the signifier Lacan attempts to intertwine the theoretical bases of Freud’s psychoanalysis and the linguistic theory of Saussure. Freud’s achievement, according to Jaques Lacan, ‘was not so much the discovery of the unconscious but the insight that the unconscious possessed a structure which affected what we say and do. We are in the grip of the unconscious’. Anderson Hughes, and Sharrock, *Philosophy and the Human Sciences*, 27. Lacan, provided an examination of Freud’s psychoanalysis from a structuralist standpoint. For him, structure and language were connected and the unconscious was structured in the same way that a language is. So, while Freud used ‘behaviours’ to understand forms of communications, Lacan connected the unconscious to the theory of languages and how human beings communicate. Whereas in semiotics theory the sign is that which represents the signifier, in psychoanalysis it is the unconscious that takes the place of it. This signifier represents the hole, the part that is missing, but is
Whether the exploration of the ‘Hidden Message’ is done through the senses, critical reflexivity of the new discourse or psychological reflexivity, what stands out is that the ANPO methodology generates spaces of interaction that are the product of interrelations wherein multiplicities and heterogeneities are negotiated. These spaces are open and constantly under construction due to their interrelations.

still perceived. Lacan uses the example of the trace in the sand. If an animal marks the sand with its foot leaving a footprint, the animal becomes the object but the trace left in the ground represents its presence, the signifier. As Lacan wrote in his Seminar III:

Then there is the trace, the footprint in the sand, the sign about which Robinson Crusoe makes no mistake. Here sign and object separate. The trace, in its negative aspect, draws the natural sign to a limit at which it becomes evanescent. The distinction between sign and object is quite clear here, since the trace is precisely what the object leaves behind once it has gone off somewhere else. Objectively there is no need for any subject to recognise a sign for it to be there – a trace exists even if there is nobody to look at it… the signifier is a sign which refers to another sign, which is as such structured to signify the absence of another sign. Miller, *The Seminar of Jaques Lacan, Book Iii: The Psychoses*, 167.

The absence of another sign is what carries the hidden message in the communication; one knows that an animal has passed by the beach because one can see its footprint in the sand and it is that trace that produces the meaning, it communicates and carries the information of the object that was before, in this case an animal. In the words of Lacan ‘…The signifier does not designate what is not there, it engenders it.’ Lacan, *The Seminar of Jaques Lacan Book XIV the Logic of Phantasy*, 8. Extrapolating this into human behaviour, the main question that arises is how these traces relate to human beings. What is that mark that produces the information? Those marks are the circumstances that a person lives in the course of his life; they are the stamps of interaction and memories that produce an indelible trace in human behaviour.
SECTION 2

This section explains the critical reflexivity that led to consider the ANPO methodology as an instrument to un-fixing ideas and developing anti-structured spaces. The initial approach of the hypothesis was informed by Allan Kaprow’s philosophy of ‘lifelike’, explored in his *Essays on the Blurring of Art and Life*\(^1\), and the philosophical differences that John Dewey proposes in terms of ‘experience’ and ‘an experience’ in ‘Art as Experience’\(^2\). Dewey’s and Kaprow’s philosophies are compared and help define ANPO as an open ended experience wherein artist-participants renounce their ‘authorial presence’\(^3\). The anti-structures generated by open endings allow participants to be part of the experience leaving behind their immediate social differences and structures temporarily. This temporality is what creates the ‘liminal-phenomena’\(^4\) that takes part in ANPO.

---

1 Kaprow, *Essays on the Blurring of Art and Life*
2 Dewey, *Art as Experience*.
4 Bial, *The Performance Studies Reader* ; *The Performance Studies Reader* ; Thomassen, "The Uses and Meanings of Liminality."
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The boundaries between artist-participant and the so-called participatory art today derive from a series of changes that began in the first decade of the twentieth century, with the Italian Futurism’s approach to performance. This movement was underpinned by the concept of destroying art in its traditional form using provocation as a starting point. Futurists broke the traditional spectatorship into a new concept of participation where the audience was deliberately forced to react to external stimuli and used to end up in a collective hostility as ‘a brutal form of entertainment’. For the founders of this movement, this hostility was a representation of participation and their aim was to create vehicles to induce anger, such as:

Spreading a powerful glue on some seats, so that a male or female spectator would stay glued and make everyone laugh, selling the same ticket to ten people: traffic jams, bickering, and wrangling, offering free tickets to gentlemen and ladies who were notoriously unbalanced, irritable or eccentric, and likely to provoke uproars with obscene gestures, pinching women, or other freakishness and sprinkling the seats with dust to make people itch and sneeze.

Although the Futurists’ approach was centred on a feast of destruction, their avant-garde idea of considering spectators as an important part of the performance developed a concept of participation beyond the restricted art environment of that period.

Futurists were the first to re-imagine the identity of participants. Later, specific historical moments emerged over the course of the twentieth century: ‘from a crowd (1910s), to the masses (1920s), to the people (late 1960s/1970s), to the excluded

---

5 Bishop, Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship 46.
6 Filippo T. Marinetti, The Variety Theatre(Manifesto, 1913), 33-34. As quoted in Bishop Artificial Hells, 45
(1980s), to community (1990s), to today’s volunteers whose participation is continuous with a culture of reality television and social network⁷ and where audiences seem to enjoy being subordinate to ‘strange experiences devised for them by an artist’⁸ or being co-producers of the work (occasionally paid).

Each phase of the history of participatory art has been accompanied by ‘a utopian rethinking of art’s relationship to the social and of its political potential’⁹. These arguments seem to be centred on a binary relation of active versus passive that attempts to make participants (the people) more active by direct inclusion in the production of a work. As a historical result, artistic practices today give emphasis to the necessity to connect the individual and the collective in artworks that reflect social realities¹⁰; social practice is now a term commonly applied to this type of art practice.

A critical reflexivity of social practices has shown that the artist who relates to this practice usually deals with multidisciplinary projects where the role as an artist may get confused with the role of the ethnographer, sociologist, and anthropologist, to name a few. There is a constant battle to redefine his or her practice. On the one hand the artist is in the process of acquiring social science concepts, which can then become directly related to roles as social worker, case manager and other similar functions related to social models of help, yet their lack of expertise in these fields exposes them as amateurs. On the other hand, the artist is not dealing with the concepts of fine arts, aesthetic and beauty. Contrary to this, they wish to liberate themselves from the precepts of artist as god. Thus, the artist is in a kind of limbo that connects him or her with the Kaprow theory of ‘art that is not art’.

To understand what Kaprow defines as ‘art that is not art’, the idea of the artist must be outlined before the participation process is started. For centuries, the artist was conceived as a semi-god or ‘genius’ who controlled variables and produced ‘beautiful

---

⁸ Ibid.,277
⁹ Ibid.,3
¹⁰ Ibid.,37-40
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objects”


that were an expression of sublime beauty. Immanuel Kant wrote in his

Critique of Judgement that, ‘Sir Isaac Newton – does not deserve the name of

“genius”, because he “merely follows rules”, whereas artistic genius “discovers the

new, and by a means that cannot be learnt or explained.””

12 Kant’s doctrine was ‘the

separation of art from life’

13, a theory that afterwards, in 1960, Allan Kaprow
critiqued through the philosophical approach of ‘lifelike’ instead of ‘artlike’. In one

of his essays, ‘Art which can’t be art’

14, Kaprow states:

It is fairly well known that for the last thirty years my main work as an

artist has been located in activities and contexts that don’t suggest art in

any way. Brushing my teeth, for example, in the morning when I’m

barely awake.

The poetry behind this statement shows a man who has found a metaphor in the act of

living, in the small activities that a person does everyday. Kaprow considers these

activities art, because they are not searching for art. This is what he defines as

‘lifelike’. He was searching for a space where art could escape any categorization, a

space where art could be created free of labels and with no concern of whether it was

art or not. For him, it was important to escape the formalism and concentrate on the

experience, ‘even a crude experience, if authentically an experience, is more fit to
give a clue to the intrinsic nature of aesthetic experience than is an object already set

apart from any mode of experience’

16.

Through these philosophical enquiries, Kaprow moved into the world of the

experimental art, becoming an artist that was able to imagine something never before
done, by a method never before used, whose outcome is unforeseen”

17. The concept of


12 Ibid., 11

13 Kaprow, Essays on the Blurring of Art and Life

14 Ibid., 219.

15 Ibid., 219

16 Ibid., xvi.

17 Ibid., xxiii
An unforeseen outcome was reinterpreted to understand the ANPO methodology and the importance of having an open-end when the experience takes place. Hence, in the reflexivity of an unforeseen outcome, the hypothesis of having an open-end in the ANPO methodology became solid. Therefore, the methodology should facilitate a process that allows multiplicity and constant change. In this way the mutual communication between the artist and the participants would generate spaces of interaction (see Section Three for an extended explanation of this). Then, the artist would have the opportunity to engage with the participants freely. The possibility to consider participants’ inputs and opinions in terms of creation and experimentation within the artwork would lead to mutual understandings.

An important point of reflexivity was that if an artist were to bring a pre-determined solution to the experience, then he or she would be discarding the involvement, collaboration and empowerment of the participants. Hence, a responsible engagement would be to set a methodology that was flexible in terms of results and offered nuanced solutions based on participation, as Sara Kindon states: ‘where there are multiple participants, there is multiple knowledge and multiple interfaces for sharing knowledge’ 18. These spaces of interaction activated by the ANPO methodology would shift the role of the artist into new experiences and roles. Thereby the artist would be forced to open himself to mutual collaboration and to enter into the realm of unfixed ideas. With this, the artist would be avoiding dialectical relationships: artist-employee, in the case of artists paying participants to be part of the project19; or in the case of artist-volunteer, if the artist asks for free collaboration, but has complete control of it.

18 Sara Kindon, Rachel Pain, and Mike Kesby, Participatory Action Research Approaches and Methods: Connecting People, Participation and Place (Routledge, 2007), 188.
19 An example of this type of work is the Spanish artist Santiago Sierra who pays participants to be part of a performance previously designed by him. In his work ‘250 cm line on 6 tattooed on paid people’, Sierra paid a wage to six participants from a low socioeconomic class in the Havana, Cuba and tattooed a continuous line that went from one body to other. ‘Many of these early performances involve finding people who were willing to undertake banal and humiliating tasks for the minimum wage.’ Bishop, Artificial Hells : Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship 222-23.
Under this hypothesis, the open ending would offer participants the chance to transform the artwork and share authorship as well as offering mutual understanding and establishing a channel wherein artist-participants renounce their ‘authorial presence’. The consequence of sharing authorship would give the artwork a different aesthetic to the single authorship model and would bring the possibility of exploring ‘an experience’ in ‘an anti-structure’ model.

**Unfixing the idea of ANPO as a workshop**

Reflecting on Kaprow’s philosophy of ‘lifelike’ led to the initial conclusion that: (a) the ANPO methodology is primarily an experience; (b) ANPO collides with different disciplines, in particular with social sciences; and (c) the borderline between art and social sciences generates a constant tension between the role of ANPO and its definition as experience or workshop.

By definition a workshop is a group of people engaged in study or work on a creative project or subject, whereas the definition of experience is something observed, lived through, or undergone. Despite these differences, there are initiatives and institutions that promote the idea of developing interactions on the borderline between workshop and ‘an experience’. An example of this is the Triangle Network, an organisation in South Africa that works together with a network of international artists and arts organisations to promote the exchange of ideas around the visual arts through the format of artist-led workshops and residency programs. The first workshop started in New York in 1982 with 25 artists from Canada, UK and United Stated. The South Project, "Mapping South: Journeys in South-South Cultural Relations," (The South Project Inc, 2012), 305.

---

20 Bishop, "The Social Turn: Collaboration and Its Discontents Claire Bishop," 182. For Claire Bishop ‘the critically-correct position today is to dismiss a singular model of authorship, which is understood to be complicit with privatised individualism and necessary for establishing market value’. Bishop, *Artificial Hells : Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship* 3.

21 Dewey, *Art as Experience*.

22 Bial, *The Performance Studies Reader*

23 Dewey, *Art as Experience*.

24 The Triangle Arts Trust (now Triangle Network) was established in 1982 by Robert Loder and Anthony Caro and is a network of international artists and arts organisations that promotes and supports the exchange of ideas around the visual arts through the format of artist-led workshops and residency programs. The first workshop started in New York in 1982 with 25 artists from Canada, UK and United Stated. The South Project, "Mapping South: Journeys in South-South Cultural Relations," (The South Project Inc, 2012), 305.
organisations to exchange visual art ideas through artist-led workshops and residencies. What makes the Triangle Network unique is that these workshops develop interaction within the art community without having a specified outcome.

The founder of this organisation, Antony Caro, with regard to the way the Triangle Network was established states:

The way [the workshop] was put together was deliberately haphazard, because we wanted something flexible and very open, but the idea was pretty solid. We didn’t want to set too many rules because, as I still think, stimulus through communication and exchange of ideas with other artists is the central contribution we make to the development of artists’ practice.\(^{25}\)

After the success of the initial workshops in 1982, the organisers decided to expand the idea to other countries. A group of artists from South Africa adopted the format and organised a similar workshop in Johannesburg:

They invited artists from South Africa and neighbouring countries, some of whom returned home and decided to start workshops of their own, thereby instigating the development of a network which is still growing and to date has spread to over 40 countries worldwide.\(^{26}\)

A co-founder of the Dead Revolutionaries Club\(^{27}\), Sharlene Khan\(^{28}\), in a discussion with her colleagues about the Triangle Network states:


\(^{26}\)Ibid., 297

\(^{27}\)“The Dead Revolutionaries Club (DRC), established in 2007, is an artist collective based in Johannesburg, South Africa. The DRC consists of Khwezi Gule, who is a creative bureaucrat, freelance, curator and writer; Kemang wa Lehulere, visual artist; Bandile Gumbi, poet and coordinator at Market Photo Workshop, Sharlene Khan, visual artist, freelance curator and writer; and Fouad Asfour, researcher at the institute for Art Education, University of the Arts Zurich and freelance writer. Project, "Mapping South: Journeys in South-South Cultural Relations," 297.

\(^{28}\)Ibid., 297 South African visual artist, freelance curator and writer co-founder of The Dead Revolutionaries Club in 2007.
The focus was not on the works produced at the end of the residency or workshop, or on producing exhibitions, but rather about processes between people…Each one of these workshops is completely individually run. There’s no kind of stipulation about what kind of works get made or any kind of ideological framework, except that it is like a network so that information gets passed along the line.29

The Triangle Network experience focuses on the process generated by the collaboration between multiple artists. Even though there have been groups that want to frame the experience with a definitive outcome, the structure and nature of the organization has tried to keep the process as the main point of the encounter. And it has been like that for almost thirty years. In this interaction, artists have had to negotiate the authorship of the artwork and focus their attention in the experience. The example of this organization maintains relationships with the Kaprow concept of experience and the ANPO intention to focus on the process and not on the results.

To understand what Kaprow defines as an experience it is important to link firstly with the American philosopher John Dewey. Dewey divides the experience into two different categories: ‘experience ’ and ‘an experience’.

Experience occurs continuously, because the interaction of live creature and environing conditions is involved in the very process of living. Under conditions of the resistance and conflict, aspects and elements of the self and the world that are implicated in this interaction qualify experience with emotions and ideas so that conscious intends to emerges.30

This definition of experience is based on the way that a ‘live creature’ lives; there are no premeditated actions, because they occur naturally in a constant flow of living. This is related to the way in which human beings live. We observe, we think, we understand things, as Dewey explains:

30 Dewey, Art as Experience, 36.
We put our hands to the plow [sic] and turn back; we start and then we stop, not because the experience has reached the end for the sake of which it was initiated but because of extraneous interruptions or of inner lethargy.\textsuperscript{31}

On the other hand, ‘an experience’ has a start and an end. When the end is met, the sole act of consummation carries the personal individualization and a self-sufficient moment of satisfaction. For example, an athlete who breaks a record, eating the meal we craved, or finishing a piece of writing after months of working on it. Hence, an experience flows from something to something. For Dewey, ‘[t]he experience itself has a satisfying emotional quality because it possesses internal integration and fulfilment reached through ordered and organized movement’\textsuperscript{32}. When the emotion moves and changes the quality erupts through the normal process, making it significant. In addition, ‘an experience has a pattern and structure, because it is not just doing and undergoing in alternation, but consists of them in relationship…this relationship is what gives meaning’\textsuperscript{33}. Thereby, the pattern is ‘the result of the interaction between the live creature and some aspect of the world in which he lives’\textsuperscript{34}. Therefore, when the creature is aware of the quality that has produced an experience, the feeling of fulfilment arises as a consummation.

This act of consummation led Dewey to define art as experience, whereas Kaprow defines art as participation. Kaprow’s conclusion lays in the relationship between art and audience. If the expression of art is an object then the audience is experiencing art passively because they cannot interfere with the object made by the artist. However, if the experience is participation the audience should be able to transform the art-object into something new. Kaprow states: ‘In choosing to participate, one may also be choosing to alter the work – its object, its subject, its meaning. In choosing not to

\textsuperscript{31} Dewey, \textit{Art as Experience}, 36
\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., 40
\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., 45
\textsuperscript{34} Ibid., 45
participate, one has at least acted consciously. In either case, the work has been acted upon.  

Experience as participation generated a universe in which participants were able to be an active part of the process of creation wherein the results were open ended.

Critically reflecting on Dewey’s and Kaprow’s philosophies and their relationship with the example of the Triangle Network, the definition of ANPO as ‘an experience’ emerges due to the blurring of the line between participation and experience. ANPO offers participants an interaction with no defined ends or expectations about a final product. Therefore, ANPO exists because the participants exist. Without them ANPO would be just a theoretical approach to a methodology but would never be an experience.

In the same way that an experience counts on a mechanism, ANPO uses tasks (see Unit Two for an extended explanation of the methodology) to generate interaction and participation. These tasks guide participants during the experience but never mean to control their inputs and ideas. The artist sets free the tasks proposed and observes them changing in every contact and interaction with the participants. Therefore, the observation of the journey is what grants the experience. Also, every experience will be unique because the participants will be different and their interaction will change. Thence, the constant change is part of ANPO’s nature and constitution, as well as being ‘an experience’.

Hence, the main distinction between ANPO as ‘an experience’ or ANPO as a ‘workshop’ is that in a workshop the goals have been set from the beginning while in ANPO as an experience the outcome is unpredictable, even though the experience relies on a series of tasks/mechanisms to make it possible. This distinction is an essential part of the methodology. ANPO generates an experience and not a solution, even though the whole experience generates participation. So, the open-agenda is the significant approach of facilitation in ANPO, therefore ANPO is the experience of

35 Kaprow, Essays on the Blurring of Art and Life ibid., xviii.
letting things flow while participants live the experience without thinking about the results.

**The anti-structure in the new discourse**

The temporal dimension that ANPO ignites and its further development throughout the experience, is based on a dialectical process that involves a constant reasoning between ideas and their opposites (see Section One) and moreover, between structures and ‘anti-structures’[^36]. The anti-structures generated allow participants to be part of the experience leaving behind their immediate social differences and structures. Their structures in terms of income and race or any reference in regards to their social status disappears temporarily. This temporality is what creates the ‘liminal-phenomena’[^37] that takes part in ANPO.

The ‘liminality’[^38] that participants experience has similarities with the concept of ‘anti-structure’[^39] that Victor Turner proposes. In his work on the Christian pilgrimage[^40], Turner “argued that pilgrimage shares aspects of liminality because participants become equal by distancing themselves from mundane structures and their social identities, leading to a homogenization of status and a strong sense of *communitas*[^41]. In the temporary experience of communitas, it becomes possible to suspend social norms, challenge them and perhaps transform them[^42].

[^37]: Ibid.; *The Performance Studies Reader* ; Thomassen, "The Uses and Meanings of Liminality."
[^38]: Ibid.
[^39]: Thomassen, "The Uses and Meanings of Liminality."
Turner made a distinction between ‘liminality’ and liminoid. For him, liminality refers to any ‘betwixt and between’ situation or object that produces a transformation or an irreversible change. In comparison, liminoid experiences are the product of modern consumerist societies and do not ‘involve a resolution of a personal crisis or a change of status… The liminoid is a break from normality, a playful as-if experience, but it loses the key feature of liminality…: transition. On the other hand, Mckenzie goes away from the difference that Turner suggests and defines a normative dimension of liminality, the so-called ‘liminal-norm’. The liminal-norm operates in any situation where the valorization of liminal transgression or resistance itself becomes normative – at which point theorization of such a norm may become subversive.

The liminal-norm suggests that the normative can be transformed by the liminality and vice versa. Also, any conceptual model designed to produce transgression and transition is limited in terms of formal and functional aspects. In other words, it is possible to transcend social structures by creating models of interaction that generate transgression; however, these models will always be limited by their functionality among the participants.

When comparing the theory of Victor Turner and McKenzie to the ANPO methodology, it is possible to find links to the liminal-norm, especially because participants use ‘sense and denotation’ to define the topic. This task assists participants to enter into a dialectical game and disconnect themselves from their social context. It also inserts them into a world of language, meaning, contradictions and representations. In sum, they are on the threshold of a three-dimensional dialectic of ‘Definition – Dialectic - Hidden Message’, where, to overcome the contradictions,
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the participants’ inputs are taken into consideration in the different stages of the methodology.

In the dialectical construction of the topic, the artist encourages participants to break their inner dialectic of ‘participation – no participation’ and promotes a situation of liminality that is repeated through the different tasks explained in Unit Two. The liminal space opens the possibility to a new discourse that is represented outside of the normal structure wherein participants set themselves free of social structures and enter into a kind of ‘rite of passage’ 50. These anti-structured spaces provide opportunities for participants to remove themselves from the dominant surrounding society and to express their identities in ways that may not be possible in their permanent communities. Hence, the focus is stressed on an intensive encounter that promotes participation 51 and generates spaces of interaction.

50 Arnold Van Gennep published Rites of Passage in 1909. ‘In Rites of Passage Van Gennep started out by suggesting a meaningful classification of all existing rites. He distinguished between rites that mark transitions in the passage of the time (eg. Harvest, new year), whereupon he went on to explore “the basis of characteristics pattern in the order of ceremonies”(1960:10). Stressing the importance of transitions in any society, van Gennep singled out rites of passage as a special category, consisting of three sub categories, namely rite of separation, transition rites and rites of incorporation. Van Gennep called the middle stage of the rite of passage a liminal period.” Thomassen, “The Uses and Meanings of Liminality,” 6.

This section explores spaces for interaction where multiplicities and heterogeneities are considered through the lense of Pablo Helguera’s theory of socially engaged art (SEA)\(^1\). With the intention to compare different forms of creating these spaces of interaction and the applied value of the ANPO methodology, this section has been informed by three examples of SEA projects where the double articulation between theory and practice helps to reflect on the practice and its application\(^2\). The first example relates to a personal enquiry and compares ANPO with the art methodology developed by the artist/poet Dira Martinez-Mendoza to generate a process of engagement and reflexivity with people of different backgrounds and political ideologies. The second is a local example in regard to the SBS reality show *Living with the Enemy*\(^3\) and reflects on the use of radical dialogue as a way to generate spaces of interaction in comparison to the ANPO methodology, which sidesteps social conflict to make the most of heterogeneities. Finally, the artwork of Pawel Athamer and Thomas Hirschhorn are analysed as contemporary ideas that go beyond audiences and participation.

---

\(^1\) Helguera, *Education for Socially Engaged Art*, 1.


\(^3\) SBS, "Living with the Enemy".
In Section Two the basis from which the ANPO methodology generates participation and mutual cooperation was explored. In the praxis of this cooperation an ethical code is established where the artist negotiates the transformation of the artwork with the participants and thus shifts them from spectators to active agents. The interrelations that are created by the mutual interactions lead to moments of transformation in which space is conceived as a ‘product of interrelations and it is in constant change’\(^4\).

These spaces of interaction devised by the participants open new ways of comprehending the relationship between participants-artists and allow multiplicity and heterogeneity. Pablo Helguera describes these interactions as ‘socially engaged arts (SEA)’\(^5\). SEA, he argues, doesn’t fit well in the traditional collecting practices of contemporary art, and the prevailing cult of the individual artist is problematic for those whose goal is to work with others, generally in collaborative projects with democratic ideals. Many artists look for ways to renounce not only object-making but authorship\(^6\).

However, the artist should not renounce his role and categorize himself as facilitator, sociologist or any other interdisciplinary function, as the art-making is the key link, which generates mechanisms of interaction/participation within the project.

In SEA the artist cannot disappear but assumes full roles as teacher, leader, artistic director, boss, instigator and benefactor without any concern about boundaries in terms of definitions. The multiplicity of the artist’s roles help frame SEA projects in a context where usual definitions do not apply, where the function of the artist is to induce participation, creating spaces for dialogue with and within the community. As Helguera states: ‘it is this temporary snatching

\(^6\) Ibid., 4.
away of subjects into the realm of art-making that brings a new insights to a particular problem or condition and in turn makes it visible to other disciplines\textsuperscript{7}.

Often in socially engaged art projects the artist tends to think that his work has to be ‘useful’\textsuperscript{8} and should solve a problem. But maybe it is not a matter of problem solving or making people aware of a social situation, but rather of creating spaces of interaction; spaces of interaction that seem to be separated due to social contexts. The multiplicity and heterogeneity of these spaces allow for intertwining different realities and producing liminal instants through the social contradictions and the permeability that each multiplicity has within the other. These heterogeneities thus overcome their own contradictions.

It was in the search for a concept of space where to bond disconnected multiplicities and make them interact that these arguments evolved. In this evolution the ANPO methodology emerged as a response to dialectical multiplicities and heterogeneities and allowed seeing ANPO as a social instrument able to generate mutual understanding within multiplicities.

ANPO proposes an experience that uses the participants’ heterogeneities in order to create an anti-structured space. In this way the participants would connect to each other through their commonalities. The generation of these spaces of interaction celebrate differences and produce dialogue. In this dialogue participants go from a critical thinking of the problem as shown in Appendix I, II, III, to a perception of the problem through senses, as it is described in Appendix IV. The gamut of possibilities that the tasks address allows participants to open channels of communication and therefore spaces to interact.

\textsuperscript{7} Helguera, Education for Socially Engaged Art, 5

\textsuperscript{8} The term ‘useful’ refers to the definition of ‘useful art’ that Tania Bruguera gives. Where the art is a media to create proposals and implement solutions.
These spaces of interaction can be addressed from different standpoints and the role of the artist may become confused with other disciplines and expertise. With the intention of comparing different forms of creation these spaces, this section has been split into three sub-sections in which some examples have been outlined. The first is related to a personal example that connects my creative practice to the political situation of Venezuela. The second is a local example in regards to the SBS program *Living with the Enemy*. Finally, the third is a group of contemporary art examples, where the role of the artist becomes confused with the role of the teacher.

**A personal example of spaces of interaction**

I am originally from Venezuela and came to Australia for political reasons. My father was an important left-wing politician in Venezuela who stood up against then president Hugo Chavez’s decision to unify all left wing parties into one party, PSUVE (Venezuelan United Socialist Party) in 2007. This brought him into conflict with the Venezuelan Federal Government and its followers. Since then my father has been the subject of political persecution. In 2009, he was forced to abandon his country and request political asylum in Peru. To this day he remains a political refugee, now in Panama. In addition, a ‘legal’ action was taken against our family; my sister was not permitted to leave Venezuela; my brother and I cannot return or the government will imprison us. My sister hasn’t been able to see my brother, our father, or me since 2009. The case against this illegal action has been in court since 2010, but lack of cooperation from the Venezuelan Government has made it difficult to settle.

This drastic situation placed my family in a broken space where each one has been forced to survive no matter how hard the circumstances have been. Five people from the same family live in four different countries. In some way, all my family are exiles, no matter who remained in the country or who left. We are exiled from our familiar spaces. To be an exile is to miss your land and your family, food and friends to name a few. Often an exile lives in extreme poverty and may choose to dwell in sorrow and pain. We have promised, as a family, to
overcome that pain and sorrow and use it to support and understand people who have been through a similar situation to ours. It is my belief that the only way to step forward is to concentrate our energy on the present rather than being stuck in the past. Despite the many ups and downs, I have taken an oath to live by this value.

This personal story along with the artwork developed by my sister have been the engine which has inspired the idea that it is important to generate spaces of interaction instead of constantly fighting to be right. I remember, when I lived in Venezuela, spending hours talking to people about the Venezuelan government and its many faults. But rather than effecting any change within the government, our mutual intolerance got me thrown out of my motherland and left them living in deteriorating conditions. As a result of my experience I decided to develop a social instrument that allows people to generate spaces of interaction that might become an instrument to help people avoid conflict.

To have a better understanding about the personal example that I expose here, it is important to concentrate attention, for a moment, on the political situation of my motherland:

Figure 10. Body intervention by Dira Martinez-Mendoza⁹. Photo by Maybe Chacín

Venezuela has been wrapped up in a battle for more than 17 years. The country is split into two ideologies that have been in constant tension with each other. On one hand, there are people who support the deceased president Hugo Chavez, a populist figure who demanded justice and dignity for the lower socioeconomic classes in the country. However, the entrenched state corruption made his task impossible. On the other hand, there is an opposition who found his government inefficient; they consider that handing out money (to people) will not sort things out. Every party has a valid reason to disagree. For poor people it is a matter of inclusion, for the opposition it is about efficiency. These two ideologies have not been able to connect to each other but have radicalised even more. With the death of Chavez and the takeover of the new President Nicolas Maduro, who is named ‘ilegítimo’ president (illegitimate president)\(^\text{10}\) by the opposition, the economic crisis has intensified producing more distance between the parties.

In response to this situation, my sister, artist and poet Dira Martinez-Mendoza, positioned a thesis of common places, the things that are akin to both parties, like love, heartbeat, nostalgia, loss, happiness and others. Dira invites people with different backgrounds and political ideas to connect with that which makes them ‘human’. They tell her their stories and she writes a poem for them on their body, a poem of her authorship, which is exhibited as a temporary tattoo. The participants support different ideologies but in their bodies the tattoos do not have political distinctions. She has found places to produce interactions, to reunite the person with his/her feelings, no matter what their background. Her artwork also creates spaces of interaction in peer-to-peer experiences. Dira engages with participants on a personal level wherein both see each other devoid of any political boundaries. For her, art has become a self-healing instrument through which she connects with those who produced this terrible situation in our life.

\(^{10}\) In the Venezuelan Election of 2013, the margin of victory of Nicolas Maduro was much smaller than 1.49%, reason why the opposition denounced that the election was a fraud and since them, the President Nicolas Maduro is known as the ‘ilegítimo’.
Comparing the way that Dira works with people of different ideologies to the ANPO methodology, it is possible to conclude that in both cases a temporary community is unfolded where all the different backgrounds, religions and cultures share the same space. In addition, her artwork creates a peer-to-peer experience while ANPO is based on a collective experience, linking this with multiple realities as well as producing spaces for negotiation of heterogeneity. Finally, Dira’s methodology and ANPO can be applied in any context regardless of background, age and sociocultural status. Both methodologies generate a process of engagement, participation and reflexivity. The spaces of interaction produced by the experience allow participants to see each other in a different way, outside of their skin colour/language and more as human beings.

Local example of spaces of interaction

SBS’s\textsuperscript{11} \textit{Living with the Enemy} is a six-part documentary series exploring the tense lines of social cohesion in Australia:

Each episode explores a different subject currently dividing Australian opinion by asking people to live 24/7 with others whose lifestyles and beliefs directly contradict their own. The cases for and against are argued in the voices of the people involved, in their homes and at their places of work – a gay couple who are engaged to be married live with an Anglican minister opposed to same-sex marriage; a devout Muslim couple live with an Aussie ‘patriot’; a Sudanese former refugee lives with an ultra-nationalist; a former ‘boat person’ lives with a woman who believes he should be deported; a former junkie lives with an old school hippy who has smoked his own body weight.

\textsuperscript{11} SBS is a national broadcast TV/Radio/Online in Australia that has produced educative and multicultural programs for more than 30 years.
in marijuana; a hunter who owns 280 guns lives with a vegan, animal liberationist.\textsuperscript{12}

In Episode 3, ‘Immigration’\textsuperscript{13}, the tension rests on a white Australian man, ‘Nick’, who is the founder of a political party that campaigns against African migration. For Nick, the police statistics show that a big part of the robbery, rape cases, violent felony and other crimes are due to African migrants. To justify his thesis, he is guided by Drew Fraser an academic who believes that black men are less intelligent than white men\textsuperscript{14} and considers that the White Australia Policy\textsuperscript{15} was an absolute success since it only allowed white migrants to the country. Nick believes that African migrants cannot integrate into Australia and are a ‘welfare drain on the economy and have nothing to contribute to a society built on Anglo-Celtic foundations’\textsuperscript{16}.

Nick’s counterpart is Abraham, a Sudanese migrant who left Sudan due to civil war and asked for political refuge in Australia. After ten years Abraham cannot get a job and has been subjected to racism because of his skin colour. When

\textsuperscript{12} SBS, "Living with the Enemy”.
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid.,
\textsuperscript{14} Ibis., 14’14”-20’05”
\textsuperscript{15} ‘In 1901, 98% of people in Australia were white. Australia wanted to remain a country of white people who lived by British customs. Trade unions were keen to prevent labour competition from Chinese and Pacific Islander migrants who they feared would undercut wages. One of the first pieces of legislation passed in the new Federal Parliament was the Immigration Restriction Act. Now known as the infamous White Australia Policy it made it very difficult for Asians and Pacific Islanders to migrate to Australia. This Act stated that if a person wanted to migrate to Australia they had to be given a dictation test. The dictation test could be in any European language. So a person from China or Japan who wanted to live in Australia could be tested in one or all of French, Italian or English languages. In 1905, the Act was changed so it could be given in any language at all. Of course, most Asians failed the tests and were not allowed to migrate to Australia unless they were able to enter the country under very strict exclusion rules and fortunate enough to have well connected sponsors.’ Migration Heritage Centre, 1901 Immigration Restriction Act(2007). http://www.migrationheritage.nsw.gov.au/exhibition/objectsthroughtime/immigration-restriction-act/
\textsuperscript{16} SBS, "Living with the Enemy".
Abraham arrived in Australia he ‘knew two words in English, “yes” and “no”, and he consistently confused the two of them. He is now the Slam Poet Champion of Victoria and recently came third in the national titles. He is also about to have his second book published and has performed at the Glastonbury festival\textsuperscript{17}.

In this episode, both parties must share their ideas and beliefs. There is no apparent point of inflection; Nick is convinced that African migrants are destroying the country and Abraham thinks that Nick is a racist politician with a square mind. Even though they constantly talk about their dogmas and have met each other’s families and friends, they do not seem to be able to develop a mutual understanding. At the end of the episode, there is a massive crack in the temporary relationship that they had developed over the ten days and they separate from each other without even saying goodbye.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{example.png}
\caption{Living with the Enemy\textsuperscript{18}. From left to right, Nick and Abraham}
\end{figure}

The initiative to induce conversations about differences around the same topic in national broadcast is an intelligent way to ignite a dialogue and reflexivity in

\textsuperscript{17} SBS, “Living with the Enemy”

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid.
relation to the actual Australian context. The methodology used – two people living together for ten days – is drastic and does not necessarily bring good results for the participants. The dialogue is direct and generates a constant tension between the parties who are constantly reaffirming their beliefs.

The presentation of this example aims to reflect on how specific dialogue between people with radical ideas may entail reaffirmations of their own dogmas, wherein the contradictions are not overcome but reasserted. Nonetheless, it seems that the main intention of the program is not to resolve the contradiction but to present these extreme cases on national television as a way to open spaces for interaction and dialogue within the audiences who have to face a reality that could be touching their day-to-day routine. When comparing the methodology of Living with the Enemy to ANPO it can be concluded that ANPO offers a possibility to interface with cultural topics in a way that sidesteps social conflict, potentially making the most of the multiplicities and heterogeneities of the participants, which is not necessarily the case in the SBS program.

Contemporary art examples in pedagogic realms

In the reflexivity of my creative practice I have found that the role of the artist has swung from facilitator to artist and in some cases to educator. The uncertainty of the artist’s role generates spaces of interaction that overcome the dialectical relationship ‘Artist – Participants’ and ‘Teacher – Students’. As a way to illustrate this reflexivity two examples of contemporary SEA projects have been chosen. Therein the artists have developed projects that generate innovative forms of interaction, as well as having a pedagogic purpose. Or, as Claire Bishop defines them in the title of the final chapter of Artificial Hells\(^{19}\), Pedagogic projects ‘How do you bring a classroom to life as if it were a work of art?’\(^{20}\)

\(^{19}\) Bishop, Artificial Hells : Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship

\(^{20}\) Ibid., 241-74.
One of these projects is the ‘Einstein Class’ by Polish artist Pawel Athamer whose ‘work has moved in an increasingly unexhibitable direction’\textsuperscript{21}. Over a period of six months, Athamer worked with a group of young delinquents – the Einstein Class – in Warsaw to teach them physics. A physics teacher who had recently lost his job due to his unconventional methodology was hired for the task of teaching the young group. With the support of the teacher and Athamer, the group undertook playful science experiments in different locations: in the field, on the beach and in the artist’s studio. Afterwards, the group showed the experiments to their neighbours. Even though the Polish filmmaker Krzystof Visconti tried to catch the Einstein Class in a documentary, the unremarkable film could not capture the richness of this project\textsuperscript{22}. This demonstrated how any secondary spectator was an outsider within the Einstein Class and that to understand the artwork it was mandatory to be part of it.

Another case is the Paris-based artist Thomas Hirschhorn and the deliberately misleading title of his project The Bijmer-Spinoza Festival. As Bishop explains, ‘The project was not so much a festival as a large installation environment for hosting a programme of daily lectures and workshops. The construction was topped with an oversized sculpture of a book (Spinoza’s Ethics).’ \textsuperscript{23} The installation, an intentioned low level of ‘finishes’ and poor aesthetic, consisted of rooms with different activities:

A library of books by and about Spinoza, a newspaper office, an archival display about the history of Bijmer (including footage of the plane that decimated one of the buildings in 1992), an internet room (hogged by children), and a workspace for the Ambassador, an art historian in residency…Everyday the same timetable was followed: ‘Child’s Play” at 4:30 pm., a workshop in which local

\textsuperscript{21} Bishop,\textit{ Artificial Hells}, 255
\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., 256
\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 260
children learnt to re-enact classic works of body art from the 1970s.\textsuperscript{24}

On the other hand, a daily lecture led by Marcus Steinweg took place. The lecture was not informative but, rather, a random game of words and ideas. The town’s residents attended the lectures and even went to the bar after Steinweg gave the signal to move place. In the words of Claire Bishop:

Looking at the audience, I could not understand why such a mixed bag of people kept coming to hear these obscures lectures and watch their opaques performances...I realized that this random collective presence was the point...in which many different sectors of society were brought together. You didn’t need to follow the content, just give yourself over to a quiet meditative space.\textsuperscript{25}

\begin{figure}[h]
  \centering
  \includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure12.png}
  \caption{The Bijmer-Spinoza Festival}
  \end{figure}

\textsuperscript{24} Bishop, \textit{Artificial Hells}, 260-261

\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 263
Similar to the Einstein Class, when watching the documentary about The Bijmer-Spinoza Festival one cannot see any rich images or understand what is happening. The 13-minute video\textsuperscript{26} starts with a local man who explains that they didn’t know anything about carpeting and the artist just brought them together to make an installation. The man introduces pictures of each one of the people who helped to create the installation to the camera. Minutes later, Thomas Hirschhorn appears affirming that he is taking care of his people because he is part of the group and he has no other responsibility but to be there: ‘I don’t say I have more important things to do somewhere else, I’m here.’\textsuperscript{27} After, a group of girls claim that they are there to learn, with the \textit{sine qua non} condition that they are their own teacher. Then, they re-enact, time and time again, the work of Saburo Murakami’s ‘Breaking through many paper screens’, Robert Morris’s ‘I box’, Vito-Accconci’s ‘Trademarks’, Marina Abramovic’s ‘Impoderabilia’, to name a few, while a moderator (a girl) reads phrases and ideas of the artists that they are re-enacting. The whole video seems to be a homemade documentary that shows a hectic collaborative process. However, the depth of the The Bijmer-Spinoza Festival rests not only on giving the responsibility of the installation to the inhabitants of the town but also making a pedagogic project that is incapable of being exhibited outside the local boundaries wherein it was created.

The aim to present the artworks of Pawel Athamer and Thomas Hirschhorn in this section is to reflect on how artists can work on the frontier between pedagogy and art. In both cases the artwork is no longer an artefact or an object since the artists’ ideas go beyond audiences and participation. Athamer and Hirschhorn look for a complete disconnection with the artistic and educational parameters and create their own dimension of generating knowledge, education and interaction. The absence of audience is present in their work wherein there is an urgent need to be part of the process in order to understand it. In comparing the Einstein Class and The Bijmer-Spinoza Festival to the ANPO

\textsuperscript{26} Thomas Hirschhorn. "Thomas Hirschhorn Bijlmer Spinoza Festival 2009," http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ThmdkP6v-0o.
\textsuperscript{27} ibid., 1’50”-50”
methodology, it is possible to conclude that ANPO has a blurred relationship between art and pedagogy, which is generated through a collective experience in which knowledge and participation become core pillars of the experience. This blurred relationship is the structure by which the ANPO methodology swings between definitions of what Kaprow defined as the ‘un-art and lifelike’\(^{28}\). Therefore, this swinging through iterations of engagement within ANPO overcome the contradictions through generating a ‘third term’ (c.f. Bishop 2012) that permits the ANPO experience to have present an expanded public imagining of cultural interrelations: ‘neither legitimated in advance but need continually to be performed and tested in every specific context’\(^{29}\).

\(^{28}\) Kaprow, *Essays on the Blurring of Art and Life*

\(^{29}\) Bishop, *Artificial Hells : Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship* 284.
Conclusion

This practice-led research is a methodological enquiry into my community-based art practice A Non-Predefined Outcome (ANPO). This was originally developed as a participatory art project to generate culturally safe spaces for people to engage in artistic and critical thinking. It was by generating these spaces of interaction (to challenge mainstream or personal cultural prejudices) that the practice became more defined and led to the development of ANPO as a methodology.

The methodology developed in this research departs from the objectification of the process and the participants. Its core values are dialogue, decision-making towards potential consensus and the experience, which only those who are part of the project can live, enjoy and understand. ANPO overcomes the binary relationship of artist-participants by bringing it into a whole process of interaction and constant construction of space. The reflexivity about the construction of this space, informed by Doreen Massey’s *For Space* philosophy, helps to conclude that the ANPO methodology generates spaces of interactions that are the product of interrelations wherein multiplicities and heterogeneities are negotiated in which these spaces are open and constantly changing. Therefore, taking this as the starting point of the development of the methodology it is possible to conclude that:

- ANPO is an experience wherein the outcome is unpredictable.
- ANPO collides with different disciplines, in particular with socially engaged arts and theory of language. The borderline between art and social sciences generates a constant tension between the role of the artist and his/her authorship.
- The open ending offers participants the chance to transform the artwork and share authorship as well as offering mutual understanding.
- The consequence of sharing authorship gives the artwork a different aesthetic to the single authorship model and encourages a possibility of exploring ‘an experience’ in an anti-structured model.
- In the dialectical construction of the topic, the artist encourages participants to break their inner dialectic of ‘participation – no participation’ and promotes a stage of liminality that is repeated through the different tasks explained in Unit Two.
- The liminal interaction helps participants create a new discourse validated by them and represented outside of the normal structure wherein participants set themselves free of social structures.
- In the overcoming of the contradictions ‘Hidden Message’ the methodology becomes active and generates spaces for engagement and reflexivity. These contradictions may be explored in different ways depending on the participants’ enquiry: (a) through the exploration of the senses; (b) through the generation of a new discourse; or (c) through psychological reflexivity.
- The anti-structured spaces generated in the ANPO methodology provide opportunities for participants to remove themselves from the dominant surrounding society and to express their identities in ways that may not be possible in their permanent communities.
- ANPO offers a possibility to interface with cultural topics in a way that sidesteps social conflict, potentially making the most of the multiplicities and heterogeneities of the participants.
- There is scope for further development and research of the ANPO methodology in order for it to be applied within organisations and communities.
UNIT TWO. THE ANPO METHODOLOGY HANDBOOK


**About Unit Two**

This unit represents the ‘practice as methodology’ of this research and includes a handbook and four appendices that describe how the methodology works. All the examples used in the appendices I, II, II, and IV are hypothetical scenarios that aim to aid people attempting to apply the ANPO methodology. Since no trial has been done yet, the participants’ answers presented in these hypothetical cases of studies have been best guesses by the researcher and they have no connection with any real situation. As a consequence of this, it is no possible to estimate the real time that every task-propositions would take when the methodology is put into practice.

The methodology was partly informed by my creative practice related to community projects in the last five years via the support of government institutions and is based on dialectical games where participants interact with each other as a means of developing connection and mutual understanding. The methodological enquiry consists of four task-propositions, where every task has a specific function and generates a sequence that connects participants with language and its expression through the senses in an artistic way. The first task is ‘This Is Not A Chair’, a warm-up exercise informed by Gottlob Frege’s theory on ‘sense and denotation’. The second ‘The Topic’ informed by Paulo Freire’s ‘generative theme’ is the proposal of the theme that will be explored during the experience. The next ‘Vis-á-Vis-á-Vis’ a dialectical game designed from the three-dimensional dialectic of ‘Definition – Dialectic – Hidden Message’. This game is informed by Hegel’s dialectic, and the structuralist language theory of Saussure and Michel Foucault. The overcoming of the contradiction ‘Hidden Message’ offers critical reflexivity in three different forms, depending on the participants’ enquiry: through the exploration of the senses; through the generation of a new discourse; or through a psychological reflexivity. In the final task ‘Dialectical Representations’ participants reflect on different possibilities to comprehend the ‘Hidden Message’ employing visual, aural, performative and gustatory tools, informed by sensory ethnography methodology.
Chapter One. Warm up

CHAPTER ONE. Warm up. This is Not a Chair

This is Not a Chair (hereafter TINAC) is the first task in the ANPO methodology. It is used as a warm-up exercise wherein participants expand their understanding of an object within its philosophical, sociocultural, environmental and political contexts. At the end of the activity participants are able to perceive an object, in this case a ‘chair’, as something more than a seat. Working together, the participants develop a communal ‘discourse’\(^1\), validated by themselves, that allows them a better understanding of the object.

TINAC is analysed from the point of view of language theory and its representation. The first connection is the theory of ‘sense and denotation’\(^2\) developed by Gottlob Frege, where ‘sense’ gives a cognitive significance to the word/name and ‘denotation’ is the way the word/name is expressed in language\(^3\), for example, ‘chair’. Frege’s theory brings the understanding that when one refers to an object, there are two different structures of language taking place. The first is the name that the object has and the second as the psychological implications that that specific object has in our life. And these psychological implications are the connections that human beings develop with the object.

---


\(^2\) Zalta, "Gottlob Frege".

\(^3\) Ibid.
However, the sense and denotation of an object is essentially related to the discourse that we, as society, have learned about the object. Therefore, the denotation of the word/name is related to a discourse that has been ‘historically located and individually shaped’ and has been validated by society and expressed via discourse. This discourse encloses the definition of the object as a mere object disconnected from its context. So, when one goes to a dictionary to find any definition, this definition, validated by centres of knowledge, creates a rough idea of the word/name unlinked from its environment and makes it an object of consumption, in this case, through knowledge.

Rene Magritte explored the relationship between the discourse and its representation in his painting *The Treachery of Images* [*La trahison des images* (*Ceci n’est pas une pipe*)]. is an example of this. The pipe is floating in a space where the pipe is conceived as an object of analysis and below its representation is the inscription: ‘*Ceci n’est pas une pipe*’. The pictorial composition oscillates between verbal statement and image: ‘a painted pipe is just as much a pipe as the inscription is correct in stating that a painted pipe is not a pipe – it is at least an image of a pipe’. The contradictory relationship between the image and its representation, as well as the over explanation of the object invite the spectator to reflect on what a pipe is.

Based on this reflection TINAC employs sets of questions to ignite an analysis about the object. The artist/facilitator places a wooden chair on top of the table and asks ‘What is this?’ The first logical answer would be ‘a chair’, however, from there on, the artist/facilitator keeps asking questions that suggest that participants perceive the object beyond its denotation and the historical discourse embedded in our minds and

---

6 Rene Magritte, *The Treason of Images (This Is Not a Pipe)*.,1929, in ARTstor [online database], <http://library.artstor.org/library/secure/ViewImages?id=8DiKaFItKTQzLg%3D%3D>, (accessed on the 17 April, 2014).
7 Gohr and Magritte, *Magritte : Attempting the Impossible* 113.
invites them to see the chair as a consequence of philosophical and social contexts and not as a mere chair.

**This is not a chair**

What is the difference between what we see and what we think an object is? Our social context is loaded with images and object names: the bank, the park, the school, the house, the dog, the table and so on. Every little being has a name; every little object has a word that defines it. There is no single space where the eyes of the man have not named things. Society takes for granted that a table is a table and a door is a door. But, how often does one stop to reflect upon what a door or a table actually is? Societies tend to objectify everything and at some point this kills the nature of the object or being and transforms it into a mere object. However, there is a big difference between the name of a being and the name of an object, because in society one sees the being as something that has a life but how often does a person see the humanity behind an object?

For Paulo Freire and Erin Fromm a necrophilous person is an oppressor who wants to convert the organic into the inorganic and considers living persons as things, disconnecting the object from the environment where it was produced and its social realities. Nowadays, the system of interaction in society does not have time to reflect or simply stop to evaluate what one is eating or buying. It is about processing and possessing as fast as possible. A clear example of this is the mass production system of food. One only needs to go to a supermarket to observe how food is packed as a product, an object of consumption that does not have soul. People buy ‘meat’ but how often does one wonder what meat is? When should that person make a pause in his/her agitated life to consider what is the food that he/she is buying and where does it come from?

Akin to the mass production system of food is the mass production of furniture, garments, accessories and others. One can go with a trolley to a department store and pick a chair, a bed, a closet and even a plastic plant. But where are these products

---

8 Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 58.
manufactured? What is the material used? Where does the material come from? South American forest? African bush? How many acres of land were dug up to extract the iron? Where is this land? Is it in an underdeveloped country? How many people worked to make it possible? How many hours? How much are their wages? Less than $2 per day? How old are the workers? Are there any children involved? How does fair trade work in this context? Does fair trade really exist or is it just a statement used by developed countries to stop feeling guilty about mass production?

The constant disconnection between object and its background generates a state of detachment where the objects have no purpose except those that their consumer prescribes for them. Hence, human beings produce a system of control that enforces a total domination over the environment and its surrounds and this domination is expressed through language, the simple act of naming things.

Human beings name things to create sense and denotation within their environment. Sense gives a cognitive significance to the word/name and denotation the different ways the same name can be expressed. The dialectical relationship between sense and denotation was the case study of Gottlob Frege who, employing the theory of languages, developed a model to explain the dialectical tension between the two parties. In Frege’s theory, ‘the expression ‘4’ and ‘8/2’ have the same denotation but express different senses, different ways of conceiving the same number’. To explain this, Frege uses as an example the statement ‘Mark Twain is Samuel Clemens:

Mark Twain was an author
Mark Twain = Samuel Clemens
Therefore, Samuel Clemens was an author.’

9 Ibid., 42
10 Zalta, “Gottlob Frege”.
11 Ibid. "3.2 Frege's Theory of Sense and Denotation"
12 Ibid.
13 Ibid."3.1.1 Frege's Puzzle about Propositional Attitude Reports"
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Using this statement, Frege attempts to substitute this principle in the following argument:

‘John believes that Mark Twain wrote Huckleberry Finn
Mark Twain = Samuel Clemens
Therefore, John believes that Samuel Clemens wrote Huckleberry Finn’\(^\text{14}\).

Frege discusses that this argument is not valid because:

John learns the name Mark Twain by reading Huckleberry Finn but learns the name Samuel Clemens in the context of learning about the 19\(^\text{th}\) century American authors (without learning that the name Mark Twain was a pseudonym for Samuel Clemens). John may not believe that Samuel Clemens wrote Huckleberry Finn\(^\text{15}\).

Through this principle of ‘identity substitution’\(^\text{16}\) Frege defines the ‘psychological relation between a person and a proposition. Belief, desire, intention, knowledge, etc., are all psychological relationships between persons, on the one hand, and propositions, on the other’\(^\text{17}\). Based on this, John believes that Mark Twain, not Samuel Clemens, wrote Huckleberry Finn.

Using the distinction between sense and denotation Frege gives cognitive significance to words, where denotation is the term and sense is the thought. Denotation is the true value of the word and sense is formed by an infinite number of thoughts. In which case, when one says the word ‘chair’ one deals with the denotation of ‘chair’ and the sense or thought that ‘chair’ produces in him. In addition, the sense of ‘chair’ will be related to time and place. An example of this is when one refers to ‘the president of the United States’. This statement can refer to a different person now than it did a few

\(^{14}\) Ibid.
\(^{15}\) Zalta, “Gottlob Frege”.
\(^{16}\) Ibid.
\(^{17}\) Zalta, “Gottlob Frege”
years ago. So, the sense of the expression ‘the president of United States’ denotes a different person now than the one who was president years ago\(^{18}\).

Sense and denotation are elements of the language that one refers to when speaking and these elements are related at the same time to the visual representation of the denoted word, for example, ‘chair’. When ones go to the furniture shop and asks for a chair, there are three elements playing together, such as the denotation of ‘chair’, the sense of ‘chair’ and the physical representation of ‘chair’, which in this case would be the ‘chair’ itself. These elements can be appreciated in Magritte’s painting *The Treachery of Images*\(^{19}\). There, Magritte plays a game with the image, the denotative reference of the image and the sense of the image. In this three dialectical approach Magritte invites the spectator to ask what exactly they are observing.

Instead of a chair Magritte uses a pipe as the main element to create the game. Magritte drew a well-defined pipe and ‘underneath it (handwritten in a steady, painstaking, artificial script, a script from the convent, like that found heading the notebooks of schoolboys, or on a blackboard after an object lesson) this note: *Ceci n’est pas une pipe* [This is not a pipe]\(^{20}\).

The pictorial composition oscillates between verbal statement and image: ‘a painted pipe is just as much a pipe as the inscription is correct in stating that a painted pipe is not a pipe – it is at least an image of a pipe’\(^{21}\).

In ‘This is not a pipe’ the pipe is the denotative element that makes reference to the ‘sense’ of the pipe and the representation of it. In this representation ‘the name of an object takes the place of an image’\(^{22}\), as Magritte stated. The relationship between


\(^{19}\) Gohr and Magritte, *Magritte : Attempting the Impossible* 113.


\(^{22}\) Foucault, *This Is Not a Pipe*, 38.
objects and words ‘create new relations and specify characteristics of language and objects generally ignored in every day life’\textsuperscript{23}. Therefore, when one sees the pipe in the painting they are associating the ‘denotation’ of pipe with the idea of pipe. But when the spectator reads in the painting ‘this is not a pipe’ he/she has to confront the fact that the pipe is a painting of a pipe, not a real pipe. Thus, the word ‘pipe’ takes the place of the object in reality and the image takes the place of a word as a proposition\textsuperscript{24}. This proposition can only be possible because pipe has gained credence and autonomy by being validated by society and expressed via discourse\textsuperscript{25}.

For Foucault, Magritte’s painting ‘exemplifies the penetration of discourse into the form of things.’\textsuperscript{27} Foucault refers to discourse as ‘the historically located and individually shaped sets of institutionalised definitions, practices and procedures associated with any body of knowledge’\textsuperscript{28}. So, when one is referring to a pipe, they are following what society and institutions have created as a definition of ‘pipe’, a

\textit{Figure 13. The Treachery of the Image}\textsuperscript{26}
definition that has been built through a set of propositions. Hence, the word ‘pipe’ becomes the name that encloses what a ‘pipe’ is and at some point dissociates the social context that has given the ‘sense’ to pipe.

For example, the *Oxford English Dictionary* defines pipe as: ‘a device for smoking tobacco consisting of a narrow tube made from wood, clay, etc. with a bowl at one end in which the tobacco is burned, the smoke from which is drawn into the mouth’

Society accepts this definition of pipe as true and disconnects the social context of the pipe’s definition. A pipe becomes an object. However, if a pipe can be made out of wood or clay where does that wood or clay come from? If the pipe is used to burn tobacco, where was that tobacco manufactured? How many trees needed to be cut to make a pipe and where were these trees cut? Where was the tobacco harvested? In an underdeveloped country? What is the political situation of this country: a democracy, a dictatorship or anarchy? If these questions were considered at the moment of defining a pipe, a pipe would be an object that represents social, cultural and environmental contexts in which the pipe is embedded.

**What is a Pipe? A hypothetical example**

Let us imagine for a moment a definition which, instead of objectifying a pipe, it states a relationship between the object and its context. Such a definition would be thus:

A pipe is a device for smoking tobacco. This tobacco is a preparation of the nicotine-rich leaves of an American plant, which are cured by a process of drying and fermentation and which is widely cultivated in warm regions, especially in the US and China.

The Native Americans had pipe-smoking traditions long before the arrival of the Europeans...However, after the Spanish Colonization [sic], tobacco became one of the primary exports, and its cultivation

---

29 Oxford University, “Oxford Dictionaries”.
became a driving factor in the incorporation of African slave labour. The Spanish introduced tobacco to Europeans in about 1528 and Sir Walter Raleigh is credited with taking the first Virginia Tobacco to Europe. The French, Spanish, and Portuguese initially referred to the plant as the "sacred herb" because of its valuable medicinal properties\textsuperscript{30}.

The pipe consists of a narrow tube made from wood, clay, etc. with a bowl at one end in which the tobacco is burned. The bowls of tobacco pipes are commonly made of Briarwood, Meerschaum, corncob or clay. The Briarwood is native to the Maquis Shrublands surrounding the Mediterranean Basin and West to Portugal and the Canary and Madeira Islands. The Meerschaum is a soft white mineral original from Germany. Pipes have plenty of brands and are manufactured in Africa, Europe, the Americas and the Middle and Far East. The smoke that pipes produce is drawn into the mouth and gives pleasure to human beings. This pleasure was considered by psychoanalysis as 'a symbol of the penis and male sexual power'\textsuperscript{31} in which case the cigar or the pipe became a substitution of sexual desire\textsuperscript{32}.

The hypothetical definition above allows connecting the object with a context that goes beyond the definition itself. This definition interlaces sense, denotation and representation of the pipe in a complex discourse that redefines the object and places it in a deeper level of knowledge. With this, the definition of the object is related to


\textsuperscript{32} This definition has been done using on-line sources. These sources represent the accumulation of knowledge in terms of pipe. They do not have academic peer review and are part of the public knowledge that Internet generates and that is consumed by on-line users. Some of the sources were Wikipedia, dictionaries and on-line forums.
the environment that generated the object and its effect within society, where language and its representation are intertwined. Therefore, a ‘pipe’ is not a pipe but a complex dialectic between historical, social and cultural backgrounds in which it is possible to infer that a pipe is the product of colonisation, slavery, trade and consumption. A pipe is also a representation of the cultural interchange between Europeans and their colonies and how they reinterpreted the Native Americans’ ancestral knowledge into commodities to be consumed by Europeans. In addition, a pipe is a representation of deforestation and how men make the most of their environment to manufacture products on a large scale. Finally, a pipe is a phallic image understood in some cultures to represent male virility.

The interlace of language and object, sense and denotation, discourse and proposition, are used in this task as a medium to show a range of possibilities about the social conception of ‘chair’ through the ideas of Frege, Magritte and Foucault. With this, participants are persuaded to observe the object as a construct of external facts. Thus, the participants break down the ‘structure of language’ that defines the object and create an anti-structured definition that sees the object outside the visual representation. Akin to ‘Ceci n’est pas une pipe’ that induces spectator to understand what the role of the pipe in the painting is and its connection with the discourse, TINAC invites participants to play between the object as a denotative concept and the sense of the object in a context outside its denotative definition.

‘This is not a chair’ proposition

Appendix I shows how the artist/facilitator uses a chair for this task as an object of analysis. However, any object can take the place of the chair. Whether the object is an apple, a pencil or a pair of shoes, the aim is to understand the sense of the object and its social, cultural and environmental context. With this, participants connect with

33 Anderson, Hughes, and Sharrock, Philosophy and the Human Sciences 103. Saussure’s semiology "reoriented linguistics toward the examination of the principle by which language itself works. To do this he drew a crucial distinction between langue and parole- language as a system of communication, and speech as the use to which we put that system to achieve the goal we wish”. Saussure theory of language is further explored in Chapter Three.
the sense and denotation of the object and how their discourse is related to it. The artist/facilitator takes a wooden chair and places it on top of a table and asks participants: “What is this?” and they are free to answer what they think a chair is.

In the example in Appendix I.1 participants unfold an unpredictable story about the chair that is the consequence of random answers that follow the intervention of each participant. The chair is seen as an object that is used when one is tired. That tiredness is related to a person who works hard for earning money because he has to live and survive as a human being. The connectivity of the chair with human beings takes the participant into the philosophical realm and the dialectical relationship of human existences and their contexts. The chair stops being a simple object and becomes the centre of analysis in terms of its connection with the philosophical context that surrounds it.

The second set of questions are related to the materials used to manufacture the chair. The round of questions start with ‘What is this chair made out of?’ This question is the device that detonates a sequence of relations between the chair and the materials that formed it. In Appendix I.2, participants analyse where the wood comes from, the type of tree, the person who planted the tree, how old the tree was and the quantity of trees that were cut to make that chair. However, after that, participants consider other materials that make the chair, such as metal. Participants review again the origin of the material and from where it was extracted. These questions enable participants to link the object with the natural resource used for making the chair and an environmental understanding of the object. The denotation ‘chair’ therefore goes beyond the participants’ idea of chair and blurs the dimension between object and concept, and between the sense that participants had about the chair and the new sense that has been constructed through this new input. Therefore, the denotation of chair is maintained while the sense of chair is reinterpreted, acquiring a communal definition.

In the last sets of questions the chair is understood from the point of view of its sociocultural and political context. To achieve this the artist/facilitator asks ‘How many chairs were made?’ Participants can answer any number, since this is not a right/wrong question. In the example in Appendix I.3 participants answered the
quantity of 100. Following this, the next question is ‘How many hours were required for its construction?’ This question links the chair with a process of manufacturing that allows further questions such as: ‘How many people worked in manufacturing it?’ ‘In which country was it manufactured?’ ‘How old were the people working in the factory and how much were their wages?’ These questions suggest that participants see the chair as an object, a product of manufacturing factors and the labour of workers. With this, participants link the manufacturing process with social responsibilities such as the age of the workers, who in some countries may be underage, and the salary of the workers, which in underdeveloped countries may be less than $2 per day. Participants observe how the chair is transformed into a representation of economic factors and its social impacts.

Finally, when the three sets of questions have been exhausted, the artist/facilitator asks again ‘What is this?’ This rhetorical question brings back the contexts previously developed by the participants and looks at the rethinking of the object. The chair keeps its denotation but its sense changes to such a degree that participants can perceive the chair as the result of philosophical consequences, environmental links and sociocultural implications. Hence, the chair can be the product of the system of capital as outlined in Appendix I.4, or the product of human work.

When the chair is perceived as something more than a chair, participants have the opportunity of creating a discourse, validated by them, where the object takes a different dimension and becomes a device that generates knowledge beyond the barriers of representation. Moreover, the understanding of the chair is achieved in a communal space, which allows even those participants who keep on seeing the chair as an object to have the opportunity to reflect on this matter while other participants see the chair as a consequence of sociocultural, environmental, philosophical and political contexts. Therefore, when TINAC has finished the objects that surround participants’ lives will take on a different dimension, a dimension where it is possible to see how the objectification of our environment has reduced the possibility of understanding the contexts of the objects and has reduced them to simple representations of language with empty ideas of their historical context and their role.
in our daily routine. In the end, participants will not see a chair as a chair but as a representation of our society and its dialectical representations.
CHAPTER TWO. The Topic. The communal choice of the dialogue

The selection of the topic is an important part of the methodology, since it is the base of the ideas that are further developed along the ANPO experience. There are two different ways to approach the theme selection. One is the Decoded Theme and the other is Free Election.

The Decoded Theme consists of a series of topics that have been previously investigated by the artist/facilitator and are shown to the community who then votes for the topic that they want to develop during the experience. The investigation of the topic requires that the artist/facilitator chooses the most suitable options to obtain knowledge from the community. The methods for identifying the options oscillate between readapting the idea of ‘generative theme’ by Paulo Freire, creating partnerships with local organisations or a direct approach to community leaders.

The other way to generate a theme is through Free Election. This is an interactive process where participants have complete freedom to decide the topic. The artist/facilitator makes a single question: What is the topic that we are going to work on today? And the participants have the option to propose and select the theme that

1 Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed.
they want to develop. Free Election believes in people and their thinking. The artist/facilitator works as a leader who surrenders his power and becomes an instrument of the participants.

In both Decoded Theme and Free Election the system of voting avoids the binary dynamic of choosing between one and another option. Instead, participants can vote for as many options as they want. The most voted option is the one selected. In case one or more options are tied, the artist/facilitator asks participants what they would like to do, whether it is to go through a new process of election or simply to use a coin to get a result (a hypothetical example is illustrated in Appendix II.)

Decoded Theme

Paulo Freire calls the system of selecting a theme ‘generative theme’\(^2\). Freire argues that any theme that is going to be developed within the community must relate to situations that are familiar to the ‘students’. Freire proposes that before any theme is subjected to dialogue there has to exist a previous investigation about the social context and realities that the ‘teacher’ is going to approach. The process of ‘investigation of thematic involves the investigation of the people’s thinking – thinking which occurs only in and among people together seeking out realities’\(^3\).

How these realities were sought and presented in order to re-adapt a theme into the community was part of Freire’s investigation, denominated by him as the ‘decoding process’. The first step of the decoding process rests on the investigators who have to visit the area of study where they are

acting as a sympathetic observer with an attitude of understanding towards what they see. While it is normal for the investigators to come to the area with values

\(^2\) Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*.

\(^3\) Ibid., 89
which influence their perceptions, this does not mean that they may transform the thematic investigation into a means of imposing these values.\textsuperscript{4}

The aim of this investigation is to find a theme that generates critical thinking. For Freire, critical thinking was a process of awareness in which community members were able to connect to their sociocultural reality. In order to create critical thinking, people need to feel a relation to the theme. As Freire explains, ‘it is inadmissible (whether during the process of investigation or in the following stage, when the meaningful thematics are presented as a program content) to present pictures\textsuperscript{5} of realities unfamiliar to the participants\textsuperscript{6}.

During their visits, the investigators attempt to understand the area under study as a ‘living code to be deciphered’\textsuperscript{7}. They decode how the various parts interact and how these parts behave. The investigator takes note of ‘the way the people talk, their style of life, their behaviour at church and at work. They record the idiom of the people: their expressions, their vocabulary and their syntax’\textsuperscript{8}. The area is observed under different circumstances in their daily routine, while they are working, in their leisure time or at home. The social roles are taken into consideration as well – the role of women, young people, kids, their games and their conversations, for example – and 'no activity must escape the attention of the investigator during the initial survey of the area'\textsuperscript{9}.

\textsuperscript{4} Ibid., 91-92

\textsuperscript{5} What Freire refers as pictures is a way to present the theme. The investigator after observing the environment of the object of study (the peasant) and taking analytical notes is able to understand the reality of the people. These realities are presented as pictures, so the ‘peasant’ is able to relate to it within his own context. Freire uses the pictures and photographs as a medium of creating empathy with the ‘student’, who is illiterate and does not have the knowledge to read or write. Employing this as an object of study overcomes the dialectical relationship teacher-student, reducing the tension between each party. The ‘overcome’ helps the illiterate to not feel as an ignorant who knows nothing, but a person able to provide knowledge.

\textsuperscript{6} Freire, \textit{Pedagogy of the Oppressed}, 95

\textsuperscript{7} Ibid., 92

\textsuperscript{8} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{9} Ibid., 93
Once the investigation has been done, the next step is the evaluation of the living code. In this stage, each person shares his/her notes and appreciations about the visit, and then, as a team, they work together to understand the nuclei of the social contradictions in the area and how the inhabitants are aware of these contradictions. Then, the investigators select the contradictions to be developed and used as the theme of investigation.

The investigators choose the best channel to communicate the theme; it could be simple or compound codification. Simple codification can be a visual channel (pictorial or graphic), tactile channel or aural channel. Compound codification consists of a simultaneity of channels. The codification selected is presented to the student as a way to open conversation and dialogue about the theme. Freire shows as an example a scene where a drunken man is walking on the street and three young men are chatting in a corner. The group of students (peasants) see the drunken man as a low class worker, a man who is returning home after more than eight hours of labour. Participants considered him as an honest man who works hard to maintain his family with a wretched wage. The students did not relate the drunken man with alcoholism but with a working class man. They recognised the situation and thereby they associated themselves with the image of the drunken man. They were able to say what they thought and felt about the theme.

Akin to the generative theme of Freire, the Decoded Theme, hereinafter DT, requires that the artist obtains knowledge before developing the experience within the community. This knowledge can be gained in different ways, for example:

- a) Readapting the idea of the ‘generative theme’ by Paulo Freire
- b) Creating partnerships with local organisations
- c) Developing partnerships with community leaders.

---

10 Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 102
11 Ibid., 99
In the re-adaptation of the generative theme the artist/facilitator does not count on a group of researchers who go to the area and investigate in depth the inhabitants’ behaviours and customs in their daily routine. In fact, the only person investigating the participants’ environment is the artist/facilitator, thus the observation then relies on his or her capacity to connect with the environment for a certain period of time and to gain knowledge before proposing a theme. In this case, the artist/facilitator works as an auto ethnographer; he immerses himself in the community and tries to observe any minimal detail that could generate valuable information. This process of evaluation could take days or weeks and relies on one-person perceptions.

In the generative theme process, the investigator can compile information through different mediums such as pictures of the area, notes of their observation, conversations, sounds and others. The investigator has to be immersed in the environment to better understand the social reality of the community that will be approached.

Once the investigation has been done, the next step is to analyse the data, in the same way that Freire proposes. If it is the case that the artist is the sole investigator, it is recommended that contact is made with a member of the community to show the results of his investigation and the possible themes to be developed in the ANPO experience. In this way, the theme proposed by the artist/facilitator will count on second opinions and validation from a member of the community.

Another option for choosing a topic is creating partnerships with local organisations. Usually, the officers who work in areas as community development and similar fields compile data and statistics that support the appropriateness of the theme. Creating a partnership with them facilitates the understanding of the community. The data that a public servant can provide is normally related to the social context of the community and comes accompanied by personal appreciations in terms of past, present and future projects that have been developed within the community.

Even though the partnership with local organisations accelerates the process of defining the theme, it cuts off the community investigation. For this reason, even if
the local institutions have described their realities and specific issues and problems, the artist may decide to confirm this data.

The last option is to develop partnerships with community leaders. In multicultural societies, community leaders bring extensive support for the community. They become the voice of the community and have knowledge that would take weeks or months for the artist/facilitator to decode. The conversation between both parties must be open in terms of the intention of the artist/facilitator and the community leader’s needs. The artist/facilitator can explain his considerations and ideas, such as how ANPO can bring benefits to the community. The leader has the freedom to agree or disagree in terms of the methodology to be used and some changes can be discussed in order to reach higher levels of participation.

It is essential that the artist/facilitator and the community leaders share a truthful process wherein both collaborate decoding community behaviours and interactions. The artist/facilitator can explain his expectations in terms of the topic and the community leader can give his opinion overtly. Freire affirms that an honest dialogue between the leaders and the people produces solidarity and mutual understanding. He poetically explained it thus:

This solidarity is born only when the leaders witness to it by their humble, loving, and courageous encounter with the people. Not all men and women have sufficient courage for this encounter—but when they avoid encounters they become inflexible and treat others as mere objects; instead of nurturing life, they kill life; instead of searching for life, they flee from it. And these are oppressor characteristics. 12

Once the artist/facilitator has agreed with the community leader, organisations, or through investigation on which the tentative topics are, the next step is to give the community the opportunity to select the topic they would like to develop. It is important, in order to enhance participation and interaction, that the participants in

12 Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, 110
ANPO feel that they can choose their experience. For this reason, the artist/facilitator can copy on a whiteboard all the possible themes and the participants can choose one through taking a vote.

The system of voting avoids the dialectic position of choosing between two options, which leads to polarised positions. Instead, participants can vote for as many options as they want. So, through a process of distillation of options the one with the most votes will win. In case one or more options are tied, the artist/facilitator can ask participants for their suggestions; whether it is to go to a new election, leaving the decision to luck via the toss of a coin, or any other suggestion that the participants might have.

In Appendix II.1 there is a hypothetical example in regards to the decoded theme election. There, the number of participants are twelve and choose the option ‘Work’ by following a system of voting wherein participants can suggest different ways to select the final theme. Once this process has finished, the participants are ready to go to the next task ‘Vis-á-Vis-á-Vis’ which is explained in the next chapter.

**Free Election**

Free election, hereinafter FE, is an interactive process in which participants have the freedom to decide the topic. The artist/facilitator asks the participants a single question: What is the topic that we are going to work on today?

When ‘Free Election’ is put into practice the further development of the experience rests on the participants. The artist/facilitator becomes an instrument of the participants and assists the election process. The total themes to choose from must be greater or equal to the number of participants, never less because this would be showing that some of the participants did not want to give their suggestions out loud. All the themes are written on a white board (see Appendix II.2) and a process of election similar to the one explained in Appendix II.1 takes place.
For Freire, the role of the master is to induce the dialogue as a medium to produce awareness and it is in this awareness that spaces of interaction are generated among participants. Moreover, the teacher-student dialectic is broken and the artist/facilitator becomes another participant who starts learning from the participants and sees them as a source of knowledge. This is a process of ‘emancipation’ in which the artist/facilitator has to detach him/herself from the idea of an educative or convenient topic and leave participants to take the reins of the activity. As Rancière states in *The Ignorant Schoolmaster* ‘to emancipate an ignorant person’, one must be, and one need only be, emancipated oneself, that is to say, conscious of the true power of human mind.

**Decoded Theme versus Free Election**

*The themes*

The main difference between Decoded Theme [DT] and Free Election [FE] is how the artist/facilitator arrives to the topic. In DT the theme is part of a process wherein the artist/facilitator engages previously with community leaders, community organizations or investigates the environment of the community through his own

---


14 When Rancière talks about an ignorant person he does it in a sarcastic way to show the confronting relationship between the ignorant and the master, wherein the master has all the knowledge, and the ignorant, in this case the student, has little or no knowledge about the topic. Therefore, the master is forced to enlighten him. However, contrary to this, the example exposed in the first chapter of the school master ‘An intellectual adventure’, Rancière uses the example of Joseph Jacotot, a lecture in French literature at the University of Louvain who is forced into exile in 1815. He lives out his exile in Brussels where he becomes a half-pay professor. A number of his students do not speak French and Jacotot knows no Flemish. To teach students, Jacotot gives them a French version of the book *Télémaque*. In order to learn, the students are induced to translate the book from French to Flemish in a completely empiric process. This experiment exceeded Jacotot’s expectations and the students show an incredible improvement in French in regard to writing. Ibid., 1-2.

15 Ibid., 15
analysis. This strengthens bonds between community and artist/facilitator. When the ANPO experience takes place, some members of the community will already know the artist/facilitator and rely on him to lead the experience democratically. DT induces themes related to social contexts and community queries. The dialogue around this might produce tension in the participants and the artist/facilitator has to be ready to shift the attention in order to avoid polarizations.

FE is generated freely within the community and depends on the mood of the participants on the day. The unexpected theme creates direct ownership for the participants who, working as a team, decide which path to take. In FE the theme could be Lollypops or Identity, Party or Discrimination, Galaxy or Work. In any of these cases, the artist/facilitator must be ready to become an active part of the interaction and the unknown road in which FE unfolds.

The dialogue

Decoded Theme promotes a dialogue around a topic that has been previously investigated and is familiar to the community. The conversation around the theme generates awareness in the participants since the topic might relate to a situation that concerns the community. However, the previous selection of the topic might or might not create effective interaction and ownership within the experience, especially because the participants will be voting for several themes that have been proposed by someone other than them.

In FE the dialogical analysis of the situation relies on the participants who make the decision about which theme to address and its relevance to their social realities. The conversation around the theme is always a mystery for the artist/facilitator who has to react quickly to the stimulus of an unknown theme and make the most of it to promote a dialogue. The dialogue is the act of freedom that allows the participants to be aware of their situation. The nature of the topic does not matter, because in any case it will encourage interaction and will deepen knowledge in situations that might turn into either serious conversations or relaxing ones.
**Participation**

DT and FE generate participation and interaction whatever the topic is. The act of voting and selecting the theme creates comradeship within the participants and a sense of connectedness no matter what their backgrounds. However, in FE the ownership of the topic and active participation in the ANPO experience is a guarantee, since the theme was born in the mind of the participants and generates an unknown path for the community within the experience, including the artist/facilitator.
CHAPTER THREE. Vis-á-Vis-á-Vis. The Three-dimensional view of the problem

This chapter is a summary of the information previously provided in Unit One – Section One. Due to the nature of this thesis and to avoid repetition, the information in Section One has not been included here, however, in the final handbook of the methodology this information is expected to be included.

Vis-á-Vis-á-Vis by definition means to be face to face with the opposite, to mould our own structure through the things that we are not\(^1\). Based on this definition and taking into consideration the interaction that the task generates, the proposal was named ‘Vis-á-Vis-á-Vis’, hereinafter called ‘VaVaV’.

VaVaV is a dialectical game of words and it is described as the opposite of the opposite. The participants who take part in this task-interaction are asked to provide a definition in terms of a theme that has been previously selected, as it is explained in Chapter Two. They then break down the topic into keywords. After that, they are asked to give the opposite meaning of every keyword already mentioned. Then, a further refined process is undertaken and participants are asked to define the opposite

\(^1\) University, "Oxford Dictionaries".
of the last group of keywords. This triadic approach is part of a dialectical game in which the last opposite definition is that which shows the real description of the situation-theme. For a better understanding of this process, refer to Appendix III.

The conception of the opposite is depicted from a structuralist and dialectical point of view; structuralism as a philosophical component in linguistics and dialectic with regard to a three-dimensional representation of the participants’ ideas. Both structuralism and dialectic contribute to an understanding of the participants’ answers provided during the experience. The use of structuralism-dialectic gives form to the proposal of VaVaV as a methodology to work with communities and promote spaces for interaction within the participants.

VaVaV is informed by Hegel’s three-dimensional dialect of thesis – antithesis – synthesis and Saussure’s structuralist theory of semiotics, where each word is a part-within-the-whole and belongs to a systematic differentiation in which words are different in form, therefore in sound and concept.

The part-within-the-whole only differentiates from other parts through the opposite meaning of the word. For example, if a man declares ‘I’m happy’, he is directly declaring that he is not sad. This opposite affiliation is what makes language a constant system of contradictions and oppositions.

Hegel’s triadic dialectic is the result of terms that negate and contradict each other. The core of the dialectical thinking is based on the German concept of ‘das Aufheben des Widerspruchs’ [the sublation of the contradiction]. ‘Aufheben signifies, on the one hand, negation and overcoming; on the other hand, preservation and placing on a

---

2 Spencer, Krause, and Appignanesi, Hegel for Beginners
3 Anderson, Hughes, and Sharrock, Philosophy and the Human Sciences; Pettit, The Concept of Structuralism: A Critical Analysis /
4 Ibid.
5 “Although this model is often named after Hegel, he himself never used that specific formulation. Hegel ascribed that terminology to Kant” Fox, The Accessible Hegel, 43.
6 Hegel, Science of Logic.
higher level. This ambiguity is completely lost in most translations for example …English (transcend or sublate). Based on the Aufheben, Hegel defines the intellectual proposition, which is unsatisfactory and incomplete as ‘the thesis’. This unsatisfactory proposition negates the thesis, producing the antithesis, which is also, on reflection, inadequate. So, the third term ‘synthesis’ sets apart from the contradictions and generates a new stage that overcomes and preserves (or sublates) the prior stages of thesis – antithesis and arises as a higher rational unity.

These contradictions connect VaVaV to a three-dimensional dialectic that is reinterpreted as ‘Definition – Dialectic – Hidden Message’. Definition, then, is what participants understand about the topic in terms of social categorizations and its own ‘regime of truth’. Dialectic is the contradiction always present in every definition and connected to the part-within-the-whole by Sausurre and the ‘Hidden Message’ is the ‘overcoming’ of the contradiction to generate a new discourse.

The importance of this new discourse rests on the possibility that the methodology becomes active and generates spaces for engagement and reflexivity through overcoming the contradiction: ‘Hidden Message’. Therefore, this space is open to be critically reflected upon different forms, depending on the participants’ inquiry:

- **Through the exploration of the senses** as it is suggested in Appendix IV, where participants reflect on different possibilities to comprehend the ‘Hidden Message’ employing visual, aural, performative and gustatory tools, informed by sensory ethnography methodology.

- **Through the generation of a new discourse**, informed by the theory of Michel Foucault, participants have the possibility of critically reflecting upon the

---

8 Spencer, Krause, and Appignanesi, *Hegel for Beginners* 86.
9 ‘Regime of truth’ is used to refer Michael Foucault and his philosophy of Power/Knowledge, where “each society has its own regime of truth, it general politics of truth” Foucault, *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, 131.
10 Ibid.
meaning behind the definition of the topic that they have come up with. This generates space for the engagement and dialogue about the ‘Hidden Message’ and it may produce assumptions as the result of the collective process of reflexion. Participants may explore the contradictions, doubts, dilemmas, questions and possibilities of this reflexion and the social implications in their reality. What is this definition of the topic telling us? What is the hidden message that we have to decode?

- **Through a psychological reflexivity** informed by the theory of Jaques Lacan and its connection between language and the unconscious.

VaVaV suggests an ‘anti-structured’ process of participation where participants may feel confident showing their ideas about a topic. Through the participants’ interactions the artist/facilitator receives hints that assist him to understand the ‘Hidden Message’ in the participants’ engagement. The activity provides opportunities for participants to remove themselves from the dominant surrounding society and allows them to express their identities in ways that may not be possible to express within their permanent communities. Whether the exploration of the ‘Hidden Message’ is done through the senses, critical reflexivity of the new discourse or psychological reflexivity, what stands out is that VaVaV generates spaces of interaction that are the product of interrelations wherein multiplicities and heterogeneities are negotiated. These spaces are open and constantly under construction due to their interrelations.

---

11 Bial, *The Performance Studies Reader*
CHAPTER FOUR. Dialectical Representations. The sensory form of the topic.

The triad of ‘Definition – Dialectic – Hidden Message’ explained in Chapter Three is the base of the dialectical representations. The final definition of the topic obtained in the ‘Hidden Message’ generates a non-fixed codification of the topic. With this, participants generate a new ‘discourse’ \(^1\) validated, authenticated and certified by themselves. This non-fixed codification sets apart from what society, institutions and others have defined about the topic (or have expected it to be defined as).

The new discourse is used to assist participants to perceive the topic in a sensorial way, linking the keywords obtained in the ‘Hidden Message’ (see Appendix III) to dialectical representations such as visual, aural, body and gustatory. These dialectical representations open multiple ways of knowing and exploration of unfixed routes of knowledge.

For Sarah Pink the reflexivity through the senses, sharing activities, practices and new forms of expressions ‘are alternative and ultimately valid ways of seeking to understand and engage with other people’s worlds’ \(^2\) and it is defined by Pink as

---

\(^1\) Foucault, Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977.

\(^2\) Pink, Doing Sensory Ethnography 9.
‘doing sensory ethnography’\textsuperscript{3}. Therefore, the experienced, knowing and emplaced body is central to the idea of this methodology. Sensory ethnography practice entails:

- our multisensory embodied engagements with others (perhaps through participation in activities, or exploring their understanding in part verbally) and with their social, material, discursive and sensory environments. It also requires us to reflect on these engagements, to conceptualise their meanings theoretically and to seek ways to communicate the relatedness of experiential and intellectual meanings to others\textsuperscript{4}.

The application of the sensory ethnography methodology to the dialectical representations requires understanding of the meaningful relationship between the human perception and the power of representing a discourse in an unfixed form. It allows situating the artist/facilitator as an instrument that generates active participation to produce knowledge and new understanding through the senses. In this chapter, four propositions are presented as a way to approach the topic via visual, aural, body and gustatory dialectics.

These representations allow participants to generate their own regime of truth and knowledge while at the same time helping to perceive and analyse situations in ‘unconventional’\textsuperscript{5} forms. Hence, participants generate their own ‘regime of truth’\textsuperscript{6}. This new regime of truth expresses culture with no words and at the same time transfers a hidden message to the realm of the senses.

\textsuperscript{3} Pink, \textit{Doing Sensory Ethnography}.

\textsuperscript{4} Ibid., 25

\textsuperscript{5} The unconventional forms that these representations take are reference to more than the facts that connect language and sensory expressions of a definition than to an actual validation of the art form. Hence, the word ‘unconventional’ is not suggesting that the artwork produced by participants is, in any way, \textit{avant garde} or different to any artwork done before in the history of the arts but the unconventionality of interconnecting keywords and their representations as a substitution of the academic understanding of the keywords.

\textsuperscript{6} Foucault, \textit{Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977}, 131..
Visual Dialectics

Visual dialectics are split into two initial tasks. In the first one participants are asked to represent the topic employing wooden blocks. Appendix IV.1.1 explains in detail how participants work together to find different ways in which the keywords can be summarised in a sole figure. This initial task entails a great challenge for the participants, since it depends on their capacity for abstraction and association. In addition, it is the first step where participants have to associate keywords and represent them in a three-dimensional form.

The wooden blocks are used in this task to connect participants with an element that links immediately to the act of building structures. The challenge here is that participants have to think beyond the common use of the bricks to create a form that represents the topic in an unconventional shape. As explained in Appendix IV.1.1, the whole group is split into small groups, so they have the chance to share their ideas freely and develop a concept that is pertinent to them.

After participants have shared their ideas, they are asked to find the commonalities in all the representations that every group has made. This assists participants to design, in consensus, the shape that the three-dimensional representation of the topic will have in the next task: ‘Fabric Sculpture’, as shown in Appendix IV.1.2.

The intention of using fabric in the visual dialectic of ‘Fabric Sculpture’ is to make the most of its tactile property and the immediate connection with the body. Lygia
Clark, by means of ‘Relation Objects’, believed that experiences were locked in the body creating a bodily memory, so when participants touched the relation objects they were able to bring back memories and feelings related to the materials. With a similar purpose, the use of fabric in this task helps participants create connections and develop tactile familiarity with the material that would not be possible if using metal or plastic.

At the same time, the task looks for a representation that escapes figurative forms and allows participants to create a visual representation of the topic that allows abstract forms. This ignites creative potentialities in participants and prepares the field for further dialectical representations, which demand higher levels of abstraction. Fabric can be knotted, scattered, hung and given a freedom to the representation of forms that does not require any technical expertise. Participants use their hands and creativity to develop a sculpture that might result in an organic form that abstracts itself from the figurative form that it would have had if they had to use other mediums.

**Aural Dialectics**

The aural dialectics aims to generate independent sounds for each keyword that defines the topic. In Appendix IV.2 how this task works is shown and the technical
support required to make it possible. One of the main requirements is that participants use a series of percussion instruments and freely explore and play with them.

The sound of the topic assists in engaging participants who find the experience of hearing easier and more pleasant. They will find this task fun and inspiring. On the other hand, there will be participants who are shyer, for whom this task could be quite challenging. The role of the artist/facilitator is to make participants feel comfortable and help those who find aural dialectics intimidating.

An interesting feature of this task is that the sounds change during the task. Six different sounds will be produced based on the definition of the topic. If the number of participants is 12, then every keyword will have 12 different sounds. The end result is unexpected in terms of the sounds, since every participant will express keyword-sounds in different ways. As participants start playing with the instruments, during the exercise there is a possibility that one of the participants, often the most extroverted, will disregard the instruments and start producing sounds with his/her mouth, body or any other furniture or things around the room where the task is being held. This breaking point allows participants to take the risk of producing sounds in innovative ways.

In addition, each keyword has its social connotation and rationality as well as the personal connection between the participant and the keyword. Hence, using the example in Appendix III, the keywords of work – effort, challenging, income, time, rewarding and stability – will have a special form of representation for every participant and in some cases, the instruments will not provide the medium by which participants wish to express themselves.
Chapter Four. Dialectical Representations

**Body Dialectics**

Body dialectics emerged as a way of compiling three important aspects within the ANPO experience. Firstly, body dialectics helps create a connection with aural dialectics, since the sounds used for this activity are the loop created in that task (see Appendix IV.2). Secondly, the previous tasks, those explained in chapters One, Two and Three, as well as visual and aural dialectics, demand a high level of intellectual input that might cause participants to feel mentally too tired for any other activity. Therefore, body dialectics proposes an activity that allows participants to move their body and stop for a moment to relieve the mental pressure that the previous tasks might have caused. Thirdly, as by this point in the experience the artist/facilitator has gained ‘access to the group’⁹, this allows him to take a momentary role as a ‘participant-observer’¹⁰.

As explained in Appendix IV.3 body dialectics consists of interpreting the sounds generated in the aural dialectics and creating a final photo of these sounds in relation to the keywords. Participants are asked to feel the sounds and connect them with their bodies. Each keyword is different in terms of the sounds that have been produced, so participants can clearly differentiate between one sound and another.

The challenge in this task relies on how comfortable participants feel when moving their bodies and making weird steps in reaction to the sounds. For some participants this will be a big challenge and they may refuse to move freely. Others may be able to enjoy the experience without judging themselves. In order to facilitate this task, it has been proposed to posit the artist/facilitator as a participant. When the artist/facilitator

---

¹⁰ Ibid., 86-115.
assumes this role, it allows him to encourage those who are barely moving and helps them to connect with their bodies making the experience more pleasant. This specific role is what Karen O’Reilly defines as ‘Participating and observing’ in her book *Ethnographic Methods* \(^{11}\) where she writes, ‘Participation and observation have a dialectical relationship to each other in the practice of ethnography’ \(^{12}\) since participation consists of getting involved and immersing yourself while observation demands keeping yourself emotionally and physically distant. However, for O’Reilly, this dialectic does not need to be resolved because this is what gives participant observation its strength as ‘participating enables the stranger to become familiar and observing enables the familiar to appear stranger’ \(^{13}\).

In body dialectics the role of observing aims to locate the researcher as an insider. The supporting task succeeds when the artist/facilitator plays a double role showing both empathy and the ability to fit into the group whilst always observing those who find the task extremely challenging. Karen O’Reilly states:

> The objective part of participant observation is the observation part. If you are simply being there, hanging around, taking part, you are no more than a participant (as well as in our daily lives); but as a participant observer, you are someone who is observing as well as taking part. You want to learn from the group so you have mentally to stand back and notice things.\(^{14}\)

This floating role of the artist/facilitator is possible because the group will have got used to his presence and at this point of the experience they are able to act naturally around him. The best that the artist/facilitator can do is to ‘pretend that he knows nothing, but also know enough to fit in’ \(^{15}\). (106, 97,96)

\(^{11}\) O’Reilly, *Ethnographic Methods*.

\(^{12}\) Ibid., 105

\(^{13}\) Ibid., 106

\(^{14}\) Ibid., 97

\(^{15}\) Ibid., 96
Gustatory Dialectics

The role of the gustatory dialectics is to enclose all the previous experiences in an activity that combines association, playfulness, intellectuality, creativity and generation of an outcome that might/might not be possible to eat. This specific task comprises the strength of the previous dialectical representations and is used to enclose the ANPO-experience journey.

This first challenge that participants have to go through is to associate the topic’s keywords with ingredients. In Appendix IV.4 a hypothetical example is shown where the keywords stressful, measured, salary, firm rewarding and difficult are associated to tagliatelle, salt, basil, cassava, chocolate and chilli respectively. The way these ingredients become the definition of the keywords is also explained in Appendix IV.4.

The second challenge is to invent a recipe with the ingredients. In the example of ‘Work’ the ingredients seem to share points of connectivity, which makes them easy to mix in a final recipe. However, this will not be always the case, since there will be moments where the particular combination of ingredients will make the task more difficult.

Gustatory dialectics produces a multisensory experience that enhances communication in the act of cooking and eating. As Newell and Shams propose, ‘our phenomenological experience is not of disjointed sensory sensations but is instead of a coherent multisensory world, where sounds, smells, tastes, light and touches
amalgamate. The amalgamation of all these senses allows participants to develop links that go beyond words and do not need to be explained, since the act of cooking and eating can be done in silence and expresses through textures, flavours and smells emotions that cannot be put into words.

Before Gustatory Dialectics take place, there is another moment where participants connect with food as well. In Appendix IV.5 a reference about the type of lunch that must be served in the ANPO experience is outlined. Participants take a break of one hour and this is the first time that they will have had the possibility to connect with each other, aside from in the tasks. For this reason, it is suggested that the meal must be done for the participants employing ingredients and groceries to cook their own meal, sharing responsibilities between them. With this, the lunch break is in reality another activity of the experience, directly related to the gustatory dialectics.

The Wrap-up

This is the final part of the ANPO experience. In Appendix IV.6 this task is split into three parts. Part I is ‘The apparent truth of the topic’ (Appendix IV.6.1) where participants write down what they think about the definition of the topic once it has been defined as explained in Chapter three – Appendix III. Part II is ‘The synthesis of the topic’ (Appendix IV.6.2), in this task participants are asked to write down what they think about the topic once the gustatory dialectics have finished. Finally, in Part III, ‘The dialogue’ (Appendix IV.6.3), the artist/facilitator induces participants to be part of a dialogue where they give their opinions and ideas about the ANPO experience and how this can be applicable to their daily life or work environment.

\[16\] Pink, Doing Sensory Ethnography 28.
APPENDIX I. Warm up
Appendix I.1 The philosophical understanding of the object

The artist/facilitator places a chair on top of the table and asks:

What is this?

Let’s observe a hypothetical case:

Artist/Facilitator (AF)
Participants (any letter from the alphabet)

**AF: What is this?**
B: A chair

**AF: What is a chair?**
C: Something that is used to sit down

**AF: Why do we need to sit down?**
D: Because we are tired

**AF: Why are we tired?**
E: Because we worked too much

**AF: Why did we work too much?**
G: Because we needed money

**AF: Why did we need money?**
H: Because we need to eat

**AF: Why do we need to eat?**
I: Because we need to survive

**J: Why do we need to survive?**
K: Because we are humans

…
The example above shows how the artist/facilitator makes a rhetorical question with the answer of one of the participants and uses this to ask another participant. The artist/facilitator can keep on making questions till he considers the participants are still interested in being part of the activity, or he/she feels that the questions are starting to run in circles, in which case, the artist/facilitator can start with Appendix I.2.

**Appendix I.2. The environmental understanding of the object**

With the same chair, the artist/facilitator asks another set of questions related to the materials used to make the chair.

**Artist/Facilitator (AF)**

**Participants (any letter from the alphabet)**

**AF:** What is this chair made out of?

**B:** Wood

**AF:** Where the wood comes from?

**C:** From the forest

**AF:** Where is that forest located?

**D:** In the north of Laos

**AF:** What type of tree was cut?

**E:** Pine

**AF:** How many tree were cut?

**G:** One

**AF:** How old was the tree?

**H:** Four years

**AF:** How planted the tree?

**I:** A manufacturing company

**J:** Where did this manufacturing company come from?

**K:** Sweden

…
In the same way as in Appendix I.1, the artist/facilitator uses participants’ answers to make a new question related to the material of the chair. If the chair has other materials apart from wood, the artist/facilitator can ask about these materials as well. For example:

**AF: What is this part of the chair made out of?**
B: Metal
**AF: Which metal?**
C: Iron
**AF: Where does that iron come from?**
D: From the mines
**AF: Where is that mine located?**
E: New South Wales in Australia
...

In the same way, the artist/facilitator can ask till he/she considers that it is time to pass to Appendix I.3.

**Appendix I.3. The sociocultural and political understanding of the object**

With the same chair, the artist/facilitator asks another set of questions related to the sociocultural and political context of the chair.

Artist/Facilitator (AF)
Participants (any letter from the alphabet)

**AF: How many chairs were made?**
B: 100 chairs
**AF: How many hours were required for its construction?**
C: Ten hours per chair
**AF: How many hours in total for the 100 chairs?**
D: 1000 hours
AF: How many people worked in manufacturing it?
E: 10 people

AF: In which country was it manufactured?
G: China

AF: How old were the people working in the factory?
H: 10 years old
I: 20 years old
K: 70 years old

AF: How much was their wage?
B: 50 cents per hour
...

In the same way as previously, the artist/facilitator uses participants’ answers to make a new question related to the sociocultural and political context of the chair. This part could generate answers that might offend other participants or make them feel uncomfortable. For this reason, it is important that the artist/facilitator does not polarize or take any position. In case a discussion or argument arises, the artist/facilitator has to remain as neutral as possible.

In the same way, the artist/facilitator can ask till he/she considers it is time to pass to Appendix I.4.

Appendix I.4 Redefining the object

The artist/facilitator takes the chair off the table and places it again [where? On the floor?] and asks participants:

What is this?
Participants’ responses can vary depending on the group. Some of them might answer:
- It is a chair!

Others:
- It is a product of capitalism
- It is the product of the work of man
- It is the product of deforestation
- …

The artist/facilitator can ask ‘What is this?’ as many times as he/she wants. In which case every participant will have a different or similar answer to the other.
APPENDIX II. The Topic
Appendix II.1. Decode Theme

Let’s imagine that the decoded themes are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racism</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belongings</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The group of participants in the ANPO experience, in this hypothetical case, are 12. So, the artist/facilitator asks the participants to vote one by one. This is not a private election; the vote of every participant is public and each one is free to vote or not for the different options.

The following are the result of the election:
In analysing these results three options are tied: identity, discrimination and work. So, the next task is to select one of them. If the participants decide to vote again, it is just a matter of a new election:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix II.2. Free Election**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Galaxy</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horror Movies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunlight</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cars</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belongings</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holidays</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this case, there are three tied options: galaxy, identity and work. The selected option is ‘Work’.
Option A. Participants suggest different topics.

Option B. There are specific topics that are shown and participants have to decide which one they would like to develop.

- Every participant has the opportunity to vote more than one time
- The options with the least votes are erased from the whiteboard, leaving just the ones with the highest scores

Figure 14. Selection topic diagram
APPENDIX III. Vis-á-Vis-á-Vis
What is work?

Let’s suppose that participants define work as:

All keywords are written on a whiteboard. The first task for the artist/facilitator is to associate the keywords that relate to each other. The reason behind this is that most of the words are synonyms of the others. Hence, in order to create a better understanding of the topic, the definitions that participants have given are associated with as many words as possible. It is important in this step that participants help in the process of association otherwise the sense of teamwork could be lost.

In the group of words aforementioned there are some similarities such as:
In this regrouping it is possible then to establish a definition of ‘work’ as:

- Effort
- Challenging
- Income
- Time
- Rewarding
- Stability

In addition, it is possible to infer that:

a) The keywords, ‘the-part-within-the-whole’ are related to a social recognition of the topic that has been selected. This means that participants’ answers are led by their own perception of what the topic is.

b) Participants wish to answer ‘correctly’ in order to avoid being misunderstood or judged by other participants.¹

Now, the new task is to find the opposite of these keywords or the whole, as Saussure defines:

- Effort ≠ Relaxation
- Challenging ≠ Easy
- Income ≠ Expenditure
- Time ≠ Timeless
- Rewarding ≠ Penalty
- Stability ≠ Instability

The last task is to find the opposite of the opposites. To make this task easier for the participants, it is imperative that the artist/facilitator writes what the topic is not. For instance, in the hypothetical case that is being analysed:

¹ This is further explored in the last section of this chapter.
Work is not relaxation

easy
expenditure
timeless
penalty
instability

Now the participants are asked to apply VaVaV, giving opposite keywords

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relaxation</th>
<th>≠</th>
<th>Stressful</th>
<th>≠</th>
<th>Easy</th>
<th>≠</th>
<th>Difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>≠</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Timeless</td>
<td>≠</td>
<td>Measured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty</td>
<td>≠</td>
<td>Reward</td>
<td></td>
<td>Instability</td>
<td>≠</td>
<td>Firm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hence, for this community, work is defined as the following:

Work is stressful

difficult
salary
measured
reward
firm
**Topic: Work**

**What is work?**
- Effort
- Challenging
- Income

**What is not work?**
- Relax
- Easy
- Expenses

Work is not relaxed
- is not timeless
- is not expenses
- is not unstable
- is not easy and
- is not penalty

**For this community**
- Work is stressful
- is measured
- is income
- is stable
- is difficult

This task intends to find the hidden message in the opposite words.

*Figure 15. Vis-á-Vis-á-Vis diagram*
APPENDIX IV. Dialectical Representations
Appendix IV.1 Visual Dialectics

Appendix IV.1.1. Wooden blocks

In this task, participants are asked to employ the definition of the topic and create a visual representation using wooden blocks.

Requirements:

- Sets of games of Jenga©¹

The participants must be split equally into groups depending on the number of people.

If the number of participants is 12, it is possible to create 4 groups of 3 participants.

A) Every group has to give a name to their group. For example:

Group 1: The Explorers
Group 2: The Ants
Group 3: The Fellows
Group 4: The Happiest

B) Every group receives a quantity of 54 wooden blocks. The wooden blocks used in this task belong to the game Jenga. The artist/facilitator must remove the wooden blocks out of the boxes to avoid association between the Jenga and the visual representation of the topic.

¹ Wikipedia, "Jenga," http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jenga."Jenga is a game of physical and mental skill created by Leslie Scott, and currently marketed by Parker Brothers, a division of Hasbro. During the game, players take turns removing one block at a time from a tower constructed of 54 blocks. Each block removed is then balanced on top of the tower, creating a progressively taller but less stable structure." Wikipedia, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jenga
C) Every group has between 5-10 minutes to create a representation of the topic, using the keywords developed in VaVaV (Please, refer Appendix III).

D) Once the time has finished, every group has to explain to the other groups the reason why they represented the topic in a certain way and how they related the keywords of the topic.

E) Participants are asked to find commonalities in the representations of every group.

Appendix IV.1.2. Fabric Sculpture

In this task participants use the previous information in the wooden blocks task and are asked to create a sculpture made out of fabric.

Requirements:
- 16 metres of fabric split in four different colours. For example: four (4) metres of white, four (4) metres of red, four (4) metres of blue and four (4) metres of green
- Scissors

A) In order to create the sculpture, the artist/facilitator asks participants to remember the common shapes that they found in the previous exercise. Then, one of the participants draws the shapes on a whiteboard. With these shapes participants suggest possible forms that the sculpture may have. This dialogue does not finish until all the participants agree with a way to represent the topic with fabric.

B) Once the shape has been defined, the artist/facilitator invites participants to start creating the sculpture. It is important that every person be part of this process. The artist/facilitator must be aware of participants, in case that one
participant or a group of participants does not want to participate, the artist/facilitator can help them to make him/her feel part of the group.

C) The sculpture might have the form of an object, an installation or a performance. This will depend on the participants and how comfortable they feel about exploring their ideas as/in a group.

Appendix IV.2. Aural Dialectics

This task consists of representing the topic with a sound.

Requirements:

- Percussion Instruments
- iPad
- iMaschine\(^2\) licence
- Speaker or amplifier
- Musician facilitator

Participants must create a sound for each keyword. For example, if the topic is:

\begin{align*}
\text{Work is} & \quad \text{stressful} \\
& \quad \text{difficult} \\
& \quad \text{salary} \\
& \quad \text{measured} \\
& \quad \text{reward} \\
& \quad \text{firm}
\end{align*}

In this task there is an option to work with a musician who will act as the artist/facilitator of this task.

\(^2\) Native Instruments GmbH. iMaschine. 2014.
A) The artist/facilitator must provide percussion instruments.

B) Participants are given a few minutes to explore the instruments before the task starts.

C) Participants choose a keyword. For example, difficult.

D) Employing the program iMaschine, each participant records a sound related to ‘difficult’. This sound can be made through instruments, voice, body and any other media that participant considers. The sound is recorded with the support of a musician or the artist/facilitator.

E) The 12 sounds remain recorded in the iMaschine system.

F) The artist/facilitator asks for a volunteer to play with the sounds in order to create a loop that represents the sound of the keyword.

G) Once the participant has created the loop with the support of the artist/facilitator, the sound is played so all participants can appreciate the aural representation of the keyword.

H) This process is repeated until all the six keywords have specific sounds.

I) Then, the six loops are mixed to create the sound of the topic. For example, Work. This sound is created by the artist/facilitator who mixes the loops.

Important:

- When volunteers are asked to create a loop of the keywords, the artist/facilitator must explain that the loop should be related to the meaning of the keyword selected. The sounds of every participant in relation to every keyword have been recorded in different files in iMaschine. Then the volunteer has the option to mix all the sounds into one, touching all the files at
the same time (which creates a chaotic sound) or make a melody touching every file separately, in order to create a more harmonic sequence.

Appendix IV.3. Body Dialectics

This task consists of developing a performance related to the topic.

Requirements:

- The sounds previously recorded in Appendix V.3
- iPPad
- Speakers
- A performance artist (PA) to help to facilitate the task

A) The idea of this task is to create a body and performative form of the topic.

B) The PA proposes a series of warm-up exercises before starting the body representations.

C) Once the warm up has finished the sound of each keyword is played.

D) Participants are asked to feel the sound and trying to create a posture, a movement or a position related to the sound. Participants know which keyword corresponding sound is being played.

E) After doing a series of trials participants are asked to create a final picture of the keyword. They remain static for a few seconds while the artist/facilitator takes a picture to enclose the moment. Figure 3 shows the keyword ‘restriction’. This was one of the keywords of the topic ‘Exploration’. This topic was chosen for a group of participants who were part of the only trial done using the ANPO experience.

F) These steps are repeated for each keyword.
G) At the end, the pictures taken are shown and shared with the participants.

![Figure 16. Performance of the keyword 'restriction'](image)

**Important:**

- This task must be short, around 20 minutes.

- The idea of the body dialectics is to relax the possible tension existing from the previous tasks.

- The artist/facilitator must be aware and pay special attention to those participants who find it difficult to express themselves through the body. The artist/facilitator must support them and help them to participate.
Appendix IV.4. Gustatory Dialectics

This task require a high level of facilitation, otherwise it will be difficult to achieve a common goal.

Requirement:

- The support of a chef
- Kitchen facilities
- Grocery facilities
- An assistant who will need to leave the room to buy groceries to cook

The Gustatory Dialectic aims to ‘cook the topic’, literally speaking. Participants are asked to connect the keywords with ingredients that are chosen by the group.

A) Participants connect keywords with ingredients. For example, the keyword ‘difficult’

B) Every participant must associate ‘difficult’ with an ingredient. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ingredients associated to the keyword ‘difficult’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chilli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effervescent vitamin C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark chocolate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver steak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frog’s legs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 17. Ingredients associated with the keyword ‘difficult’*

C) Participants vote following the rules explained in the Appendix II.1. In this case, the ingredient selected is chilli.
D) Following the same methodology participants suggest ingredients for the rest of the keywords such as stressful, difficult, salary, measured, reward and firm. For example, let’s consider the example as shown in Figure 17. In this, the keyword ‘difficult’ is related to ingredients, which allows the creation of a list of ingredients that can be used for cooking the topic.

E) The artist/facilitator’s assistant will ask the chef the quantities required for each ingredient and will go to the closest market to buy them.

F) While participants wait for the ingredients, they are split into groups of 3-4 participants. With the support of the chef each group writes down a recipe using the ingredients previously chosen. The final product of this recipe can or cannot be edible and it will depend on the group and their ideas.

G) Every dish prepared by the groups is explained to the other participants.

H) Participants taste the dishes in case they have prepared a dish that can be eaten.

![Keywords associated with ingredients](image)

*Figure 18. Keywords associated with ingredients*
Important:

- If this is the last task of the ANPO experience the artist/facilitator might expect a high level of participation. The group has already broken the ice and has been working for around four hours before starting the Gustatory Dialectics. For this reason, the artist/facilitator must help to facilitate the process. One of his main tasks is to assist the way participants listen to each other since the most extroverted participants could tend to overlap their voice, leaving the less extroverted unable to participate.

- To facilitate the association of each keyword with an ingredient, participants must not know what these ingredients are. Otherwise, participants will tend to suggest ingredients to create a final meal that is already premeditated in their mind.

Appendix IV.5. The Lunch

If the ANPO experience is going to be held for a period of six or more hours, the artist/facilitator must contemplate the fact that lunch will be an important part of the process. For this reason, the meal must be cooked for the participants employing ingredients supplied by the artist/facilitator. With this, participants work together to cook their own meal, sharing responsibilities between them.
Appendix IV.6. The Wrap-up

This is one of the most important parts of the ANPO experience and will help participants understand the whole process that they have gone through.

The wrap-up is in three parts:

Appendix IV.6.1 Part I. The apparent truth of the topic

Once the topic has been defined with the six keywords, the participants are given a white page and a pen. On this they are asked to write:

a) Participant’s name.

b) What they think about the final definition of the topic and if there are any keywords that they would have never included in that definition.

Appendix IV.6.2. Part II. The synthesis of the topic

Once the previous task has been completed, the white page used in Part I. (Appendix IV.6.1) is given to participants. They are asked to write:

a) What they think about the topic now.

After that, the artist/facilitator asks participants to read out loud what they wrote in Appendix IV.6.1 and what they wrote in Appendix IV.6.2.a. Then, the artist/facilitator asks:

b) Do you see anything different?

Participants are left to talk freely about this.
Appendix IV.6.3. Part III. The dialogue

The artist/facilitator induces participants to be part of a dialogue where they give their opinions and ideas about the ANPO experience and how this can be applicable to their daily lives or work environment. To facilitate this task, the artist/facilitator can ask the following questions:

a) We have synthesized the topic into six keywords, which one of them would you never have included in this definition?

b) Please mention three positive aspects of the ANPO experience.

c) Please mention some negative aspects of the ANPO experience and how you would improve them.

d) How would you apply the ANPO experience in your work environment or daily routine?

e) What do you think you have learned in the ANPO experience?
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