I will keep my formal remarks quite brief; we have all seen the videos now, and have all read the paper, and so I am particularly interested in the conversation, critique, and discussion that emerges from this work, rather than in simply summarizing the videos and music or the theoretical arguments I have placed alongside it. Instead, I will elaborate a few key ideas within my paper, and to attempt to situate this project within context of both the history of computation as well as alongside the work of experimental film and video artists who are germane to my practice.

Thank you very much to everyone for joining me here today and sharing your thoughts in what I hope will be a creative and challenging discussion. And thank you to the small, extended community who have joined us remotely via video conferencing. If I can remind everyone to use their microphones when they speak, we will be able to include those who aren't able to join us here in person. I want to welcome you all here to the Inclusive Design Research Centre. I’m very pleased to be able to present my work here, in this place where it was originally conceived and developed adjacently to my day-to-day inclusive design research. As I mentioned in a footnote in the paper, I often connect design and artistic practice together in this project. My use of the term “design”—particularly when referring to my software development activities—instead of, for example, terms like “software art” or “computational arts” is informed in part by McKenzie Wark’s concept of design as an practice that encompasses all kinds of creative activities including the fine arts. For Wark, design is the creation of new forms and vectors of creativity; forms that are cultural, technological, and social in nature. In this era of the Panama Papers, where the link between the ultra-rich and the art market is clearer than ever, I am happy to avoid retreating into a romanticized concept of art as somehow sheltered from the spectacular economic and utilitarian constraints of design, and rather to understand art and design as at least coexisting amongst and alongside each other as creative forces—as catalysts for aesthetic, technical, and embodied transformation—even when their linkages are occasionally uncomfortable and ambivalent in my own practice.

So here, I want to pick up this concept of adjacency, which informs the bulk of Section 1 of the thesis and try to elaborate on what’s at stake with it. My initial motivation stems from a desire to establish a theoretical model of practice in multiple disciplines that avoids what I see as two sides of the same flawed conceptual coin of interdisciplinarity: the idea that disciplines must either be in harmony with each other—synthesized—or must inevitably involve hierarchies and antagonism amongst them. As Morton Feldman said, “suppose we want neither politics nor art… both present themselves as all-encompassing.” Adjacency is an attempt to prevent myself from reading the relationships amongst my video, music, and software practices within an all-encompassing framework—as somehow, deep down, “the same thing.” No, I want there to be enough space within my own work to accommodate the difference between disciplines and practices, and to then see these differences as potentially generative of new kinds of relations and effects. Here, too, I am aiming to avoid the kinds of easy strategies that lead back to the ways that hybrids can simply occupy a familiar ontological status—in particular, constructs like “visual music” that imply again that somehow visual and sonic media are all ultimately fed from the same source—this all-too-common abstraction of data as the raw material for generalized, interchangeable representations. Of course I’m not opposed to visual music, and am quite happy for my work to be seen in context of the transformational textual-visual-sonic cinema apparatus of, say, my Loop Collective colleague Kelly Egan (and I’ll pick this up again shortly). But “visual music”—translation and representation across media—is simply not what I do.

Adjacency is not an argument for the lack of relations amongst disciplines in my practice, but rather a means of asserting that these relations need not be strictly defined by concepts of *unification* or *presence*. My goal, rather, is to see the ways that practicing in one discipline has non-linear effects and influences—I think the terminology of second order systems theory here is entirely apt—perturbations and irritations on the others. So, in a work like *In Passing,* where

• sum up adjacency by highlighting the opportunity of the little gap afforded by it between practices, between media—what advantage does it offer to my work?