# *VI.*
# *Why artistic research matters*

In this book, we have explored the nature of the research space that exists for the artist and have discussed a number of possible articulations of the 'cognitive, embodied and aesthetic inquiry' that the artist might make into his or her own domain and practice. In Chapter Two, we considered the divide between art and science, which upon close examination is not as profound as often thought, and proposed an open approach for artistic research, drawing on both traditions as appropriate. We then traversed the unfenced terrain of the potential territories for artistic research in Chapter Three, encountering their richness and openness, but also noting the confusion and the non-linear trajectories of its epistemic, aesthetic, embodied, individual and social aspects. In Chapter Four, we developed further the idea of openness and fluidity through the metaphor of a ship setting out on the ocean of exploration, showing how the artist-researcher might navigate the constraints of his or her practice, the conditions of society and the judgement of academic research, thus opening the way for different research practices. Chapter Five ventured into the dark side of the artist and his or her continuous (re)-negotiations within a human world, characterised by the ceaseless quest for meaning and signification and continual confrontations with conditions of vulnerability. In this final chapter, we will begin to place all these ideas into context by considering the wider social implications, the cognitive and aesthetic merits of artists' articulating their own artistic research trajectories, as well as the dangers and pitfalls of the potential institutionalisation of this practice. To facilitate this survey, the history of the relationship between artists and society will be briefly sketched, followed by a set of evaluations concerning the contemporary social situation as it relates to artistic research. Finally, we present an open manifesto for artist-researchers.

## ARTISTS AND SOCIETY: FROM COURT PROTECTION TO KNOWLEDGE-BASED INSTITUTIONS

> Art, or more broadly, culture, is always implicated, for good or ill, in the operation, manipulation, and legitimation of regnant social orders.
>
> Judith Kapferer, *The State and the Arts*, 2008, p. 5.

> (...) the production of knowledge cannot be divorced from its context. Knowledge networks are a form of power. The contest of ideas and battles to control the terms of policy debate reveal that the utilization of knowledge — indeed, what is considered to be valid knowledge — is a political process.
>
> Diane Stone, *Introduction: global knowledge and advocacy networks*, 2002, p. 9.

In *The State and the Arts*, Judith Kapferer dates the origins of the development of the arts as a collective modern phenomenon to the Renaissance. The situation at the end of the 17th century was one where aristocratic dynasties protected artists but restrained their independence. In the 18th century, this restraint was gradually eroded and eventually overcome, even if contravention of courtly codes was still severely sanctioned, but aristocratic patronage retreated correspondingly (Kapferer 2008, p. 2). The ideals of the Enlightenment and the Age of Revolution opened a rich time for '*hommes de lettres'*, philosophers, scientists and artists, who debated the place and space of culture and the interrelations between ideas, arts and science. However, the public sphere, as a realm for artists and intelligentsia, remained one with limited access, still largely the domain of the wealthy and powerful. This was to change by the end of the 19th century, as artists generally found themselves supported by, but having to appeal to, both a private Maecenas and the guardians of national interest, thus intermingling the private and the public.

Sustained by the fruits of the industrial revolution, as well as by enrichment through colonisation of the world, twentieth-century Europe entered the realm of 'big capital'. A shift from private to public financial support for the arts and culture took place. This shift first occurred at national levels, with the 'national culture' offering a means of showcasing a nation's wealth and reputation and acting as an agency for unity and the preservation of national interests. This, in turn, generated opportunities for a new class of technocrats and entrepreneurs, and for celebrities and 'stars' — popular musicians, sport figures, film actors:

> The relation between the state and the arts had been transformed from a discourse on tastes and morality to one of economic rationalism and political collusion. (Kapferer 2008, p. 3)

But this also meant that commodity fetishism entered the aesthetic realm, merging art and capital:

> The association of commercially successful architects and artists with patrons and benefactors is well illustrated by the coterie of financiers, curators, auctioneers, valuers, and dealers engaged in the dissemination of their works.
> (Kapferer 2008, p. 3)

In late capitalism, art is torn between individualist aesthetic concerns on the one hand, and the pressure of commerce and the culture industry on the other; between 'spaces for contestation and transformation in the interstices of societal orders' (Alain Joxe, in Kapferer 2008, p.6) and the fetishism of culture as market value. The danger is that states not only regulate, but also intervene in the art worlds. As Adorno warned:

> Today manifestations of extreme artistry can be fostered, produced and presented by official institutions; indeed art is dependent on such support if it is to be produced at all and find its way to an audience. Yet at the same time, art demands everything institutional and official. (Adorno 1991, pp. 116-7)

## ART AND THE 'KNOWLEDGE SOCIETY'

The relation between the state and the arts has become an ambiguous one, where the two are merged, both in the monetary value and the commodification processes of the market and in the educational concerns of social and cultural transmission. Moreover, political processes, as well as national interests, are shifting towards international interactions and economic arbiters. Knowledge production, consumption and transmission increasingly have their locus in the global economy, where the products enter a decentralized and commodified mode of circulation. Knowledge has become the principal focus of economic and market development in the last decades, leading to talk of a 'knowledge society'.

Is this so-called 'knowledge society' just a fashionable notion, or is it a concept that truly synthesizes crucial socio-cultural developments? It is clear that 'knowledge has always played a role in all human activities and knowledge acquisition and knowledge transfer are among the most distinctive characteristics of mankind' (De Weert 1999, p. 51). Can we then justify the notion of this being the era of

the 'knowledge society'? We can, if by this we mean that it is one in which we have seen an unprecedented increase of knowledge in terms of quantity as well as quality, an acceleration of knowledge production, the permeation of all spheres of life by knowledge and the development of knowledge as a key economic factor in the service economy (De Weert 1999). These aspects of a knowledge society were already remarked upon as early as the 1970s by Peter Drucker, Daniel Bell and Alain Touraine. But what exactly should we understand by 'knowledge' in this knowledge society? It is useful to examine the notion of 'knowledge' *tout court*, before reflecting on the impact of technology on knowledge, on knowledge as 'cultural capital' and, finally, on the implications of this for uses of knowledge in educational settings.

Let us first analyse recent shifts in the use of words that sustain, redefine or replace the old notion of 'knowledge', more specifically the noticeable shift from 'knowledge' to 'information' and from 'education' to 'learning'. When authors use the expression 'knowledge society', do they actually mean 'knowledge' or 'information'? The Merriam-Webster Dictionary offers two definitions of 'knowledge':

> 1. the fact or condition of knowing something with familiarity gained through experience or association;
> 2. acquaintance with or understanding of a science, art, or technique.

The primary definition of information is as follows: 'the communication or reception of knowledge or intelligence'. There is a shift from the condition of knowing and the facts of knowledge to the processes of communication, transmission or reception as they are applied to knowledge. Knowledge retains its old connotations of truth, reliability and stability; it is propositional in nature and has a use value. The post-Renaissance image of knowledge had a strong theoretical and disciplinary component, aiming at a development of 'knowers' and the transmission of knowledge in the form of justified true belief models, mainly carried linguistically, most of the time as propositional information. In contrast, information is not necessarily connected to belief or truth; it is procedural and performative and has an exchange value (Lankshear a.o. 2000, p. 38). There is a tendency to use the terms 'knowledge' and 'information' synonymously, with each concept moving towards the other. 'Information' is something searched for and explored; it is held in data to be browsed and sifted. 'Knowledge' in the 'information society' has

shifted from its participation in a stable order of 'truth', to a form of action, a 'performance epistemology' using rhetorical and normative modes instead of scientific-propositional modes (Lankshear a.o. 2000, pp. 35–6).

The shift from theoretical and disciplinary knowledge to problem-based and performance-related 'know-how' is conveyed in the notions of flexible and lifelong learning in which 'learning' takes the place of 'education'. Learning is thus defined as a lifelong process of acquiring knowledge in a context of continuous adaptation and flexible approaches to constantly changing requirements and environments. After 'education', 'learning' continues in the workplace; it is a dynamic, never-ending process (Garrick & Usher 2000). Knowledge, as contained in the notions of information and learning, has thus entered discourses of flexibility and dynamic performance. It is notable that the ancient Greek taxonomy of different kinds of knowledge—*episteme*, technical knowledge alongside *phronesis*, practical and ethical knowledge, and *techne*, productive and performative knowledge—enters contemporary society in new ways. 'Knowledge' as it is used in different employment sectors is diversified into four flexible components: scientific or technological knowledge—the more 'intellectual' part; market knowledge—knowledge concerning consumption and production; organisational knowledge—concerning networks, collaboration and learning processes; and personal and social skills— concerning communicative and relational abilities (De Weert 1999, p. 61). Art as 'commodified' through its duplication and consumption has already become part of market knowledge, while artistic skills and knowledge have generally remained hidden, accessible only by an educational trajectory and exchanges between insiders. The recent move towards the institutionalisation of research by artists in artistic milieus and education is another way of opening the doors of performance-related 'know-how'. This contributes another multi-faced aspect to the field: artistic skills—concerning personal artistic trajectories and their interrelatedness with science and other forms of knowledge.

These changing notions of knowledge are driven by technological innovations, growing leisure time, mobility and the globalization of both economy and culture. One of the most pervasive technological innovations is the internet, which has radically altered the notion and expression of knowledge, decentralising its loci, subverting and fragmenting the state and intellectual monopoly on knowledge and vastly expanding the intellectual capital available to the public. On the one hand, it offers a semiotic enrichment of knowledge production, distribution and transmission, using and merging different multimodal bearers—image, text,

sound—and encompassing a multitude of subjects now in the reach of a multitude of users. On the other hand, the internet has become a labyrinth of commodified knowledge, interconnected by pre-arranged but heterogeneous links.

This can be considered as a positive move: a new public space, offering new positions of discourse—new language games—renegotiating power relations, offering instantaneous dissemination, exchange and circulation of ideas and knowledge:

> The 'magic' and the appeal of the internet is that it is a technology that puts cultural acts, symbolizations in all forms, in the hands of all participants; it radically decentralizes the positions of speech, publishing, filmmaking, radio and television broadcasting, in short the apparatuses of cultural production. (Poster, 1995)

However, other voices critique the technologically-mediated realm of the internet and the growing institutionalization and commodification of knowledge as a pervasive 'consumption- and entertainment-driven technoculture', regretting the demise of the public sphere as a place of freedom and contestation, of practices of self-presentation and display and of participatory equality, open questioning and critique, in a context of inclusivity and rationality (Dean 2003, pp. 103-4). Others, like Manuel Castells, take an intermediate position, recognising the problem of domination and control, but at the same time pointing to the new possibilities that arise from re-combining different modes of expression and communication, organizing and mobilizing, as well as connecting and integrating, people of different classes, cultures and origins (Castells 1996, 1997, 1998). Exchanges of knowledge offer possible dialectical spaces, between domination and emancipation and between homogenous and heterogeneous processes. The internet, as such, is an inclusive sphere and can offer information of and access to other media and cultural manifestations—books, concerts, music, art and new artistic formations. Such democratization and diversification dilutes, but is unlikely to entirely supersede, the notion of 'cultural capital'.

How does society fix and reproduce its social practices? Knowledge about the social world is realized by acquiring social representations on the levels of reflection, practice and communication. Society imprints itself on the individual, often imperceptibly, by repeating social practices, responses and experiences, patterns

of conduct and lifestyle. Social order imposes itself on the body, and compels it to act in particular way, depending on time, space, circumstances, and the notion of 'the other' (Coessens & Van Bendegem 2008). Habituated, embodied and social practices merge in such a way that it becomes impossible to separate personal bodily practices from social patterns and vice versa. They form a kind of collectively-embodied knowledge of how to behave, how to understand, and how to think about the human world. Part of these socially imprinted structures and schemes can be considered as 'cultural capital'. Especially relevant here are those visible and invisible elements that concern information, education, perception and practices of the cultural world — 'subtle modalities in the relationship to culture and language' (Bourdieu 1977, p. 82). The notion of 'capital' means that acquisition and possession of these 'goods' secures a return; they possess a value, are worth the investment. The possession of capital offers a certain prestige, respect, power, and advantage in society; capital also posits the notion of ongoing, profitable exchange. Capital, whether financial or cultural, is not biologically defined or given, nor is it freely accessible to all: it is transmitted and accumulated across generations. Consequently, it is potentially subject to monopolization and unequal distribution, and will thus tend to be unequally transmitted and acquired:

> The value of cultural capital is not only dependent on the field in which it is produced, but also through the institutional and social contexts in which it is received and circulated.
> (Barrett & Bolt 2007, p. 8)

Cultural capital may be divided into three layers. *Objectified* cultural capital concerns the materialized or objectified form of culture: works of art and cultural goods such as performances, books, music and artefacts. *Institutionalized* cultural capital refers to those recognized elements, often designated by educational qualifications, that grant cultural status: diplomas, prizes, awards and reviews. These are published, commissioned, funded or granted by political and social institutions. The last layer, *embodied* cultural capital, concerns the interiorized or embodied aspects of cultural practices: embodied practices and patterns of thought concerning cultural values and attitudes. Translated to the domain of artistic practice, it refers to the artistic knowledge, creative abilities, interpretations, values and dispositions of individuals and communities that emerge from, and relate to, artistic production and manifestation (Barrett & Bolt 2007, p. 8).

> Embodied cultural capital merges representation and corporeality. It is produced and reproduced by emulation, of people, images and practices; and confers traits signifying the cultural value of their 'owners'. (Hill 2003, p. 165)

Artistic research clearly implies the articulation of embodied cultural capital, of the 'generative and performative dimensions of making art' (Barrett & Bolt 2007, p. 8). As such, it expresses and objectifies resources and schemes of appreciation and understanding that can broaden and reposition the relationship between artists and audiences, composers and performers, artists-researchers and scientists. As society now demands its articulation in the public sphere, this embodied cultural capital will partially take on the characteristics of institutionalized cultural capital. On the one hand, this will put the artist-researcher in the difficult position of bidding for funds and grants, and of depending upon the decisions of official power structures. On the other hand, it will offer some power through unveiling aspects of the hitherto concealed side of embodied cultural capital:

> Societies (...) seek to produce a new man through a process of 'deculturation' and 'reculturation'. (...) nothing seems more ineffable, more incommunicable, more inimitable, and, therefore, more precious, than the values given body, made body by the transubstantiation achieved by the hidden persuasion of an implicit pedagogy, capable of instilling a whole cosmology, an ethic, a metaphysic, a political philosophy. (Bourdieu 1977, p. 94)

## CONTEMPORARY DEVELOPMENTS IN EDUCATION: WHAT PLACE FOR ARTISTS?

A major challenge facing education in the global era is to cope with the discrepancy between traditional educational settings on one hand, and the all-pervading technoculture and globalization on the other: between the local and the global; between inclusion and exclusion; between the aim for 'capability'—aspects of identity and subjectivity—and 'capacity-building' approaches—investment in social human capital (Garrick & Usher 2000). Whereas, until recently, modern

education rested on the idea of 'universal welfare rights', on the 'aims, values and ideals of emancipation and social progress' defended as an 'ethical language game', the new era calls for an 'enterprise' of performance and efficiency, directed to 'means and techniques', tackling world competition and facilitated by a 'technicist language game' (Lankshear a.o. 2000, p. 23). Education thus seems to be struggling with two different, even opposing demands. On the one hand is the demand to continue the democratic project of modernity, in which education is a public and common good, a guarantee for professional satisfaction, a mechanism for emancipation in the work society — constructed around working time and career patterns — but also based on a bureaucratic model of 'unquestioned routines and pre-established goals' (Terren 2002, pp. 164–6). On the other, education is faced with the new requirements of economic performance and productivity and the necessity of lifelong learning, orientated towards a flexible labour market in a context of commodification and diminished civil commitment. It must offer more dynamic models, open to flexibility and discontinuity, transgressing old institutional and knowledge boundaries and open to more action.

Today, knowledge is moving into contexts of application that privilege performative, heterogeneous and transdisciplinary knowledge, while at the same time being increasingly located, produced and consumed in multiple and diverse settings (Gibbons a.o. 1994). Knowledge production is required to be flexible, problem-solving, transient and ready for commodification. This description glorifies human intellectual capital and seems to offer a technology of success (Garrick & Usher 2000). However, knowledge production is running the danger of being associated with knowledge manipulation, with unbridled commodification, with intellectual alienation, and with human subordination and regulation — as a power instrument. To mediate and cope with 'the gap between the traditional academic values of the university and the market values of the knowledge society' (Sadlak & Ratajczak 2004, p. 436), universities have to participate in wide-ranging networking; they have to move into the world, to associate with different institutions and organisations, non-educational as well as educational. Universities need to connect themselves to 'global knowledge networks' to 'advance, share and spread knowledge' as well as to be 'policy focused' (Stone 2002, pp. 1–2).

Because of this action-oriented concept of knowledge, it has to be continuously updated, renewed and restructured. As education plays a very important role in the transmission of knowledge, its curricula also have to follow this continual updating and reorganising. The flexibility of the 'information age' invades all edu-

cational settings. The knowledge society thus unsettles education, which is torn between traditional academic cultures and modernising corporate cultures, and plunged into a crisis of institutional values and identity (Marginson 2000, p. 29). However, if education should succeed in coping with this crisis, the knowledge society offers great positive potential for higher education and universities: they stand to benefit from global relationships, complex cultural and research exchanges, and internet education.

## ARTISTIC RESEARCH IN THE KNOWLEDGE SOCIETY: NEW OPPORTUNITIES

All this raises an urgent question: what do these new notions of knowledge imply for artistic education and artistic research? Does the knowledge society offer new opportunities for artists? Can research in the arts alter the dominant fetishism of culture as commodity? Consideration of research in the arts necessarily forces the debate and critique concerning artists and art education in the knowledge society into the public sphere.

We should take care to avoid considering artistic research by the artist as a *conditio sine qua non*; it is a more delicate and complex issue. We earlier defended the point of view that the question of being an artist and an artist-researcher is not an 'either ... or', the artist in his or her artistic endeavour always being, in some sense, an artist-researcher. Moreover, the many examples in the preceding chapters show that we cannot ignore that artistic work and identity is influenced by its inherent research trajectories, and vice versa. For those who reflect on their practice and the relevant research processes underlying it, representation of these through carefully constructed articulations can offer new insights, whether cognitive, artistic, aesthetic, or practical. Articulating these trajectories does not change the fact that the artist is an artist, but it can change how he or she shares, and develops further, his or her artistry. In a territorialized environment, being a researcher and being an artist are two different roles. However, in artistic research, one and the same person should be able to occupy them both. Artists have highly specialized knowledge and highly specialized skills, but as a rule these competences remain within the individual artist who possesses them. At best, we experience the products of these competences when we hear a musician's performances or compositions, or observe and study an artist's work.

Research should be committed to making this enormous treasure of implicit knowledge and skills of artists as explicit as possible, bringing it out into the open so that it may be better understood and, hopefully, used by others. By helping implicit artistic knowledge to become shared and discussed by others, research will be able to contribute to the understanding of art among the wider population and, consequently, to the promotion and development of the arts in general.

This is not an 'all or nothing' proposition: not all artists are interested in research as the means of capturing profound moments of change in how art is practised and why — at least not when such research presupposes a verbal articulation of this 'how' and 'why'. Not engaging in these processes does not mean one is any less good or 'true' as an artist; on the contrary, some of the greatest artists, as we have seen, have had a horror of explanations, just as others have felt driven to search them out and articulate them. Moreover, artists may feel at one stage of their artistic development the need to articulate the research dimension of their practice, and then either continue building on this knowledge or engage in something entirely new and perhaps less overtly articulated. After all, Alberti continued to paint, Goethe to produce poetry and Klee to produce artworks alongside and beyond their research inquiries. We must bear in mind that, in artistic research, modes of documentation, presentation and dissemination of the research need to retain their multivalent nature, ranging from public performances, recordings, and multimedia presentations to pictorial works, written texts and spoken presentations, for example. In order to be valid as research outcomes, however, they do need to be somehow communicable within peer communities and, ideally, the wider, public sphere. This inevitably creates tensions.

The difficulties that arise, however, may become a part of the ongoing discourse; for example, in *The Art of Interruption,* John Roberts develops his view of the place and space for the art of photography. He stresses the ambiguities of the position of art and the dialectical polarities of its social function and its immanent resistance to instrumental reason, of its sharing of a cultural space and its proclaiming of the abstract principle of autonomy. Art offers dialogue and communication; yet it critically counters society's values. It is both submerged by theoretical interpretations and immersed in practices; subservient to power relations, yet 'disconnected from them in the name of the 'free-floating signifier' (Roberts 1998, pp. 3–5). As such, Roberts considers art as 'a form of practical knowledge, an inscription of, and an intervention in, a socially divided world.' (Roberts 1998, p. 4). The artist must negotiate the ideological and material

conditions under which he or she works alongside his or her own artistic practice, reconciling its inherent cognitive, embodied and aesthetic inquiry with the wants and needs of his or her audience.

One of the dangers of the current trend in institutionalizing research is that of labelling individuals once more: as an artist, and as an artist-researcher. It potentially adds another competitive environment within which acceptance and exclusion may operate: that which sees artists aspiring to research roles, as in academic science, and to the kinds of career trajectories with which such roles are associated. Institutionalization of art practices may close doors to some and streamline and homogenize artistic education into a form which suits the demands of academic curricula. To counter these dangers, artists who are interested and motivated to do research should ideally be free to move in and out of institutional research roles according to the urgency and topicality of their inquiry and the state of their art. Institutional opportunity would thus correspond with intellectual and imaginative research quests—offering a way of testing the authenticity of research questions in relation to practice. One of the merits of this form of institutionalization would be to offer artists the tools, support and background for enquiring into their practices. But it would require immense sophistication within the relevant institution, and fiscal and ideological flexibility between institutions and governments, in terms of control.

The institutionalization of this artistic research in the knowledge society develops in diverse ways. Far-reaching reforms on the European level have made the interaction and collaboration between institutions of vocational higher education and universities not only possible but also desirable—not to say advisable and, in some cases compulsory. These links are forged nationally as well as internationally, and occur on many levels: intradisciplinary, interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary. These transformations in the (inter)national research landscape have been solidified by necessary and profound restructurings undertaken in light of the Bologna Declaration, which have themselves taken many forms.

First, there is a growing level of exchange. Academics, academic researchers and scientists whose subject is already art-related or who have a dual education, are recruited by art schools to help develop this new strand of research: to share research skills, to interact with artists or collaborate with them in the generation of new vocabularies. Artists may develop research skills through these encounters with scientists and academic researchers or by themselves following university courses. Different ways of doing artistic research are sustained by grants,

projects and relationships between art schools and universities. The institutionalization of the collaboration between universities and schools of higher education offers the opportunity for artists to engage in research projects funded through the academic route, rather than the state or commercial arts sectors. This means that a research project in the arts can be done for its own sake and can happen outside the public benefit or market-driven spaces.

As the duration of educational study is rationalised and higher education degrees are streamlined, across countries and across educational institutions, not only Bachelor and Master, but also Doctoral degrees become a possibility within disciplines where this was not formerly the case and in institutions that previously did not provide them. In institutional terms, this means that curricula have been reshaped to create Bachelor degrees which may be either professional or academic in focus, followed by generally more academic Masters degrees. The latter has necessitated devising research approaches and activities for what may nevertheless be practically-oriented second-cycle degrees, a process which has met with varying degrees of success. However, the evolution of academically-oriented Masters curricula based on the premise that research has always been a part of artistic studies, and closely linked to artistic practice, is now an established fact. This, in turn, has meant that it was inevitable that the third cycle—the doctorate—would be similarly affected by the educational transformations, and that artistic doctorates, presenting the outcomes of artistic research, would emerge and develop.

This brings us to our second point: by introducing doctoral degrees in the schools of higher education, emphasis is put on the importance of knowledge-based and research-sustained education. A such, the 'doctorate in the arts' has become a new goal, attainable by highly skilled and gifted artists, whether relatively young and just finishing their arts education, or senior artists, interested in these new challenges and wanting to acquire research skills or investigate and articulate their artistic processes. Before, only the most renowned artists could aspire to the title of 'Doctor' and this only by becoming '*doctor honoris causa*', in recognition of their outstanding contributions to a specific field. This was, and still is, a ceremonial degree, awarded by the university on basis of a proposal and selection procedure managed through university committees.

Now, artists may take a doctorate as a qualification, rather than having to wait in the hope that they may be offered it as an honorary award. A doctorate in the arts is granted following favourable evaluation of documented research achievements.

The criteria and conditions which artistic research must satisfy to qualify as doctoral research are, in fact, similar to those of other disciplines: the research project must form an original contribution to artistic knowledge, the research process must be documented and communicated, and it must address a specific question and follow a given method. However, the specific perspective of the research activity is the artist's point of view. Artist-researchers utilize their own artistry as an essential element of the various research stages: the questions at the heart of the project, the process and the output of this research, therefore, also have an essential artistic dimension to them.

Each discipline that evolves, whether academic or artistic, generates a critical capability with respect to itself. Until recently, artists wishing to go beyond an 'enquiring mind' (a necessary, albeit insufficient, condition for conducting research) borrowed their tools from research disciplines which deal with the arts—for example, in the case of music, these would be musicology, analysis, criticism, music history, music philosophy, music sociology, music teaching, etc. The purpose of facilitating artistic research is to emancipate the artistic discipline itself, enhancing critical reflection upon one's own practice and artistic evolution.

The new doctorates in the arts create frameworks that validate 'knowledge-expanding artistic research' conducted by the artists themselves and provide a dedicated forum for the discussion of such contributions which is separate from those of art critics and theory-oriented art scientists. These doctoral degrees reward not only research but also artistic development and the artist's evolution of high level skills in a specific domain. The research findings, although unique in some respects to the project undertaken, can have an impact on performance and other artistic practices in general and therefore transcend personal techniques, skills and knowledge.

The new doctorates in the arts offer the possibility for artists to instigate research questions and enter a doctoral degree curriculum in order to pursue them. This might involve a young, unknown and, as yet, incompletely formed artist, searching for the consolidation of his or her own artistic voice and questioning deep, potentially disturbing, issues concerning his or her young art; or, it might involve an established artist, reflecting upon and articulating his or her own well-established processes but wanting to develop them further, and in a more overtly articulated manner. Often, in the first case, the inquiry is primarily directed towards gaining more experience; in the second, it is more intensively focused upon the expression and interpretation of existing experience.

Not all results of this kind of research can indeed be expressed through words — more often than not a research project's essence can only be demonstrated rather than told. This works both ways: in the same way that music can transmit something that would be hard to explain with words, words can produce insight and knowledge that cannot be comprehended simply through music. This brings to the fore one of the most significant challenges that artistic research must address if it is to evolve into a lasting discipline: the responsive and responsible evolution of new kinds of language as the means to disseminate and articulate appropriately its domains and discoveries. The challenge of this has been evident in our discourse throughout this book. In writing it, we have frequently found ourselves resorting to sentences formed of lengthy strings of related clauses, images and ideas. In analysing why this should be, we have come to the conclusion that, far from being a mere stylistic affectation, it is symptomatic of the very issue we are wrestling with — the paradox of having to use words to describe a practice that, in its most literal sense, is beyond words. It seems as though, where words are inadequate to capture and define the intended meaning in one deft and precise stroke, the strategy of 'peppering the target' with a sequence of phrases connoting similar ideas may perhaps come close to defining in the interstices of these phrases the very thing which none of them, in isolation, is capable of conveying. But this is only one strategy; artistic research needs to develop many more.

Critics of artistic research have argued that a research culture should be measured by the results that it produces and the impact of those results on the wider culture beyond the subject interests of the discipline. This suggests, and is frequently interpreted to mean, the necessity of direct applicability of research results to the world at large in utilitarian terms. The question of utility is frequently levelled at the arts in full knowledge of its claims to an opposite set of non-utilitarian, intrinsic values. But art-making moves through culture, focussing the subjectivity of its creators independently of established cultural roles. Contemporary artists rehearse and give form to alternative ways of being in the public sphere, moving in and out of institutionally inscribed mores while also negotiating relationships within social organisations. They arguably prefigure, give form to, certain qualities of social, cultural relationships precisely because they are seeking to retain the subjective, the critical, within increasingly rational systems.

Artistic endeavour is (and always has been) concerned with playing the tensions between freedom and constraint, determinacy and indeterminacy, power of

persuasion and political power. So, it is no coincidence that art has become more and more central within philosophical discourse. It is also no coincidence that artists themselves are increasingly seeking a profound critical base from which to explore their freedom. The improvisational, yet disciplined and precise character of artistic endeavour may be seen as a concrete and real manifestation of freedom within a wider social context. Artistic creativity and its relationship with artistic research thus becomes a paradigm in Agamben's sense of the word (1999), as constituting and making intelligible those aspects of human experience that are concerned with managing our freedom as human beings.

The need for an artistic turn has therefore emerged with a degree of urgency, not just because knowledge of making and theories of making have been long neglected in favour of more deductive, scientific ways of knowing. It has also emerged as a reaction to the degree to which modern culture is itself formulated, regimented and rationalised through science in its application, rather than in its invention. Artistic creativity and, by extension, artistic research focus the possibility of infinite variability within acts of representation and interpretation. If research in general is to deal adequately with human society, it needs to embrace those aspects of knowledge production that deal with human subjectivity and relationships, not as phenomena to be deduced and re-harnessed within human control, but open-endedly, as part of a process of creative construction and interpretation that is relative, specific to context and value-driven.

The results of artistic research are largely unknown but, through the artistic turn, its horizon is being vividly imagined.

**A MANIFESTO for the artist-researcher:**

***Never forget the origin:***
the artist's experience and
creative act in the world

***Deterritorialize the research space***
to provide room for the artist's experience and
creations in the world

***Search for a possible discourse***
appropriate to the artist's experience and
creations in the world

***Search for the hidden dimensions and different perspectives***
of the artist's experience and
creations in the world

*TO BE CONTINUED...*