

chantier/ construction sites: Founding ideas for a collective trans-disciplinary research initiative involving the arts.

Founding context:

The aim of this paper is to provide the contours of a collective research initiative and to invite critical comments and suggestions in regard to its final shaping. The presentation also serves as an informing space for potential participants to gain a better insight into the working methods we have employed thus far for the collective exploration of selected topics.

We would like first to render visible the departure points for the *chantier/construction site* - a research initiative in its initial phase.

A prior collaborative art research initiative – FUNDBURO – which we started in 2011 with DataData , a postgraduate art institution in Lyon, France allowed us to test the methodological tools for cross-disciplinary research. This project, which engages multiple partnerships across distance has provided us with a fertile and complex thinking environment which will also inform this new project.

FUNDBURO: The projects helped us complicate something that started out as a matter of concern for two groups of researchers located in France and South Africa respectively who wanted to collaborate on joint topics. While doing so, they intended also to render distance as a visible and productive part of the research processes. From an initial understanding of distance as linear– either negative in the sense of separation and a space to be bridged, or as positive in allowing us to move away from a myopic to a broader way of seeing – we came to the realisation that the linear model is inadequate. It proved incapable of grasping the processes involved in investigating the topics of our project - memories, dreams and narratives. We came to understand that distance needs to be related to movement and is a subject for negotiation. In the context of a collective research project, distance is an energising space – a catalyser, which allows us to explore the potential of translation/*traduction* as producers of further meaning and which

carries back to each research component new precision for thinking the “local”.

The collective moment liberates us from the need for claiming either something that might not be ours or may be too close to us. As Barthes (1998) and others have made us aware, limits are imposed by the idea that works are the product of a single author. In our experience, the collective moment imposes a certain number of jointly accepted conditions for setting up a framework and assuming responsibility for laying the foundations and setting the investigative processes in motion. In the course of our projects we have explored notions of generative authorship.

For example, multiple authorship in the context of one of the Fundburo projects - “dream work” - offered a meaningful approach to a topic as ephemeral as dream narrations. It allowed for the creation of different, co-existing rhythms: it induced stumbling into a new dimension, an idea that we were able to better articulate with reference to the work of Gilbert Simondon (1964). He describes collective engagement as creating the possibilities for falling “out of step with ourselves”.

FUNDBURO derives its collective power through theorizing concrete projects. These projects direct a thinking, which we believe becomes pertinent in and beyond the domain of the arts, as it opens paths of thinking through doing and doing through thinking, in an ongoing, critical dialogue which engages all participants. These projects also inform us about modes and modalities of collaborative working processes: the drawing processes informing protocols, the collection of narratives, which are further tested and critically analysed in the expanded space of the FUNDBURO.

The topic of the *chantier/construction site* came to us in a number of ways:

In the context of the Berlin Archive Marathon, a conference organized by the Institut für Raumexperimente (headed By Olafur Eliasson) in November 2013, Dr Elizabeth Giorgis and Berhanu Ashagrie with colleagues from Addis Ababa University, presented a paper informed by a collective exhibition and catalogue *Addis Ababa: The Enigma of the “New” and the Modern*. It foregrounds artists responding visually to the

challenges of a city undergoing rapid transformation.

As long ago as 1997, in the context of an art residency in Hong Kong, Georges Pfruender observed construction sites in the New Territories and presented a paper at the HK Art Centre on “construction sites as systems to be deciphered by artists and theorists.”

In January 2014, we started a conversation in Johannesburg about the framing concepts for a research project on “construction sites”, which we extended through observations of selected sites - which will be at the centre of this presentation. In February 2014, in Luxemburg, Georges proposed the project of an artist in residency programme, which would have as a meta-topic, the construction site, inviting artists and theorists to produce work inspired by a site under construction – the new University of Luxemburg - and to think creatively about the societal implications of an undertaking that aspires to be a flagship of the millennium.

The term

The word in French for construction site is “*chantier*”. Unlike its English equivalent, it amply provides for the possibilities of failure as well as success: it designates a place where building materials are stocked or manipulated or where workers are actively engaged in the repair or building of a construction. It can designate a set of materials, which serve as support. However, the term *chantier* is also used when describing a place of chaos, of mess. The term “*en chantier*” is used in instances when something is in process. “*Mettre en chantier*”, literally translated is “to put into construction site”, meaning “to undertake”. The term “*chantier*” is thus often used for places and spaces in transition – and to indicate that there is a collective “undertaking” happening, with the hope of better days to come. In this, we celebrate the “unfinished”, the process. Used in its metaphorical capacity, it foregrounds the need to have a moment of chaos from which to carve out a structure. And this is the context where artists are introduced as guides and agents.

Set of Conditions/Possibilities for Study

As initially stated, this paper will map out fields of investigation and suggest tools we consider useful for the exploration of a collective research process, which we imagine at this stage, will be of three years duration. Besides its founding members, it will include a number of

theorists and artists from the Continent who have indicated an interest in contributing, such as Dr. Elizabeth Wolde Giorgis, Berhanu Ashagrie, Yohann Queland de St-Perne and others. We acknowledge the possibilities that some of the goal posts will move as we develop this initiative, which will be informed by the curiosity and expertise brought into the research space by current participants as well as those who join us in the future.

The Moderns:

Bruno Latour (1994) suggests that the “Moderns” have not achieved modernity in the way that they conceptualize it as being characterized by radical separations between disciplinary fields. The profound differences they sought to introduce between the world views of themselves and those who were “Other” as part of the colonial venture have left the Moderns with several illusions about their intellectual and ethical practices, ironically at the cost of isolating themselves from the rest of the world. The “Moderns” need urgently to investigate under what conditions and at what price the “new” has been achieved and to provide a stage for the stories that have been created to support this drive.

We wish – in line with Latour’s arguments – to explore the premises of modernity, informed by experiences located in the contemporary realities of the South. According to Latour, modernity can only come into being if it is seen in its multiple possibilities of contradictions and cross-overs when the latent conflicts of value are made visible. The logics of circulation, connectivities and the possibilities of fluidity between different modes of existence will bring us to identify “paths” rather than stable fields, which we can trace, in order to produce new meanings. In the context of a continental debate, modernity cannot be discussed without a careful consideration of *political representation*, which is mentioned by Latour and famously discussed by Gayatri Spivak (1988) in “Can the Subaltern Speak?” Modernity, once accepted as a construction site with its own limits and boundaries and mechanisms of “territorialising and de-territorialising” (see Deleuze and Guattari 1988) comes under scrutiny as we apply our minds to the real and metaphorical construction sites. This would also mean “problematizing” the language of development and re-considering notions of “authenticity” in the context of the contemporary moment, ultimately assisting us in “form(ing) our cities to fit our histories, desires,

imaginations, dreams and myths of who we are, what we will and might be” (Tesfayhoney 2013:81)

2. The city as context for the emergence and transmission of thinking processes; of societal and civic imaginaries related to the construction site.

In her catalogue text, Elizabeth Giorgis (2013) talks about the clashes and conflicts that have come under the banner of the “modern” and the “new”. “The class mix - where rich and poor lived in the same neighbourhoods – in the city of Addis Ababa has disintegrated under the impact of growing urbanization and real estate developments, which are exclusively built for the upper classes.”(Giorgis 2013:13).

The re-imagination of Addis through the power of bulldozers has had as one of the consequences that the poor and lower middle class are either in anticipation of having their homes destroyed or already confronted with displacement to the periphery. This is not a unique case. Many cities on the continent are confronted with similar conditions and, in spite of all the harshness of this imposed “drive to Modernity”, have found creative ways to organize new existences. Among others, Edgard Pieterse (2009) and AbdouMaliq Simone (2004) have argued for the recognition of the resourcefulness and creativity of the inhabitants of African cities – and have denounced scholars who judge African cities only in terms of deficit and inadequate infrastructure. On the other hand, the work of Wolde Giorgis (2013) evokes the contemporary African city as being poised to devour its most vulnerable residents – that is – most of the people who are struggling to survive within its precinct. These multiple positions and points of view, some expressed through creative work by artists who participated in the exhibition Addis Ababa: the Enigma of the “New” and the “Modern” , serve to inform this research, which will come into dialogue with notions of the modern.

The various art interventions discussed in the catalogue “Addis Ababa: the Enigma of the “New” talk to the notions of memory and belonging, as well as the difficulties of negotiating the modern, which is at times manifested with - what seems to the outsider - brutal force. The art works invite a reflection on agency and the truths of “development”, which Mekonen Tesfayhoney (2013) calls “philosophizing with a bulldozer”. He calls the “spatial restructuring of the city”... “ a war waged on the poor and on their livelihood strategies.” (Tesfayhoney 2013:79). The construction sites within Addis, though temporary

phenomena, appear ubiquitous and have dramatic relevance for the populace of the entire city.

The city will serve as exemplary environment for the definitions of modernities. It will allow us to think about the modern as part of a construction site: a space of reconsideration from the perspectives of different disciplines informed by different realities. The research will explore the complexities of connections and connectivities; of “milieus” and “territories” in relation to each other, the directionalities, and the potentialities resulting from these interactions (see Deleuze and Guattari 1988).

2. Fabrication of a tool to “seize” or “grasp” matters, energies, ideas and concepts considered useful and productive for the creation of a research environment. This tool will allow the taking of « *prélèvements* » (a swab/smear/ sample), which provide diagnostic indicators for the larger contexts. These *prélèvements* are the methodological foundation of the study and provide a shared basis for further research processes. Yohann Queland de Saint-Perne, an artist based in la Réunion and a participant in this research initiative, has been experimenting with “*prélèvements*” as an artistic strategy, realized through a series of art actions.

They also come in the shape of “field notes”, conceptualized and tested by Cynthia Kros in the context of FUNDBURO, which allow the simultaneous emergence of field/fields, and of layered subjectivities, using a variety of narrative formats. They serve, in some ways, to subvert the agenda of the Modern by going on the kind of “detour” Lévi-Strauss set *the savage mind* to achieve when he wrote –: “to arrive at the physical world by the detour of communication. It allows for the “moment in time” as part of a material path we undertake to trace on our quest regarding the “Modern”.

3. We acknowledge our debt to Deleuze and Guattari’s *A Thousand Plateaus*, especially the chapter (plateau) on “refrain” , but also more generally, to their theorizing of the rhizomic, wherein a number of dynamic interactions between elements on different plains can be imagined. Their theories seem to us to be highly generative for a cross-disciplinary research context. Beside the rhizome, the notion of conceptacle will be another useful element in our study. The term “conceptacle » is borrowed from Francis Ponge: « one needs many words to destroy one single word (or rather, to make of this word - instead of a concept - a conceptacle) »(Francis Ponge, « La Table », La

Pléiade, II, p. 919). It is no accident that we choose to rely on the vast vocabulary of Ponge when reflecting on the ways relations and objects co-evolve with all their potential for uncertainty.

Another pertinent term that we wish to activate is “articulation” as defined and theorized by Stuart Hall (1996): “articulation is the form of the connection that can make a unity of two different elements, under certain conditions. It is a linkage which is not necessary, determined, absolute and essential for all times.” Here we need to say a bit more, I think... well it seems to fit with what we have said about the rhizome and the conceptacle – it’s about constantly being aware of the making of connections (or the failure to make connections because sometimes the lines of flight go nowhere) between things, ideas and a range of external circumstances. But none of these connections are pre-determined by theoretical models or predictions and all are temporal and fluid. Deleuze and Guattari described these possibilities of temporary connectivities in the context of the rhizome.

Thus, we would like to explore linkages between articulated and hidden discourses and the social forces with which these connect at particular moments – within the construction site as a “territory”, or between the construction site and its environment. Latour’s notions of “re-organizing” and “reconnecting” ideologies and discourses, as part of his endeavour to investigate the Modern, will inform us in our attempts to open fields and to activate collective conversations about the emerging, not yet stabilized territories under observation. Our creative interactions will allow us to be in a process of “*chantier théorique*” and, thereby to create a body of new theoretical knowledge.

4. This study is of a collective nature and wishes to think the collective in the context of its own experiments and experiences. We wish to explore the capacity to project, to imagine and to accept distance and time as co-related factors, informing our observations. By linking different points to draw a larger picture we create **a constellation** of fluid or ephemeral nature. We are able to rely on a founding knowledge created in the context of FUNDBURO where we considered the organising principle of working on (rather than from) distance and theorised notions of the collective in line with Simondon’s ‘falling out of step with ourselves’.

As we allow fragments or emerging actions to steer thinking processes in regard to relationships, new connectivities, inviting the “nomadic”, the “*provisoire*” and the contingent will inform complex thinking paths. Michel Serres (1997) names these possibilities as: “a set undefined by elements or boundaries. Locally, it is not individuated; globally, it is not summed up.”

5. The importance of art as a companion/catalyst in this research process: Deleuze and Guattari (1988:310) commence their discussion of the “refrain plateau” with a consideration of Paul Klee’s *Twittering Machine* and have the following to say of the artist: *The artist turns his or her attention to the microscopic, to crystals, molecules, atoms, immanent movement; the artist tells him- or herself that this world has had different aspects, will have still others and that there are already others on other planets; finally, the artist opens up to Cosmos in order to harness forces in “work*...; this work requires very simple, pure, almost childish means but also the forces of a people which is still lacking.* The experiments we have conducted in the context of FUNDBURO and those enacted by Queland de Saint-Perne through his performance art demonstrate how art work as an intuitive process may influence and enrich our paths of thinking. Art works both co-exist with and contaminate the theoretical research processes, either preceding or alternatively echoing texts (and sometimes doing both).

Contexts, topicalities and approaches

Five meta-topics seemed to us pertinent to be co-explored in this initial stage of the research. Below we map them out to create the foundation for the study:

1. The site – observations from real places and histories associated with the specific place. These observations allow for the breaking down of sequenced actions and interventions, which consecutively reveal and hide precise moments. Through these observations we are able to consider the effects of spill-over; the contamination (in both a positive and negative sense) of the immediate environments. Readings of the site will allow for the consideration of utopias and nostalgias linked to the appearing

and disappearing of layers of the past and the emerging of new realities. Readings will also reveal bodies in action – construction sites can only be realised if there is participation by human beings. We also wish to allow for metaphorical readings of the site and refer to founding myths and stories of the *chantier/construction site*

a concentrated observation of the construction site has led us to identify the scaffold/ing as a significant feature.

Scaffolding – thinking about support structures in regard to their functions, agency and roles connected to the built or renovated environment. Scaffolds will be discussed in regard to their capacities to structure an unstable environment and create distance as well as proximities to the matter that is under construction. We shall explore the inherent characteristics of fragility, impermanence and precariousness which are part of “scaffold” narratives of the past and present. We shall look at scaffolds in regard to their metaphoric potential: the characteristics of the multiple, the repetitive patterns, its importance for the staging of the spectacle, its meaning as signifier of construction site. We shall also explore the notions of scaffold as an agent that assists with identifying discourses.

2. Disciplines and pedagogies : we wish to think about the question of fields/territories and how they are constituted – the necessary distances between them and where and how they do or might co- exist; we would like to investigate notions of specialisation and articulation, and explore the meanings and functions of professional territorial “refrains”. We would like to ask how differences are understood and maintained in the disciplinary sense, including a range of discourses of difference that connect with the outside world; we would like to understand the relations between the blueprint which stands as initial act of declaration and the tangible outcomes of building processes. Possibilities for autonomy will be considered – even radical “de-territorialisation” and what Deleuze and Guattari refer to as becoming a “body without organs”, that is, radically challenging designated functions and the relationship between organ and function; the orchestration

of different disciplines coming into interplay and interaction as the construction site advances. Institutionalized ways of thinking will be identified and probed, which we would like to understand as embedded in a complex, layered set of systems and phenomena. And, finally we would like to search how various agents inside and outside the construction sites are registering and reacting to change.

- 3. Aesthetics** - a set of aesthetics is activated in construction sites: in this context the locations of power will be discussed; the unveiling of underlying principles of official discourses and counter-discourses. We shall consider the aesthetics of the emerging and ask how to discover coherence even in highly complex co-existences of activities, matters and intentions and how to explore their limits, where our readings registers chaos and noise. To some extent, under the influence of Deleuze and Guattari's "refrain", we have begun to listen to construction sites, registering the sounds/noises produced by those who are proclaiming their "territory" or attempting to reshape or even negate it. Construction sites may equally be thought of as theatres with scenarios, actors, props, scripts and directors shaping its format. We will be engaged in trying to understand principles of aesthetics as they are embedded in a complex, layered set of systems and phenomena under transformation; registering and reacting to change.
- 4. Networks of translation;** in order to realize any project on a construction site, negotiations around language and translation are indispensable. Latour suggests that when thinking about language and discourse we need to consider translation networks, which are not "work of purification", but "work of mediation". Only then can a construction site escape the curse of Babylon, a site of misunderstandings and the creation of ruin. Translation is understood as an act of ensuring the right of all parties to state what they have to state and equally, to be adequately heard in the places pertinent to the conversation. Translation should be read as an act of empowerment and with consequences for action: ideas to be translated into acts and acts to be translated back into discourses to support or to critically re-think these acts. The

construction site can only be realized if connections between the plan and the site are activated through efforts of translation.. Networks of translation are the vectors for disciplines and pedagogies to come into motion.

5. Outside World in interaction with Construction Site . We shall analyze discourses of collective and singular identities (political, economic, cultural, societal) and ideologies in reaction to a construction site. We shall look at visible and invisible markers which signify the disappearance of a place and emergence of space. We shall study how zones of exclusion are created through announced and hidden protocols. The capacity to activate or de-activate memory in regard to spaces will be explored. The organizational principles of temporary co-existences within a stable context will be considered as well as the signage that declares protection from dangers, or areas of privilege and the consequences for citizens who disregard them.

Approaches

| We wish to engage in these topics from a series of angles on the basis of the following informing principles:

- Rules, Regulations and Protocols
- Catalyzing forces, Risk factors, and Mechanisms of Appearances or Disappearances
- Ideologies and Discourses
- Potentialities and Phenomena of Emergence.

Tools /Theories

One of the core tools for the initial phase of constituting a knowledge base will be the collection of **field notes**, a practice piloted and theorised

by Cynthia Kros in the context of searching in areas which are not yet stabilised as fields and in which various layers of histories and subjectivities come into interaction. These field notes, which call also for the activation of private memories are the founding material for further collective and individual theorizing and artistic work.

Insertion of three field notes

1. **Refrain:** We think it makes sense to highlight the “refrain”, which is one of the thousand “plateaus” Deleuze and Guattari (1988) identify in a book that tries to escape the conventional structure of the book, inviting us to start wherever we like, although Holland (2013) warns us that we should be wary of presuming that means we can extract particular concepts without due respect for the whole. We may not be able to abide by Holland’s warning entirely, but we argue that focusing on the refrain plateau allows for a more concrete understanding of the trademark Deleuze-Guattarian concepts of territorialisation/de-territorialisation and re-territorialisation, which we think are key to mapping the kinds of complex and shifting landscapes that lie before us. Deleuze and Guattari maintain that the “refrain” is not necessarily expressed as a sonic form. It may, for instance be a colour. Nevertheless, averse as they are to hierarchy in most other respects, Deleuze and Guattari privilege music as the most powerful agent of “de-territorialisation” since of all the phenomena capable of being received by the senses it possesses the greatest power to move and change us. The “refrain” in Deleuze and Guattari’s sense is fundamentally about movement, regrouping and intensification.

In fact, it is easiest to “visualise” the refrain as a repetitive melodic form or set of words, capable of degrees of variation over time or region, as we know it in music. In their lexicon, Deleuze and Guattari do not use “territory” in conjunction with refrain only in the sense of it marking out a space over which the singer of the refrain is claiming ownership, as an ornithologist or other student of animal behaviour might. Deleuze and Guattari draw freely on works in this field, particularly studies of bird song from different species, but do so to advance their own singular argument, illustrating the “refrain” in action. They maintain that bird song is a territorial marker more or

less in the conventional way it is understood, but stress that it is the instrument that creates the territory as if the territory had no independent existence prior to the song. Furthermore, the “territorialising” refrain, under changed circumstances – when a bird of the same species of the opposite sex appears on the scene, for example - is capable of transmuting into a “refrain” with a different function. It is then understood as passing into a new “assemblage” – in this case of courtship rather than “territorialising”(Deleuze and Guattari 1988:324). When it comes to human beings the “territorialised refrain” (Holland 2013) might assume a much greater range of functions such as the professional, the social, the liturgical and even the cosmic (Deleuze and Guattari 1988: 311). Identifying a particular “refrain” – or multiple refrains – or how one form of “refrain” assumes another function or alters its form or sequence to suit altered purposes – allows us to hear and to consider the implications of the co-existing cries of the merchant, the lovers’ refrain, the lullaby, the merchants’ refrain, the refrains of the specialised craftsman and so on in (Deleuze and Guattari 1988:321). We are interested in applying the idea of the “refrain” in the Deleuze-Guattarian sense to see if it helps us to trace the intricate and intersecting movements in the territories and “assemblages” we intend to study.

In my (Cynthia’s) field-note on refrains and territorialisation/de-territorialisation you can see how I play around in a very simple way with the idea of music creating a sense of place, which is then ruptured by the brazen assertion of the unhappy patron who says he hates music. I interpret this as the kind of radical de-territorialisation that Deleuze and Guattari (1988:327) say is expressed in the phrase: “Goodbye I’m leaving” – not so very different from the declaration made by my unhappy patron.

The field-note form allows me to be tentative and playful – approaching the spirit that I imagine from their own account, in which Deleuze and Guattari wrote *A Thousand Plateaus* (see Dosse 2010). The field-note allows me to be simultaneously one of the deluded patrons fantasising about sipping my glass of wine in a Roman piazza and the outsider recording the habits and follies of the “Moderns”, which fascinate and perplex Latour. My field-note series was initially inspired by Latour. Although he famously declared (Latour 1994) that we have “never been

modern”, his more recent work (Latour 2012) has urged us to consider in detail what scientific approaches we might adopt to study those who think – at any rate – that they are modern. Latour’s (1994) work translated as: *We Have Never Been Modern* begins to ask what would happen if we turned anthropology, the science the “Moderns” developed to understand what they were not, back on themselves. He remarks on the “West’s long tradition of taking the measure of the other” (Latour 1994:153), a fairly commonplace observation by the late twentieth century. His originality lies in his claim that this tradition is founded, not only on arrogance but also “despair” and “self-flagellation” arising from the “West’s” consciousness of having committed irreparable crimes against the rest of the “cultural and natural world” (Latour 1994:155; 170). He holds out the possibility of an alternative anthropology that does not depend on the exoticism of the non-West as a consolation for the profound loneliness experienced by the Moderns, which they have brought on themselves because they insist on exaggerating the differences between themselves and others (the ‘non-Moderns’). In effect, he argues, the Moderns have cut themselves off both from the rest of the world and their own history. In his subsequent *anthropologie des modernes* (2012), Latour constructs an elaborate and comprehensive scheme for conducting an anthropology of the frequently myopic and masochistic Moderns.

Lending my anthropological ear to various construction sites, I have been struck by how the sounds mimic a percussive orchestra (of clash cymbals, I remark, in regard to the construction site at the Rosebank Mall in Johannesburg close to where the fake piazza is – see my field-note). It seems to me – through the reflection and experimentation that is allowed by the form of the field-note when one has temporarily retired from the field to take stock by sequestering oneself from the ‘natives’ that are the objects of study (Clifford 1990), that the blows and mighty crashes of the construction site, unsettling as they are, serve to contain the shoppers perambulating through the mall under construction. They are located and reassured by the rhythmic sounds of demolition and rebuilding all around them. Why else do they continue to walk calmly between the cardboard hoardings while all hell is being unleashed just a few metres away? What then, we might ask, would be the equivalent of the unhappy patron who precipitates a complete rupture – who makes the real circumstances suddenly vividly apparent perhaps setting off a minor or major rebellion?

The Rhythm: The other Deleuze-Guattarian concept we want to deal with here and which appears on the refrain plateau (Deleuze and Guattari 1988) is the rhythm. In our discussion of the refrain above we have emphasised movement, change, moments of radical rupture. The rhythm, on the other hand, is associated with consistency and orchestration. The rhythm, Deleuze and Guattari tell us, puzzlingly at first, is not the meter, which they call “dogmatic” in that it subjects a musical form like the waltz to the crude measurement of 1,2,3 (Deleuze and Guattari 1988:313). They define the rhythm as the instrument of co-ordination that holds heterogeneous elements together exemplified as: “night and day; inorganic and organic; plant and animal; animal and human being”(Deleuze and Guattari 1988:313). However, as we might expect from our experience of Deleuze and Guattari, “rhythm” is not linear. In their paradigm (Deleuze and Guattari 1988:313) rhythm “changes direction”. They illustrate the possibility of reciprocal rhythmic relationships in which each party has the “refrain” of the other in its head (productive and destructive respectively) with their famous examples of the fertile relationship between the wasp and the orchid (from Proust) and the spider creating her web and the fly for whom the trap is set.

Consistency/consolidation: how different assemblages are held together, with passages of replay and relay. There is no beginning from which a linear sequence would derive, but rather densification, intensification, injections.

There must be an arrangement of intervals, a distribution of inequalities, such that it is sometimes necessary to make a hole in order to consolidate. There is a superimposition of disparate rhythms and articulation from within an inter-rhythmicity with no imposition of meter or cadence. “Consolidation” is creative – “consistency” is the same as “consolidation”- it is the act that reproduces consolidated aggregates of succession as well as of co-existence, by means of three factors: intercalated elements, intervals, and articulations of superimpositions.(Deleuze and Guattari 1988)

Organizing Principles and Directions for collective work

Members will be invited into this research initiative based on their

existing expertise and their desire to contribute. As the initiative is cross-disciplinary in nature, the express wish of the co-founders is to open this research space to a number of disciplines and urge all participants to make use of this context to create new possibilities for dialogues which aim to enlarge /re-situate fields of knowledge. The participants will create platforms for collective publications, exhibitions, and postgraduate learning. PhD students, whose research is situated in the area of our interest are particularly encouraged to join. They will be able to tap into the collective archive and benefit from various modes of supervision for thesis writing. The collective will decide at a later stage about its legal status, and the kinds of affiliations it will have with universities.

Conclusions:

It is hoped that through the principles and theories we have outlined above, we have begun to give some sense of what this research initiative named for *the construction site/chantier* will look like. We have suggested a number of topics: the site, disciplines and pedagogies, aesthetics.

We have also indicated our theoretical debts to various philosophers – principally Simondon, Latour and Deleuze and Guattari – as ways of opening our senses to discovering different kinds of meanings and connections; valuing distance as a producer of meaning and understanding the collective as generative author. Finally, we have proposed using several tools for collecting and organizing our data in relationship to our evolving sense of ourselves as part of the collective and to the body of theories we have selected. We have stressed that it is an inter-disciplinary project in which the arts have a core role to play in furthering and in echoing the other conversations.

Johannesburg May 2014

Cynthia Kros, Georges Pfruender,

References

Clifford, J. (1990). 'Notes on field-notes' in *The Makings of Anthropology* (Harvard.edu PDF, accessed 20th April 2014).

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1988) (translated by Brian Massumi). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (London: The Athlone Press).

Dosse, F. (2010). *Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari: Intersecting Lives*. (New York: Columbia University Press).

Gadamer, H-G. (1975). *Truth and Method*. translated by W.Glen-Doepel) (London Continuum International).

Grünbein, D. (2012). *Dream Index: Aus der Traum* (Kassel: Documenta 13 Catalogue).

Hall, S. (1996). *Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies* (London: Routledge)

Latour, B. (1994). *Nous n'avons jamais été modernes* (Paris: Editions La Découverte).

Latour, B. (2012). *Enquête sur les modes d'existence: une anthropologie des modernes* (Paris: Editions La Découverte).

Holland, Eugene W. (2013). *Deleuze and Guattari's A Thousand Plateaus: A Reader's Guide* (London, New Delhi, New York, Sydney: Bloomsbury).

Ponge, F. (). « *La Table* », (Paris: La Pléiade).

Serres, M.(1997). *Genesis* (translated by G. James and J.Nielson) (Michigan: University of Michigan Press).

Simone, AbdouMaliq (2004). 'People as Infrastructure: Intersecting Fragments in Johannesburg' in *Public Culture*, 16 (3), 407-429.

Simondon, G. (1989). *L'individuation psychique et collective* (Paris: Editions Aubier).

Spivak, G. (1988) "*Can the Subaltern Speak?*" (in Cary Nelson and Larry Grossberg, eds. *Marxism and the interpretation of Culture*) (Chicago: University of Illinois Press).

Tesfayhuney, M. (2013). "Wey Addis Abeba Hoy" in *Addis Ababa: The enigma of the "New" and the "Modern"* edited by Elizabeth Wolde Giorgis (Addis Ababa: Modern Art Museum: Gebre Kristos Deste Museum).

Wolde Giorgis, E. (2013) "Addis Ababa: The Enigma of the "New" and the "Modern" In *Addis Ababa: The enigma of the "new"* (Addis Ababa: Modern Art Museum: Gebre Kristos Deste Museum).

Wolman, G.-J. (2001) *Défense de Mourir*, (Paris: Editions Allia).

