

## QUESTIONS OF PUBLICIZING PROCESS: 10/21/14

Ain Gordon

Many of the questions that follow grow out of my own conflicts as an artist who periodically gets paid to talk about myself as an artist to a room that might include people who might offer me things I need as an artist *if* I manage to talk about myself via a performed cogency I don't always feel—*if* I order my chaos for general consumption/self-promotion. None of the questions below are asked to mask an answer I think should be obvious—I AM NOT SURE. I know 10/21/14 was built on generous and idealistic intent (all thumbs up for idealism) plus pragmatism.

When is it counteractive to *summarize expansive* process (for the uninitiated)? (But if not for the uninitiated, then who is the target “audience”?)

If expansive processes (purposeful chaos) is to be ordered/framed as one clear pathway to a performance “deliverable” can this be done without shrinking, trivializing, or retroactively bestowing pre-design (thereby setting a false measuring stick for future efforts)? Should deliverability be purposefully and repeatedly struck from a conversation around incubation strategies; training us to value the rigor (and meander) of process rather than long for the closure of product? (Artists, the ones I know, encounter a related problem: we have to remind ourselves to not “solve” too soon in the studio what should only be known in the theater—to value what that limbo may bring.)

SO...framing the inward intentionality of what outwardly appears to be chaos is not a new problem for many artists—but it was interesting to see it (in Charleston) as a problem belonging to (using the word advisedly) “institutions,” meaning Hatchery partners and guests.

What is the (sometimes oppositional?) relationship between goals of defining so-called “best practice” for repetition and the brand of fully customized residency offered as a Hatchery ideal?

By this convening, is the Hatchery raising the visibility of individual artists' process or the overarching process of sites that support such processes? Or both? Was there (not fully intentional) slippage in the daylong discussion between these?

Will it help individual artists' work to have their gestation process more visible?

Or will it help artists to receive a more supported gestation process by making the site's modes-of-support more visible?

Or will it draw greater resources if the Hatchery works to legitimize process as being equal to product?

If it is the last, I return to my question of the risk: imposing a new need to regularize the modality of support (and therefore supported process) for outside measurability.

Whichever of the above are true (maybe more than one), if artists are to act as spokespersons for the value of their varied creative processes OR for the value of varied kinds of support for their creative process, what kind of spokesperson voice is most vital to the furthering of that field-model VS the furthering of their personal/individual creative structures? Does everyone know how to assume that role? Was that role defined in advance? (Maybe it wasn't yet understood; I know this is the first cycle of the Hatchery and the first time any such convening was tried.)

I assume some invited speakers were there to broaden the scope of attendee, to democratize what some might see as a closed shop (EVERY shop is closed to someone at some point so I'd like to stop having that conversation for now). But I also assume some attendees were there to possibly further inculcate/radicalize "inclined" but more "traditional" participants in future program iterations.

The challenge here is that this whole event and initiative is so new that the internal moral integrity/ecosystem is perhaps not yet gelled enough to self-sustain amid the pragmatic needs of visibility/inclusion or even promotion (particularly if program goals rest on moment-to-moment customization rather than a prescriptive method applied to all comers\*). Speaking from my past life with the Center for Creative Research, it took some time before we could maintain our "core values" within varied public formats. There was such a quick inexorable tug to known behavior (i.e., presenters enter the room and suddenly we're pitching). We found we had to always meet as a group (the ENTIRE group) before any kind of "audience" could join. And we had to firmly design the self-performance or we risked backtracking to the very behavior the organism had been founded to counteract (or at least annotate).

Don't get me wrong; I know the mass of excellent intention and sometimes contradictory imperatives behind trying to make visible a process in hopes of attracting more support in order to maintain the integrity of that process. But I did feel fuzzy in the room about the end-goals of that particular moment in time and wondered if the "performance contract of that day" had been clear enough when authored and when all the parties (perhaps not always knowingly) signed on. And, if I might paraphrase an old axiom in order to question it: IS all visibility good visibility? Does expansive and elastic pre-product process need to be extra astutely framed for its rare public viewings (as opposed to the eventual product which is inherently made for viewing)?

**BUT I SUPPORT CUSTOMIZED SUPPORT – AND PUBLIC ORATION IN SUPPORT OF CUSTOMIZED SUPPORT – AND "INSTITUTIONS" STEPPING UP TO PROACTIVELY DESIGN ELASTIC CREATION TRACTS. So, thank you.**

---

\* though you could argue "moment to moment customization" as the Hatchery Method: your prescriptive is proactive response.