

## Convolved Statement

Artistic research is not a limitation to art, but a new way to focus art on the essential question of knowledge. Knowledge is not the opposite of art but at work from inside it. Despite this, art can be made without interest knowledge. Art can be put forward as a hunch, an idea or a test that challenges both the artist and the audience. Artistic research makes the hunch explicit and sharpens its meaning. It may use devices that delay or divert knowledge not in order to escape the question of knowledge but to deepen it. It is not clear what knowledge is. It is not clear that if we think we know something we actually know something. Artistic research does not take knowledge at face value, but is an enquiry into what is also present when knowledge appears. Artistic research wants to understand completely. It does not want to leave anything out that could be relevant. It may at times speculate, but it will always frame such speculation in order not remain a hunch only. In fact, speculation shortcuts knowledge and appears when the artist's mind breaks down. Art needs to be thrown into its future. Knowledge is nothing which requires a future. It is now and always, or it is not. The quest to develop knowledge is either a personal quest or an economic quest. As personal quest, we can accept that development is necessary in order to leave behind personal determinations that hinder knowledge. As economic quest, we reject development, because it limits the potential of knowledge by predetermining its future. When a research culture buys into artistic practice, it does not buy into such practice, because of a creativity art can offer. Scientists are creative enough. The research culture buys into art, because artistic research offers a radicality of knowledge, a radicality such culture is at loss to achieve. Seen from the perspective of artistic research traditional knowledge happens along the fringes of knowledge, moving towards the centre only in moments of great transformation. Traditional knowledge, however, has always shied away from transformation, because transformation is a radical concept that questions even knowledge's place in culture. Artists, however, are trained to let go. Artists are trained to require doubt; they are trained to wonder what it is that is before their eyes. Artistic research embraces this wonder as the transformative site of knowledge. Artistic research projects are difficult to understand and almost impossible to evaluate, because there is no outside standard. All is inside the work, the proposition and its transformation. Artistic research requires the world to be thought through the work absorbing all points of reference. It fails to convince when it fails to transform. It fails to transform when a style cuts through an idea that is not rooted in the question. It fails to transform, when it explains what should not be explained, and it also fails to transform when it does

not explain what needs explanation. Artistic research is precise in concept and in feeling. Artistic research demands the utmost precision from a work and its transformation. A precise concept determines the research, while a precise feeling indeterminates the research. Precision is not determined by determination. Precision is at the heart of what knowledge desires, which in art is radically expanded. Artistic research is needed to focus art on its own precision, which aesthetics has muddled up in a mixture of surface and effect. To be sure, there is a precise effect, but this effect reduces the potential of a work, which needs to be thought and understood. The effective work needs to offer an opening. It needs to want to break down its protective surface. It needs to want to stop being clever. Precision works and it is precision put to effect that drives today's markets. In artistic research precision finds an alternative, a deeper reason. Through artistic research precision stops being clever. Stopping being clever is the first lesson of research. If a work is clever it is of the wrong kind. A work needs to invite knowledge and take rather than give. The more knowledge a work can take the better the work is. The better the work is the more tension it is able to carry. The work can only transform through carrying a tension. The greatest tension is the highest goal of knowledge. Then there is nothing for the work to take and all is contradiction understood, however, in a single thought between the parts that suddenly belong together. Artistic research cannot exclude any science like philosophy does when it tries to discover some kind of a general rule or principle. Science appears in artistic research like any other thing, not yet understood and probing its strength. An artistic researcher has to become a scientist, transforming a finding into a work. The work, however, struggles. The work is charged with so much expectation that it stops being a work, or rather, that everything starts becoming a work rendering the 'work' as category useless. Art is when I know a thing as a work, but the more things this world throws at me, the more difficult it is to know the thing as a work. When there is one thing only making a work is easy. When there are never ending multitudes of things making works is very difficult. Foucault in 'What is an author?' not only questions the role of the artist, but also the role of the work. Artistic research is art in which the work has become uncomfortable. In artistic research the work is not controlled by art or worse even made by the artist. In artistic research the work fails in the face of knowledge and becomes knowledge, a knowledge-beyond-the-work. The work is a limit and an obstacle, although it is only through the work that we get to know what works. If what works is contained in a work, however, what works becomes the source for a desired effect. In art the work is like a pill or a tablet, smooth on the outside, potent on the inside. Affecting by being passed through the defence of the mind, the work is clever

and contained and disinterested in challenging the mind and the mind's capacity to know and understand. When we think about art we also have to think about the way in which art is handling us as if we were children. Taken by the hand of the work, which we trust as we trust all art, we are guided safely to a mind in admiration, but not knowledge. In artistic research we want to understand the end of the work, not its effect. We want to understand the work's meaning, which our knowledge transformed through the work becomes when the work is left behind as understanding arises. Sure, all of this can be called art. All of this can be brought back into the comfort of the studio and the gallery. But is it not the source of a constant misunderstanding of knowledge when an artist big or small claims 'research' for his profession? Artistic research needs to differentiate itself forcefully from art as long as effective work is accepted as art, which perhaps means forever. Otherwise, we are made to discuss the failing of a work as a failure of art or as a failure of us, the artist. Only when we start to discuss how a work can fail and in such failing become knowledge do we become researchers. Artistic research is a force within art directed against art not as a matter of principle but as a question of survival. How can knowledge survive when the work and the artist is left behind? In what form? Knowledge becomes unformed movement from a practice to a mind. And back. And forth. Searching for a better practice that is capable of a precision beyond effect we attempt to include everything. We lay a task.

Michael Schwab

michael@seriate.net