

THE NEW POLITICS OF THE IMAGE

By: Jonathan Indo

From Ejercicios Electrocoreográficos artwork

Translation: C. Ortega

Santiago of Chile, 2006

(published on INTERFERENCIAS book, SCL-2009 by Brisa MP)

The image is no longer a product of the work; rather the work comes to be a product of the image, of the exercise of the image. This difference, although it seems subtle, points out to a fundamental question; the work is no longer a project in views to which is thought a final scene, since now it operates starting from that purpose already installed, the image became a product of constant exchange, of smuggling (Internet and other technological devices), in which the conclusion of such operations can never be well defined. The multiplicity in which this new foot of the contemporary art is articulated loses its center and works in an alternating way. This cannot survive but with one taking of conscience radical on the part of the spectator.

The continuous reference to the repetition expression is the setting of an operation that does not require the work budget, but rather of the public that achieves the continuous effect of being in its spectator position, they are the work object. The work, works in the spectator by means of mockeries that incite to the movement and displacement inside the scenic space. The relativity of perspectives is captured this way in the projection of the image, there where the performer carries out her action she has of bottom the projection to the spectators. The classic established difference is this way overcome, inviting us to question what role are we carrying out in the work, if that of spectator or that of performer.

The electrochoreographic displacement (the work or play) occupies the whole space, the inability of being assigned a precise place annuls the chore and the spectator's situation, leaving him to the drift of the only place that can recognize; the scenes. But these they are always changing, the on and off of the light drive the look and force it to move and to follow the dynamics of the work. The spectator understands immediately that his attention has to be constantly "on in work", the restlessness must repair in any expression that the performers carry out, being confused at moments when the one that was a while ago showing an electrochoreographic exercise is resting to its side like an spectator more. The critical situation that is formulated starting from these operations happens by means of the power transgressor of the image that works as an unfocused center. A kind of incontinence spark is revealed in not being able to assign a precise place to what is shown. The inside or outside the work does not exist. The performer that rests drinks water, she observes the work next to the spectators and later she returns to scene, that is everything in the work, as if of nothing (us spectators) completely, could leave and enter to disposition, liberating them of any preconfigured outline.

The work is in construction and in perpetual change because the spectator is there assigning it a constant value. This way, when it is asked to the public to choose the setting of a scene of an electrochoreographic exercise at random, it is intervened the work notion as previously given, surrendering to an effect of circumstantialities dependent of the "fellow" and their decision (the fellow decides in the action) concerning what is the final product. This is more than a history of the art, is more than to go and to install the work notion as history of the art, because it is the decision that solves that history finally, therefore it would be about something that it is beyond the teleological machination, even postmodern, because the work, is that historical historicity (history of the contemporary art) but it is also the dysfunction of a

totally theoretical assimilation. Worked and finished it always implies the active participation of that that presence it, of which attended the encounter, non temporality the creative process of a before and an after in views to a present convergence of work and spectator in effective terms. We can infer that no sample is similar to the other one because to define the luck that they will have it always depends of the active and absolute opinion of the spectator that decides. The work is the spectator's situation; it is with him the total resolution and its "product." It is an interruption of the concept.

The interaction, the interview, the answer to the entrance questionnaire, is not the assignment of a certain value, it is the own spectator the one that assigns that value, the question and then their answer comes to be a happening of the same work. It works as a production device. The one interrogated responds and it is observed-listened (television and audio) by people that goes entering and it is already inside-outside of the process. The interviewee assigns his own categories. "What does he/she understand for work? "A synonym for representation" ,etc. Little cares what it is said, or rather, it cares less for the result that for the introspection process of the one interrogated (that is always in silence) and of the same work. The translation that makes of those loose concepts is heard to the question and the question. The answer is always an inaudible whisper. And this not because the answer is unnecessary, but rather, because the complexity of such concepts of art can never be well defined. The scene of such moment is witnessed in a disconcerting atmosphere, the audio is a sound of what could be an electrocardiography monitor, that sound calls us to remember that we are there that we are being part of something that inevitably implies us and urges us to experience it.

We read in such moments the urgency and the emergency of the political, a very present component in the whole work. It is about making respond in act, of producing the movement effect and immediate displacement because it cannot be in another way. We are hooked to the action and reaction forces. If we truly want to know, if we truly want to be spectators, then we cannot stop to have an active participation in the process.

The lease, the "scenery" (there is not scenery, it is the natural space of a building) has obstacles for the view, we should move I "together" with the performers to know what is happening, putting under an obligation to be participant of the work as long as movement, and this even if we decide to not attending those places, because that fair it lapses when a camera films us and it projects us of screen bottom, becoming accomplices of the process. The view accent to be an omnipresent look because those observed have already become image, they circulate as active image and place of value. There it is however the human being's insalvable difference and it is that the inscription effect "work" opens the auto conscience amid this same process. Facing the question what to do? Where to go? Should I follow the people that are in that place? The decision, in some way, is already this taken. We were solved to execute it. It is the unavoidable to be and to occupy that place of circulation of continuous value what determines the "me", being object of the work and not this of the "spectator", and there is nothing we can do to stop it.

The accusation of a repetition makes more apparent this question in one of the performances. The performer carries out reiterative, interrupted movements and the infinite emulation of quick cameras while she gets dressed. The daily expression of the day by day (to get up and to get dressed) is committing the natural displacement of people in the space of the work. Not we can be indolent to that reality that denounces us that shows us in our obvious and routine behavior. Because she forces us, routinely

to get up, to move day by day, we are conscience of it. And this does not necessarily has to be understood in catastrophic terms, as if in the intimidation of this conscience the daily expression was annulled to accept it with indifference and not to "make nothing" in this respect, but rather, on the contrary, given the fact that the life one lives is this way, the expression that was already consummated indeed should but being assumed, and then what it fits here but the necessity of the conscience commitment with the "incontinence" decision? Not there is a clear exhortation of the political in such taking of a reflexive position? How to understand the reality but adopting an active participation in it, and with this, directing us in the same life?

The reflection to which this work invites us guides us starting from an irrecusably ethical perspective. If there was an art in which such a necessity of moral conscience commitment was demanded, at the moment we can realize that that phenomenon is not necessary. The ethical demand has put on in the scene. By means of this "work", such an imperative has become the same evidence. The political necessity is the "equal" and "participatory" situation in which the means are settle, devices of information and communication that now reach "democracy" levels unexpected in other times.

The technique occupies each corner of the planet and threat less than invites to recognize the place in which we are. The new nets provoke to extend the constitution of such an essential commitment more clearly. It is not an arbitrary and incontinence decision, but rather to approach the entirety of the society implies each act, each expression of the social individual as to be necessarily connected with the other one, with the knowledge of the other one in the possibility of reaching it (Internet, msn, electronic libraries, etc). And that it is the conscience that has achieved the contemporary art.

A conscience of disagreement in the proper behavior of the modern individual. It would no longer be then about a fellow that thinks, but of a fellow that "is" thought starting from categories that make it recognizable to interior of a process that defines it. That "I am conscientious" is not more than the illusion of an infinite effect of images, of overlapping and fictions that recreate a dislocated and interrupted identity.

It is that the inflexible decision that submerges it in a continuous doing: for example, it makes them believe that such image, such brand; it would sum up the best in their person. "I choose a NIKE snicker" "I choose such president because it is the one that best represents me", etc. The decision defines the fellow and that fellow is built starting from images, (the images represent ideals) such images circulate in an unfocused self, "I KNOW that such snickers does not define me, however, with them I feel really good" "I KNOW that such president could make a mistake, but I consider that he is the best alternative." In that bet, in that risk of attendance an encounter happens, in the expression the implication movement is given in what this work makes us see.

But is it enough knowing that the, I am, is made, is built, is existed? What is what the work invites us to meditate about but this sign of decibilidad mixture of indecibilidad and ethical exhortation? Would it simply be about giving away to the religions that deny the "I am" and the image to go in search of another encounter, of that mysticism never very understood (maybe because it cannot be understood) and to surrender to the ascetic so reviled ideals? Or is this rather a clear political exhortation that helps us to decide what we are and that can describe what we do not want to be? Is this; a product of the image, of the politics as positive production of the image, of its manipulation like the negative valuation of the same one and of what is better for all as for a recognition of the human being's essential freedom?