

A support scheme
for emerging creators of contemporary circus in Europe



Think Circus!

ROUND-TABLE

Research practices and places

European Conference Think Circus!#2
La Villette, Paris ■ May 18, 2017

Facilitator : Alix de Morant

Translation: Agathe Curatolo & Gabrielle Da Silva

RESEARCH AND INVENTIONS

Innovation, experimentation, uncertainty and risk are at the heart of CircusNext's approach, but spaces available to take the time to mature a project remain rather rare in the field of performing arts. How to define the notion of artistic research in circus and in other performing arts? We will rethink time and spaces of artistic research and question its position in a creation process. Beyond delineated territories, could we invent new ways to work, to invest the space, to create?

Presentation of the speakers

Olivier Hespel

Olivier Hespel is an independent critic and dramaturge, especially for choreographers. As such he also works at L'L (Brussels), venue for the accompaniment of the young creation research.

Quintijn Ketels

Quintijn Ketels is an author and circus artist, co-founder of the Side-Show company, and a graduate of ESAC (Brussels). In 2015 he benefited from an artistic research program from the Flemish government for an artistic project and therefore integrated a program with several laboratories, in dialogue with other artists or mentors and with no immediate production goals.

Valentine Losseau

Valentine Losseau is an anthropologist at the Higher Studies for Social Sciences (EHESS), a magician and a dramaturge. With Raphaël Navarro and Clément Debailleul (Jeunes Talents Cirque 2001-2002 laureates), she initiated the artistic movement of New Magic. She carries out different researches on the practices of magic in the world and more specifically on Mayas societies and street magicians in India. Since 2009, she is associated with the Center for Mexican and Central America Studies in Mexico. Member of the 14:20 company, she uses her researches in anthropology to contribute to the writing and the dramaturgy of different shows and installations: *Vibrations*, *Wade in the Water...* She also took part in the shows of the companies *Monstre(S)/Etienne Saglio* (Les Limbes) and *l'Absente/Yann Frisch* (Le Syndrome de Cassandre). Since January 2017, she is an associated-artist at Théâtre du Rond-Point in Paris. She wrote several scientific articles as well as a book with Michel Butor, *Les Chants de la Gravitation* (L'Entretemps).

Alix de Morant

Alix de Morant is a lecturer in Theater and choreographic studies at Paul-Valéry Montpellier 3 University and member of the research laboratory RIRRA21 (Representing and inventing the reality of romanticism at the dawn of the 21st century). She also works with the program "Cirque: histoire, imaginaires, pratiques" and is co-responsible with Philippe Goudard of the circus arts documentary collection in the Montpellier University Library. She is also head of the Master's degree DAPCE (Artistic direction of European cultural projects) and member of the Master's degree "Exerce - Choreographic studies, research and experimentation" (Paul-Valéry University / ICI-CCN Montpellier-Occitanie-Pyrénées/Méditerranée), headed by Christian Rizzo. She is the author with Sylvie Clidière of *Extérieur Dance*, an essay on dance in public space (Montpellier, L'Entretemps, 2009), and has contributed to the editorial projects of *Stradda*, *Urban Scenes*, *Dédale*, *Cassandre*, and collaborated with *HorsLesMurs*, *Ligeia*, *E pur si muove*, *Ballet / Tanz*, *Alternatives Théâtrales*, *Théâtre/Public*, *ArtPress*. She has also worked as an artistic programmer and advisor for several choreographic companies and cultural institutions in France and the Netherlands.

Introduction

Alix de Morant

First of all, I would like to thank Jean-Michel Guy for the questioning he is sharing with us this morning, which I hope will be debated as well during this round table. I think that one of the themes of the round table will be precisely the question of dialogue, which he discussed earlier, and the will also to initiate new forms of collaboration both in the field of scientific research than in the field of artistic practice between researchers and artists. This question of "research" is an open question, it concerns us all here.

I wanted to start by thanking the organizers of this think tank, Think Circus, who thought of bringing us together as researchers, artists and project leaders, and who also entrusted Agathe Dumont, a researcher, herself in search for the articulation of different disciplines - circus and dance - but also present on different fields of research, from pedagogy to artistic practice - the organization of these days.

We find in the program the collective of circus researchers, which is very present because we are a number today to speak or coordinate these round tables and these speeches, members of the circus program of the University of Montpellier 3, the RIRRA 21, directed by Philippe Goudard and to which I belong and with which I develop research, but also practitioners, artists, institutions that share this same interest for the research and who have decided to position themselves as experimenters, all attracted by this question which is that of investigation, and to take advantage of this time to search, to understand, to try also to develop methods that can help us understand and understand complex realities.

Today, I salute the unifying nature of this initiative, which ignores divisions to bring us together on this issue of sharing knowledge and sharing methodologies, because in research the method is something very important.

I'm not going to go back to the question of art research and the artist-researcher because I think we're going to deploy it in this moment, but I would still like to recall a Kandinsky quote in the book *Point et ligne sur plan* which is: "theory follows practice but does not precede it". This sentence also serves as a starting point for an analysis of Pierre-Luc Landry's creative research, which recently published an article entitled "The academic artist, the theoretical artist: towards an intellectual and artistic paradigm of research-creation". In this article, he says the following and I completely share his point of view: "The research requires a certain method that is different from that of art but that can still emerge from the practice of a particular artist, and he will then become a philosopher, a researcher, a theoretician. " One could add here that this affirmation implies spatial and temporal delimitations, and that there is only situated research. We will see how thanks to my fellow speakers of the morning. So, together with the speakers who will speak as well as with you in this room, I hope that we will be able to put ourselves in a state of research to ask ourselves how can we in our spaces, in our lives, in our methods, approach this question of the research and that we can affirm, transversally through the practices, that they are scientific or artistic, an issue which for me is very important, that to allow itself the uncertainty, the uncertainty without any other objective than to search.

You see the routes are rich and singular, and diverse as well. I asked each of you and it's going to be the starting point of the discussion, to situate his research by defining what you meant by the word research, because it seems to me that there is a question of semantics and language that is played that is extremely important. By using this term "research" we can effectively call upon different functions of research, with different statuses of research, whether speculative, fundamental, experimental, applied, be it research in the arts, human sciences, or in the hard sciences. What interests me here is also how the vocabulary evolves, how it is twisted, reinterpreted, reused in your personal experiences.

Quintijn Ketels, is an acrobat, graduated from ESAC, has experimented with Hopla Circus and with a street theater company, La Familia Rodriguez. You have set up a multidisciplinary space where circus, theater, dance, and visual arts meet today, the Side-Show Company, whose name is inspired by the curio cabinets that adjoin circuses at the beginning of the 20th century. , and especially in the United States where this practice was widespread. You also carried as an artist, individually, a desire for research and you set up a laboratory, From A to B, which inaugurated a series of 10 residencies during the year 2015-2016, a whole year of research, by inviting artists from different origins to experiment in a laboratory where you allowed yourself the right to make mistakes. We will talk in particular about this experience and what you did during this time.

Finally, Valentine Losseau, you are both anthropologist at the School of Higher Studies in Social Sciences, magician and playwright. You have with Raphael Navarro and Clement Debailleul initiated the artistic movement of the new magic. You conduct research on the practices of magic in the world and more particularly in the Mayan societies of Mexico and with street magicians in India. You have also been associated since 2009 with the Center for Mexican and Central American Studies in Mexico City. Member of the company 14:20, you are also playwright and you rely precisely on your knowledge of anthropology to address this issue of dramaturgy. You have also collaborated on shows by Etienne Saglio's of the theater company Monstre (s), and Yann Frisch's Absente, and you have also written various scientific articles and a book with Michel Butor. So you have a lot of research fields and it would be interesting to hear about this possibility of moving from one's own research field to another.

You see the routes are rich and singular, and diverse as well. I asked each of you and it's going to be the starting point of the discussion, to situate his research by defining what you meant by the word research, because it seems to me that there is a question of semantics and language that is played that is extremely important. By using this term "research" we can effectively call upon different functions of research, with different statuses of research, whether speculative, fundamental, experimental, applied, be it research in the arts, human sciences, or in the hard sciences. What interests me here is also how the vocabulary evolves, how it is twisted, reinterpreted, reused in your personal experiences.

A. de Morant: Olivier may be able to tell you about the birth of the L'L project but also this recently published *Dictionnaire à la recherche*, which presents the research and experience of L'L through a number terms chosen as the term "framework" or the term "support". And then I will give you the floor on your own definition.

O. Hespel: What do you want me to say to you? The term accompaniment, or support, for example?

A. de Morant: You may already be talking about your research definition, for example, based on the practical experience of 'L'L.

O. Hespel: I think everyone somewhere is in research. I have the impression that we can also bring it closer to introspection, self-questioning, understanding why and how we do things. It's true that an artist is in perpetual research, like any human being. In L'L, the specificity is that one does not come to start a process of research to produce a show, one comes rather to dig issues which are much more about the writing, therefore of the order of his artistic personality. To move as an artist to explore other areas of legitimacy to write as an author. Other areas of legitimacy than what the training offered us, what our CV, our career as an artist has offered us. It's a bit of that definition there. When you asked me the question, I told you "we are doing applied fundamental research". It's a bit of an introspection exercise, but with a stage. That's why I use the term "fundamental". "Applied fundamental" because it is outside any objective of result. And then applied because indeed the research is done on the board. L'L has existed for 25 years, but since 2008 it has been strictly a support area for research. So we have defined over time this protocol, which we precisely called protocol, to insist on the term "research"; outside a space of productivity. We have more or less drawn a methodology that is questioned fairly regularly. It revolves around 4 pillars, the question of time, the question of space, the question of loneliness and accompaniment and the question of means.

The question of time is linked to the non-obligation of result. That's pretty clear, when you come to L'L for a research, there is no finality. We do not say "in a year it's over". And then there is a regularity in the work. These are residencies of two to three weeks, 4 times a year. The residencies extend over two to three weeks because we have noticed that today we offer residencies of 5-6 days and that it is hardly the time you need to put down your suitcases. Two weeks is the minimum to really get into a research process. The maximum time is set at three weeks to allow the artist to stay in the sketch and avoid moving towards the construction of an object. There is a regularity with a fallow period of the field of research, a month and a half to three months maximum between each residency. Why ? To have the time to decant, while not taking too much time back so that the wire does not cut.

The question of space is fundamental too. Research is moving. So we take it literally. From one residency to another, you are never in the same space. All this not to get back into the same frame in which we were immersed during the previous residency. It allows somewhere to review the paradigms of its work methodology. Another space is also another imaginary field possible.

The question of loneliness is a question that makes a lot of noise. The artist can not come with a team, he has to come alone. It was not the case in the beginning, we decided that 4 years ago. We thought that loneliness was necessary. Why ? Precisely to move. We are in a workspace, the performing arts, which is more like a team workspace, so moving is also about finding oneself alone, answering rather large questions with one's own tools, avoiding this which are called crutches. This question is not only a question of collaborators it is also a question of technique. For the first residencies, the artist is asked to use no technical element, no artifice. This question of loneliness also makes it possible to move and find other doors of legitimacy of writing.

Since he is alone, a choreographer may be able to afford to write, talk, make music, play with video at some point in the course. Effectively, the technique is not allowed at the beginning but it is possible at a given moment that the use of certain technical tools becomes intrinsic to the writing that the person develops.

The question of loneliness is linked to the issue of accompaniment because being alone does not mean being lonely. This support is not paternalism, we make sure that it is not. There is a will not to be intrusive, there is no posture of the one who knows and the one who does not know, nobody knows, we are ourselves in research with the artist. The first year we seek to identify research. An artist arrives with a file, a question, a travel issue or a thematic or theoretical issue, for example to be able to combine art and politics without being in the discourse. It is a poetic stake. But beyond this very generic issue, we seek to precisely define the pragmatic issues of an artist's research.

The accompaniment is built in the dialogue, in the questioning, and not on the result shown to us. I forgot to say that there is a modality in the accompaniment - we are two, me and Michèle Braconnier, it is an important element because it means that there is not only one word which is given. We really have different characters, different questions, different looks. There are two appointments that are mandatory, an appointment at the opening of the residency called the dramaturgical meeting. We review the file that has been submitted, we try to identify the pragmatic issues of research. From residency to residency, we try to be careful not to deviate too much from the questions that were asked from the beginning. Sometimes, after two to three weeks of practice, the original question is deflected, sometimes simply because the person was confronted with a wall and did not know how to get around it. In this case, either we return to the question of the previous residency, or the residency brings out new issues.

We are trying to target in this dramaturgical meeting what has happened since the beginning of the research and what could still be a driving issue for the next two to three weeks. try to define the issue of these two three weeks of work as well.

There is also an end-of-residency meeting during which the artist is asked not to give us a show but to try to share "concretions". Why are we calling it concretions? Because the challenge is not to share an artistic object with an audience but rather to share the sedimentation that has been done during the last weeks of work. Somewhere it is a concrete object, not finished, but which allows to create a dialogue with the artist and to understand his path in the research. This is what interests us in the methodology of accompaniment, it is to question the process that leads, not to a result but to concretions.

There are also mentors, because being only two is not enough. Mentors come during the research process but never more than three days and bring their experiences and views. Mentors are not always artists, it can be a philosopher, or a boxer for example, who comes to work with a choreographer to warm up differently. Now there is also what is called a "third eye" that comes regularly, because we noticed that we can be two, after a while we have more virginity of the look, we are more foreigners, and this notion of stranger I think it is important in the accompaniment. And then there are the means.

Alix: Yes, we will talk about it after, I think, because it is for me a very sensitive question. We will talk about it and it may be a question that will be discussed between us in a second time, I would just give the floor to Valentine. Valentine your answer to my question was no more an answer on the hijacking, the twist, the work of apprehending the real in a concrete way as something that is given to us to see and to us to see and question, and I have the impression that in your experience what you are

passionate about is the back and forth process: what are our perceptions of the real and how we approach them. You use this position of researcher in anthropology to question this reality.

V. Losseau: To a certain extent more schizophrenic than the other speakers of this round table, I really have this distinction between scientific research, anthropology on one side and artistic research, dramaturgy, on the other. It's not a question of going back and forth for me, it's the symbiosis between these two elements that is important and that I'm looking for, but this symbiosis only exists at a very virtual level of my interiority from my thought, it is inside of me that this symbiosis is made.

We will be able to talk about the different spaces and times of the research and the different interlocutors with whom we are led to work according to the contexts of research which are, in practice, very different and very distant worlds. To explain a little bit, on the one hand I worked for ten years at the Maya, in a Mayan group in the rainforest of Mexico as an anthropologist and what interests me is the apprehension and the cognitive perception of space, therefore, something that may seem far removed from artistic work or artistic research. Before that I also worked for 3 years in the villages of traditional street artists in India and especially on traditional street magic. In addition, my work as a playwright is done only within the framework of the new magic movement that we initiated with Raphaël Navarro and Clément Debailleul fifteen years ago and whose most active companies are the company 14:20, the company Monsters and the company l'Absente. It is precisely with these three companies that I tend to work more often and the language of the new magic that we try to use, the material of work is the real, that is, the definition of what is being made of the reality of the here and now, of the materiality of things.

However, this apprehension of the real is extremely variable according to the cultures, according to the countries and the languages that one speaks and in this context one has obviously made researches on the question of the magic.

What is magic for a society or for an individual?

What is magic for one is not necessarily magic for the other.

We realized for example that among the Mayas, there are things that are extremely magical for us in our society that are not for them. If I levitated this bottle of water on the table, I think there would be a stifling effect in the room. If I do the same thing in Mexico before the Maya, it will happen in absolute indifference ie they will not find it interesting. Not that they will understand how it works or that they will attribute it to supernatural causalities but there is a vertigo that does not happen in terms of the representation they make of reality and in particular I think, I attribute this to a lack of resonance with regard to the general representation we have of the verticality, the divine elevation, the spirituality, the social hierarchy that we represent according to this vertical grid, emotions that will be represented towards metaphors related to the lowest or the highest that do not exist at all in this society. All the magical emotion that one could feel from simply levitating this bottle of water in an extremely secular context, is not only because there is an incomprehensible effect or something, but is also done because somewhere, there is a consensual definition of the reality between you and me that is not the same, which is variable depending on the cultures.

In India, on the other hand, there are things that are absolutely upsetting in certain areas that are for us very simple tricks, juggling tricks where the magic is almost absent, like the disappearance of a piece in the hand or this kind of little things that can be extremely "impacting", extremely strong in other parts of the world. Finally, this work on the reality and on the pact of representation, ie the consensus that the author and the spectator will create around an object of representation, of figuration that it is on the plate, or that it is in a plastic work or during a happening in the street, this pact of representation is written in new magic differently for each show and it is an integral part of the dramaturgy of the new magic.

This question is deeply anthropological.

Anthropological research is very fundamental, it is not applied directly in artistic research and at the same time there is an interconnection that nourishes the imagination equitably between scientific research and artistic research. From an extremely practical point of view anthropological research on my side is done with methods that are finally quite classic (participant observation, linguistic surveys, long-term immersion stays) and in an academic network that is still today extremely disconnected from the artistic network. Artistic research is done in specific places dedicated to culture and can be done outside, on the set, or back and forth between the set and the conceptual work that has no dedicated place. These two research times are very disconnected and the work I'm working on is to make it come together. I think there's an openness to that. Research in art is relatively difficult, it lacks resources, it lacks places, it lacks recognition and listening but working on a scientific research that does not have illustrative applications is also something which is very hard to understand. We, with the 14:20 company, needed to create at one point a short piece to illustrate one of the concepts we are working on, the concept of afterlife for the Mayas.

We decided to work on this issue from a magical point of view. We made a whole room with a dancer who leaves the trace of her body in space, with processes that were invented for the occasion and this piece has often served us as pedagogical element to explain the link between basic anthropological research and artistic research. But in reality, we are almost in the area of play of words or metaphor because the infusion of these two researches is much more subtle and much deeper than in the illustration or the resumption of an element that we would have dug into a world and simply transposed to another world. Nevertheless, I feel that this approach has been very well received. For example, the research that has been done in India has been financed by the public funding sources of the 14:20 company and with the network of Alliances Françaises. It was artistic and ethnographic researches so we called it artistic and ethnographic missions.

As an ethnologist I was concretely funded by cultural structures to do this research, accompanied by artists in a context of long-term exchange that lasted 3 years, between the traditional magic of Indian street and French magic. We also took a dozen French magicians in India who participated in the research, but who also did shows and participated in festivals.

Three Indian traditional street magicians have been brought to France on three occasions and have also performed at festivals. For example, we were greeted by Philippe Decouflé at the Chaufferie. We made junctions between the researchers and the magicians of the two countries. This type of dynamics is necessary for us. After, obviously, each artist, each researcher, will have its own specificity, but I think that the dynamics are rather favourable to this kind of exchanges now because the boxes are so specific and so unique that there is an absence of structuring that makes this type of circulation obvious. There is still an interest and a listening towards this kind of approach a little schizophrenic.

A. de Morant: We may come back to this schizophrenic side. Your speaking is very important because there is also the way in which one puts oneself in research, one makes the decision to put oneself in research, to move oneself and to find oneself in situations and different research contexts and at the same time we hear in what you say that there are fields and ways of looking that are extremely different. The question of the intersection, the dialogue, the coupling between artistic and scientific approaches is really very rich, and that there is also a whole field of investigation on which we really have to look. The exchange with Indian magicians you just told us also shows that there are knowledge that is transmitted and thus opportunities to evolve knowledge in their own specificities.

We will also come back to these questions with different representations of research depending on where we are located. I would now like to hear from Quintijn about his own experience, which I consider to be an "artist-researcher" experience

which I consider to be an "artist-researcher" experience and you have done it yourself, which is also worth noting.

Q. Ketels: Like most circus artists today I think we start at 15 years to jump to the rocking and unicycle, after we do graduate studies, after we work a lot, we make creations, we turn and a moment is a dynamic that takes place where we are productive but not really listening to ourselves, how we want to work and what we want to develop. I think that moment had come for me after wounds and breaks with companies, to ask me the question of what I was doing and how I wanted to evolve. I put in place what it took to buy time to research, but not by doing it alone. I wanted to pretend I was doing a production without anything.

I say production because even if it is the opposite because there is no result, it was still necessary to work. I wanted to have the time to hire people to work with me, I wanted to have companions who accompany me in a process like that. I wanted to really lose myself in the research process and it's a difficult place to voluntarily get lost. At times, you regret it! I remember writing a file to be able to do this research and the day when I knew that I was going to have the means, I wanted to give back the funds, because I felt already anguished of the fact that I was going to really expose myself very intimately. To put myself in front of what I really am. It's a little Flemish terms that I use to describe my practice but basically it was that, this desire to buy time, to have space to experiment, to have a laboratory that digs and digs even more, which does not end with a result. The only palpable result of this research would be the deposit, the trace, almost like the dust that remains in the glass when all the water is evaporated, the experience, the confidence, the practiced methods that today change my way of creating but who comes from this research.

A. de Morant: You explained very well in the conversation that we had this morning too, regarding the question of methodology, how much this moment of research had transformed your

work, to production too, and finally to the traces of this research, even this visible format was something very different finally from an object of creation. The last point on which I would like to hear you, it would be on this distinction that you made this morning between the pure research and the research of creation for a show or with a production aim.

Q. Ketels: A research project within a creation entity, company, there is already a goal in sight and it necessarily compromises the research, it already indicates a way. While in pure research, which I have experienced, there is no such guide. We have to keep research out of this space to continue to claim the fact that we use means, time, we deploy energy, his and those of others, without it having to end and that it's a very difficult question to explain. For this particular research, there are places that have welcomed me who know what it is artistic practice and creation, but in many places, smaller cultural centers for example, people had more trouble in to realize that an artist would need this at some point in his life. It is necessary to defend this ground, to protect it from conclusions too quickly drawn. It's tempting to define what we're doing, but as soon as we define it, name it too much and draw conclusions, we're already elsewhere, we're finding ourselves, we are more willing to lose ourselves. I think that everything is there to help us on the road to success but it is rather the other way that it lacks, the courage to afford to get lost, to do things that should not please, to make things that may be personally interesting for the artist. It's very selfish what I say but it's like that. I did this research for myself at first, not to revolutionize the circus, or anything. I learned a lot and it made me want to continue this type of research where I re-release things to have this free ground.

And then, the first question you asked me was something I had a hard time giving up. One of the laboratories, the 8th, I invited Kenzo with his unicycle and my wife Aline, co-director of the company, who is a visual artist, to do a research with ink and unicycle. This is one of the ideas I wanted to put "in physics".

You must already have the place and believe it to do it. We searched like that between us, and we presented as at each end of residency an "open lab". We opened the door of the lab or the studio so that the people of the direction where some friends and mentors could come to see. Not to present the work but to make it public. People came to watch what was happening. What happened was that this lab scored and we had the proposal to present this work again and it was difficult to give a place to that, because it was not part of a whole. presentation process. If we presented, what was presented? Of research ? We were going into a production system when I wanted to keep it out

I took a little time, I waited until the research was finished before deciding what I wanted to do with this lab 8. I had the feeling of betraying something in the beginning. After that it's also a chance to develop a job and the only criterion is that it's a form that we want to leave open and that for me must stay close to what it was initially: a research , an open process.

A. de Morant: I would like to highlight two topics in relation to what has just been said: the first is this claim - the question is also to preserve the self-reflexive value of research as something that is "in itself" , something that is not quantifiable or calculable in terms of direct returns or returns on investments. My question precisely is about this term of research which comes to arise today in our cultural world, a world where the scientific research is impoverished more and more for lack of financial means, and it is the same for the means of productions. This necessity of a symbolic asset. This need to build his artistic career or his career of researchers on a symbolic capital. How to do it, precisely to find places that are places outside the requirements of the market, imperatives that are increasingly focused on the project, on the projection, on the fact of recovering these values of creation. What interests me is the place of research as a place of "empowerment", a place that we could protect, enhance, grow but which is also an unlimited time, a time of deceleration compared to very real production

V. Losseau: To bounce off the top and in relation to what Jean-Michel said this morning about utopia and about deconstructing the concepts, I think that the research today and the importance that this word has taken in artistic practice and the artistic community in general echoes the question that Naum Gabo posed in his realistic manifesto in 1920: how does art contribute to the present time in the history of mankind? I have the impression to see a continuity in the emergence of the question of research, with what happened from the 50s and 70s where we saw a pairing of the artistic universe with the working class. At that time, the arts venues were abandoned industrial sites, sheds, factories, workshops. Artists defined themselves very willingly as craftsmen. I had the chance to work with Michel Butor, we wrote with Raphaël Navarro and Clément Debailleul a piece that was created here in La Villette, "Poèmes jonglés" and then we wrote a book together and Michel Butor had every day a blue worker and worked on a baker's table. There was a kind of symbolic willingness to say artists are useful to society and somewhere they are included in civil society.

There was a sort of real effect to be associated with these wasteland, this world of the working world. I have the impression that the places are called laboratories, "research centers", the artists speak more and more willingly of artistic research, it even became obligatory in the art schools and the biennial Theater in Venice in 2013 was symbolized by an Erlenmeyer, this chemist's instrument. I have the impression that we have a sort of extension, the artists try to invest a symbolic territory which is very linked to the desecration of the place of the artist and also to a form of secularization of the role of the artist. There is this desire to mark the place of the artist and the artistic milieu in civil society and its direct utility in relation to territories.

A. de Morant: I would say "direct utility" but also "critical utility" because in an economy of attention that always seeks to capture more of our time of reflection and attention, this importance of deceleration can also be extremely political.

It seems to me, in what you describe of the attitude of Michel Butor who endorses his blue of work and who goes to his table, there is also a paradox which is to put the question of the research in relation with the question of work, work as a work force. What interests me in the experiments like L'L for example is what it creates in terms of crossings, synergies, porosities with partners, how in your place you can also challenge a medium in a way to evaluate an artist. We know that it is difficult to find times when we are getting out of the demands of the market, the law of the project, the way we have to produce shows to obtain funding. How exactly can we negotiate these spaces of deceleration, fallow and put them into dialogue and criticism compared to other places, other partners?

O. Hespel: We are in a society that educates us to produce, and to produce well, the error is considered as negative. I think there's a whole bunch of things there - in the first residencies of research it's really an exercise we have to do together - leave the guilt issue, losing time is good. There is also the question of modesty that must be broken, that is to say, "show us your trash, do not try to please us that's not the goal" - these are fundamental issues for a research practice.

Now, the frame. We are not looking for places outside the box. We are trying to gangrene the system and therefore develop partnerships. Indeed, from one residency to another it must be another space. That's why we have 4 clean spaces in L'L but that's not enough, so we developed partnerships. It takes a lot of time, because even if the management is interested in this research approach, this space decompartmentalization and de formatting, it is necessary to create with spaces for research in a workplace that also works in productivity. This place must be profitable, but these three weeks are closed to the public. We also look for places where there are no stands for example because we are in the non-obligation of result. When the artist finds himself in a space where there is a stand for the audience, it reminds him of the idea of the finished product. These are really complex elements to find, it must also be a

space that breathes, which opens the mind.

It's political philosophy. The term public service no longer exists and even the public money that is given must go back to the public: this concept of return on investment is always present.

I forgot to say that L'L only accompanies young artists who have no more than two productions at the time we meet them. There was a problem in 2007 in French-speaking Belgium where theatres did not know what to do with all those young people coming out of school. The L'L already existed for 18 years and we were already in this process of accompanying young artists but Michel was tired of accompanying artists in conditions of constraints. How many artists failed because there was the imperative of a first that all the producers were waiting for them at the corner? It's very pernicious all that. Research is something that needs to be challenged throughout the system. It is also up to the artists to find the way to talk to their interlocutors. There is something here to reset at the level of the notion of power. There are co-producers who offer co-productions at an amount that is their monthly salary - that's horrible what I just said. But I think it's indecent ...

A. de Morant: I would like to hear you Quintijn on the question of the relationship between what we defend and the partners we find because you said earlier that you have self-produced on this specific moment of your journey.

Q. Ketels: Yes, when you set up a production you need partners and set a date of premiere, it's the journey of a classic show creation, normal. I think it's very good also that all that exists. Beside that, you have to be able, as an artist, to defend this space where the course is different. I think we need to invest in a space where there is no such relationship, this pressure. How did I finance this project? Part self-production, I did the calculation of what I thought I needed to work for one year on the 10 residencies and invite artists and then I found a scholarship to fill the part I missed. It was a scholarship for an artist's journey awarded by the city of Brussels.

Questions & Answers

The project was very open so I myself formulated the process and the research project that I wanted to formulate. The places where I worked did not give me money for that. It is important, but difficult, to have what it takes to be able to work in research.

A. de Morant: And it also requires the establishment of a strategy, to have a Trojan.

V. Losseau: We designed the monolith, this traveling research laboratory on magic with 14:20. It is a traveling theatre that can accommodate 80 to 120 people and is specifically dedicated to the techniques of magic that require special conditions, including the front, there is a whole black box device that is fundamental. I have the impression that this is a trend in magic since Yann Frisch is himself creating a traveling theater truck that has the same proportions as the Monolith and which is a place that will allow him to experiment at the same time. and to disseminate alongside the classical French network. After, we also developed in partnership with the National Center for Circus Arts, a place dedicated to research. A fixed place this time. For several years now we have been developing a magic research center at the CNAC. In the new buildings there is a black box that is dedicated to magic and has also been co-financed by the territorial structures around the CNAC specifically to develop new techniques in magic. We have not only artistic research but design research. These are two searches that play a lot back and forth, with artistic research often calling for a completely new conception of a magical system. We really needed to pose this creative shell for the moment at the NACC and we are delighted. This is something that will really allow a lot of new magic companies to be able to come and take research time outside the channels and creative obligations, whether for artistic research or for the actual design. There are all the technical devices at the disposal of companies.

N. Radvanyi: Hello I'm Netty from the company Z Machine and ex-winner CircusNext, I had a question for Quintijn. I understood your approach, which I am quite admiring about but what did you do concretely as research? You gave the example of the monocycle which is quite concrete but could you give others? Know a little how you have mounted all this folder!

Q. Ketels: So what did I do concretely as research? This is a question I asked myself too. And I had people to help me ask that question. I had three mentors: Michel Bernard, a playwright, Alain Platel, a Belgian choreographer and Hilde Mueller a director. They accompanied me in the questioning and I had a lot of futility in mind, I could not really dig on paper upstream. They uninhibited me by saying "start working and what you want to talk about will come back after a while". First, we started with word association games simply, starting from a blank piece of paper and developing a work around the words we write. I had many methods where I selected a piece of research that I took the next day, sometimes I developed a form and then I deleted it. I wanted to open up as much as possible, I was looking for, I did not know what I was looking for, maybe I already knew what I was looking for but I wanted to find it first to know that was what I was looking for. Concretely too, as I did not work with the same artists during each residency, I did not resume the work done from one residency to another. Between the residencies I had time to digest what had happened and to align my desires if there were things that I had developed with people and that I wanted to take back, I took them back from zero, with new bodies.

Towards the end, I was worried that I was taking too much pleasure in materializing. In one of the last residencies I told myself "if now I still have 3 weeks I would do a show with these people", which was not the goal, and what was not possible in terms of time also because they were already engaged in their own projects.

I think you only become a better researcher by looking for a better dancer than dancing, I think it's just the practice that is important. They were circus artists so there were somersaults and pear trees and the vocabulary of circus bodies but we never left that. We never started with a circus technique. Most research residencies have not even come close to a technique.

S. Kann: Hello, I'm Sébastien, I'm a researcher at the University of Utrecht and I'm also a circus artist and playwright. I had a question about the word research. For me the analogy between artistic research and academic research ends with the fact that in the university what is produced can be published and therefore shared. It exists as an external object, has its own "being", its own experience. With artistic research there is still a production of knowledge but I wonder if you find it as important without falling into a productive framework, to make something external to yourself?

A. de Morant: This is a question that has not necessarily been addressed, which is also that of the evaluation of knowledge. In different sciences, there are different methodologies and there are different forms of publications or results it's true. There is also the question of implicit knowledge, especially knowledge about the body, which is very complex to update. This is an issue that interests me particularly in working in the choreographic field, to highlight the knowledge produced by the experience of the body, which are also those that can not be apprehended simply with an intellectual aim. How can we let this knowledge emerge? This is an important question: to clarify what is being researched in practice.

O. Hespel: The question of sharing. It depends on the research, the researcher and his desires. I said there is no audience at L'L that's for sure, but we feel that there is an issue of sharing with an audience. This becomes necessary because the artist constantly opens doors, and sometimes drowns a little in there. It is sometimes proposed to the artist to present his work to the public at the

end of a residency for example and try to put that in place. The challenge of the research residency will be, at that time, to determine what concretions we would like to share with an audience. After we get rid of everything and we resume research during the next residency. After that, there is research that ends because the artist feels that he has dug all the places he wanted to dig and comes to produce something from everything he has amassed and we are also accompanying this process. For some, it will not be an artistic object for example but a bookish object!

V. Losseau: I think that's an interesting question because there are also similarities between academia and the arts community at the moment, especially its funding. There is also this obligation of results in the scientific community and the tendency to want to publish as much as possible, to give as many lectures as possible. There is a pressure on visibility, it is the big word of the research, "to make visible" the results of the research. And that's why many scientists are turning to the artistic community hoping to find a kind of platform that will give visibility and public research that is primarily intended for a closed world, a world of specialists.

It is more accepted in the research community that the researcher is in a state of permanent research and that even the rendering, whether in the form of a publication or not, is always a step, whereas in research artistic we are still more anchored around the final production, the show, which symbolizes a kind of finality. In scientific research, we have more support for a thought that will develop throughout a lifetime and whose returns you be sort of beacons on a long intellectual and biographical journey. I think that today, there is a risk in the pressure that we put in live performance and particularly in the circus on the issue of dramaturgy, which is a central issue. I sometimes have the impression that we require practically in advance of an artist that she gives us the keys of the dramaturgy of the creation in progress even before having initiated it. One gets closer to an inductive research, if one draws a parallel with academic research, whereas the scientific

researcher is rather based on the hypothetico-deductive research that is to say, to start with an idea but with the possibility of to be contradicted by the data he will accumulate in his research.

Q.Ketels: Regarding my research people asked me what would be the returns of all that, the results palpable. There is none. There is just this deposit, somewhere in my working methods and the experience I shared with the people who were there at that time and that's it. It would have been nice to have someone follow me from beginning to end and document it but I did not have the means for that and it is already a project in itself to do this kind of documentation on a research. I plan to put this in place for the next research in 2018. I still filmed a lot, and I also had some trainees on the research who interviewed the participants and me and observed the rehearsals. There are traces of this kind but it has not been formalized or published. The presence of these people is also what made the work progress. Someone in front of you who asks you questions about what you are doing, helps you formulate and move forward but all that was not for the purpose of doing something about it.

A. de Morant: We will continue the questions afterwards and we will let the rest of the morning unfold. I thank you for the richness of your contributions.



A support scheme
for emerging creators of contemporary circus in Europe

CircusNext

2013-2017

A project conceived and piloted by

Jeunes Talents Cirque Europe

% Parc de la Villette
Cité admin. Bât. D
211, avenue Jean Jaurès
75019 Paris • France

Director: Cécile Provôt

www.circusnext.eu
tel.: +33 (0)1 43 40 48 60
email: info@circusnext.eu



MAIRIE DE PARIS

île de France

SACD la culture avec la copie privée

INSTITUT
FRANÇAIS

Culture

onda