On the "Public" and "International" Nature of Performing Arts

It is not only in Japan that the arts including performing arts have been going through changes. This conference is for active theatre practitioners and festival directors of Japan and other countries to discuss what roles performing arts should play in the society and the world now, and the future roles of performing arts markets, including TPAM that has been organized for 14 years as a place for national and international performing arts practitioners to physically meet, as "marketplaces" and as "platforms" to come will be explored

Panel Discussion: The Future of Arts Markets

- Toward the Establishment of International Platforms that are beyond "Host-and-Guest" Relationships -

● **March 1st [Mon] 13:30-15:30／Large Meeting Room, Tokyo Metropolitan Art Space (5F)**

Speaker: Mary Ann DeVLIEG [Secretary General, IETM]
Frie LEYSEN [Curator, Theater der Welt 2010]
Tang FU KUEN [Dramaturg / Producer, Singapore/Thailand]
SHIOYA Yoko [Artistic Director, Japan Society, New York]

Moderator: SOTA Shuji [Professor, Atomi University /
Secretary General, Japanese Centre of International Theatre Institute (ITI/UNESCO)]

● **Mary Ann DeVLIEG**

Born in United States and now living in Brussels, she has been Secretary General of IETM since October 1994. Holds a Master's Degree in European Cultural Policy from the University of Warwick, UK. Her professional career include cultural manager in California, New York, London and the South West of England specialising in production, presentation, diffusion, development of performing arts, and in funding institutions. Taught cultural management training and has initiated several training programmes for artists and arts managers. Teaches, advises and speaks frequently on cultural policy, cultural networking, international and European culture issues. Winner of the EU “Individual” Prize, 2007: Year of Workers’ Mobility” for her lifelong contribution to mobility of art and artists.

● **Frie LEYSEN**

The Belgian festivalmaker Frie Leysen is the artistic director of Theater der Welt 2010. At a time in Belgium when the perennial conflict between Flemish and Walloon communities was escalating, she was both radical and successful in her use of art to foster integration and understanding. In 1994 she founded the multidisciplinary Kunstenfestivaldesarts in Brussels, which she ran with great success for over ten years and developed into one of the most influential international festivals in Europe. In recent years, Frie Leysen's cultural researches have been focused primarily on the Arab world, where she curated the interdisciplinary festival Meeting Points 5, which presented artists working in theatre, dance, visual arts, film, video and music.

● **Tang FU KUEN**

Tang Fu Kuen curated the Singapore Pavilion at Venice Biennale 2009 where artist Ming Wong won special jury mention. He co-organized the first IETM meeting in Asia (Singapore 2004) and will coordinate the next IETM meeting (Jakarta 14 - 17 June 2010) during the Indonesian Dance Festival. He has worked as a dramaturg, critic, and festival organizer, promoting contemporary dance and performance between Asia and Europe. He read media and cultural theory at University of London, literature and theatre at National University of Singapore.

● **SHIOYA Yoko**

Yoko Shioya became Director of Performing Arts at Japan Society in New York in 2003. Since joining the Society in 1997, she has expanded the collaborative projects with other American cultural organizations and universities to introduce Japanese performing artists, and launched new initiatives including artists' residency project and workshop series. Since 2005, she has taken additional directorship on Film Program Operations. Also known in Japan as a writer/researcher on the public and private arts support systems in the U.S. and Japan, she has been invited to speak at numerous symposiums, lectures,

TV programs. In 1998, her first book, "New York: How the City and Its Artists Coexist" was published from Maruzen Publishing Co. She has been a regular contributor for arts columns on performing arts as well as visual art for Asahi Newspaper.

● **SOTA Shuji**

After he had worked as publicity producer at the theatre department of Toho Co.,Ltd., he engaged in the management of Tokyo International Performing Arts Festival and Tokyo Performing Arts Market at Japan Center, Pacific Basin Arts Communication from 1990 to 1999. A professor at Atomi University since 2002. He has also been a committee member of an incorporated administrative agency "Expert Committee for Evaluation of the Japan Foundation" since 2004.

●**MARUOKA Hiromi**

Director of TPAM since 2005. She coordinated the first meeting of IETM in Japan and directed International Showcase in 2008. She started "Postmainstream Performing Arts Festival" (PPAF) in 2003, and has been directing international programs of the festival, introducing such companies as PME and Forced Entertainment. As a producer, she has been producing projects such as Compagnie Marie Chouinard's Japan tours in 2005 and 2009.

Maruoka: Now we would like to begin the panel discussion: *The Future of Arts Markets——Toward the Establishment of International Platforms that are beyond "Host-and-Guest" Relationships*. The title is a bit complicated, but the idea is that it is not about where the main cultural spheres and marginal ones are—— international markets always require travel—— but we want to move toward platforms that can transcend the idea of host versus guest or host and guest, developing relationships that enable that kind of exchange.

The speakers are, from this side, Tang Fu Kuen, Mary Ann DeVlieg, Yoko Shioya, and the moderator Shuji Sota. There is one more member of the panel who is just getting up the escalator and is going to arrive very soon. She has come. This is Frie Leysen.

Sota: Sorry to have kept you waiting. We now begin. My name is Sota and I shall be acting as the moderator.

With your permission I'd like to introduce myself. 1995 was the first year when Tokyo Performing Arts Market [TPAM] was held, and from that year I was working as a staff member of its secretariat until about 2000, so for the past 10 years I've not been directly involved in TPAM. So I might be a bit Taro Urashima [Rip Van Winkle], but I accepted the offer to be the moderator for this session because perhaps I can represent points of view about how TPAM is seen from the outside and about how it is expected to progress in the future.

As for today, the title is *The Future of Arts Markets*, so I would like to start from reaffirmation or reconsideration on the roles which have been fulfilled by arts markets, and then I would like to open a discussion hearing what the guests from abroad——including Shioya-san, we have four guests from abroad——think about the direction we should head toward.

First, I would like to call upon Maruoka-san of the secretariat of TPAM to talk briefly about the objective of having this session and then to invite the panelists to speak.

Maruoka: The objective is simple. This is the 14th TPAM. We started with the name "Market," but the situation has changed in these years. Especially since 2005, we have been focusing on contemporary performing arts——although it can be said that any performing arts is in principle "contemporary." So it has gone beyond just putting out booths or showing performances. We have also been organizing meetings to create encounters, cooperatively working with various people during the period of TPAM, and collaborating between arts markets. In today's audience, there are Alain Paré from CINARS, Kyoko Yoshida who has created CTN, which is a network within the US, and also people from Performing Arts Market in Seoul. They and other colleagues have all provided us with insight and we exchanged information, which have helped us to proceed to today.

At the same time, there's the issue that a gap has been growing between what people might imagine from the word "market" and what we have actually been doing. Another thing is——how many of you participated in the morning session?——that we have been being questioned if we can change and how we are going to change in the ongoing fundamental transformation in the Japanese cultural policy, as mentioned in the morning session. In this room are probably not artists but presenters or producers. How are we going to be involving ourselves into these changes, and what sort of role can "arts markets" fulfill for that? It is to discuss this that we organized this series of sessions for.

Sota: Thank you. We started with the name "Performing Arts Market," and there was a good reason or background in 1995 for deciding the name that way, but I suppose it can be said that the reality has been broadening beyond what the word "market" can express.

I said I was involved from 1995, the first TPAM, and while we did define ourselves as "international," I recall

we did not have so many foreign participants compared to today. We intended to be international, but we were not directly connected to networks outside Japan, not to the degree that I can see today.

In the experience of about fifteen years, we can see that there is much larger presence of non-Japanese participants, and I suppose the meaning that coming to Tokyo has for them has been changing along with the times. So, I would like to ask the panelists from abroad to talk about how they see TPAM. Shioya-san, I am going to ask you to speak last. Mary Ann, you first and then Frie Leysen, Tang Fu Kuen. This order please. Ten minutes for each, please, as the target time. I would like to ask you to talk about your current position, standpoint, the content of what you are working on, and how that relates to TPAM.

Mary Ann is the secretary-general of an organization called IETM, and two years ago a satellite meeting of IETM was held here in Tokyo. The discussions in it were published on the web and I read that for the first time quite recently to prepare for this session. The document is massive. There is a tremendous amount of discussions which have all been put up. Look at IETM@TPAM later. 92 pages in A4 size format, it is something that is not likely to be read in one night, but the discussions are really geared towards experts, and perhaps require a certain amount of knowledge about global distribution of performing arts.

If we start our discussion based on that degree of knowledge, it might actually leave some people confused or make it difficult to understand. So, although, it might seem to be far too basic especially for the experts came here from abroad, but I would like to start from the basic of the basics, in other words, things like what an arts market is, what the difference from a festival is, or what the difference from a network is. So, Mary Ann, if you would like to begin.

DeVlieg: Thank you. Thank you also to TPAM. This is the fourth time I've been to Japan, and each time I have to say, also in response to your introduction, that I find it a very interesting meeting point not only between Japanese and foreigners but also between Europeans and Europeans, between other people from other Asian countries. So, for me, the TPAM each year is a hub: I have ten minutes, and I have a lot of notes!

Let me first, at the sake of boring some of you who know about network theory, give a few basic introductions to what we mean when we use the word "network." Everyone knows what networking is. In English we say that computers are joined in a network, that there is a network of roads, that there are networked air travel systems. But when we talk about professional networks in the cultural sector, at least in Europe for the last 30 years, we mean groups of people who are working in a cultural sector, performing arts in this case, and are doing this job in a professional way whether they are producers or presenters, running a theater or running a theatre company: these are groups of people coming together who have some shared aims or goals.

The reasons they come together? The first reason of a professional network usually is to share information. It's been well documented through a lot of scientific research that networks ——human networks or computer networks, they are the same——their principle function is to make information circulate faster. So, when we belong to a professional network, we know about things more quickly. I would link this information to a kind of training because most of us can't keep going back to university to improve our skills. So we learn from other people. We hear the information from our colleagues. We learn how our colleagues are coping with different problems. We are inspired by interesting models from elsewhere.

The second classic function of a professional network is to make some political pressure: that is to say, to understand what the sector needs from other givers of resources, whether that's money or government policies, and to actually say to them, "This is what we need in order to make our sector healthier," lobbying and trying to improve the conditions for the kind of work that we do.

In the 1980s there were some international arts associations. Of course there was the ITI, and there were other associations of festivals, for example. But IETM, the network for which I work, now includes around 560 organizations, theaters, festivals, public authorities, independent programmers and producers coming from 53 countries. So it is quite big. In 1981 when we were formed, I think we were the first ones to really call ourselves a network. Well, what is the difference? As the other European cultural networks who were formed after that, we liked to think that we had no hierarchy: no one was more important in the network than anyone else. We were an open network, that is to say, people didn't have to apply to join, they weren't selected. The only criteria were that people said that they were committed to working in the contemporary performing arts, and also that they were committed to working across national borders. This international aspect was very important, and some of those original values of our network have still stayed the same, the most important one being that the goal of the network itself is really to encourage people to communicate with one another. So we don't have an outside goal, the goal is really internal. We want people to talk to each other, to stimulate each other through looking at their own

good practices and the way that they cope with the problems in their theatre. Our network was based also very much on what has now become quite normal behavior in Europe——co-production and touring——and I suspect that my colleagues will talk a little more about that because they are working directly with artists.

The other quality about our network which I think was important and now is quite widespread in Europe is this concept of being open. Why do we want to have an open network and not a closed one? Well, everything needs air. Everything needs stimulation whether it's a plant or air in a room to keep you awake this afternoon after lunch, and networks also need air. We have new people coming in. We need new ideas. The new people teach the old ones just as much as the old ones teach the young ones. It's this constant dynamism, this constant aspect of people coming, staying for some years and going. At the same time, the feature of continuity is extremely important. When I meet you once, you and I can have a certain kind of basic level of conversation. If I meet you two times, three times, if I know that every year I will meet you one or two or three times, then you and I can start to have a very profound discussion. We can learn a lot about each other's artistic tastes and learn a lot about how we might want to work and collaborate together.

On the plane coming over here——I traveled on Austrian Airlines——there was a magazine in the plane like there always are, and in the magazine was an article of an Austrian——I don't know who he is, but apparently he is a very influential guy——who is one of these people who gives advice to companies about the future, and his vision of the future was that people will have to continuously and increasingly depend on one another. So we will have to learn how to collaborate more——though he is talking to businesses, of course——and we will have to learn to work in decentralized teams in different countries, which means that we will have to understand the cultures of other countries. And I thought, "Well, how lucky that we are in the network," because we've been doing that already for many years. And if that has to increase, then how lucky we are in the performing arts, because we certainly have a tendency of working in this collaborative way.

Some weeks ago, I gave a speech to an association of Spanish theatres——managers, directors and companies——and in order to give the speech, I researched some of the members of our network, and I asked them how they were working these days. All of them answered me in the same way that they were not selling a ready-made product anymore and they were not buying ready-made products anymore. Whether it was a company or a festival or a theater, they spoke about working much more on a long term basis, finding partners and working with these partners, whether they were making a new project or they just wanted to exchange some ideas and get some feedback——no project is coming out of that, but they have their circle of people whose confidence they can trust——and I think this is also an increasing way that we need to work in the world.

Theatre, as we know, is one of the few public spaces——spaces in the public realm, not government-sponsored but places which are open in society. Theatre is one of the few places where we go to think. If we look at the other media——newspapers, television——all of the media are designed not to make us think but to make us accept a very simplistic message. Black/white, right/wrong, good/bad. And theatre is one of the few spaces, like some of the other contemporary arts, which doesn't tell us right or wrong, good or bad. It presents us with a complex situation like our lives today and asks us to analyze and to think about that. I was recently in the US for two weeks, and I was absolutely horrified at the lack of analytical thinking present in a country which is, let's say, at least amongst the most influential in the world. The messages given are simple, they are often exaggerated, they are based on scandal, and there is no one who——it seemed to me——had the power to stop and deconstruct them, to take apart these arguments and ask people to make their own judgments by thinking about what was being said. Once again, I thought how lucky we are that we work in the performing arts where this is actually the business of what we do.

I guess finally I would like to make an argument for the continuity of possibilities of meeting on an international level. I know, because in Europe we work with 27 countries, members of the European Union, that normally the policies of these countries are still based on national geography. If we try to make an argument for European or international partnerships, the ministers of culture might say "Yes, but what good does that do for the people in my country?" And I think it does do a great good for the people in our countries. Yet again, by presenting an artistic point of view, the artist's reflection on the world, we are able to touch so many people coming to our theaters to inspire them to see the world also through different eyes. I was very inspired this morning by the discussion that we had about the differences in language——the difference that has been made to the Japanese theatre to have works in translation.

I think we all have to work on this international level, we have to inspire ourselves, we have to open our own minds so that we are able to pass this on to our audiences. Thank you.

Sota: Thank you for succinctly pointing out a number of

important issues, in particular, the clear explanation about the social meaning of a theater and art. I have a basic question on behalf of the audience. In 1981 IETM started as "Informal European Theatre Meeting," but only the acronym has remained. I suppose the fact that it is no longer an organization within Europe is one thing, and perhaps I am asking you to repeat some of the things that you have already told us, but could you talk about why being "Informal" was important, why it was "Europe," and how these things have changed through the years since the establishment?

DeVlieg: We stopped using the name "Informal European Theatre Meeting" several years ago, and like the car BMW, we still keep the letters. Nobody knows what BMW means anymore, and nobody knows what IETM means anymore. But it is true that we were international from the beginning. Amongst the number of people who founded the network——there were around six of them——none of them was English-speaking. My own thought about this——I wasn't there at that time——is that they used this English name because none of them were English speakers. It was a "neutral" language to use, probably.

It was "Informal" because it was not a network of institutions: no one had to be selected by the government to represent their country. People only represented their own work or their own place where they were working, not the country. This is rather normal now, but we started in 1981——so almost 30 years ago——and it was not usual. The most international organizations were often those in which people represented their country and were nominated by their government. In terms of "European"——once again, I wasn't there at the founding——I don't know, Frie, you weren't there either, were you? You weren't born yet? You were around, I know. But I think that there was a kind of pride because Europe was still quite new. Of course the EU was founded a long time before that, but the conception, the recognition that we were Europeans was just getting into the society at large. But we are not "Theatre" anymore either. We are all of the performing arts, and performing arts is much more interdisciplinary as well. The only thing we do, which is still the keyword, is that we meet. We are "Meeting."

Sota: Thank you for the very interesting story. Next I would like to ask Ms. Frie Leysen. Those who know Frie know her very well——she has been making wonderful achievements as a festival director in Europe. She is now directing Theater der Welt——I suppose it can be called "Theatre of the World" in English——held in next July in Germany. She has also established Kunstenfestivaldesarts, which is held in Brussels in Belgium, and she directed the festival until it became widely acknowledged. She is also curating another festival of performing arts of Arabic area. I would like her to speak about cultural policies, how they are connected to festivals, and the roles of festivals in terms of creation and distribution of pieces.

Leysen: Good afternoon. It's a sleepy hour of the day after lunch, so we try to keep you awake a bit. I'll try to explain in a nutshell how I see festivals, which is a very subjective, personal way of looking at it. I'm sure there are 100 different and maybe better ways to think about what a festival should be, but I can only speak from my personal point of view.

I created a festival in Brussels for two reasons. First, absolutely artistic reason. I thought Brussels, as a capital of Europe, didn't have an international offer that was suitable for a capital. And I felt that, like Mary Ann mentioned, the unification of Europe in the 80s and 90s was a tough process, but it was all about politics and economics and there was no thinking about a cultural Europe or an artistic Europe. So that was one of the reasons——I thought we should add that. We wanted Brussels to be not only a political and administrative capital but also an intellectual and artistic one. That's one thing.

Of course you can make a lot of festivals. I decided to make it not a "best of" festival. I can perfectly understand if you would decide to make a best of festival, but that was not the choice, and that confronted me a lot with the question: what is the responsibility and the role of a festival?

For me the keyword is——that is also something I was thinking about this morning. We have so many structures, and the discussion this morning was also about how to restructure the theatre policy and the theatre landscape in Japan. I feel that we are losing a bit the artist in all of this. A lot of structures come to have a life of their own, and we forget about the artist in the end. Well, I think that's what it's all about. So, in the festival I made, I wanted to take the artist back in the centre of the whole enterprise. I am now working in Germany, for instance. I see that the structures are fantastic, but they are so rigid, and the artist has to adapt to the structure. I think a structure should adapt to an artist, and not the other way around. I think, in the whole thinking of arts policy all over Europe——and maybe it will start here too, or it is maybe also here, I don't know——we lose this notion that we are there to support the work of an artist and they are not there to fill my festival or to fill my space. So that is the key idea of the festival: the artist in the centre of attention. If you do that all the rest comes out of it. That means we focused on contemporary work because I'm not so interested in putting a dead artist in the centre of the attention. I like to work with living people.

If you talk about contemporary work, it also means that it is interdisciplinary. Contemporary artists use film and music and dance and theatre and visual arts in one and the same artwork, which should be absolutely possible. I think the borderlines between the different disciplines are very questionable today.

It should be radically international, and by "being radically international" I also meant "non-Western" because there are a lot of festivals in Europe that are quite Western-oriented, calling themselves "international" festivals, which is in a degree absolutely true. But I think we need today more than ever to go against clichés with which we, the Westerners, look at non-Western cultures and I think we are still very imperialistic and colonialist in our way of thinking and perceiving the world. I think, with a festival of contemporary arts, if you invite young artists from urban context in different places of the world——be it Bangkok or Tokyo or Kinshasa or whatever——then you have another notion of what the contemporary culture in non-Western parts of the world could be like today.

I also feel that if the artist is in the centre we have to follow his needs and his wishes, which means that automatically you come up to produce or co-produce or support an artist in creating of a new work. And that's not only giving money but very often also helping in organization or helping in bringing them in contact with material or the people who could nourish the work or who could enrich the work, which means also that it's a risky enterprise. As I said if you make a festival the best of, you can guarantee your audience that this is really the best of and you can show the newspaper articles——how it was criticized in New York Times or in Le Monde or whatever. If you create new work and you present new work, you have to say to your audience, "I don't know what it will be." It can be very bad also. I mean artists do not only make interesting work. But the only thing you can say is that this artist is important. So I don't know if this work is going to be the best of the best, but this artist is one of the most interesting people I met. That's again putting your artist in the centre of the attention.

I think for me it is also important to create a kind of no man's land for an artist where he can develop his work in complete freedom, and I am not just talking about countries where there is censorship. I think in the so-called free West we have a lot of censorship, and the worst of all is our auto-censorship. The worst of all is how we all want to please the community and to please the power and to please the economic world because we need more sponsors and so on and so on. And there is also a kind of aesthetic intolerance. So, it is to create a kind of no man's land where people can really talk, speak out, without any pressure or influence from the outside world, not on aesthetic, economic, political, philosophical, religious, or whatever grounds.

For me personally, a festival is a confrontation of visions. It's not just a number of nice performances and that's dull. I mean for me a festival is artists coming together who have a very personal, critical view on the society they live in, and the exploration on the world that we share with them wherever they come from. And with these people coming together you get clash of visions that sometimes go against each other, sometimes go a little bit parallel, but it's about this clash of visions that is an invitation to an audience to rethink your own vision or to at least question your own vision. I always say a festival should be electroshock. It should wake us all up and make us say, "Oh my God! This is what I'm thinking all the time!" We don't realize how we settle in our own little convictions and how we settle in our readymade concepts of the world, and I think a festival should disturb that. I think a festival should be very disturbing in a way.

Last but not least, or maybe two more things. I think a festival should also introduce artists that are not known yet, that are starting, and not just a Peter Brook and all the big names of today who are not necessarily still the biggest artists today. But the question is where the big people are, where the big artists for tomorrow are, and to present them in an early stage. I think it is very important to give them a platform to present their work, develop their work, create their work and to confront with different audience.

And then the last and this is really the last. I think a festival should also be a real platform where people meet. The artists meet between them, they meet with professionals from other festivals or other theaters, and they meet with local audiences. We created in the festival in Brussels a kind of initiative that I still cherish a lot although I'm not in the festival anymore. It was called "Artistic Tourists." We invited people that I met during my travel, for whom I thought maybe it was too early to be presented in this kind of international festival because——this is for me very important——a festival can also be a killing machine. If you present people too early and the work is not mature, they will be killed, and it takes years for them to recover from that and to try to rebuild a new reputation. So I am always hesitant to invite artists and always think, "Am I not going to kill somebody here?" But sometimes you meet artists that you think have a lot of potential, but then sometimes they live in faraway areas in the world and have never any exposure to what is happening in theatre in the world today, so we invited them then to come to Brussels and to live the festival for 10 days or something without any obligation. But they met during the day all the time, and there you have very interesting

discussions by people from Africa who have been looking at a production of Japan for instance, and then another guy from Germany who has been seeing the same production. When they start to discuss, you have the feeling they have seen a completely different show——the whole question of what the perception is, from which point of view you look at the work, how interesting that is, and how limited that is also, and how interesting it is to confront with how somebody else has read this work.

So this is something that is just costing, and it is not giving anything. It's no gain for the festival, but I think festivals should not only take, take, take but also give, and invest in the future, invest in not just new work but also individuals that they can develop. For me the scale of a festival is still about a very personal contact with an artist and a part of the road you go together with an artist. I think that is really something that cannot be replaced by any other structure I think. I hope I wasn't too long.

Sota: Thank you for a very informative series of comments. In this room there are people who have wonderful careers in this field, so if I raise a question that has already been answered, I might appear stupid. But please let me make sure.

I wanted to hear from you what the social meanings or functions of a festival are, but I think you meant it is not that a festival itself has some kind of function or meaning but that the importance is in what kind of festival is to be made.

At least in Europe there are theaters in each city and various areas, and cultural policies visibly exist. There is a precondition that a festival exists as something that is different from daily activities of a theater. This makes a festival something that has meaning and influence. Why Kunstenfestivaldesarts is one of the most influential festivals is that the choices it makes are considered reliable. Other festival directors or presenters cannot ignore it and look at its program with much respect, and the same program will be presented in other events next year and the year after next. Can I understand this as the importance or meaning of a festival?

Leysen: Not necessarily I think. I think in any case a festival is a political thing, which does not mean that the artistic work should be political. I think a festival in itself is a political statement. You implant an event in a society and the question is why you do it and what the effect you want to achieve with this event in this society is. But I don't believe that a festival should have a social role to fulfill or should have a political combat to fulfill. I don't believe that artists should make political work or socially inspired work at all. I think a political statement can also be that, as I said, you create a no man's land for people in the society who don't have much space, namely the artists, and I believe profoundly that the artists and their thinking and their analysis of society are the motor of our society, and if you cut this, then everything will stop in its evolution. But on the other hand you implant this event in the society and you deal with the society and, I think, you have to make an analysis of what is already existing in this area, in this country, in this city, what is missing and how we can fill these gaps of what is missing. I think being an electroshock is quite political ambition also.

Sota: I just like to ask you a point which the Japanese members of the audience are probably very interested in. The theatre company chelfisch led by Mr. Okada, who was one of the speakers in the morning session, was featured at Kunstenfestivaldesarts for the first time in Europe and that performance was very well received, which is why they have continued to tour in Europe next year and the year after next. But in Japan, chelfisch has not really been in that kind of situation, it is getting closer though. My understanding is that there is a kind of institutional condition or system that could make it happen in Europe while that is just at the starting point in Japan. What do you think about Japanese market or the role of TPAM, in terms of social reception of a new expression?

Leysen: I hate markets. I really hate them. But it is the second time I come here so there is something wrong with me. But I hate markets because market is a place where you sell and where you buy, and these are not the words that apply to what artists are doing and what we as presenters should be doing. I think what we as presenters should be doing is much more research and investigation related to comprehension of what an artist is doing, the context in which he is working and living, and the pertinence of his work in his own local context. And then at the end comes the question: "Is it possible to transplant this work in another cultural context?" or "Will it die if I do that?" which is also possible.

So I hate markets but I come. So why do I come? Because it's also a platform, and I think I realized yesterday that I come to Tokyo, to TPAM, for the side effects, not for the market. One of the side effects is the platform, the productions that are presented here. Another side effect is the meeting of Japanese artists because the market attracts so many people and there are also other performances happening at the same time around TPAM. It is also a moment to meet colleagues from all over Asia here and to discuss and learn who is doing what, which is very important and fruitful. I think another reason is that Hiromi is somebody I really respect and I believe very much in what she's doing. So it's very related also to people that you believe in.

Why I don't like market is what I just told: it's not about

selling and buying. In arts markets you meet a lot of managers and not so many artists, and I hate discussing things with managers. Artists should not sell themselves——they are not for sale. But of course it is very efficient and it makes us, programmers, very lazy. We go through a few days of TPAM, and if we want, we can fill our program for the next season. We have our Japanese program ready. I think we become all extremely lazy, and I think this is just too much pampering for lazy programmers.

But I always have the idea "develop the side effects," which is the platform, which I think could really be strong moment to have a gathering of the most recent Japanese theatre productions to be seen in a short time span. That could be fantastic. Take off the booths, all of them, and make one big booth with a nice restaurant, with a nice bar, with a nice ambience, and we can all sit there and meet, and if you want to sell you sell, if you want to buy you buy, but at least you can talk in a normal way also. That could be, for me, an "arts market." But even then, I think, let's keep a part of the money just to give it to very individual people, for artists to travel as artistic tourists to all parts of the world and to visit other festivals and other countries to see theatre all over these places, or give money to presenters to do a trip so that we are not always in a battery of 100 people walking around but have very individual discoveries and individual connections with the artist. For me that is irreplaceable, and that is the essence of the work I think, for an artist and for a presenter.

Sota: I think she addressed very important points, the core issues. I absolutely agree with her, since my question came out of the fact that this is Tokyo Performing Arts Market, whose name includes the word "market," and the necessity to re-question the notion of market.

Listening to Toshiki Okada in this morning, I actually felt that he did not intend to sell his own works himself. What he was saying was that he wants spaces for his activities or systems that broaden or ensure spaces for his activities. I think the question is how we can make it possible. This is something that I would like you to have an open discussion about afterward.

Next I would like to call upon the Asian situation. Tang Fu Kuen from Singapore. He originally was a performer at a company TheatreWorks, and I have heard he has also performed in the company's performances in Japan. He has been broadening his activities covering not only performing arts but also even visual arts. Last year, he curated the Singapore pavilion of Venice Biennale, the biggest art event in the world which is far more than very famous in the field of art, which everyone knows.

Looking at the current global distribution of performing arts and the mechanism of how a work is created and distributed, would you talk about what your thoughts may be about it, including the situation in Singapore?

Fu Kuen: I should begin by saying that by nature I'm a very curious person for information. I was very blessed since early in my career that I was able to be very mobile. I could travel, see a lot, and often I stayed on to find out more. When younger I had a lot of stamina—I could live in New York, roam in Europe and take in all the information. I was very Western-centric that way, but I sat down one day and I asked myself, "So I know a lot about the arts of the Western world - there is so much information. But what do I know about the backyard where I come from, Asia?" I realized the situation was because of the difference in infrastructure. It's also the journey of how modernity took place in the Western world that allowed such structures to establish themselves for communication. But Asia, somehow with its different value and ideological systems, has not been able to be cohesive in its own ways.

I returned to Asia more often and decided finally to base myself here, choosing Bangkok as the location. I started my quest for information in Asia, and it was a very difficult journey because things were in a desperate situation. There was not an IETM organization in Asia, especially in the theatre field, and people within Asia were not talking to each other enough. That said, there were initiatives to begin this kind of regional encounters, but because of my own liberal education, I'm very skeptical of people who establish themselves and claim to be authorities. So I did my own independent research and I became a bit of a strange individual, always popping up in places and finding out about this and that. And soon I asked myself what I should do with this information. I had to share this information. In this time, in my capacity as a critic and dramaturge—I was dissatisfied with the situation of presentation and I was dissatisfied with the agencies that claim to be doing international collaborations and international productions—I decided that as an individual I could exert myself in whatever small ways, first by identifying gaps where there is a problem of artistic flows in terms of information, methods or even dialogues. So independently, I found ways to organize events and platforms to surface emerging artists whose practices I believe to be part of the future.

Over the last ten years, there has been a very interesting phenomenon. Things have started to organize themselves more systematically in the region. For instance, there is a kind of biennalization of the region. Overnight, you have a kind of outburst of biennales in Asia, so too performing arts markets have appeared. Right now there is TPAM, which is one of the oldest, one in Korea, one in Singapore, and even in

China and Indonesia—in Indonesia alone I think you can count like maybe five arts markets. Whether they are contemporary arts market is for yourself to decide, but everyone is suddenly caught up in this rhetoric of cultural industry. With this surplus of arts markets—I have attended most of them—I ask myself, “What do they really provide for me?”

I’m a person who is interested in artists—the artistic vision and the artist himself or herself—so dialogue is a key imperative. Hence I decided that I should work with IETM to bring in a platform for dialogue, an open platform where professionals could meet outside of our market framework. That initiated the appearance of IETM in Asia, and thereafter each year we’ve been fortunate to be able to host IETM as an Asian edition in a very informal way - in China, Korea, Japan, and this coming June in Indonesia, Jakarta.

The kind of platform for meeting that Frie is espousing, is for me a very important one, of course, for all the obvious reasons that she has listed. But in my encounters with European festival directors, it's just so hard to convince them to come over to Asia. A lot of them do secondhand buying from key information holders. If they do not engage with the latest trends in different parts of the world are, they do a kind of derivative shopping.

And the IETM editions that we’ve had in Asia so far have reached a certain point of limit. So for Jakarta, I am proposing that people from both continents come meet and talk in a very open and informal way of sharing best practices and best models of exchanging information and producing. And then we move on to spaces where artists actually inhabit, meaning we should be really immersing ourselves in the presence of the environment that the artists work in their studios. "Do not be afraid of the exotic," I always tell people. The exotic can be wonderful. Why are we demonizing ourselves with these colonial hangovers over the exotic? The first point is really that we must have a fascination for the other, and then how we find an approach to be fair and mindful of how we conduct the procedure is the important thing. But first let's embrace the exotic, you know. You have to see the temples, you have to go to the mountains, you have to see this fantastic nature that the artists are deriving their ecology of imagination from. If you don’t share that, you can’t understand the landscape of the artists. And so after Jakarta, I propose that we move on to Solo and Jogjakarta, which are very ancient cities for artistic production, to understand really where they come from.

Lastly, a bit of a side talk on what I would like my vision of an ideal meeting point to be. First, it is artist-oriented. As Frie has reiterated that without the artist we have no imagination, we have no universe from a unique point of view. And because we are going to be artist-oriented, we have to be very mindful first of the conditions that the artist operates in, the kind of philosophy and ecology that form his practice, and then the kinds of critique that he offers through his or her work.

The second is for us to be process-oriented, to move away from the market logic of buying and selling products. And in this, we have to be very rigorous and careful in how we enter the artistic creation through means of knowing them in their spaces, in their studios with their immediate social environment.

Next is to be research-oriented. And by research, of course, in all our own capacities of work, we have to be very detailed with how we find information and the kinds of contestations this information is embedded in. If we could work with the artist, as well in creating this research, then I think all the more we can offer meaningful content to the audience. And part of research for me is also the need to lobby for archives. I have been very fortunate because the time that I spent in New York was in the Public Library where they have an amazing archive - in fact I first saw butoh films in New York. Also in Berlin and in Brussels they have fantastic archives that are current. But in Asia we do not have that resource. That’s why we forget. We are all amnesiac to our own history and tradition. The information portals are not secured in the right places and access cannot be made to these resources.

Last, of course, is to be dialogue-oriented so that we are constantly having conversations even if we disagree — you know we “agree to disagree”— and this platform of dialogue should take place in all scales of operation: from personal dialogs between artists to seminars where we have academics to share their research with us.

Sota: Thank you. You told us about the situation in Asia that is quite different from Europe, and I have one question which is, perhaps, not a comfortable question for you to answer.

In Tokyo we did an IETM Satellite Meeting too, and you did the Singaporean edition in Singapore and are going to do the Indonesian edition of IETM this year. So you have been employing the style of IETM as the platform of information. It is good to adopt what is good, but most of the participants are European and there are few local people. In Tokyo too. Those who have constantly been participating are IETM members, and for instance in Tokyo, most local people participate only that time. So, I kind of suspect that how local people can be spontaneously involved in creation, distribution and evaluation of a work might be judged from European points of view, if I am to be skeptical. What do you think about that?

Fu Kuen: I’m not sure we are into evaluation because it

is an informal network. We are not placing concrete goals or achievements to be measured by. It is really a way of meeting, of having an encounter. I think for all the Asian editions, especially the one in Tokyo, we were very mindful to include a substantial number of Asian participants. For me, the problem is always economic, and it is strange of course when the European players are often saying "We do not have enough budget to travel." What more the Asians? For the Jakarta meeting, we ensure an equal presence of both Asians and Europeans (we also have Australians coming onboard). So I'm not sure about being subject to evaluation by locals like that. I don't know if by saying that, I'm repudiating some colonial tendencies; I don't know if I'm being colonial. I suppose in our earnestness we are just trying to forge closer encounters with the artists.

Sota: I'd like to ask Maruoka-san to participate in discussion about that afterwards. And now, last of all, I would like to call upon Shioya-san. We have started from talking about Europe and then moved to Asian perspective that is supposed to be different from Europe. But in America, in the US and Canada, there are large-scale arts markets. A national-scale performing arts meeting called APAP, where it is said more than 2,000 people gather, is the largest arts market in the US——according to an interview with Mary Ann published on the website of The Japan Foundation, IETM is a quarter of it——which gathers four times more participants than IETM. It is held every year in New York. And there is CINARS, which started with a name with the word "Commerce" meaning "market" and now using such words as "Congress," "Meeting" or "Network," in Montréal. Could you talk about how things differ in America, about APAP, and what you think about what we have discussed?

Shioya: [In English] I guess I can speak in Japanese? My name is Yoko Shioya. I am the artistic director of Japan Society, an organization in New York.

APAP is the acronym of Association of Performing Arts Presenters, which is an umbrella organization compiling the opinions of presenters nationwide or lobbying on behalf of such presenters. One of its most acknowledged activities is its "annual conference" where everyone gather, and the event is usually called "APAP" although it is the name of the organization. It has been held every year for 30 or 40 years in New York. The official name of the meeting is "annual conference," so it is neither a "market" nor "festival." We say "APAP is held" naming the organizer for the sake of convenience, but it is actually its annual conference.

I am too young to know how APAP's annual conference started and how big it was 30 or 40 years ago, but the difference from festivals or Mary Ann's organization is, first of all, around 300 booths are set there like an OA show or boat show, in spite of the fact that it is called conference. This is one of the central venues, and roughly speaking, there are two types of participants: those who come mainly for the booth place and those who come for the conference just utilizing the booth place as a hub.

People who come for the booths are, ignoring various exceptions, can be categorized as sellers and buyers of performing arts, namely marketing people. For example, the music industry is very different from contemporary dance or ballet. These people fill their theaters' programs by buying products from, for instance, a management company selling country music artists or an agent circulating native American——in Japanese so-called "Indian"——dance that has been modified to be something more entertaining or theatrical. The way these people see performing arts and present it into society is different from that of people who meet artists and create together with artists as Frie described. In other words, there are two fundamentally different positions to settle between creators and the final products. Those who fill their theaters' schedules mediated by agents are presenters, and those who meet artists and create together with artists or improve environment for artists to raise questions toward society are also presenters. But I think, in spite of the similarity, these two are totally different business. So I suppose the word "market" implies the former, who have dealings with agents to fill their theaters.

Knowing Maruoka-san personally or looking at various structures of TPAM, it seems that it has been pursuing the latter, the notion of "presenter" who explore communication with artists and improvement of environment where artists can create through dialogs. That is my personal view on TPAM.

As for APAP, its annual conference, it is so gigantic that it can include these two tendencies. However, at least I belong to the latter, the people who are not dealing with market, and the management principle of my theater itself is like that. So I do not have enough knowledge about market to talk about it. I do not have information. That is another world.

And there are two kinds of people in "presenters" of our side, if I can say "our side." When it comes to communicating with artists, we frequently hear people questioning if that can be called "presenter" in the US recently. I think the word "to present" is translated into Japanese as "joen suru," which sounds "to present a performance at a theater," but more suitable words for the work of talking with artists to find a way to creation should be "support" or "service," and "producer" is more suitable for the financial work and responsibility about creation. Though the word "producer" sounds a bit vulgar in Japanese, it means that they take

responsibility including financial things to offer a production. In English, we recently say "presenter/producer" meaning they do both.

To do both, research is indispensable as already mentioned. If I want to commission an artist to make a new work or think about the theme of this season in contrast to the previous season, without knowledge I do not know who I should commission and who I should talk with to find this or that type of piece for the season. If I want to produce something not only at my own venue but also with this and that person, this presenter/producer and that presenter/producer and another player in cooperation, our work takes the form of touring. But without knowledge or research experience, I do not know which presenter/producer I should bring the idea to and who can empathize with my idea or fit it into their plans.

The reason why we gather three, four, many colleagues is first of all financial problem. For example, if I gather four, a production of $50,000 can be done with $12,500 for each. And if it is a new production, as Okada-san said in the morning session, it can be refined through performing at one, two, three, four venues and becomes a strong piece that can communicate toward broader public, which is better than presenting it at only one place and ending like fireworks.

Returning to the topic, to have an idea that having this artist do this can interest or benefit him or her because he or she is making this kind of piece or is in this level or his or her career, and to be able to form a producing team gathering certain kind of people to organize a tour, very wide knowledge is required. There are two levels of gaining knowledge. First of all, in this business, nothing can be done without seeing live performances. You see a performance, and if you see two, three pieces of the same artist, you are at the level where you can guess how the artist's next piece is good somehow by watching DVD. Then, for example, you have seen a piece that you thought was interesting, meet people who see as many performances as you do, and ask them "What did you think about that piece?" Especially in the US, the ways people see things differ very much, so sometimes someone says "That piece is good in blah blah" about a piece that I thought "What the Hell," and I feel as if scales fall from my eyes and think "Well, I didn't know that kind of point of view existed." Then you can give more flexibility to yourself and, for example, you decide to endure one more piece of this artist. To be able to do that, email communication among presenters is not enough, and the biggest merit of APAP as a meeting point is that we can physically meet there and talk like "Did you see that? Did you see this? He said that piece was good, did you see it?" That is basically what every presenter of our side is thinking.

However, with that gigantic scale, we have to go through, even only to make an appointment to meet someone, so complicated processes that I almost throw up. Actually there is a saying "Everyone hates APAP" and it makes you vomit. But after you vomit, you can meet people. Hilton Hotel is the main venue, and only by strolling in Hilton Hotel——I always say it is a jungle——you encounter someone and are captured and talk. And then after three, four steps you are captured by someone else or you capture someone else and talk.

This cannot be done by email or Skype, so I think it is very important for us presenters to physically gather whether it is called platform, festival, conference, or market. Did I speak too much?

Sota: No, no. You talked very clearly and made it compact. Thank you. But our time is limited and we do not have much time left.

Today, I think there are people from theaters built and managed by regional municipalities that are called "public cultural venues," most of which usually do not involve themselves in creation. I think they are dealing with situations where, for example, the officials of these municipalities are not necessarily think creation is necessary or budgets for that cannot be made because needs for that do not exist.

So I would like to ask each of you out of the remaining time about how we should connect cultural policy with creation, distribution and structures for supporting artists. You do not necessarily have to relate your view to the situation in Japan, but please talk about what you think is effective——Mary Ann mentioned lobbying at the beginning, for example——in Europe if you work in Europe and in Asia if you work in Asia?

DeVlieg: Thank you. I want to talk about that and I want to talk about something else too because I lived in England for a long time and I was in England at a time when the British cultural funding system was also thinking about how they could reform their policies. And one of the very interesting papers which was written at that time to reflect on a *New Arts and Media Strategy*, was about theatre. The Arts Council commissioned about 12 documents——one for each of the different art forms——but the two most interesting were about poetry and about theatre, and the theatre paper presented some interesting ideas which at that time were quite shocking.

The first was the idea that it was the individual that counted more than the system itself, that if you had a very good dynamic, intelligent person, he or she would make a festival or a theatre or a company successful, that it wasn't necessarily the format that would create the success or failure but the dynamism of the people. And I think, from that moment on, in Britain, there was

a change which took a long time but maybe has resulted in a lot of programs now which are attempting to develop the capabilities of the individuals. So that's just a comment about systems. "Can you make the best system?" I think as usual the ideal doesn't exist in life.

In terms of what we're doing in Europe at the moment, because there has been a growing professionalism of the cultural lobby in Europe, we try to influence European level, EU cultural policy. And I'm chairing an European working group on creativity and creation. We are non-commercial, in other words not the cultural industries, not video and movies, music industry. We've come up with the idea or the concept that the whole of the value chain is really important, that if one link is weak then the rest will be weak, and what we mean by the value chain is 5 links: first education and training——from arts education in schools all the way through to the professional education of artists and the continuing education of people working in the field. The second link is creation. Creation is not always production, sometimes yes sometimes not. So the third one is indeed production. The fourth one is distribution or diffusion of the work throughout the country or throughout the territory. And the fifth is the one I think is one of the most interesting because traditionally it can be documentation, but in this case we're particularly looking at media. I think, probably in all societies, the role of the critic is really threatened because the newspapers are not commissioning critics to write so much anymore. People are blogging whether they are trained as critics or not, and so this ability to write intellectually and interestingly about the work and to be a mediator between the public understanding the intentions of the artist is kind of getting lost now. So what we're fighting for in Europe, is that all these five points in the chain, are equally strong and also equally linked so that you would have not a separate diffusion system, so that the theaters and the festivals wouldn't be separated from the creation processes, nor from the critical processes of the critics, but then everyone in that circle would be linked together and working well together.

Sota: Thank you. To prepare for this session, I read what Mary Ann said at TPAM two years ago. She said that new meanings can be created by constant gathering of professionals. I think what she has just said is related to this: it is not that establishing of a certain system can solve everything but that continuous activities in the five fields——education, creation, production, distribution and documentation——can make unprecedented ideas shared among us.

Then I would ask Frie——I would like you to give an advice or tell your thought. In Japan, the meaning of gathering of people involved in this field cannot easily be understood by people of other fields, or experts of this field are not usually acknowledged or respected by the administration——I think organizations such as The Japan Foundation or Japan Foundation for Regional Art-Activities that organize TPAM are ones of the very few organizations that acknowledge the meaning of the existence of the experts——but in Europe, is there precondition that cultural activities are something that deserve public support? Or are you continuously persuading people who do not think that is not of high degree of necessity? What is the situation?

Leysen: I think the difference is that in Europe the arts is very much institutionalized and organized by the government. So of course they respect the people who are on the head of these institutions, so that's clear that it's a profession that is respected and that is existing. I think we also have to be careful——I think Europe is absolutely not the model to be copied and I think there are a lot of things in Europe that really do not function either. And what Mary Ann was saying about producing, co-producing, education and all this, I mean when you concretely would look into how the situation in Europe is, it's not so fantastic either. For instance just the first thing that came into my mind is how the distribution in Italy works for instance. This is terrible. I mean you have these state theaters and they are just like salesmen——I buy your production, you buy mine——and you do that with five or ten partners and your season is fixed, and this is what is really happening in reality. A lot of the theatre budget goes to these theaters. So what you have is these very quite conventional productions produced in the big theaters that are hopping from one big theater to another big theater and that's it. So I just want to tell you——also this morning there was a lot of comparison with what is going on in France——I'm sorry but when you look at what is happening on the field of theatre in France today, it's not fantastic either. So, if the system is so good, how come there is not an interesting outcome? When I look at the system in Germany, I mean it is so strict that it kills new upcoming artists because they have no space to be, to work, to breathe. So I really think it is important that if you look at other models, you look not only at the positive points of these models but also look at failures and don't repeat the same failures. I mean we've hurt ourselves a lot in Europe and we're still not there, so if you start now developing a new policy, it is better not hurt yourself on the same stones that we did in Europe.

Sota: How is the relationship between the governments and the professionals of this field in Singapore or Southeast Asia?

Fu Kuen: I have to confess that I don't spend so much time in Singapore anymore. But I keep track of what

happens there. I should say that over the last ten years, with the formation of the National Arts Council, many things have become institutionalized and centralised. But no one actually offers enough critique of such a practice. The government itself is the main portal for corporate sponsors. So arts groups have lost almost all direct access to corporate sponsorship. Corporate sponsors are happier to donate to the Arts Council a pool of money, and then the Arts Council decides how it is disbursed. So there is a kind of really top-down procedure, and because of the lack of direct corporate funding, artists are very dependent on the Arts Council and their agendas for the day. This kind of reliance really cripples artistic production. In fact if you look at it in a more insidious way, the artistic content is being regulated now because whoever speaks or whoever bites the hand that feeds him or her shall not receive funding. How to free up this kind of regime in a country with this kind of political culture - I am not very optimistic, yet.

Sota: Do you have any comment about the situation in the US in terms of the relationship between the government and this sector?

Shioya: About governmental support, as you know, the US is famous for its inexistence. So it is impossible to compare. But in the US, though the money is very limited, there are supports for each region, for example New England or the Mid-west or the Western regions. And non-profit organizations that received the money from the administration connect directly with professionals and give money to them and/or function as linkage between people. The fact that there are half-professional half-administrative institutions between the administration and professionals is at least healthier than the current situation in Japan or the situation in Japan up to present. Whether there are professionals is another question though.

Leysen: I just wanted to say something concerning what was discussed this morning. I was really concerned and worried when I heard that there was a project of distributing the subsidies to the theaters only and that it would not go to individual artists. I'm convinced that this is the beginning of the end. I think we really need to support individual artists directly. First of all, if it goes to the theaters——which is final, so I think theaters should have money to produce and present, that's absolutely sure——then you need a different type of directors in these theaters who are really engaged, have the knowledge and the professional way of doing that and deciding what to invite and what to produce and how to do it. That is one thing. It's a good idea to give them more money and to give them this new mission, but then you need the new people to do it. And the second thing is that if you make artists exclusively dependent on what theaters will decide... I mean Toshiki, now everybody knows him, but I'm sure no theater in Japan would support Toshiki five or ten years ago when he started. So this is something that needs individual and direct money from the government, and that should not go through the theaters. And the third thing is that theaters should stop putting their conditions on the table if an artist wants to work there. The artist should have the freedom to work in that theater with the people he wants and the rhythm he wants and the length of time he wants and so on and so on, and not with these strict rules that, for instance, are killing Germany at the moment.

Sota: It is necessary to support artists, but if there is only the system for supporting, that rather kills the artists. Lastly, while TPAM started with the word "market" in its name, other elements such as "meeting" or "platform" that have been mentioned, have also been functioning in TPAM. I would like to ask Maruoka-san, the director of TPAM: am I right to say TPAM is going to further emphasize the function as platform in the future?

Maruoka: The organization I work for is the organizer, but it is an NPO. So we do not have our own budget, and I am not the type of player that has succeeded in creating budgets. The reason why we wanted to raise these questions through this conference is that it was difficult for presenters like us to raise voices in Japan, while associations of artists more or less had opportunities to do that. That is partially because the system was designed in accordance with the way theatre companies existed, but I would not go into detailed explanation about Japanese system because it will be too long. However, what we have focused on is the fact that company managers, theater managers or everyone involved in this field are facing the same direction in their involvement in connecting works of art and audience. One thing I would like to develop is this.

Secondly, the problem of the name: what is imagined from the word "market" seems to be unwanted anymore.

Lastly, since we are not the type of organization that can offer spaces or money, we, for example, visit theaters that have a character. That kind of theaters exist not only in Tokyo but everywhere in Japan, and visiting them can be, for example, experience with what Fu Kuen called the exotic. We can also learn many things because there is producing effort behind each performance, so each company's activities to show its own work tells us a lot. Meetings based on this kind of knowledge gained through experience should be steadily held, not only in this country but also always opening to the outside.

Although we try to open information, In Japan there is the tendency that someone controls and compiles

information and conceals it for fear of failure. For example, when the "budget screening" by the government began and the subsidies for performing arts were going to be cut, we organized a forum about it. It was the first of that kind of gathering, so there were many naive opinions. But we should speak that out. We should start from there. A voice should not be cut just because people are ashamed of its immaturity, and I think we have been creating spaces where that wouldn't happen. And when we want to develop this side, the word "market" might not be suitable. That is my personal——although I have a job title and a position too——opinion.

Just one more thing. We have been trying not to make it competitive, and a clear example is the showcases. For example, we introduce works of different genres in one context to let audience create different ways of seeing. This year we have a dance showcase, which caused a bit of fuss during preparation because works that do not look like dance are included in it. But what we wanted to suggest is that it is one of the ways what is called Japanese contemporary dance exists now. Of course there are many other excellent dance performances that absolutely look like contemporary dance, but this direction we took is one of the results of trying not to be competitive.

Sota: I am sorry for being a bad moderator——we have run out of time. I think the fifteen-year experience of TPAM in Tokyo is our great asset, and the fact that people from Europe and America constantly come every year speaks for TPAM's usefulness. It is a precious base for broadening other networks for European people for example, and its meaning as a hub is increasing and not going to decrease. Speakers have pointed out that it should not be copying the style of Europe in Tokyo, and actually there are various possibility in various places in Japan not only in Tokyo. So, as the final word of this session, I would expect TPAM to be a place where these possibilities gather and networks are formed out of that. Thank you very much for participating.

Maruoka: Thank you. Another discussion by Mr. Toshiki Okada and Mr. Oriza Hirata is held tomorrow morning as a part of this series of sessions. Please participate in it if you like. Thank you very much.

A reception is held at five o'clock at the foyer of the Medium Hall, and a showcase begins after that. If you have a pass, you can see performances——please go to the TPAM Showcase reception. Thank you very much.

The "Theatrical" Space that Permeates Cities

- Interactive Performing Arts from the UK and Japan -

●March 4 [Thu] 10:00-12:00 / Large Conference Room, Tokyo Metropolitan Art Space (5F)

Moderator: SUMITOMO Fumihiko [Curator / Vice-Director, NPO Arts Initiative Tokyo]

Speakers: Tassos STEVENS [Co-director, Coney]
Matt ADAMS [Co-founder, Blast Theory]
Duncan SPEAKMAN [Artist]
TSUKAHARA Yuya [Dancer, contact Gonzo]
exonemo [Artist]

In the time of economic crisis, excellent smaller-scale works with new presentation forms that are beyond preexisting performing arts have been emerging in the UK. Their "portability" and the fact that these works exhibit fascinations of theatre and dance in different ways from large-scale productions widely drawing attentions in many countries and regions outside the UK. This cutting-edge current of performing arts will be introduced through actual presentations of these works and discussed by artists and Asian presenters who are building network for this type of productions.

Presented and cooperated by: British Council

●SUMITOMO Fumihiko

Born in 1971. Received his master's degree at the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of Tokyo University (Culture and Representation Course, Department of Interdisciplinary Cultural Studies). He has been a curator at NTT InterCommunication Center and Museum of Contemporary Art Tokyo. He planned such exhibitions as "Out the Window — Spaces of Distraction" that introduced young artists of Japan, China and Korea, and "Art meets Media: adventures in perception" in 2004. With such an exhibition as "Beautiful New World" that toured in China in 2007, he was also involved in the promotion of Japanese contemporary art into the world. He directed International Festival for Arts and Media Yokohama in 2009. Among the books of which he is a co-writer are "21 Seiki ni Okeru Geijutsu no Yakuwari (The Roles of the Arts in the 21th Century)" (Miraisha, 2006) and "Curator ni Naru! (Become a Curator!)" (Filmart-Sha, 2009).

●Tassos STEVENS

Tassos Stevens is a runner and co-director of Coney, rumoured to have been involved in most of their work. He did a doctorate in Psychology, was an award-winning theatre director and scratch producer of new theatre, before falling down a rabbithole. He's currently occupied in researching emotional resilience in teenagers for an interactive broadcast project, designing an audio-only iPhone game, developing an adventure for families, and plotting playful interventions in public spaces around the world. He blogs irregularly at allplayall.blogspot.com, and recently spoke at Playful '09, Arts Council Decibel and RSA State of the Arts. youhavefoundconey.net, allplayall.blogspot.com

●Matt ADAMS

Matt Adams' first passion was theatre from the age of 13 as an actor and director. Acting credits include The Ghost Of Oxford Street directed by Malcolm McLaren for Channel 4. He co-founded Blast Theory in 1991 with a group of friends. Matt co-curated the Screen series of video works for Live Culture at Tate Modern in 2003 and curated the Games and War season at the ICA in London in 2003. He has taught widely on performance, new media and interdisciplinary practice at institutions and has presented at conferences across the world. www.blasttheory.co.uk/

●Duncan SPEAKMAN

Duncan Speakman is an artist based in Bristol, UK. His work examines how we use sound to locate ourselves in personal and political environments. Seeking out the poetics of the everyday, he creates socially relevant experiences that engage audiences emotionally and physically in public spaces. He is currently developing site-responsive soundwalks, street games and pervasive theatre works. He has been exhibited internationally (including ISEA, Navigate, M:ST, ArteAlmeda, Futuresonic, InBetweenTime). Since 2008 he has been an artist in residence at the Pervasive Media Studio, Bristol and he was selected to be part of the Vauxhall Collective 2009. http://duncanspeakman.net/

●TSUKAHARA Yuya

Born in 1979. He developed "contact Gonzo" through solemnly hitting and punching each other with his friends at a park and jumping from heights, and has been instantly and trashingly relating to cities and people based on this method. He has participated in Nanjing Triennale, Platform Seoul, International Festival for Arts and Media Yokohama, HARAJUKU PERFORMANCE+, Azumabashi Dance Crossing and other events. He will also participate in Roppongi Crossing in 2010. He received his master's degree in aesthetics at The Graduate School of Humanities of Kwansei Gakuin University. He is a management staff member of NPO Dance Box, and the attacking commander of a golden powder unit "New World Golden Finance."

●exonemo

An art unit formed by SEMBO Kensuke and AKAIWA Yae. Since 1996, they have been flexibly crossing between digital and analog, as well as the network world and the real world. They expose the relationship between technologies and users, working on a number of experimental projects that examine the impact that digital media impose on the contemporary society with humorous points of view and new approaches. They received Golden Nica award in the Net Vision section of Ars Electronica. The bases of their activities are Tokyo and exonemo.com.

Maruoka: We would now like to begin the last seminar in the Tokyo Performing Arts Market: *The Theatrical Space that Permeates Cities——Interactive Performing Arts from the UK and Japan*. We are broadcasting this via Ustream, and it is being broadcast in English only, and only abroad. Are we in agreement about that? Thank you. I would like to introduce the speakers. Yae Akaiwa and Kensuke Sembo from exonemo. Yuya Tsukahara from contact Gonzo. Duncan Speakman. Matt Adams from Blast Theory. Tassos Stevens from Coney. And today's moderator is the curator from the NPO Arts Initiative Tokyo, Fumihiko Sumitomo.

We had a seminar on a similar theme yesterday with presenters' or organizers' perspective, but today we are going to have the artists' perspective. Mr. Sumitomo, please.

Sumitomo: Thank you. My name is Sumitomo. Good morning. Are you awake? It is pretty early in the morning, and I guess some more people are going to be joining us afterwards. I would just like to very briefly summarize what we are going to be doing today. I usually work in the field of contemporary arts, especially focusing on the themes of cities, physical expression, and new media. And I think these will be some of the keywords for today's discussion. First, I would like to have the three artists from the UK to use about five to ten minutes each in giving their presentations. Some of you might have already taken part in their performances, but there might be people who have not been able to do that yet, so I would like you to take a look at their activities in the presentations. And then the Japanese artists, Tsukahara-san and exonemo, will be doing presentations as well. Their approaches might be slightly different, but I think that there are some common threads in what the Japanese artists and the three artists from the UK are doing.

I would like to have the panel talk about differences in their approaches in this order, but pretty early on I hope to be able to open discussion to the audience, to invite questions about the background, the context and also other elements regarding these artists' activities.

I should mention that Tassos-san is going to be doing Coney's showcase. It is supposed to start at 12:00, but it will only begin after this discussion is over, so you do not have to leave this room in the middle of the discussion to participate in the showcase. Please feel safe to be here until the end.

I would like to have Matt Adams from Blast Theory go first. I myself was involved in presenting Blast Theory's performance at ICC [NTT InterCommunication Center] in 2005, so I am looking forward to hearing what they have been doing since then.

Adams: Thanks a lot, Fumihiko.

I am just going to give a very brief introduction to Blast Theory and to one of our projects in the few minutes that I have got today. Blast Theory is a group of three artists. We are based in Brighton in the UK and we collaborate regularly with the University of Nottingham's Mixed Reality Lab. The Mixed Reality Lab is a group of scientists, an interdisciplinary team looking at the boundaries between real and virtual space.

And the threads in the work that we make, some of the themes that we are trying to explore in the work that we make, certainly over the last ten years, has been around the idea of games and thinking about how games might be considered to be a cultural form and the ways in which we can use games for their artistic possibilities. Games are clearly a significant part of our cultural life, but they are still in their early stages of being thought of on the same level as some of the more mature kind of cultural forms. And we wanted to think about what games might be if we could see them as an art form, not just as an activity.

We have also been very interested in the city and putting work out onto the streets of the city, and trying to think about what it might be if we were to consider the city as a landscape for artistic activity.

And thirdly, we have become very interested in interaction and participation and trying to reconfigure the role of the artist to some degree. We work collaboratively within our group——Ju [Row Farr] and Nick [Tandavanitj] and I——but we also work collaboratively with many partners including the University of Nottingham. We have also become interested in thinking about how we might collaborate with our audiences. My background is in theatre. I am particularly interested in the relationship between a performer and a member of the audience at a particular moment in time at a particular place. For me, those are the four constituent elements of theatre that make it an exciting activity. But over the last ten years, I think we can see a number of changes that pose new questions about how those relationships might be configured, and who we might consider to be an audience member and who we might consider to be a performer is something that might shift considerably over time. It might even shift moment by moment. And those questions have been some of the things that we have explored in some of the work that we have made.

And finally, in terms of the themes of our work, we have become particularly interested in electronic spaces——the rise of the whole set of new devices and technologies that enable us to talk to one another——and what that might then mean for what we can say and how we can say it. To acknowledge that those things are not just positive changes but they bring costs with them, as artists, our job is to try and elucidate and identify and find precise moments to examine some of those shifts and some of those changes. And for me, trust is one of the key questions that sits at the heart of these changes: how we relate to other people around us, in what ways these technologies reconfigure our relationships to other people, and what the social and political possibilities of those changes are.

So today I am just going to talk very briefly about one of our projects. It is called *Rider Spoke*. And it is a work for cyclists. I am just going to give a couple of minutes of introduction to it and then just show a very short piece of video about it. The structure of the work is that members of the public come to the venue, whether it is a theater or a gallery, a museum or somewhere else, and take a bicycle and cycle out into the city at night on their own with a computer attached to the handlebars of their bike. They record answers to questions and get a change to listen to recordings made by other people. And the technology that underpins this work is not GPS or more traditional forms of locative technology but the existing Wi-Fi network of the city. And the map that the riders place their recordings on is built in real time via Wi-Fi networks. So it builds, as a result of that, a very mutable and variable map of the city. It is not a precise map. It is a map that shifts over time as Wi-Fi networks shift and change. And that, in a way, is not only the technology that underpins the work but is the metaphor on which the work rests: the kinds of communication spaces of the city are subject to change and they are ad hoc spaces all of the time.

It uses an internet tablet, and that internet tablet is able to listen to all of the Wi-Fi networks it can see, and use those Wi-Fi networks as a way of defining what it thinks "here" is, enabling recordings to be made in that place. In terms of the interface for the work itself, we were very influenced by a tradition of Mexican votive painting, which is a tradition——it is still very strong in Mexico, particularly in Mexico City——of commissioning a painting to give thanks to one of the saints if you are hoping for something to happen in your life or you want to thank for something that happened in your life. Perhaps you have narrowly escaped misfortune, and you commission a painter who will commemorate that moment and capture that moment. And we looked very much at the tradition of heraldry and sailor tattoos, and these three things are combined in the interface. You see a couple of screen shots from it there. So I am just going to switch now and show a couple of minutes of video from a first presentation of this work. This was filmed in London at the Barbican.

[projection: Rider Spoke]

So, it is just a very brief excerpt, but you can see in *Rider Spoke* that there is a combination between games and theatre in which people are able to go out into the city and make these recordings. And what we are particularly looking at in that work is how we might navigate a new line between the private and the public. People are alone as they cycle, but they make recordings that are for everyone to hear. And the work enables people to speak in their own tone of voice in their own terms about things that are particularly meaningful to them. I am going to stop there. Thank you.

Sumitomo: Thank you. Other projects that use a game as the interface have existed, but I think their projects always, through theatrical narrative, create an excellent system that enables participants to embed their private space into public space. I think this *Rider Spoke*, though I have not participated in it, also does that. I would like to discuss how narrative is employed later, if possible.

I would like to have Duncan Speakman do his presentation next. He has just done his project in which people participate bringing downloaded MP3 data in a shopping district in Ikebukuro yesterday and the day before yesterday. So, Duncan-san, please begin.

Speakman: Thank you. So, I am going to talk a little bit about who I am and the issues I am interested in and the work I make, and then describe quickly the projects I have been showing here: *as if it were the last time*. I am a musician, I think, who is sort of looking at theatre as a different way of composing. I do work with digital media and technology and I am interested in the issues around that, but actually at heart, I think I am in some ways much more a traditional and possibly naive believer in the transformative power of art and the idea that you can make change and you can have some kind of impact.

And one of the things I have been really interested in is how mobile technology and mobile devices are very good at connecting us to remote locations and remote spaces and people far away. But they have a tendency to disconnect us from our immediate environment and the people right next to us. And I, again, in my slightly naive and hippie manner, I kind of think a lot of the problems that we have in numerous situations are down to a lack of observation, a lack of connection. So a lot of my work is about looking at these technologies and looking at how you can rethink them, how you can make them connect people in social spaces, in physical spaces, and in direct proximity.

I am interested in the writing of Michael Bull, who talks about the iPod culture and the Walkman culture, and how the warmer we make our personal spaces——we can sort of isolate ourselves in this personal bubble by putting a pair of headphones on and creating a protective, warm, and soft environment for ourselves——the colder that makes the public space, and the colder and chillier that makes the social space.

I think that we have had the Walkman now for 25 years, and I still do not think we really understand what it means to write music for listening on the move and listening to music and sound works divorced from an acoustic space: not in a concert venue, not at home on your hi-fi, but actually directly into your ears in a different acoustic space, in a city street somewhere, in a field or in a park. So I still think it is actually really valid to keep exploring ways of developing work for these environments to think about how you write music for these environments. And also there is a part of me that thinks there is a chance that in the future we will have nostalgia for that isolation: that opportunity to reshape the city. There is an idea that when you put on a Walkman and you listen to a piece of music it is the listening of elsewhere. It is the listening of another space, another time. And I guess what I am interested in is trying to think about how to write something that actually makes you listen to where you are and makes you focus on what surrounds you.

There is a personal interest for me in that I like putting on pieces of music and listening to a piece of music, seeing how it shapes the environment around me and how it talks about the world around me. At the same time, I am interested in how our culture has become a much more visual culture——we do not listen to the world enough. So I have a constant tension in terms of looking at this work where I want people to actually be out there understanding this really complex acoustic world but at the same time I am putting earphones in their ears so they cannot hear what is going on around them. And I justify this loosely by saying that you cannot appreciate light without darkness. You need to have that moment of being cut off from the world and seeing it in one way so that at the end, when you pull off those earphones and the soundtrack ends, you really drop back into the environment, and hopefully there is a lingering memory of the way you saw it before that makes you really start to appreciate what is there, both acoustically and visually.

In terms of the sort of styles I am working with, although they are definitely theatre or live performances, I actually think I am making cinema. I think I am trying to make films without cameras, I sort of say, rather pretentiously. I use cinematic stylings, cinematic frameworks, and cinematic music in a way with quite traditional assumptions of what a cinematic scene is: the sort of sweeping strings or dramatic moody tones. I have worked with a number of different kinds of technologies. I have sort of worked with similar kind of locative media, but the piece I am showing at the moment, which is what I call a subtlemob, reduces this back down to MP3 players: to what would almost be considered a more traditional technology now.

And there are a couple of reasons for this. One is accessibility and trying to remove a sort of technological fear. Obviously here we have provided MP3s for people, but normally I would expect people to bring their own because there is a certain factor that when you go to engage with a piece of work and you are given something new, you have to deal with that as well: "Is this working? Is this doing what it's supposed to do?" But I want people to be able to engage with the piece directly. So by using their own technology, by using their own MP3 player, they are not thinking about that. They know how it works and what is supposed to happen. They can go straight into the piece.

Subtlemob is a form. I would describe what it is for people who have not taken part of it. A subtlemob is related to a flash mob. And there is a slightly cheap marketing tool to, sort of, play on the name of flash mob. But in some ways it is a sort of reaction to a flash mob. I was making soundwalks that were solo experiences: they were pieces that you listen to on your own dealing with the environment and the space on your own. But I was interested in this shared secret that happens when you see someone else with a pair of headphones on: they know something you do not, they are listening to

something that you are not. And when I was making these walks and sending them out to more than one person at a time, suddenly they were having a connection. They were having a moment where they would see each other. They would both know they were involved in the same art experience. They had the headphones on and they would make a connection in that way. So this, sort of, expanded and I tried it with larger and larger groups of people, and there was this risk that it was becoming a flash mob.

For people who do not know what a flash mob is, that is the sort of thing where everyone will freeze in a train station or everyone will suddenly have a pillow fight somewhere. They are mass events which just happen "spontaneously"——they are organized very quickly and a lot of people turn up and do something. The problem for me with flash mobs, though I do like them, is that they are outward-facing. What happens is that there is a larger audience sees them on YouTube, sees them online, than those who actually participate in the event. And what I was interested in was creating experiences that happen in a place and in a time, and you had to be there, to sort of coin an overused phrase.

So I wanted to make pieces that were very small and "subtle," and referring to what Jude Kelly was saying yesterday about the fact that responses to the scale of urban environments can be tiny gestures, those are the kind of things I am interested in. I am interested in how you can use this soundtrack experience to make and observe tiny interactions between people, whether it is two people shaking hands over a coffee table, whether that is someone resting hands on someone's shoulder. So what happens in a subtlemob is that the audience are invited to download an MP3, arrive at an area of the city, not a specific meeting point but a large, spread-out area, and invited to press "Play" at the same time. The MP3 that they have downloaded, the audio file, divides the audience into two. So there is one half of the audience listening to one MP3 and the other half of the audience listening to the other MP3. And it creates a mirrored experience, where you might be asked to do something——a simple instruction: stand in front of a window, look at your reflection, put your hand on your partner's shoulder. As you are doing this, the other half of the audience is being described the scene as if it were a film scene. So it is being described: "As the camera zooms in, we see a couple. One rests their hand on the other person's shoulder." And it sort of draws you into looking at these moments, and it swaps backwards and forwards. So you sort of move between being a performer and a viewer and you end up in this sort of in-between space——something we will probably come to when we talk about all the different kinds of work we make, when that line between performer and audience starts breaking down.

And I guess the way I think about it in terms of what I am trying to do with these pieces is that when you start observing small moments and you are told to look at that and it is given a soundtrack, suddenly everything that is happening around you and every moment that is happening around you become worthy of observation. Whether that is just members of the public who are passing, you start looking at their interactions, and you really start engaging with the world a lot more, and you start watching it. And for me, it comes back to this idea that I always loved: we do not so much change the world as we just see it through new eyes. And that is where I will stop.

Sumitomo: Thank you. Both of them use locative media or locative technology, but they make it really accessible so that anyone can participate in it. In Duncan-san's piece, we listen to words that have been very carefully chosen and sound almost poetic, and being in the city crowd listening to the soundtrack, we start gradually to listen to our own feelings inside us, feeling as if we are becoming performers, becoming the main characters of the town. The moments where these changes happen were really impressive. Tsukahara-san, Sembo-san, and Akaiwa-san, you did not participate in it, so do you have any question?

Akaiwa: Is it possible that some kind of relationship between the participants and non-participants who are just walking around there is created?

Speakman: There is an intentional moment where you are not sure because the participants are asked to spread out in an area. When they start the piece, they do not know who else is a participant. So what happens is there are moments when you are asked to smile at people, to make connections. And because they do not know who else is an audience member, they may find themselves making that eye contact with somebody who is just walking along with an MP3 player. So those moments become a relationship, and sometimes although I do try to make the experience invisible, in different environments it becomes more visible. And there is one moment in this piece which is a bit of a cheat, where everyone starts dancing, and when we have done it here, there were doormen, bouncers, from bars that joined in and started dancing as well in the street. They did not know what was happening. They just saw people dancing and decided to start dancing as well. So there are those contact moments between strangers who are participating/not participating, and sometimes the public realize something is going on and feel that they can join in and feel that they can participate.

Sumitomo: Ikebukuro is a busy town, so there are many so-called barkers. These people are always watching various people passing by, so they noticed it. That gaze is also interesting.

Akaiwa: So it is possible that they just jump in?

Sumitomo: Yes. They are looking at us and thinking, "What are they doing? They are acting in a weird way."

Sembo: So it creates a kind of uncanny atmosphere?

Sumitomo: I think so. And interactions emerge there.

Akaiwa: When you are told to smile and you smile, someone might smile back because they were smiled at, even if they are not participating.

Sumitomo: Yes, it is possible. Thank you.

OK, I would like to call on Tassos-san for the third presentation. As I said before, he is also going to be doing a showcase of Coney after this.

Stevens: How are you? I am Tassos. I am a co-director and runner of Coney. Coney is an agency of adventure and play. And as everybody keeps saying, I am doing a showcase seminar immediately afterwards, at noon in a room in the basement. So I am not going to duplicate too much here what I am going to be doing there. And down there, I am going to be talking about some other pieces.

Coney is rather prolific. We make quite a lot of stuff, and there is quite a lot I could talk about, so I want to focus now quickly on some of the relevant pieces and thinking about making adventures and play in a city, in public space, and probably touching very much on the themes and thinking that certainly Matt and Duncan so far and I think the Japanese artists as well share. I think we have got very much in common in our approach.

A little bit about Coney: Coney is an agency of adventure and play. What does that mean? It means we make live interactive play, "live" meaning that it is responsive to you and to the place in which you find yourself. And it talks and listens to you: the audience. And it is all about you. You are it. The story happens wherever you are. And you have the opportunity to take a leading role in that. Part of the game of Coney is that we are led by Rabbit, which might be this, or also might be this. I will talk more about Rabbit in my 12:00 seminar.

Coney uses digital technology quite a lot because the experience of the event for the audience is wherever they happen to be. So in order to make that journey possible, to make it go all the way through, we are using digital technology to communicate with them, and to play, and to bring them into the story wherever they are. Now, the important feature about digital is not that it is high-tech. That is a big mistake. It needs to be accessible. It needs to be something that people can use wherever they are without any explanation because we have no control over that. So we use the simplest possible forms: stuff that my mom could use. And this digital infrastructure means that we can bring people into the work that is happening in any place. The panel was talking yesterday about flash mobbing, but that is just a tool to gather an audience together.

There was an adventure called *NTT* that Rabbit led in and around about the National Theatre in London. And the playing audience, for the finale, were assembled on the north bank of the river facing the National. They were waiting for a signal. They did not know what that would be. They happened to be in the perfect place to see a gigantic illuminated sign on the front of the building that normally advertises the plays suddenly changing into a message from Rabbit, leading them into the adventure.

The National Theatre is a public institution with an architecture that reflects that role. It is an architecture that is used by people in particular ways. We spent a while observing what the building is and how it is used by people and looking for its affordance for adventure. Now, the word "affordance" is something I knew years ago from perception psychology. It is also used in interaction design. It is all the uses and properties of an object or an event or a place: everything that it affords you to do, not just the ones that it was designed for. Sometimes they can be surprising. You find them through playing with it, and you can make play with those.

So, with the National, the earlier part of it was a little adventure that Rabbit sent people into. And we made this by finding the most exciting way to enter the building. So people found a little concrete symbol that we had concreted into the pavement outside the building. They ring a phone. They get a message which leads them down into the car park. Car parks are very exciting places. They are anything-can-happen places. They are dangerous places. You find your way into the lifts going through a very spooky door. Go all the way up to the top. Suddenly you see the view. And you are in these top floors of the building, which, we observed, are not used during the day. They are empty. Everybody in the building goes and has coffee downstairs. These floors are only used when the play is coming in and out. So they are wonderful because you can get lost. You are by yourself and feel that you are on this secret adventure. People would explore these before going down eventually into the bookshop, and they have instruction to find these out-of-date leaflets about the history of the building, and to pay for it, but when they paid for it, to wink at the person behind the counter and say, "I'd like this gift-wrapped, please." And they would go, "Oh, certainly, sir," and come back with a package that contained what I will tell you later.

By having an adventure in the building, about the building, using the building, we can transform the way that people felt inside that place and the way that they perceived the building. It was really important that we used the reality of the building and its people in the story and the adventure. We wrote the least possible fiction, the least necessary story to make this, and used as much as

possible what was already there. And I think this is, kind of, part of what Duncan was talking about the in-between spaces: you do not know what is real and what is the fiction. The authorship is obscured, and it means that everything can be part of it and perceptions of your place that you find yourself in are heightened and transformed. You are suddenly listening with all your senses, like at maximum volume. Eventually the rabbit led along the banks of the Thames on Valentine's night. A player wrote afterwards that the most memorable moment was meeting a busker there. He was playing the Nirvana song *Smells like Teen Spirit* on a banjo. And they were almost certain that something that was so unusual and beautiful must have been part of the adventure. It was not. But even as they wrote that they were almost certain. Not definitely certain. Almost. That uncertainty that is present is what is transformative.

Valentine happened on the banks of the Thames, happened in public space. *NTT* happened in a public building that was readily accessible to anyone as long as they do not cause trouble. Public spaces in cities are being rapidly encroached by corporate space——private land that is owned by corporations who then determine the uses of that space. When Rabbit returns later this year, it is likely to be an adventure called *The Green* that will explore public and corporate spaces, finding the cracks in the architecture where greenery grows and the cracks in the virtual architecture of communications where liveness happens. It is something that will start and first take place in London, but then it could happen in cities all over the world.

Here is something about cities that interests me. Cities grow in similar ways. So even though they look very different, there are commonalities too. And they may be uncontrollable as we talked about yesterday, but it is not without underlying principles. Cities tend to develop in ways that we can understand, and we can find common things amongst the differences. As an example, which was the only thing I could think of this morning when I wrote this, big cities are often on rivers, often by the sea. The areas near the docks will have been poor, with migrant communities refreshing every generation, unless the docks should fall into disrepair, when they will have been first transformed by artists, who always hunt for cheap space, and then by estate agents, who also always hunt for cheap space. And then that area is transformed. And in all the different cities I have been to all over the world, there are places like this. But they are all different at the same time. And buildings too. Institutional theaters, train stations, petrol stations, hotels——all over the world they have so much in common, wherever they are. They have similar affordance for adventure and play wherever they are.

And neighborhoods. There is a little piece that Coney made in collaboration with myself and Annette Mees in London, with an artist called Hey Fan who was based in Beijing. We have never met Hey Fan in the real world, but we have met him over Skype. And the piece is called *Hutong*. *Hutong* is this: it is this red rectangle. That is the piece. You place it on a map of your neighborhood, wherever you are, at a scale of your choosing. And you must walk the perimeter of the red rectangle in your neighborhood as best you can, looking out for landmarks along the way. A place of books, a temple, a clock, happiness. These are the landmarks that Fan saw when he made the first *Hutong* journey around the neighborhood of Beijing that is itself called Hutong. And following other directions, on the south side, acknowledge all the dogs that you meet. On the east side, go into a café that you have never been in before. Ask the server what is their favorite hot drink and then have that. And anyone anywhere in the world can do their own *Hutong*. This is one that somebody made in Edinburgh. And as you do it, it makes you see the place in which you live in a different way, to make connections with strangers in strange places across the world, the beauty and the mundanity of everyday life, commonality and difference, the affordance of a place.

I am very interested in how, generally speaking, the same pieces can be remade in different places, and remade in a way that they themselves have commonalities but are responsive continually to the different places in which they find themselves and the different people who are doing them. Thank you.

Sumitomo: Thank you. What Coney is doing, perhaps, is something that could be especially interesting when their projects are moving in different cities as in the case of Beijing and through site-specificity in different places. Sembo-san, Akaiwa-san, Tsukahara-san, do you have any question about Coney's projects?

Tsukahara: I thought that project was a very good program for discovering unexpected spaces spontaneously through the ideas of adventure or play in the space called "city" which expands whether consciously or unconsciously. Foe example, the pleasure we have by participating in *Hutong* and its game can be repeated without a game after that. In other words, it newly provokes a sense that we have lost, which I think is an element that was also in other presentations. I think maybe we used to do that kind of things in our childhood, and these projects are filled with that kind of joy.

I would like to ask if there have been examples that participants started to do something by themselves after taking part in these projects or workshops. I want ask this question because we have also been doing similar things by ourselves. For example, when we went to Helsinki, we kept walking in the underground passages for a month. In Helsinki, there are a lot of very deep car parks some of

which are also nuclear shelters, and in winter, you can walk underground from this building to that building or from this mall to that mall. There are also tunnels that are under construnction, and we just went into them without permission in the darkness. We played like that, and if there are examples that participants who had experienced the rules started to develop something by themselves, I would like to hear about that.

Sumitomo: Are there that kind of people in your audience, Tassos-san?

Stevens: It is highly possible. I think what you meant is that if people do these things enough, then they start to make their own discoveries. And maybe the nature of it is that if they find them themselves, then you, the artist, will not hear about them.

I mean none of this is new, you know, everything has been done before. And I am reminded of the situationists' "dérive [drift]" which is, as I understand it probably wrongly, kind of to go for a walk in a place and just have your eyes wide open like a kind of wide-angle view and to respond to wherever that kind of periphery leads you. So you are kind of being followed by your nose and you find surprising things. And I think that there is a kind of a mindset and an attitude that comes more through play that people discover for themselves, and surely they will be finding their own things.

As we make these things, the period of observation is really important. And there are things that we are discovering then that we did not imagine. There is one point in *NTT* where we had not had time to put something in a place, but then the players went into this place and they found something that we had not seen, because they looked up. People very rarely look up in a room. I do not know how many of you have clocked the ceiling in this room. You might want to do it now, because there might be a hole in the ceiling. That is what we did not do in the space. There was a huge hole in the ceiling that players found, and they found things inside it. So I mean there are always surprises present.

Speakman: Can I respond very quickly to that? I really like that thing about you can enjoy it without the game. And I think one of the really beautiful things about these works is that they linger in a way that works within a venue or a gallery space quite often do not linger, because you will go back to that street and that place that you played the game and that memory stays with you. I am not saying that galleries are bad, but it is one of the strengths.

And about the idea that nothing is new, I think it is really important to remember that because I think there is a myth of innovation. And there is an idea that everything you do, especially when you are working with games and technology, has to be an entirely new form. What I am doing has been done before, but I do it with a different aesthetic. Some of the games that Tassos is making are quite traditional game formats, but there is an aesthetic and there is a thinking, and we can sort of get better at doing these things. We do not have to reinvent a game every time. We can just do it better in the same way that people develop styles of painting, but it is still painting.

Tassos: I think as well that it is important that there is a commonality about the subtlety and the fact that we are finding the least possible fiction with the game, because the game, the action, is so tiny and so detailed and belonging in the place so much that when that is removed, then there is still this lingering. I think that is very important.

Sumitomo: Thank you. So, we just want to change the seating a little bit because we would like to ask the two of exonemo to come over here to make a presentation next. Tsukahara-san then follows. I notice that we now have a bigger audience, so I would just give an idea of what we are going to do. Presentations by the three artists from the UK have just been finished, so we are going to hear from the two groups of Japanese artists, and the panel will discuss all the presentations. Then I would like to invite questions and comments from the floor. I expect your active participation. So exonemo-san, please begin.

Sembo: Hello, we are exonemo. We two have been working together, and in our early stage, we presented our works only on the internet. Since around 2000, we have also been doing installations that connect galleries in the real space and works on the internet. I would like to talk about some of them, which actually used city locations, because they are relevant to the theme of this seminar.

She suddenly started to tell me that we should talk about this or that work in the course of this discussion, and I am kind of at a loss. Should I begin with this one?

Akaiwa: Let's start with that one.

Sembo: This is an installation we did in Nimes, France, utilizing city locations. I would like to explain about it showing the video. Nimes is a town in southern France, a resort-like place with nice atmosphere with old structures and stone pavements. It is like a tourist place for French people. We made four photo booths in the town, with which you could take a photo of your face and print it out. It is like prikura, but the system is a bit different from normal prikura. It is easy to take a photo: you need only to place your face in the frame and press the button. It will be printed out automatically. However, it is not a normal photo. Only a part of your face is printed: it is a fragment of your face. You bring this photo to the other booths, one by one, to layer four photos, and then your face is completed like collecting pieces of a jigsaw puzzle. So you have to walk around the town to visit the four

places to complete your face.

This project has this game element with the system and the mission to complete your face, but at the same time, you have to walk through the town if you want to complete the photo. Another element is that you sightsee and explore the town to find the photo booths, so it is a kind of dual structure where you have to complete yourself and you have to explore the town.

Sumitomo: Were the terminals mainly located in these kinds of public spaces?

Sembo: Well, that depends. One was in a lobby of a theater, this one was in this shopping mall, and that one was at the end of a corridor in an art school. So they could be located somewhere normally people would not enter.

Human beings love themselves, don't they? They love their own face, for example. So they are very much interested in completing the face, and by doing that, they automatically engage in the town. And, though this was not our intention, people formed a long line at a booth because the printing process was quite slow, which made them communicate like, "How was it going?" "Yeah, I made it." That was also interesting.

And this game of collecting pieces of a face was not what it was all about. These pieces were sent to the internet and stored. In the night, various fragments of the faces photographed during the day were amalgamated or mixed and projected on the wall of an old structure in the middle of the town with a big projector. Not really like the "Lucky Laugh" game, but many faces that do not belong to anyone are generated automatically.

Sumitomo: Is that completely random?

Sembo: Yes. Randomly shuffled and generated. Our intention was that although people would participate with various personal interest during the day, these personal elements would be rid and everything would become anonymous in the night. The eyes, noses and mouths of people who are in the town get together in the night creating anonymous faces. So there were two layers in this project. We thought we need both of these levels to make it our work, or to make it interesting. So this is the first one we wanted to introduce.

Akaiwa: Why don't we talk about *The Road Movie* next?

Sembo:We did a project called *The Road Movie*. We only have photos of it. There was an art project called MobLab that toured across Japan for three weeks. A few artists brought their projects in it like doing a live performance at some places in the route, and this is the project we brought in.

We attached webcams to the four sides and the top of the bus, and they take a photo every five minutes. So the landscape around the bus that is moving is taken in every five minutes. The landscapes are stored as logs on the internet and they form patterns for origami. This is one of the origami patterns. This is GPS information on the Google Maps, which is constantly plotted on the internet. If you see it on the internet and click it, you can download the pattern at the moment at home. You can print it out and make an origami piece. This is what it is like.

Webcams are seeing the landscape through the wall or window of the internet, and we wanted to make it possible to recreate it as a real three-dimensional space at home. This intensifies reality than seeing things through a webcam, or this enables you to sneak into further space. We joined the tour, and what was interesting for us was that people had made origami pieces of the route of the bus and an installation had been made with the pieces by various people when we arrived at a destination.

Sumitomo: Did they make that before your bus arrived?

Sembo: Yes. They had folded the origami patterns and had made an installation out of that or origami workshops had been held. The bus is moving in the real space, and there is a point of view that follows the bus on the internet, and then the experience spreads horizontally. You can actually fold origamis, and that can come back to the reality. Indeed, when we arrived at the destination, the origamis were there. The axis of connection between the internet and the reality is not vertical but can be horizontal or diagonal.

Sumitomo: You do not know who are looking at it, but when you arrive, you know who were and what they were doing. You encounter.

Sembo: Yes. That kind of process was reflecting the nature of the internet and was interesting. Was that in 2006?

Akaiwa: I think that was in 2005. We were not always riding in the bus. We just rode half of the route. I presumed that I would strongly feel myself traveling when riding the bus because I would actually be moving. However, because myself in the bus was always the center, the feeling of traveling was stronger when I looked at the GPS information and downloaded the patterns and folded origamis at home than when I was riding in the bus. I felt the positions shifting and had a strong feeling of traveling. I do not know how to explain that.

Sumitomo: Probably there was a reversal in terms of the sense of moving between those who were at home and those who were moving.

Akaiwa: Yes. Reversal. The participants were also able to ride in the bus, but people who were participating through the virtual space strangely had a stronger feeling of traveling.

Sembo: You look at the current position, and it could be

between mountains. You zoom in and maybe find the bus stopping at a service area. You call someone in the bus on the phone and say "You're at the service area, aren't you?" and they go, "Why do you know?" This kind of interaction happened. I think when you are actually moving on a highway and stopping at a service area, you do not intensely feel you are traveling. But spotting the bus in the map from the bird's-eye view and knowing that the bus is at this position in this mountain and the surrounding is like this gives you more intense feeling of tripping.

Akaiwa: The feeling that we were creating our own trip imagining from less information than actually being there was intersting.

Sembo: I would like to introduce one more project briefly. We made an iPhone application last year. We transplanted our old work to an iPhone application. That was called *Fragmental Storm*, which was originally for playing on a PC. You type a keyword, and it searches for the word on the internet and automatically makes collages using the pictures and words that are found. We made an iPhone version of this program with the same system, but iPhone can obtain its own position information via GPS. We added this function to the program. Normally, for example, if you type "skateboard," relevant pictures are made into collages on the screen. But with this function called "Location Sync," an address is generated from the GPS coordinate data, and pictures and words found through searching with the address are added to the collages.

We just thought it would be interesting to utilize the locative function of iPhone, and actually, if you play this on a train, the data are constantly updated and information such as you are in Ebisu or Shibuya changes the images constantly. This accelerates the sense of moving, which I did not realize until actually playing it. With this device, looking at the screen where information is constantly moving, we have even more intense reality of awareness about location than when we are just normally moving. I thought the subtlemob might be like this in a sense, listening to his presentation.

Sumitomo: Everyone moves or places oneself in the city in their daily lives, but this kind of tool makes us realize what we do not usually realize.

Sembo: Yes. It makes us realize, with stronger reality. I do not know if that reality is the right reality or not, and that might be amplified, but that makes us realize. I think appearance of this kind of device has broadened chances for various approaches to that.

Sumitomo: Akaiwa-san, do you have anything to add? OK? Thank you. So we are going to have the last presentation. Tsukahara-san, can you do it there?

Tsukahara: I can do it here. I just want the photos to be randomly shown on the screen, and I do not have video material. Hello. I am doing contact Gonzo, which is something that appears to be an unit——we rather call it a methodology——and the other members could not come today, so I am going to be talking on behalf of them. Compared to the other presentations, what we are doing is overwhelmingly low-tech. So I wondered why on earth I was invited to be one of the panel members in the beginning. But I gradually understood why, or I have become able to make up a context on my own. So I will try to make my explanation about our activity relevant to other presentations and the context of this seminar.

I started this in 2006 with a dancer Masaru Kakio, who has left us now. I was working full-time producing, planning and managing contemporary dance performances and workshops, at a small theatre with 100 seats. I met the dancer Kakio there, and that led us to the activity of contact Gonzo.

Listening to the presentations, I was very much impressed by the fact that they are trying to create rules, or to reinterpret or play with the rules or the systems of the city. I think what they are doing is not to express a hatred of pressure from this huge thing called city but to positively overcome it through actively engaging with it and playing with it.

I was impressed by that because, although I had considered contemporary dance the most flexible form in theatre arts where everything as it is could be artistic expression, I thought it had its own system as well and there were shared implicit rules and manners for making a contemporary dance piece. Of course some artists make a different use of the rules, or modify or play with them. But I felt most artists just follow the rules to make something that can be considered contemporary dance. I was dissatisfied with that tendency, so honestly speaking, I was always irritated when organizing and producing workshops in the job and I thought I would never be a participant of these workshops.

Kakio was the most interesting artist that I met in the job. So we thought we should do something, and we simply left the theater or the system of contemporary dance. The range of his ideas was wide, so it was not difficult to make that decision. In the beginning, we went to a park in autumn, and with a video camera, I shot Kakio dashing to catch a falling autumn leaf. We did it at many parks involving many locations, an old man with a dog, a person on a wheelchair, and various people.

Based on this experience, one day, Kakio suggested that we should try to contact. I still think that contact between a person and another person is the simplest information, and we though we should try that. So we borrowed a method of dance called contact improvisation. Kakio just dropped in a workshop and we modified the method he

brought back at a park. We did not have money to use a studio, and anyway we were not doing that to be able to do something in a studio. So we did contact improvisation rolling on the ground at night in a park, and people were staring at us. Kakio was fond of martial arts, and one day he said "Instead of loosely contacting, let's hit." So we hit and kicked each other and jumped, and repeated that at different places. We finally invented something weird, and if we called it contact improvisation, contact improvisation people would have got angry. So we named it contact Gonzo.

The name contact Gonzo was chosen because we thought the name should be ambiguous and at the same time to some degree an expression of the idea, to make a framework with which we would be able to everything that we wanted to do. We wanted to be naturally able to modify the rules that we made. The rules were based on the idea that we stole, so we had to be able to further modify them. So we first of all carefully chose an ambiguous name, but we also wanted it to be expressing what it is like somehow.

I had never participated in workshops and had never had artistic education of course, so I had to have my first motivation as an effort toward invention of play. I did not know any artistic methodology, so we just uploaded videos in which we hit each other at a train station, in mountains or other places to YouTube, because we felt there were potential companions. For example, the way skateboarding people are connected is useful for me: if you see their video, you immediately understand how fun it can be only by attaching rollers on a board. We wanted to do that kind of thing as a contact Gonzo version, a people-hitting-each-other version.

And we have been hoping from the beginning that someone steal, modify and enjoy our methodology although no one has done that yet. So we do not really want to do things like workshops because we do not want people to follow our rules as rules. Our attitude is more like "Use this to do something by yourselves."

That is why I think the kind of format that allows people to do something by themselves before the bus arrives, as Sembo-san explained, is a good format. I want to be challenged by people who have stolen and modified our methodology, and I really want to challenge back the modified and improved contact Gonzo, which may not be contact Gonzo anymore. In a process of evolution of some kind of movement, the biggest factor that contributes to the evolution should be mistakes, errors and misunderstandings. Something intense can be born from that, and I think the only way or reason we continue to work is to ask ourselves how the original can overcome it.

I was thinking about these things listening to the presentations. For instance, I suppose rules are necessary for a game or a game is a game because the rules exist, but I think the question is how the users or participants set the rules. The rules can be ambiguous so that they allow errors to happen, or they can be reduced to the minimum rules without which nothing can be done. There must be many ways to design rules. They can be either narrative or anti-narrative. They can be about how to understand a town. Their methods appeared to be totally opposite, but the fact that everyone is thinking about their methods that way interested me very much and I think I have learnt a lot from that.

Sumitomo: Can you show the YouTube clips?

Tsukahara: If we connect to the internet... no, there is no connection.

Sumitomo: Then, since we also would like to open discussion to the floor, please just search for "contact Gonzo" in YouTube later. As Tsukahara-san said, a lot of performances that were done in non-theater spaces without providing information about the performances to anyone have been uploaded. Someone might see one of these clips, and they might discover that there are people doing this kind of thing. That is how the activities of him and the members have been like.

Tsukahara-san also talked about participants and rules, and today we have many people whose works can be accessed in the forms of a game or play. I think these kinds of forms allow people who have not been familiar to theatre or art to participate. In these people's habits, there might be no conventions about participation or relation to theatre. I was interested as well in the capacity of these works for participation of these people.

I would like to invite questions or comments from the floor now. And yes, there is a hand up.

Andy Field: Hi. Thank you very much. I just wanted to first say thank you very much to all of you. Those were really, really fascinating conversations. I had a question for everybody about sort of the limits of scale in this work, especially in the relationship to, sort of, mass activism and mass protest. I am not sure what the situation is like in Japan, but in the UK, I think there is somewhat of a crisis in the way that we protest. Hundreds and hundreds of thousands of people marched on London against the war in Iraq and it had no effect. And in fact we were banned for a long time from protesting in the center of London. All of you have discussed the really interesting ways in which you are transforming the relationship that people have with the city and with the other people living in the city, but all of you are talking on a quite small and intimate scale. And I wondered whether in all your cases you thought that was implicit and necessary——that scale in your work——or whether it might be scaled up onto the much larger scales and therefore potentially be a way of reanimating mass protest and massive events on the

scale of hundreds of thousands of people.

Sumitomo: I was reminded of what Duncan said. He said the rise of mobile technologies has been making us disconnected from the closest people, and I guess that is somehow relevant to that question. Does anyone want to respond to that?

Stevens: I think that there are many different ways to scale up to mass. And sometimes that might be like an individual action that is repeated hundreds and thousands of times in different places. There are so many ways... I mean in a way, the answer is almost to look at what happens in life. You look at a crowd of people, and that is an organism which is made of thousands of people who are doing their own thing. And yet there are also very simple rules of interaction that they might not even be aware of. And if we can build up works following a similar principle, where you are doing your own thing but then you are able to have kind of contact with like three people who are near you, that might then be a way to make something that a crowd can do. It is like, you know, if you try to choreograph a group of dancers, like a flock of birds, you cannot do that in detail by blocking to minor detail. You have to give each a set of instructions to follow. Follow the person in front of you, whatever they are doing. Make sure that whoever is in front and that you are following them. And then suddenly people will move like a flock of starlings. And I think it is in these kinds of bottom-up emergence approaches and by looking at what is already in life that we will find ways to scale it. But it is a really important question.

Adams: Can I add something to that? I think there are perhaps two ways of looking at the kind of question that you raise. One is about just taking the kinds of experiences that we have and moving them to scale. And I think that is possible. It is just something that you have to think about at the very outset. We are doing a project for Channel Four's Education Department at the moment. They are a TV broadcaster in the UK that is designed for a quarter of a million people. As long as you think right at the very first moment that it has to work for a quarter of a million people, then you can start to work in that way.

But I think that the other thing about politics is, of course, about how art can deal with politics in ways that other things cannot. And when you march against the war in Iraq, the level of articulation that you have around that issue is to join with the other people and follow the person in front of you. It is a very mute form of protest, but a powerful one when done at that scale. You should also look to art to be able to give you incredibly rich and detailed and precise and potentially life-changing political exchanges or experiences. That may be at a smaller scale, but the impact is much greater because of that. Perhaps that live performative moment where you are brought together with a very small number of people put you into a position to think about that. We made a piece last year called *Ulrike and Eamon Compliant*, which ends up with each individual member of the public having an interview with one of us in a room. And that is precisely about looking at your political identity on a one-to-one basis. So the scale is minute but hopefully the impact is potentially greater.

Speakman: I would like to follow up that because I think that one of the things in terms of talking about it as protest or as message when you scale up to that size of protest and join that group and you are following that person——and it is, as you say, a mute protest but quite a powerful one——is who you are actually trying to make that statement towards. If you are trying to generate that mass protest to essentially speak to the rest of the public in a way, I think the problem with the mass protest is the binary reaction. The reaction is either: "OK, there's a big statement. I agree with that" or "Hold it. There's a big protest. I don't really agree with that." And the one-to-one intimate situation allows you to have slightly more engagement and your response to be a little more varied. As a maker, you can think, "OK. I'm trying to engineer a specific question in people. I'm trying to make people ask a specific question," and rather than just showing them, "This is the question I want you to ask with a hundred thousand people. I want you to think about what these hundred thousand people are doing," it really is that one-to-one moment possibly like the conversation at the end of that piece, "I want you to ask this. I want you to think about this question. But I'm not going to tell you that there's a hundred thousand other people who've decided this or that you should respond one way or the other."

I think it is not implicit that we have to do the small gestures, but I think, for me, I am kind of interested in the small gestures because it allows that flexibility.

Tsukahara: I have something to say about it. Roughly speaking, I guess there are two issues in the question: mass and protest. About mass, I think everyone in the panel is working on it on a very small scale or individual level. I think we are doing that too. That is some kind of sense, inspiration, or idea that anyone can have or already has. I think it is possible to immediately become mass, and to become one, two, three as well. Depending on what kind of motivation or trigger is there, the levels can change quickly, I think.

About protest, I think every art form contains some kind of protest. Paradoxically speaking, as Kai-san said yesterday, the city is a system and it does designs in order to make people live safe and comfortable lives. These designs are for leading, and I think what everyone in the panel has been doing is to reinterpret, play with, destroy, or have a new eye on, the methodology. However, their purpose is not protest itself. I think they are seriously

looking for the sense of play that we used to have in our childhood through sneaking into a building or that kind of plays. Maybe you find that sense beyond a fence, and then you interfere with the system as a result. I think, through finding fun in something dangerous——for example, there is a fence at the top of this hill because the hill is dangerous, but it must be fun to roll down the hill——we, as a result, protest against something.

Sembo: The themes of our works are different in terms of politics, but I guess politics is something that is common in hundreds of thousands or millions of people. And it happens at once, like a war happens. I guess movements emerge at once that way, but what we are dealing with is more about awareness and unawareness of small individual senses, and these things happen at different moments for each individual. So I think extending the scale to something huge at once may be difficult. We indeed have limitations such as the fact that only people who come to the gallery can experience our work, and there are similar limitations in an iPhone application, the internet or YouTube, but these things allow you to have an experience whenever you like. So, even if our works probably cannot immediately have public visibility or become a huge movement, I think our works can be quite big in the form of individual experiences.

Sumitomo: Anybody else, questions or comments?

Danielle Wilde: Yeah, hi. My name is Danielle Wilde. I'm from Australia, currently based in Tokyo. I had a comment, I think. I am not sure if it is actually a question, and it came out of two things. Matt, when you started talking, when you showed the video of *Rider Spoke*, I was incredibly touched by just how intensely personal and intimate it was and the kind of information that it feels like it is a privilege to access about other people: this extraordinary intimacy that working on that personal level especially in public spaces can generate.

And in a way that sits alongside what my original comment was, Tsukahara-san, when I saw contact Gonzo in the presentation you did——I don't know if it was yesterday or the day before——something very interesting happened for me. My background is performance. I am an interaction designer, but I have always worked with performance and performativity. And it was very exciting for me because for the first time in a very long time, I sat in an unusual state of attention throughout the entire performance. And I felt like everybody on stage was in total control and they were completely safe, and at the same time there was a sense of extraordinary danger. Operating on that line between safety and danger, it was like the state of terror that the American director Anne Bogart speaks about as important for theater: sitting on the edge of your seat and, kind of, forgetting to breathe.

You spoke about your soul mate who was interested in doing this in the beginning, and I feel like the framing of performance is somehow, is what helps to keep it safe. When other people come into it and when it is being done in public, does it move from the intimacy that you share as people that work together into something else? How do we relate to these kind of spaces that have the potential for extreme danger, like a cyclist being alone with a computer on their bike? I lived in London, and if the seat was not chained to my bike it would be gone when I got back. So riding through the darkened city with a computer on the bike, there is a level of danger to that. I think it is more just a general question about the importance of having danger and the importance of allowing and creating space for intimacy, and how we kind of navigate the human propensity towards violence when given the possibility, but also operating in that space which is "art," which is this kind of interesting "art"-with-a-small-"a" space that was raised yesterday. Thank you.

Tsukahara: Responding to that, our performances are said to be violent, and we surely understand that they appear to be. However, if an action of hitting is violent, we are also doing an action of being hit. I am——and probably other members too——concentrating more on what to do when being hit than hitting. I concentrate on reactions.

As I said before, there is the notion that dangerous things are interesting, of course. And we want to see the edge of, kind of how far we can go——what the area of being able to be safe and go home and eat something is.

However, exactly as you said, it is true that we are in a very safe situation. We notice this and that position is dangerous as soon as we go there, and how to cope with that is implicitly shared among the members. And knowing that, sometimes I deliberately push someone to there and he reacts to that because he also knows that position is dangerous. How hard I push him, as I said, is very simple information, and because we share a lot of information by just touching, I think we have been able to avoid serious injuries.

There is also a different kind of, non-violent kind of dangers. Before starting something like contact Gonzo, I and Kakio constantly climbed mountains. We were of course amateurs, so we went to a mountain without enough tools and climbed vertical rock cliffs that were four or five meter high. Sometimes we were scared, and I think that experience is functioning now. There is a limit that you cannot climb even if you want to. Sometimes we were only fidgeting at a height for thirty minutes, and sometimes we played too much there and mistook the route, wandering until it became dark and almost being lost in the mountain. We felt we were in a very dangerous situation, but we shared that sense and said "Let's climb a

bit more" when either one was about to give up.

And we experienced how safe we feel when finally standing on a flat asphalt road. I think these experiences are indirectly related to ideas that instantly come to us on the edge. When we are able to avoid something by a small twist, we enjoy that very much. Maybe this was rough or weird response to your question, though.

Adams: Just quickly, if I may, Duncan, before you speak. So, thank you, Danielle, for your comment. I think you are absolutely right to talk about this line between danger and fragility. And it is interesting that in live performance there is always terror on the side of the performers, you know, the moment before you step on stage is always an extremely, sort of, peak moment. And you are then looking to just find a kind of language of performance that enables the audience to be aware of that tension and then make use of it. I mean in terms of *Rider Spoke* that you referred to, it is kind of interesting that there is, to use an old showbiz term, a kind of triple threat. First, you are going out cycling at night on your own with a piece of valuable equipment on your handlebars, and that in itself is scary. But also, secondly, you have these people who participate. It is a very high threshold of participation and interaction, where people do not know what they are going to do. They have very little information about what they are going to be up to for an hour. So you have to have this huge threshold to participate. And then thirdly, you are going to be speaking. You become a performer yourself. So this kind of terror all comes into play. I think the ideal situation in live performance is that you can harness that terror——it is maybe not a terror but a kind of ambivalent fear, a kind of hovering possibility of disaster——for artistic ends.

I unfortunately missed the contact Gonzo piece, but I can kind of really get that sense from hearing your comments and other people who saw it and really enjoyed it that that was part of what was going on. It becomes an engine——an artistic engine——that actually has a sort of semantic force, because when you are nervous or put on edge, a door opens to a slightly different way of being and a slightly different possibility. And when that is really working, that is what artistic experience can do. It lets you into a slightly different space, and a certain anxiety is part of that. And I am sure Tassos and Duncan would be able to testify that people who go into their works probably have very similar levels of heightened fear about going into an interactive environment.

Speakman: I mean in that terms of danger, I went to——I think it was at Futuresonic [currently FutureEverything]——a piece by Blast Theory, *Uncle Roy All Around You*. And when I was given the device, I was very clearly told that if someone tried to take it off me I should give it to them because it was insured and I was not.

I think when you do a performance, an event, a game in a public space, there still is a level of audience's response that says, "OK, this environment is being made OK for me. It's being made the theatre space. The show is going to start. I'm going to be able to wander around and do stuff, and it's all great. And then I'm going to leave it." And sometimes there is a responsibility of the artist or the maker to actually remind people, "No, that's the real world. We don't control the real world. We've set up something and we've done as many things as possible to make it safe because generally we don't want our audience dead or injured."

There is that sort of sense of responsibility that comes when you have a setup and you are saying, "OK, it begins now and it ends." There is a thing that Tassos has said before: "A Coney experience ends when you stop thinking about it." And I think that is really important because that sort of opens it up to saying, "Yeah, you're in the world while you're doing this, and you're carrying on in the world afterwards. And in both those environments, you've got to deal with it as you would as a human being." And one of the reasons I have tried to take out the venue part of the subtlemob, saying just download it and turn up, is that that stops people thinking that it has been set up for them. It says, "Turn up in a part of the city and do this. We're not there. We're not even involved. So you've got to take full responsibility for your actions."

I have made works in performance space in Sydney where people came back afterwards and said, "Well, we thought that was very bad. You sent us through a very dangerous street." And it is interesting that there was no point where I said, "You have to do this, and this street is safe." I suggested, "This is the route I have made and this is the sound for this street, but it's up to you to take on that personal decision of whether you walk there." I did not think it was a dangerous street, though.

Um, but I think it is the responsibility of the artist or the maker to say, "OK, I'm going to put people into an environment. Do I want them to be aware of the fact that that's the real world?" I just think it is how you frame it, in a way. It is whether you want people to feel safe or feel that extra element of threat. I think part of it is actually interesting to give them that edge and say, "No. Feel it. It's Manchester," or "Evelyn Street" or wherever.

Stevens: I was thinking that it comes back to the rules as you read what is going on in the situation in the moment. And it is the uncertainty alone sometimes that can cause anxiety and excitement. Again, I regret not having seen contact Gonzo, but because of what could be seen as the extreme action if you saw it in any other context, you would have a very different reading of what is going on in this situation. What are the rules here? What would the responsibilities be that you would have? Then those are kind of placed within a space which is safe and with a

signifier that says, "This is performance." But if you encountered that on the street, then that would be very different. And in some ways, perhaps then the responsibility of the work is to be sensitive to the different changes of where you are, and to be open to the ongoing negotiation the audience is always making in their mind about what is happening here, like, "Do I understand this?" And as soon as there is uncertainty, that can be exhilarating. That can also be like quite paralyzing. And people are always looking to determine, kind of, just what is going on here. And I think that is something that is very interesting.

It does not have to be extreme action. I did a small role in a piece by Shunt, who are a very important London performance group. You entered through a door in the wall in a Tube station, and you kind of went in and there was seemed to be no way out. You seemed to be in a cleaning cupboard of a Tube station. You had passed through somebody tearing tickets, so there was a signifier of, "You're in a theatre space." And this space that you were in was manned by a railway worker, who kind of ignored you. And you looked around and you could not see any way out. And then finally when you were just panicking, the railway worker, who was me, would kind of notice you and go, "Oh, sorry. The theatre show. You've got to just go through the locker." And you would open the door to the locker, and then through there, there was a little tunnel that kind of led into the next space. And the rules in which those two spaces of the Tube station and the theatre show were kind of superimposed on top of each other were really delicate, and it was best when it was very sensitive and very much in negotiation with the audience in that moment.

Sumitomo: Well, everyone is very eloquent, so I do not have to do anything. Although I notice that we are running out of time, we can still receive a couple of comments or questions if any.

Sembo: May I? Earlier, Tsukahara-san was saying that he wanted people to steal their method when they uploaded videos to YouTube. And I think there are two things in a subtlemob: the form in which participants play and listen to the sound in the city, and the contents that participants actually listen to. Which is more important for you? For instance, other people can do something with totally different contents using only the frame of a subtlemob. Is that OK? Do you see it as your work including that possibility? I wonder what you think about this kind of thing.

Sumitomo: Duncan-san, would you like to answer first?

Speakman: Sorry, I might need to take that question again.

Sembo: Which is more important for you——the framework of a subtlemob, in which participants play listening to the sound in the city, or the contents, which is the story that participants actually listen to?

Sumitomo: Sorry, Duncan-san, Tassos-san has to leave now.

Stevens: Sorry. Thank you very much. I have just got to go downstairs to prepare for the noon presentation that I am giving, but thank you very much.

Sumitomo: 25 people can participate in the showcase, and it starts only after this seminar finishes. It is just that he needs to go earlier to prepare. Sorry, Duncan-san. Please continue.

Speakman: Yes, so the question is about how important the story of the piece is versus just their experience of being in the city space? With this piece that I showed here, the story is about being in that place and in that moment. So if all that happens to you from the beginning to the end of it——when you press "Play" to when it stops——is that for those 30 minutes you engage with what is happening around you and engage more directly with the people and the place, then that is fine, actually. That is what I want to happen. What I am trying to do is to find ways to make you do that by speaking about loss and place and speaking about different people in that environment. But if you do that by yourself anyway once you hear the music and you are in that event, then that is fine.

Sumitomo: Sembo-san, what do you think?

Sembo: If there is a framework, and if the framework is the important thing, there will be the question about what the meaning of your own participation, like, why you yourself have to do that.

Sumitomo: Someone else can do contact Gonzo. You make a framework, but other people might follow the rules and participate in it, and it can be that they are not yourself.

Sembo: Then, there must be a question, "Why am I participating in it?"

Tsukahara: Yes.

Sembo: I just wonder how you are dealing with that.

Tsukahara: What I understand is just that it would be less flexible if we insist too much that contact Gonzo is a product or an artist. We have not decided a strict guideline about that, but we always talk about that when drinking. We always say, "Why doesn't someone steal it?" And if someone says "I'm doing contact Gonzo now" and does it, that is fine. The ideal situation is that these people can be performing in Tokyo as contact Gonzo instead of us. If they appear like "Let's challenge those guys" and if there can be Osaka Gonzo and Tokyo Gonzo, that would be nice and that does not have to be a fight. In this sense, someone else might be doing or rewriting a subtlemob.

Sumitomo: And that can be already happening before anyone else knows.

Tsukahara: Right. There can be an organization like Subtlemob Vietnam. I wonder if Duncan-san allows that, or is expecting that like "Isn't that interesting?"

Sembo: That is what I wanted to ask.

Speakman: Yeah, there is already Subtlemob Manchester. They are a group of teenagers in Manchester who made their own subtlemob recently, and it is about flooding a sort of fictional story of Manchester. And I think what is important for me is coming back to that idea of "Everything has been done before." Subtlemob for me is just a trendy word I came up with because I like the idea of going, "I made a word!" But it is just a form. I do not feel like I own this form. There are already people making MP3 guided pieces. There are lots of really amazing companies making that kind of work. I have an idea of what a subtlemob is, and I think it is about a piece that integrates with a space. And I am making different works using that form. So for me it is great if more people make works that use a similar form because I get to see different takes on it in the same way that if you play a guitar, no one says, "Oh, I've seen other people playing guitars. That's so boring." You play something different on the guitar. You write a new piece of music. But you are still saying, well, this is punk rock or jazz or something. And a subtlemob is just, for me, a way of making work. So, yeah, I would hope lots of people do it——hopefully not better, though.

Akaiwa: So I guess the fact that the system is simple is important. You can do that only with MP3 players.

Speakman: I would say in response to that, though, it is the distribution that is simple, in that it goes on an MP3 player like with music that goes on an MP3 player. It is what you put into it: the content. So you could make a very simple one where you just record instructions into a Dictaphone and you put some music on it. In my case, I labor over the music composition and work with performers to make the content. So I think there is any way to make the content you want to make, and yet the form is simple MP3. But you could make the making of it a very complicated process or a very simple process.

Sumitomo: For example, if theatergoers will have come to feel that it is easier to have that kind of experience in the city by downloading something than purchasing a ticket and going to a theater, more people can be choosing the former way. Using quite accessible technologies that anyone can use, you can work flexibly and there can be a number of variations depending on each maker's creation of stories or words. This is a very open framework and I think is very interesting.

We are running out of time, but does anyone have a question or comment? OK? I guess we are ready to go to Coney's showcase downstairs. As the last comment, let me thank especially to the three artists from the UK, though Tassos-san has left, for telling us about their unique and interesting work where not only theatre but also other various elements such as cinema, music or street cultures are blended to create new expressions. To be able to do this kind of work in various places, like to be able to do a subtlemob in Tokyo and then other cities, it would be interesting to learn from these structures to go beyond systems, morals and hurdles.

Thank you very much for participating from the early hours in the morning. We would like to ask for a big round of applause to the panel. Thank you.

Maruoka: Thank you very much. Thank you, Sumitomo-san. As announced, Coney's showcase and other workshops are held in the rehearsal rooms at the second floor in the basement. So if you go there now, you can see something. As for contact Gonzo's YouTube clips, you cannot see them here but there is a quite big Mac in the large conference room that you can use for that. You can see them at home too, but if you go there now, you can watch them together. Thank you very much.