

FROM BOTH SIDES NOW

IMPROVISING ACROSS COMMUNITIES (film transcription)

ERIC LEWIS (NARRATION): In the Fall of 2009, MedeaElectronique, an Athens based artists collective focusing on the creation and presentation of experimental multi-media works, held its first residency. Ensnared at a remote, yet comfortable, olive oil farm in the Peloponnese, some 15 artists, chosen as the result of an international open call, and all committed to improvisation as a method for collaborative art production, spent 8 days working collectively prior to returning to Athens to present the results of their collaboration as an evening of performances.

Hailing from 6 countries, and working in varied arts, including dance, electroacoustic composition and performance, acoustic improvisation, video improvisation, circuit design, scenography and stage design, video and photographic arts, this group, which did not even share a common first or second, language, and did not know each other prior to the residency, needed to quickly find a way to collaborate together and to decide what they were going to produce. They needed to find both a common ground artistically and socially.

Given the variety of cultures the participants came from, the numerous art forms they were used to creating within, their lack of familiarity with each other, the close quarters they were to live and work in and the purposeful lack of a pre-determined goal for the residency, other than a public presentation of the “results” in Athens at a small, yet sympathetic, performance space, this residency was an ideal petri dish in

which to observe the many ways in which the social and the artistic interpenetrate each other in the context of communal improvised art production.

I was both a participant in the residency, and designated the official documentarian for it, while also undertaking to research the residency as a site for potential insight into how the creation of an improvising artistic community from scratch unfolds along both social and creative fault-lines. Artistic challenges we faced were often, at the very same time, social challenges, and solutions to these challenges often required consideration of them as both artistic and social gestures.

Were we 15 distinct artists working on distinct projects, to be somehow, perhaps very loosely, combined in a final performance/exhibit, or were we each parts of a single improvising collective, contributing to a single “product”? What did it mean anyway, to improvise across traditional art-form boundaries? Were we to focus on the final product, the performance, or on the process, the day-to-day, moment-to-moment acts of collaboration? How were we even to talk about what we were doing, or wanted to do, or the product we wanted to produce, or wanted to avoid producing, seeing that we were unfamiliar with working with each other, and did not share a common artistic, or linguistic language? Each of these questions had an artistic and social formulation, and the myriad social and artistic negotiations that took place in the course of the residency impacted upon each other, and often could not even be distinguished one from another. As this film hopes to demonstrate, social decisions were artistic decisions, and visa versa. Artistic road-blocks often aired themselves as social roadblocks, and visa versa. Ultimately our ability to find a way to live together was to find a way to work together, or was it the other way around?

The unofficial symbol of the residency became the omnipresent clouds that often surrounded us, or engulfed us. They became another member of the residency, which we both improvised with, and looked to for guidance or inspiration. They ended up incorporated in our final performance, the product, and seemed an apt metaphor for the process, the unfolding collaboration itself. For many of the tensions that emerged within the residency, and much of the thoughtful dialogue that took place between participants, concerned the relationships between process and product. How were we to balance the perhaps conflicting demands the collaboration itself, and the need to produce a public performance, placed upon us? Are these demands essentially at odds with each other? What is process vs. product in an improvisatory context anyway, as improvisation is often described as an artistic method where the distinction itself becomes occluded?

Clouds seem to be both process and product, both “object” and “action”. They have unclear limits, and are always changing, as are the divisions between individual and group in improvised contexts. They are often difficult to count, it is hard to tell where one begins and another ends, which seems to both model the status of individual contributions to the collective product, and the relationship of individual agencies vs. the emergent collective agency. The clouds that surrounded us, and sometimes descended to engulf us, helped throw into clear contrast the issues that divided us, or the means to resolve issues, at other times obscuring our actions, making it hard to “see through them” towards a clear process of collaboration, or an artistic product we were moving towards. The fuzzy nature of clouds seemed to model the imprecise and fuzzy nature of the language we employed to talk to each other across artistic and

cultural boundaries. Were these boundaries to ossify into barriers, like the clearly etched edges of storm clouds, or perhaps to merge into each other, to coalesce and unify? And would our success or failure in crossing these barriers of communication determine, or be determined by, our ability to cross over the parallel social and artistic barriers that existed? In the end, would the clouds bring blinding fog, or help reveal interesting artistic contrasts? Would they merely be a way of obscuring our ability to collaborate, or would they help us merge our individual artistic and social visions into a single, fluid, changing mass, responsive to, and a product of, each individuals vision and intentionality?

The residency was a success, due primarily to the sensitive and flexible ways the participants thought and acted concerning the nature of collaboration in improvisation. What was striking was the degree to which our social and artistic challenges interpenetrating each other, and the degree to which participants realized this, and articulated their concerns and needs in both social and artistic terms. What follows is an examination of the issues we faced, and the manner in which we addressed them, along three related fault-lines: the nature of collaboration, the role of language, and the tensions between focusing on process vs. product within the context of the residency. Each of these topics has both a creative and a social formulation. The role of language unfolded in a number of ways. First, there was the question as to what degree we should talk at all about what we were doing—should we just do it? Would dialogue get in the way of actual collaboration, or would it help facilitate it? Second there was the question about what language to use, seeing that the participants spoke distinct natural languages (English being the one common language), and, crucially, employed distinct vocabularies and concepts when talking about art,

improvisation, and artistic collaboration. What soon emerged was the issue as to whether or not a goal of the residency was, or needed to be, the creation of a common language, or the integration, somehow, of many distinct languages. This last point related most clearly to the second major issue concerning the nature of collaboration in improvisation. In particular, should our artistic collaboration be somehow rule-bound, in an attempt to produce one unified common work? To what degree should we be focusing at all on the activity of collaborating itself, as opposed to thinking always instrumentally, toward the final performance? Issues such as this bled into the third main fault-line, the conflicts between a process vs. product driven residency. An emphasis, expressed by many, on process, tended to suggest the creation of one unified project, focused on the collaborative act, while seeing the need, therefore, of discovering or creating one unified artistic language. This is a kind of “melting-pot” model of collaboration, and the advocates for such a model, were often quite clear that it had ramifications not just for the work we might produce, but for the ways we needed, or should, socially interact. They were also clear that it entailed a certain loss of autonomy, both artistic, and personal, and bore the risk that such models, whether artistic or social, always bear, that what might result is a tyranny of the dominant artistic or cultural vision, having it imposed upon the whole.

Others were more focused on the product, the final performance, and they tended to be more open to a lack of unity in the final work, desired to talk about the product, and wished the product to bear the hallmarks of each residency members distinctive artistic visions. Here individual autonomy was not subsumed into group autonomy, and no single artistic language needed to be developed. This is a kind of “multi-cultural” model of collaboration, and bears the risk that such models do of simply

having a number of artistic or cultural communities not really interacting, but existing in close quarters to each other, while in fact being quite isolated from each other. The collaborations that might result could be quite superficial.

In general, the members of the residency broke down into two groups, although there was much movement between them. The first was centered upon the following set of concepts: one unified language; one unified project; emphasis on collaboration; loss of artistic autonomy; emphasis on shared living and working; and the product falls out of results of process. This was the “Melting Pot” Model. The second group was centered on the following concepts: many related languages; many related projects; emphasis on product and how to integrate autonomic projects into a product; personal and artistic autonomy largely retained; emphasis on facilitating personal work and living; and the process is product focused. This can be seen as the “Multi-Cultural” Model.

[TITLE SCREEN] On Language [15:25]

[TITLE SCREEN] “Everyone has their own language... why don’t we just do it?”

[Group discussion.]

UNKNOWN MALE: Everyone has his own language, so we should try it. I mean, why don’t we just do it?

JOVANA POPIC: But even if you improvise, you bring something, part of yourself.

UNKNOWN MALE: Yes, because I see you what you're doing, or hear other things.

STELIOS GIANNOULAIS: For me, the most important thing is that it's a collection of personalities, okay, we are 12, 13, 14 people, each of us has a certain language and a certain set of skills and a certain set of experiences like some valuable baggage we carry with us.

[TITLE SCREEN] Language can yield confusion – don't speak, show and share

[Group discussion.]

HARIS GERMANIDIS: I think for people that are like we are, who define things in words, it's very complex, because something that has very profound meaning for you, for the other one might mean a completely different thing, so it's very easy to get confused. We shouldn't speak about it, we should show and share and observe.

[TITLE SCREEN] A common language helps form community. It is difficult to improvise across arts that do not share a common language.

[TITLE SCREEN] This may yield a difficulty in forming communities across the arts.

[TITLE SCREEN] Ariadni Mikou: Dancer

ARIADNI MIKOU: Observing people improvising yesterday, which were not dancers, musicians mostly, it had a different feeling; it was “okay we are a community of people who might not know each other, but we are artists who work in a similar kind of art,” so there is already a common language. I felt “oh, yes, we are jamming, we are improvising, we are having fun” which was really great, but I feel like if I talk about improvisation generally, I think that dance is not very easy, at least in that specific community, it is not very easy to come out. I feel like it’s a totally different element.

ERIC LEWIS: Do you think it’s something about dance—what it is, or something about the community’s relationship to dance?

ARIADNI MIKOU: No, no, I think, maybe both.

[TITLE SCREEN] One language, or many?

[Group discussion.]

MANOLIS MANOUSAKIS: We’re trying to figure out how to communicate artistically with each other. It is a very interesting process, about sharing material, trying to find not a common language, but two languages, how they can coexist and what if this language is not two, but three or four. It is a great mess. Even to survive in it, it would be really interesting.

[TITLE SCREEN] Stelios Giannoulakis: Athens-based composer

[TITLE SCREEN] A shared language can bring us together, but...

[TITLE SCREEN] Talk brings with it dangers

ERIC LEWIS: You've worked with some of the people here, in the past, and some people I know you must be meeting for the first time. Is there any difference for you in how you're interacting with or forming collaborations with the people you're familiar with and other folks?

STELIOS GIANNOULAKIS: Not really. For example, with you or Thomas or Michal and also with Ariadni, I feel like we have been playing together a long time, because we have similar languages and similar musical references and stuff, so without saying much, we can understand one another and what is going on. We are in the same talk musically, or can be able to share the same talk. I don't know what other kinds of music you would play with someone else, and I'm not saying that I immediately discovered your whole musical world, but what you do with me is very familiar to me, and it seems that what I do with you, is very familiar to you, so this immediately brings us together. The only difference with people I know is a more personal type of humour perhaps. We can swear at each other, without having to think too much about it.

Because style and aesthetics is for many people, a very personal thing, they love using language to express that, it can be very tricky and lead to many philosophical, vague,

conversations, and because some things can be very personal, people can be really touchy about things. It must be handled very delicately.

[TITLE SCREEN] Angel Faraldo: Dutch based Spanish composer and digital instrument designer

ANGEL FARALDO: Well, I'm basically used to working with musicians and in particular with improvising musicians. That means that we don't use many words to set our objectives. Even if we have to use words, they correspond to a common language. In here, dealing with video artists, with dancers, means that there are some words that are completely differently understood. Something very simple, such as melody or harmony, those kinds of words, for a musician, are very specific, become really metaphoric. It could be talking about flowers, it's as imprecise as that.

[TITLE SCREEN] On collaboration

Discussions on collaboration focused on the difficulties of talking about the collaborative act, and the potential of governing concepts to place unwanted limitations on collaboration. Would imposing rules on our process help us work more effectively, efficiently and communally, or simply create barriers preventing us from realizing our creative potentials? The talk of rules to allow us to communicate with each other seemed to simultaneously concern artistic communication—rules governing our improvisations—and social communication—rules governing our social interactions, our twice daily meetings and the like. Rules can be broken, and that is a choice we each get to make, in both creative and social contexts. The range

of views expressed concerning collaboration often manifested themselves as differences concerning how many projects we were creating. Although the organizers of the residency were somewhat taken aback by the possibility of not creating a single unified project, they also evidenced tremendous thoughtfulness concerning the possible reasons behind a hesitation on the part of some to enter into total group collaboration. This issue became a focus of our group discussions.

[Group discussion.]

HARIS GERMANIDIS: Nobody's trying to limit anybody here, either of the way he works or his ideas or the process that he wants to choose. I think the purpose of this discussion is to first of all, by putting out some words, each one of us, to start getting to know each other and at the same time, try to establish some way to work. It might not be on a logical level, it might be on a supplemental level. It might be on a subconscious level. It might be on all these levels, but words like "ethics," "rules," "themes," are not thrown on this table in order to limit us. I think they will help us free ourselves—construct something

MANOLIS MANOUSAKIS: They are definitions though, of the work in process, and we define work in process by using them. Because by saying "rules," by saying "work in process," you actually limit the ability of each of us doing whatever comes to their mind. You said improvisation has certain rules that we all know and we all obey them in order to communicate with each other. So actually you made a general comment about how people communicate while improvising.

STELIOS GIANNOULAKIS: Yeah, it's an observation...

JOVANA POPIC: Yes! Exactly! [at Stelios] You are talking all the time, really right! Observation is very important. Observation and your attitude, this is how you have to start.

PANAGIOTIS TSANGARAKIS: And also, improvisation has to do with rules. The other thing is that improvisation has a lot to do with personality. You pick when you leave, when you enter, and when you exit. On a stream of things that happen, on a performance, you say "I'm entering! This is inspiring to me, and now I'm in!" And you, maybe you say: "when I hear you, I go away so you can play," but others say: "no, I'm in." So personalities will come up. The rules are something you can go with, or not go with. You can choose, and you can state what the rules are and decide if you want to go with them. It's a kind of, you select a position in this process.

[Scene changes, part of the group is sitting outside.]

ERIC LEWIS: So what are the surprises?

MANOLIS MANOUSAKIS: The surprises are, let's say, I expected from the beginning, actually I wanted to lead the whole thing towards one project. I never thought in a small community like the 12 artists that we are gathered here, or 14 artists we are gathered here, that the big idea for me will be that everybody will work with everybody really peaceful. That's what I always sought at Medea, and that's why it always had so many members, because we always wanted to have new blood,

and processing new ideas and stuff like that. So big surprise for me was last night where we had actually different, I can't call them projects, but directions, they're directions. So we had these different directions that they'll build up, somehow, as a sub-context of the whole thing and they were presented yesterday. So I had the hope that these will happen in a more communal way than directions of artists that created theirself themes. Maybe that was created out of a need these artists had before they came here.

[TITLE SCREEN] Collaboration involves giving up ownership over material....

[Group discussion.]

HARIS GERMANIDIS: Without forcing anybody for anything, but this residency and actually the works of Medea up until now, because it's very important to me, and to the team that has invited you here, is to do collaborative works. Of course, you can do your own work; definitely you can do your own work with the people that you choose, from the residence. You can do your own work and everybody can do his own work. But the whole process here is not for the Medea people to work by themselves within the 13, because they can do that without the residency. And they do it regularly. And it's not for us definitely to say: "I'm going to work with you" and "I'm going to work with you." But the thing is that maybe in the whole scenario of presenting the thing, we should have in mind somehow to connect these different parts, and maybe by the end of this week we reach a point that all these projects are interconnected. Today I sat down and I edited all the sounds that I recorded in the past two days and I named them. And I passed them around. It's something that I've done, I've named it and I

gave it to everybody to play with it and do their own art and I expect that they will do their own sounds or do the same thing. When I play with him live, I manipulate the sounds he gave me and we do not have ownership over that.

STELIOS GIANNOULAKIS: It's an exercise of using yourself as an individual artist into this idea of the group as one artistic entity. So I create material and give it to whoever is interested to work with it, and it belongs to the communal. At the side of it, I can have some material that I will keep for myself and work it later on.

[TITLE SCREEN] ...but not the right or obligation to judge the use of the material.

STELIOS GIANNOULAKIS: Everybody will be very strict with their stuff. Even if Manolis says, for example, here are my samples, take them and do what you want with them, he means do what you want with them, but then I will challenge it afterwards. I will tell you if I like it. You might do what you want, but he can say "I don't like this at all." It's like playing table tennis: I throw you something, you throw it back to me, then I throw it back to you, and it goes like that. We should come to an agreement at some point, as time runs out.

[TITLE SCREEN] Is there too much information in improvisation involving many media?

ARIADNI MIKOU: It's difficult to improvise, to have different media, different kinds of artists improvising all at the same time. I found it hard. So far in my life I have improvised only with dancers and maybe one musician per time, but now it seems like

there are so many elements. Maybe if it wasn't the visual effect in the same time as dance, maybe it would be much easier for me to jump in, but I think that when there is image and dance, and dance is something we see as well, and music, it's too much information.

[TITLE SCREEN] Process vs. Product

Issues surrounding collaboration and language coalesced around questions concerning the relationship of product to process, and what each participant expected to get out of the residency. In particular, the question, "How many projects are we producing?" reflected: the tensions between focusing on process vs. product; the difficulties concerning how we were to collaborate; the role of language in our ongoing negotiations; and, crucially, whether we were socially to cohere into one group, or breakup into a number of smaller communities. Melting pot or multiculturalism?

ARIADNI MIKOU: What I observed until now was that we were talking so far about how to start—we were talking about the start, and the end. There was no conversation, no discussion about how we would go from the start to the end. All of us say that we are interested in "the process," but actually I don't know if we're interested in the process – everyone is talking about the end result and people started talking about lighting, and sceneography, which is okay, but has nothing to do with the process. You have an unfinished piece of art in the finished, perfect environment. Does that make sense, what I'm saying? I'm missing talking about the process, talking about what is missing. What are we doing? How can we listen to each other better? Is everything so great that we don't need to talk? Do we want image and

dance and music at the same time? Those should be the kinds of discussions and group direction.

To answer your question about what I expected to find here, I was expecting to find cooperation and not only with one person, which I really love—the cooperation—because we might not speak the same language, and understand each other, and maybe speak the same language, maybe—huge question marks—but I was hoping that all of us together would present something. We could prepare something, all of us together, and not be individual things. I guess not all of us can communicate—

JOVANA POPIC: —I think it's impossible, to be honest.

ERIC LEWIS: Do you think it's too late for that to happen?

ARIADNI MIKOU: No...

JOVANA POPIC: No... it's just the third day.

[Group discussion]

JOVANA POPIC: I want to project from somewhere, because the beam has this adjusting angle thing, so you can project from somewhere, but I want to suspend the block into space somewhere. In the corner, I don't need a special place. It's like it's for one listener, one spectator.

[Inaudible voices.]

JOVANA POPIC: I see my collaboration here and my way of working is to try to work with people I can work with, and if anyone has an idea come talk to me. And I was working with Ariadni because some of us have been trying to start working together.

STELIOS GIANNOULAKIS: A big part of the collective exercise is to do one collective thing.

JOVANA POPIC: I cannot work with 15 people. I'm not able.

STELIOS GIANNOULAKIS: Within this one collective output, there is place for many things.

[New scene, new discussion, no people visible but voices]

“At this point of the residency it should be clear how many projects we have.”

“Exactly.”

“Do we know how many projects we have?”

“This is the first time we mentioned projects.”

“Yes.”

“And we’re in the middle.”

“For me, it’s important that we mention the projects now.”

[WORDS ROLLING ACROSS SCREEN] The passion with which we addressed the question of how many projects we were creating may indicate that we were also discussing how many communities we were to constitute.

[Voices contd.]

“How many projects do we have?”

“I can tell you what’s been mentioned so far.”

“Okay, yes, yes, yes.”

“Right now, what we’re doing is really just taking the inventory of what people have been working on. You might discover Saturday that one of these disappears, one of them gets fractures in pieces, two of them become simultaneous...”

“It depends if 6 or 7...”

“It’s very important what I want to say. The reason we have seven projects is because we have seven different themes made into this residency and seven different needs. It’s seven different projects. I’m repeating that, I want you to have it in your minds, that we have seven individual projects.”

“Wait! That’s not correct!”

“They’re not individual projects, it’s the first time we are talking about groups in here that have been created after discussion, individual discussion and common interest. They came together and created something. For me they’re not projects—they’re ideas and works in progress. How they will be developed and how they will be matched, it will come.”

ERIC LEWIS: (Narrator) Our collective decision was to merge our respective projects into one continuous performance, a performance with both a global unity, yet still, through its many sections, bearing the hallmarks of the discrete projects that were brought together. Much thought went into how to inter-relate these sub-projects into a whole, no one wanted to simply string them together. Each section needed to reflect the contributions of the collective, while still remaining grounded in its primary creators intent and artistic vision. Talking about how to do this was not easy, but once the decision was made to proceed in this manner, the difficulties were technical, and no longer social. We attempted to merge features of both the multiculturalism and melting pot models, to respect individuals’ concerns for both process and product, to allow individual autonomy and creativity to be discernable in the final work, yet to also allow any member of the collective to add freely to each part, bearing in mind the

stake others might have in a particular section. For in truth, in spite of differences in temperament, work style, language, collaborative ideals, and technical prowess, we collaborated very well together. Our hybrid model of collaboration was, in truth, also a hybrid model of community formation.

[TITLE SCREEN] The following interviews address a number of the themes that have emerged.

[TITLE SCREEN] Panagiotis Tsangarakis: Circuit Designer

PANAGIOTIS TSANGARAKIS: What interested me, and intrigued me was to be in an area, isolated from everyday life, be with people of different areas of interest, exchange ideas, communicate, and actually be part of a process that will create a project within a week—which is very tough and something I’ve never done. It’s an experiment both in an artistic way and living in this kind of strange place, environment.

ERIC LEWIS: What do you think it would mean for it to be successful—the residency?

PANAGIOTIS TSANGARAKIS: I believe a success is if people enjoy, have fun, manage to communicate and create a common goal.

ERIC LEWIS: How do you tell if people are doing that?

PANAGIOTIS TSANGARAKIS: That has to do with the final outcome, which I don't have something in mind. The final outcome will be... we will know it only when it happens. It's a very liquid thing—something that always, every moment, it creates itself and develops and that will happen up to the last minute, I imagine. I think that the final outcome will reflect the process, and I think that's the most important thing in this kind of project, the actual process of collecting and mixing and collaborating with the others. The success will be a good communication and collaboration, and I think that's what the outcome will be. I think there are two ways to go. One is to set something from the beginning and go for it. The other one is: allow individual exploration, if you want, then the project will arise, will emerge, from the communication and collaboration. I think that's the path we are taking. For me, it's the more risky way, but if you trust yourself—not all myself, but each of us—this will bring us the final outcome. Yeah, I'd like to talk to everybody in the same way, exchange ideas, talk about the worries, the agony people might have, because as I said, this is an experiment, both in a social way and in a more artistic way.

[TITLE SCREEN] Michal Larsson: Video Artist

ERIC LEWIS: I'm just curious. What did you hope or expect to get out of this residency?

MICHAL LARSSON: When I applied, I imagined it to be a larger collaboration, and in past projects that I've been working with, I've had smaller collaborations, maximum three people. Considering that most people would probably be in different pathways and working with different forms of expression, there would be very

interesting the exchange that would happen. Also, meeting other visual artists and working closer to musicians could actually provide me with a very good exchange.

ERIC LEWIS: Has that been happening?

MICHAL LARSSON: Oh, yeah. Definitely more than I ever expected or could expect.

ERIC LEWIS: I guess we're approaching the end and really having to prepare the final performance. What do you think are the challenges we face now?

MICHAL LARSSON: In the end of the process? I think the most obvious challenge is putting together some form of a structure that everybody is comfortable with. I do remember at the beginning when everybody was against structures, rules, and everything and despite that, we have come to that stage where we do need to apply some form of structure. Considering that we are 13, 14 people and we tried to put this together; I think that's the biggest challenge. Also, something that I thought was a challenge, that has been resolved more and more, is the level of communication; because I think that's become better the more time has passed. Maybe two days ago when it was very loud, very intense, it was almost like we had peaked somehow, and what has happened after that has become like a resolution in some way. Almost like a linear narrative, but put in a one-week time frame.

ERIC LEWIS: What did you expect to get out of this residency? What were you hoping for?

STELIOS GIANNOULAKIS: I was hoping for a nice performance and piece of work. Also, I was hoping for the opportunity to improvise with people and this special situation, improvisation, I was sure, would be more intense and more concentrated and we would have all the time in the world to improvise. I'm happy this is helping me a lot. I was also hoping to work on my skills personally of collaborating and communicating and managing group situations. I am happy this is happening. All the different artistic drives of the people are looking for a way, finding ways to coexist and work together. I see this developing because people show each other their bits and stuff that would be considered private, like what you show as a finished product and you don't really share it, people are happy to share it and this was the idea of the whole thing.

As time passes, there will be more need for the act of "composing," providing space for improvisation, but we need to compose everything into one thing unless we find a system to let it live in there in an improvisatory way, but still we need to compose this system of improvising. This is a challenge.

[TITLE SCREEN] Tim Ward: Electroacoustic Composer

ERIC LEWIS: What were you hoping to get out of the residency?

TIM WARD: I was quite interested to see, quite selfishly actually, I was quite interested to see that there were some video people coming, and I was quite interested to see how they work and what technologies they used and how they developed ideas,

as I would like to see if I expand what I do to include video, because I'm quite interested in that area. It's quite complicated and it's nice to watch somebody in practice. That was my main idea. My other idea was to contribute and to have a nice performance at the end and always working with other people I think you learn things, you see different ways of doing things, you have fun.

ERIC LEWIS: In your opinion, what would it mean then for this week, this residency to be a success?

TIM WARD: I think if we produce something interesting and enjoyable for the final concert on Sunday, and we have an interesting and enjoyable time making it that would count as a success; that's a success for me. I think if I learn things, that's also a success and I think I have already.

Obstacles? I think it's become clear that we all work in slightly different ways, which is a positive benefit of course, but it does make an obstacle in how you generate and prepare creative material, when somebody else generates and prepares on a different time scale, or with a different sense of urgency or maybe they prepare things earlier and faster or later and a little bit slower. That's something that maybe we need to watch out for and try and manage so that we all participate together and there's not somebody that, because of the time scale they work by, they're not really included in some of the things we do. That's an issue I've noticed.

ANGEL FARALDO: It's weird the way one is forced to kind of, define his individual, in a way I'm not used to. Usually I don't have to, or I don't deal with putting

boundaries in what I do. I'm really concerned about music, it's not that I wouldn't like to make videos myself, but the very constraints of my practice is something that here, they come to a serious question. [ERIC LEWIS: Why?] Because I came as an improvising musician, but probably I am one to view improvising musicians as working with a new lineup of musicians twice in a week, so really dealing with that. And probably you and me are the ones which are really used to that situation and that's actually kind of an invitation to rethink our composition and things like that. And the problem is to accept what's going on is obscured by the very fact that we have this performance on Sunday and everybody's very much concerned about that.

[TITLE SCREEN] Haris Germanidis: Video Artist

HARIS GERMANIDIS: For sure, since we have also a very specific outcome that we need to achieve, this will be a point of judgment. We have to make something, a presentation, judging this presentation would be easy enough, but I will not base my judgments on that only, because I think that will be the end of a journey. So we have also the whole journey to record and all these memories and all the process of the journey will be the answer to the question.

[TITLE SCREEN] Manolis Manousakis: Electroacoustic Composer

MANOLIS MANOUSAKIS: What do I expect? I expect a fantastic new project to come out of this fantastic place and cinematographers and performers; that would be the ultimate. But what is fantastic? I mean, you cannot actually put an end to it or a start to it, so it's just... I'm expecting a good collaboration, that's what I'm expecting.

If we can have a good collaboration, between different art forms, then we will have achieved something.

CREDITS:

MedeaElectronique

Koumaria Residency

Oct. 23-Nov.1, 2009

www.medeaelectronique.com

Participants

Thomas Bjelkeborn

Angel Faraldo

Haris Germanidis

Stelios Giannoulakis

Ioanna Kambilafka

Kleopatra Korai

Michal Larsson

Christos Laskaris

Eric Lewis

Manolis Manousakis

Ariadni Mikou

Jovana Popic

Panagiotis Tsangarakis

Tim Ward

Video produced and edited by Eric Lewis, who would like to thank

MedeaElectronique and all the residents for their cooperation, friendship and artistry.