

(Un)Doing-Being Together-Apart

Emma Cocker

DOING TOGETHER was a two-day creative practice symposium at Bath Spa University (3-4 April 2023) co-organised by Dr Natasha Kidd and Dr Conor Wilson. I was invited by Natasha and Conor to engage with the duration of this event in the spirit of an 'artist-ethnographer', and to share my observation-reflections within the final session of the programme. The following text is a reworking of the transcript material from that final session (with some additional references), within which I attempt to remain in fidelity to the texture of the unfolding reflections that were offered during the experiential liveness of the event itself. The form of the text is therefore somewhere between speaking and writing — or rather, I conceive it as a form of 'contiguous writing' — comprised of thought-fragments arising in-touch-with my live encounter of DOING TOGETHER rather than necessarily being 'about'.

The How-ness of Practice

Throughout the two-day event, *DOING TOGETHER*, I was mulling over various questions that resonate with ongoing concerns within my own research practice:

Towards how-ness — How might we attend to the *how* of practice? Consider the question — *How do you do?* How are our practices? What is at stake in attending to the *how* of artistic process and practice? How might attending to the uncertainty and not knowing within the unfolding of process offer new perspectives on artistic practice, research and pedagogy? How might practising being-in-the-midst of open-ended artistic activity connect with how we navigate some the vagaries of contemporary life, the uncertain times within which we live? How might attending to the *how* of artistic processes and practices offer new possibilities for a more creative, maybe even a resistant, approach to other aspects of life?

How to share? — How might we share practices? How to share one's practice *in its practising* — not just to not to *talk about it*, but rather to share through the co-inhabitation of the very practice itself? Less concerned with the production of art works as such — how do we *think-feel-know as artists*, how can that be shared? How might we find languages that operate in fidelity to the complexity of practice — not to explain or justify or even theorise one's practice, but rather to find ways for *writing-with* or *languageing-with*?

How to engage? — Admittedly, I experienced something of a dilemma in taking on the role of 'artist-ethnographer'. Should I engage as a participant, as observer, or in some other way? How might my experience of witnessing, or even *with-nessing*¹, differ from the experiential sense of being a participant or indeed from leading a session? How do we engage with another's practice? What is witnessable? Can the experience of doing

together be tangible from the outside, or can it only ever be felt? In the sharing of practices — what can be seen? What is see-able? Or is sharing of practices something that is necessarily experienced as an embodied, sensorial event of interaction? What other sensory modes might be required? *When* does one engage? How is the difference between engaging with a practice in the middle, at the beginning, or at the end? How is this arc of ‘doing together’ experienced or felt? From *where* to engage — herein lies the dilemma of observation always being too near (the self-consciousness of being observed or being an observer) and yet also somehow always too far (observing from the distance, looking in).

How to enter? — Through what lens might one enter an event such as *DOING TOGETHER*? At first, I was struggling to find a point of access or of entry, for there was so much to encounter, so much unfolding. It felt impossible to *grasp*. Certainly no overview was possible, only ever a partial glimpse. I began by attending to *verbs*: making a list of all the verbs that I encountered. In time, this shifted to listening out for questions that were emerging. Then, an attempt to try and name the various practices being shared. In turn, each approach was eventually abandoned — I remained looking for another way in. I wondered — how did the others find a point of entry? For those that were leading sessions — how did you enter, what was your entry point? Or for those of you that were participants — how did you enter? What did you witness? What did you discover? What lens did you bring? During the first day of *DOING TOGETHER*, I asked individuals why and how they chose to engage with specific sessions: for some, engagement with another’s practice was prompted by the limits of their knowledge, by the desire to engage with something that they did not already understand, or else by wanting to engage in something *different* from their own practice. For others, the motivation to engage with another’s practice was through identifying shared resonance with their own. Still, how does one enter and engage with another’s practice — being open and receptive to the practices and processes of another, whilst at the same time retaining the integrity of one’s own? How do we encounter the unfamiliar or unknown? How not to ‘get lost’ in the practice of another?

Doing Together — An Etymological Dérive

Still searching for my own way in, I began wrestling with the title, *DOING TOGETHER*, interested in the etymologies of the two terms — *doing* and *together*. I was curious how this exploration of language might open or shed light on what was being foregrounded or valued within the event *DOING TOGETHER*.

Doing — an action or the performance of an action or doings, deeds, proceedings, happenings or events. *Doing* — to do, a verb, meaning to perform, execute, achieve, carry out, bring, to pass by procedure of any kind, to do, to make act, perform. From the PIE *dhe** — to set, to put or place.

Together — into or in one gathering, a company, a mass, a place or a body. Into or in union, proximity, contact, or collision of two or more things, to be taken or considered collectively or conjointly. Or of a single thing — in a condition of unity, compactness or coherence. In relationship, in association, in business or agreements of two or more persons. Together — meaning with or in proximity to another person or people, at the

same time without interruption or continuously. There is also this sense of *together* as in self-confidence, meaning level-headed or well-organised. Or else, together — from ‘to gather’, to gather, to collect, used as in flowers, thoughts, and persons. Gather — from the PIE **ghedh-* ‘to unite, join’. From the Old English *gædrian* also associated with the word — *good*. Good as in — excellent, fine, valuable, desirable, favourable, beneficial. Gathering as uniting, agreeing, assembling — a *good gathering*.

What or how then is this *doing together* that we are *doing together*? What might different shifts of emphasis or inflection reveal? How does the sense-making shift depending if I place more stress on the word ‘doing’ or on ‘together’? Is it a form of *doing together* concerned with performing or bringing about a mode of *togetherness*? *Doing togetherness* or performing *togetherness* — activation of an emergent ‘we’.² The doing of a desirable or beneficial *coming-together*. Or is it *doing* together, an act of gathering for the activity of *doing* in whatever way? How might these two possibilities be related or interwoven?

Still, what is being foregrounded? How else might it be said? Consider the various synonyms for *doing together*.

Doing — accomplishment, act, action, deed, performance, thing, achieving, exploiting, performing, carrying out, executing.

Together — closely, collectively, in tandem, jointly, simultaneously, unitedly, all together, as one, at one fell swoop, coincidentally, combined, commonly, concertedly, concomitantly, concurrently, conjointly, contemporaneously, on mass, hand in glove, hand in hand, in the body, in concert, in cooperation, in one breath, in sync, in unison, mutually.

What kinds of values and qualities are foregrounded through this emphasis on *doing together*? What kinds of capacities and attributes are privileged and amplified? What is at stake in *doing together*, through this emphasis on doing *and* togetherness, moreover, in the act of bringing these two terms together? What might be excluded through this emphasis? What values become diminished or left aside? What is not being foregrounded? Consider the antonyms, the opposites, of *doing* and *together*.

Doing (antonyms) — secession or cessation, failure, idleness, inactivity, inertia, repose, rest and stoppage.

Whilst *doing* is foregrounded in the notion of *DOING TOGETHER*, consider the role and value of so many of these antonyms for artistic practice.

Together (antonyms) — separation, even un-balanced-ness.

Again, whilst togetherness is foregrounded in *DOING TOGETHER*, consider the resonance of these antonymic terms for artistic work.

Not Doing

Consider the value of *not* doing — of artistic practice and the artistic studio as a space of *not doing* as much as of *doing*. I wonder: What aspects of our artistic doing/not doing are we willing to make public? What are we hiding? What aspects of our practices remain hidden — how is the relation of the public/private dimensions of our

life-work-world? What are we concealing? What are we willing to share? What are we *not* willing to share? Are we willing to share only our acts of *doing*? How might our *not doing* also be shared (together)? Consider the ‘maintenance work’ of practice — the doing which is *not* the doing: all the work which is *not* the work. What would it mean to *not do* together? What would that look like, feel like? Here then, is there a certain performativity and rhetoric of *doing* that has energy and feels exciting for practice — yet how might we also hold a space open for a more cautionary view?

There was a certain *intensity* of doing experienced during the event of *DOING TOGETHER*, of many activities happening concurrently, overlapping, side-by-side. Yet, how might the intensity of doing be understood? How might we avoid the emphasis on intensity within the *doing* of practice from becoming complicit in the neoliberal rhetoric of doing, of heightened productivity, of the endless ‘I can’? In *The Burnout Society*, philosopher Byung-Chul Han identifies the relentlessness performativity of production within contemporary life as symptomatic of an endlessly self-motivated “achievement-subject”, of an individual driven by the possibilities of ‘I can’. Han diagnoses contemporary existence as marked by a “violence of positivity”, derived from overproduction, overachievement, and overcommunication, alongside an excess of stimuli and information, resulting in a radical change to our “structure and economy of attention”, and an inevitable rise in exhaustion, fatigue and burnout. Han’s later publication, *The Scent of Time: A Philosophical Essay on the Art of Linger*ing proposes an alternative or even antidote to his diagnosed burnout society of achievement, where he argues that to give back life its time and duration, we should reclaim our capacity to dwell and linger, for reflection and contemplation. He observes the importance of intervals as way of structuring time — perhaps also for structuring our way of being (together) — arguing how intervals give structure to life, give life its sense of meaning: “Intervals or thresholds are zones of longing, hope, adventure, promising and expecting. Yet today’s experience is very poor in transitions, it deprives the in-between space of any meaning ... the effect of intervals is not only that of delay. Without intervals there is only the unstructured, directionless side-by-side or confusion of events. Intervals structure, not only our perception, but also life.”³ Following Han, rather than only focusing on the productivity of ‘doing’, how might we create intervals that allow for lingering, tarrying, waiting, drifting, trepidation, anticipation, doubt, and hesitation, alongside the generative experience of boredom, not knowing and doing nothing.

How might we hold a place open in our practices (and in the sharing of our practices) for boredom and for the uneventful? During *DOING TOGETHER* there were moments of lull, or lapse of energy, once the initial excitement of encounter was able to subside, perhaps even as the exhaustion of the intensity of the event began to be experienced in mind and body. My own experience of practice, of practising, is that is it often after the initial effervescence of activity has quietened, and within such moments of lull — these can be the moments where something unexpected or surprising happens, or where a breakthrough might emerge. Not in those first effervescent moments, but after the lull, after *many* lulls. How do we encounter these lulls in our practices, the rising and falling of energy within the arc of doing? Moreover, how might this aspect of practice be shared or sharable — especially in the context of an event such as *DOING TOGETHER*? How can we advocate a value for the actions of *not doing*: for

looking out of windows, lying down, staring into space, perhaps even for the nebulous event of artistic *thinking*.⁴

Consider the quiet *politics of not doing*? Recall the work of conceptual artist Mladen Stilinović's, *Artist at Work* (1978), a series of eight black-and-white photographs showing the artist lying in bed asleep. How might we share our processes and practices of not doing, of resting, of dreaming, of *doing nothing*? Indeed, what might be the pedagogical — as well as political necessity — of such an act of sharing? Perhaps we neglect to acknowledge the critical and creative function of not doing/doing nothing within our practices at peril. Certainly, contemporary life feels to have accelerated — my own experience of working as an academic and as a writer-artist feels *busier*, indeed, more hurried. Somehow the perceived or experienced space-time for inhabiting the lulls and the not doing and for lying on the floor in my studio seems smaller and smaller and smaller. In a recent reading group that I hosted for exploring 'embracing uncertainty', the question of 'privilege' arose, the question of whether the capacity to 'embrace uncertainty' was a matter of privilege. Likewise, given the precarity and uncertainty of contemporary life, how might one bemoan the opportunity for doing nothing, lament the lost opportunity for lying down on one's studio floor? In one sense, yes, such non-events can appear even a touch self-indulgent. However, against the various accelerated pressures of our live(d) experiences, how might 'not doing' operate in the key of both criticality and resistance?

Rest as Resistance – The Ethics of Slowing

Drawing on a lineage of Black political thinking, for poet, artist and activist Tricia Hersey, "Rest is resistance"⁵ — it is a racial and social justice issue. Hersey reimagines rest as a counternarrative, as "trust work", as "decolonizing work"⁶, that "disrupts and pushes back against capitalism and white supremacy"⁷, against the "cult of busyness and productivity" with its "machine-level pace of labor"⁸, its imperatives of exhaustion and overworking. How can we collectively inhabit 'not doing' as a space of resistance, finding ways for reclaiming fallow spaces and empty pockets of time? Practised in the key of resistance, rest is not self-indulgent but rather perhaps even an ethical act. In *Slow Philosophy: Reading Against the Institution*, Michelle Boulous Walker explores slowness as a precondition for engaging with complexity, with strangeness. She argues how, "Under situations of high time pressure, it becomes more and more difficult to engage with the complex and difficult in substantial and intense ways [...] harder for our thinking to retain its ability to take new paths, to innovate, to question and to challenge."⁹ For Walker, slowness "enables an unhurried openness to otherness; it involves a desire to be transformed in this open encounter [...] We embrace openness as the beginnings of a reciprocal relation with the other and the world."¹⁰ For Walker, slow modes of engagement enable transformation rather than simply acquisition; deceleration is deemed necessary for exploring complexity and intensity. Significantly, she asserts that slowness (in reading and in life) has an ethical dimension, for unhurriedness is a precondition for being more available, receptive, and open to the other, as well as to the experience of ambiguity, strangeness and uncertainty, in turn increasing our potential for intimacy, for love and wonder.

However, rather than privileging *doing* over *not doing* (or vice versa), how might we make (protect, advocate for) time and space for the critical relationship, perhaps even the complex ‘ecology’ of doing and not doing? In considering this fragile ecology, what might we need to *not to*? What might we need to let go of? What can we release hold of? What can we say no to? How do we individually and collectively *make time*? The importance of time in relation to practice is not always a matter of *quantity*, but rather of *quality*. Or rather it is not only the lack of available time that is antithetical to practice, but perhaps also the pervasive sense of hurry and of rush that steals into one’s experience.

Doing Together/Being Apart

So, if *not doing* is the hidden shadow side of *doing*, what might the emphasis on the value of togetherness eclipse or side-line? In *How to Live Together*, the writer Roland Barthes explores *idiorrhythmic* life forms. Barthes’ use of the term ‘idiorrhythmic’ — *idios* (own) and *rythmos* (rhythm, measure) — draws on the example of monastic communities, where the rhythm of coming together and being apart is critical to spiritual life and practice, capable of protecting the individual’s need for both solitude and solidarity. How is this rhythm of coming together and being apart activated within artistic practice? At times during the sessions, I witnessed individuals gathered together within a group context, yet at the same time completely immersed in the process. In their engagement with materials they appeared to have necessarily withdrawn from the sociality of the group. How is the necessity of this *being-apart* for *being-with* one’s material? Collapse of binaries, porosity of terms — the co-relation of *being-with* and *being-apart*. Within the frame of togetherness, consider these moments of isolation and total absorption. Are the deep states of absorption necessary for certain kinds of practice possible within the frame of sociality? Does an emphasis on (human) *doing together* eclipse these other kinds of (more-than-human) relationality or *being-with*? How is the relation and potential difference between *doing together* and *being together*, *being-with* and *doing-with*? What different modes and variations might we discover within our practices? All these different kinds of togetherness — we-ness, nearness, besides-ness, with-ness, participation, observation, conversation. The notion of care and caring recurred over and over, listening as a mode of *being-with*.¹¹ Hosting, guesting, audiencing, supporting, bearing witness, hearing out, feeding back, offering help, spending time — we need a more nuanced vocabulary to speak of these very subtle shades of doing and togetherness and collaboration and participation, for they are not reducible to any single verb/noun.

Is Sharing Necessarily Pedagogical?

Central to these various modes of encounter and connection is the matter of *sharing*. Yet, *why share*? Why might we want to share? What makes it desirable? What is at stake in the act of sharing one’s practice? Moreover, how might one share a practice in its practising — *with* and *through* the practice itself, rather than *speaking about*. Certainly, the notion of sharing and sharability is at the heart of a standard notion of research. HEFCE defines research thus: “*Research is a process of inquiry leading to new insights, effectively shared.*”¹² I wonder — is research also a process of inquiry whose *practices* are effectively shared? Is that what was happening during *DOING TOGETHER* — the effective sharing of (research) practices? Still, *how* was the sharing

taking place? What are the *conditions* for sharing? What is opened or enabled through sharing? During *DOING TOGETHER*, I witnessed so many varieties of sharing. Some modes of sharing involved a co-creative process of interdependent exploration and reciprocal discovery — artist (as researcher) and fellow participants (as co-researchers) engaging in an open-ended process of practising together. At other times, I observed a lead artist (or session leader) sharing their practice with participants — the generosity of opening a singular practice *for* and *to* others. There was the side-by-side or adjacency of sharing happening *between* participants or peers; or at times, a form of sharing — perhaps even of collaboration — with the material itself. Often there were all these different registers of sharing happening at the same time.

There was also a pedagogical dimension to some of the sharing, specifically through the format or model of a ‘workshop’. Maybe this was because we were engaging within an art school context, but I came to wonder — is sharing necessarily pedagogical? I wonder — how is the doing together (or the act of sharing) different or similar across the registers of research, practice and pedagogy? At times, the sharing took place through *doing* or engaging with different artistic, aesthetic or creative practices together — the *sharing of artistic practices*. In parallel, there were also evidently *practices of sharing*. Again, is the *practice of sharing* (indeed, are *practices of sharing*) necessarily pedagogical? How is this complex ecology between practices — between creative practices and practices of sharing? How might practices of sharing also be creative practices? How is this relation between artistic-aesthetic-creative practices and practices of sharing? Where do they overlap? How are pedagogical practices themselves artistic research practices? How is the mode of sharing encountered during *DOING TOGETHER* related to *teaching*? Whilst the possibility of pedagogy as a creative practice feels very resonant, I also wondered, what *other ways* of sharing can be conceived that *might not* derive from pedagogical practices? I was thinking about other forms of sharing — perhaps those encountered within a wider art-world context with its notion of *audience*. Still, the notion of *audiencing* also felt somewhat inadequate for describing the mode of connection, interaction and correspondence witnessing during *DOING TOGETHER*. What new vocabularies might be required for describing the kinds of doing together that we have been doing together? What new vocabularies are needed for communicating the togetherness of sharing, the sharing of togetherness?

Collapsing Hierarchies

How might the different ways that we engage with materials offer alternative models and vocabularies for how we might engage with others.¹³ I was struck by the complex nature of the material (more-than-human) engagements that I encountered during *DOING TOGETHER*, and wondered — how might we be more like that in our human relations somehow? One theme that emerged through this focus on material encounters was around collapsing the *hierarchies* between subject and object, maker and material. I was also thinking about how we might collapse the hierarchy or power dynamic between the ‘knower’ (session lead) and those that don’t know (participants). Here, I was recalling the values of radical pedagogy and the work of thinkers such as Brazilian educator Paulo Freire or Jacques Rancière — their attempts at collapsing the hierarchy between teacher and learner.¹⁴ How can we better activate this side-by-sideness of practising together, of sharing — this sense of adjacency or alongside-ness?

How is the ethical dimension of this adjacency or alongside-ness? How is it to become open to another's practice? How does one remain open to another's practice, whilst at same time retaining a sense of one's own? The encounter with another's practice can both expand and destabilise the horizon of one's own practice — extending the sense of what practice *can be*, what even might be possible for one's own practice, whilst at the same time potentially destabilising that same sense of practice. I was able to recognise two tendencies within the event of encounter. At times, the encounter with another's practice was like an 'ah yeah' moment, a moment of recognition (even if the medium or material was different) that strengthened the sense of confidence or clarity in one's own practice: "Oh yeah, I can see that. It's a totally different way of working but I *know this* — I can recognise what you are doing in relation to my own practice." For example, two different sessions — one poetry and one exploring collage — shared many similar approaches, processes and values: the generation of material or of finding the material, followed by the act of redacting and cutting, and then recombination. Very different practices, yet there was so much resonance at the level of process. At other times, there was also a different 'ah, yes', a different quality of recognition — more like the surprise of — "oh, I have never thought of that before." Suddenly, a new possibility appears, comes to light or into view. Here perhaps, one's habitual practice becomes encountered anew through the angle offered from another's perspective, from the standpoint of an outsider's eye.

Towards Undoing

Given the focus on *doing* together, I was struck by how much the activity of *undoing* figured in the various sessions, specifically, this quality of taking things apart or disassembling or cutting up something, so to re-encounter it or to see it anew, to see it afresh. Cutting away the background of something, taking the ground away. Yet not just undoing, but also allowing oneself to become undone, having one's ground taken away or destabilised — being in an unfamiliar place as a way of undoing what one already knows. Allowing the preconceptions about one's own work to become undone in the moment of encountering somebody else's practice. Then there was a form of undoing as a way of sharing practice — the taking-apart of a practice so as to open or unfold it for others. In parallel, the undoing of iteration: of making and unmaking, making and unmaking — doing, undoing, redoing. Or else, undoing, taking apart, disassembly for seeing afresh, to generate wonder, to see anew. To somehow estrange or defamiliarise the practice to see it again, as if for the first time. To disclose the hidden workings — which might be different from showing how something is done. Yet treat disclosure with caution — for there is always a risk of destroying something through explication or the step-by-step *how-to*. An emergent lexicon of undoing then — from an undoing through the destructive smashing up of things to a form of undoing practised with delicate care and intricacy. A care of undoing — witnessed in the gentle unpicking of reverse engineering. Undoing can be practised as a way of understanding something better, but also for *not knowing* or for rendering strange.

Over and over — I find myself colliding with the limitations (and language) of (my own?) binary thinking: doing/undoing, knowing/not knowing. In practice, the relation of doing and undoing, knowing and unknowing, is felt as interwoven, entangled, reciprocal, undifferentiated. Consider the relation between structure and the unstructured, the messiness of practice. Anthropologist Tim Ingold's reflects on two

different ways of working: planning in advance and knowing *through* doing.¹⁵ However, I have also observed other models within practice: (1) practices that begin from not knowing (even from the messiness of doing), and gradually find or evolve an emergent form; (2) practices that begin with frames or rules or parameters in order to *invite the unknown in*. There is a different vector operating in each of these examples, yet each is concerned with the question of ‘how to navigate uncertainty’, or perhaps better, how to invite or *embrace* uncertainty. During one workshop someone said [whilst holding a ball of clay], “Sometimes it holds its structure, sometimes it just falls to bits.” This seemed to resonate with the way that structures might become activated in our various practices — *sometimes it holds its structure, sometimes it just falls to bits*. Either way, how might we inhabit or hold the space open for uncertainty, for not knowing? This might seem counterintuitive at times, for there are times when a sense of openness can be deeply paralysing or prohibitive — the overwhelming potential of *anything goes*. Or else, consider the value of *enabling constraints* — constraints that somehow offer leverage against which to work, that allow for making openings. All these false or illusory binaries — consider too the relation of making and thinking, often framed as opposites, perhaps even pitched in opposition; or the relation of artistic practice and language/writing.

How might we conceive of language in relation to artistic practice, not separate from making but itself as a *makerly* practice? At times, there can be a tendency in the arts (and in academia) to conceive language only as a contextualising sense-making tool, concerned only with explaining and justifying and explicating what happens in the art itself. Here a double manoeuvre becomes activated, where language is somehow given certain power or authority, yet simultaneously disempowered as a creative practice. Rather than conceiving writing in such terms, or even somehow as an obstacle or as a problem, the issue at stake as philosopher and media-theorist Dieter Mersch suggests, is one of rising “to the challenge of nevertheless finding words to say the unsayable.”¹⁶ Mersch voices a call to action — rather than “talking about art”, how might writing practice the “more careful and gentle of which merely dares to touch.”¹⁷ There were so many different writerly practices/language practices unfolding during *DOING TOGETHER*. At times, I was struck by how working with language shares much with working with clay, or how it might resonate with the practice of collage. In the side-by-side-ness or adjacency of different practices, unexpected resonances emerge. Through the event, the practice of conversation seems ever-present — whether between humans or with other more-than-human agencies. Conversations enabled through the engagement with materials being touched with the hands — all those material lubricants that allow for conversation to happen.

Doing Together as a Radical Act

How might this act of doing together, of coming together, of being together, emerge as a political gesture, as a quiet yet radical act? What does it mean to come together, to bring attention to another’s practice, to spend time with another, to give one’s time. In *The Ecology of Attention*, Yves Citton seeks to reconceptualise the vocabulary through which contemporary attention has been inscribed, moving away from the language of ‘attention economy, economics of attention, economy of attention’ towards the notion of an *ecology* or even (drawing on the work of both Norwegian philosopher Arne Naess and Félix Guattari) an *ecosophy* of attention.¹⁸ Citton argues

that we inhabit a contemporary culture where there is in an abundance of production (perhaps even an abundance of *doing*) but a deficit or lack of attention. Citton asks: “What can we do collectively about our individual attention, and how can we contribute individually to a redistribution of our collective attention?”¹⁹ He addresses the potential of ‘joint attention’, collective attention and even individuating attention — where “The coconstruction of subjectivities and intellectual proficiency requires the copresence of attentive bodies sharing the same space over the course of infinitesimal but decisive cognitive and emotional harmonizations.”²⁰ It is also in this sense perhaps that *DOING TOGETHER* — making a decision to come together and spend time exploring one another’s practices, to become absorbed together in the practice of sharing — might be conceived is a political move, an ethical gesture, a quiet mode of resistance.

¹ *With-nessing* is a neologism of the terms *witnessing* and *being-with*. The notion of ‘with-nessing’ as an artistic research approach was developed by Emma Cocker, Nikolaus Gansterer and Mariella Greil. See *Choreo-graphic Figures: Deviations from the Line*, (Berlin, de Gruyter, 2017), pp. 164 – 166. A variant of the term is also used by Bracha L. Ettinger who states, “the question of wit(h)nessing arises, where the I reattunes itself in co-response-ability with the non-I’s traces within a shared psychic space ... where we can talk about co-response-ability and asymmetrical responsibility and coemergence-in-difference on a transsubjective level, as the time-space of encounter-event is shared by several borderlinking I(s) and non-I(s) [...] Here a copoietic jointness evolves, only inasmuch as it is transfused with compassion.” See Bracha L. Ettinger, *Intimacy, wit(h)nessing and non-abandonment*, <http://jordancrandall.com/main/+UNDERFIRE/site/files/q-node-562.html>. See also Ettinger, *The Matrixial Borderspace*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006).

² For example, Miwon Kwon coins the term “temporary invented community” to describe the social configurations that are “newly constituted and rendered operational through the coordination of the art-work itself” (See Miwon Kwon, *One Place After Another: Site-Specific Art and Locational Identity*, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: The MIT Press, 2004, p.126). In *WE: Collectivities, Mutualities, Participations* (2002), Irit Rogoff points to how an ‘emergent collectivity’ or “performative collectivity, one that is produced in the very act of being together in the same space and compelled by similar edicts, might just alert us to a form of mutuality which cannot be recognized in the normative modes of shared beliefs, interests or kinship.” (See Irit Rogoff, ‘WE: Collectivities, Mutualities, Participations’, in *I Promise its Political*, (Museum Ludwig: Cologne, 2002).

³ Byung-Chul Han, *The Scent of Time: A Philosophical Essay on the Art of Linger* (Polity Press, 2017) p.36.

⁴ This list recalls the project *Inventory of Behaviours* (Jo Addison and Natasha Kidd) which was highlighted during Natasha’s session as part of *DOING TOGETHER*. See <https://www.inventoryofbehaviours.co.uk/>

⁵ Tricia Hersey, *Rest is Resistance*, (Aster, 2022).

⁶ Hersey, 2022, p. 95.

⁷ Hersey, 2022, p. 13.

⁸ Hersey, 2022, p. 20.

⁹ Michelle Boulous Walker, *Slow Philosophy: Reading Against the Institution*, (Bloomsbury Academic, 2017), p. xiv

¹⁰ Walker, 2017, p. 53.

¹¹ See María Puig de la Bellacasa, *Matters of Care: Speculative Ethics in More Than Human Worlds*, (Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press, 2017).

¹² See definition here - <https://praguk.wordpress.com/glossary-of-terms/research/>

¹³ For example, during her session, Abi Hunt described the act of “putting together fragments of things and trusting that something will happen.”

¹⁴ See Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1968) and Jacques Rancière, *The Ignorant Schoolmaster*, (1987).

¹⁵ Natasha cited this distinction by Ingold in her introduction to *DOING TOGETHER*. See also the research project <https://knowingfromtheinside.org/>

¹⁶ Dieter Mersch, *Epistemologies of Aesthetics*, (Diaphanes, 2015) p. 10.

¹⁷ Mersch, ‘Figuration/defiguration: for a dialect of choreo-graphy’ in Emma Cocker, Nikolaus Gansterer and Mariella Greil (eds.) *Choreo-graphic Figures: Deviations from the Line*, (De Gruyter, 2017), p. 122.

¹⁸ Yves Citton, *The Ecology of Attention*, trans. Barnaby Norman, (Cambridge: Polity, 2017)

¹⁹ Citton, 2017, p. 10.

²⁰ Citton, 2017, p. 18.