

Attitudes and principles of making

Ellis, S

Author post-print (accepted) deposited by Coventry University's Repository

Original citation & hyperlink:

Ellis, S 2016, 'Attitudes and principles of making' *Choreographic Practices*, vol 7, no. 1, pp. 65-69

https://dx.doi.org/10.1386/chor.7.1.65_1

DOI 10.1386/chor.7.1.65_1

ISSN 2040-5669

Publisher: Intellect

Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

This document is the author's post-print version, incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer-review process. Some differences between the published version and this version may remain and you are advised to consult the published version if you wish to cite from it.

Principles of Making

In the last three years I've been working as a dramaturg with choreographer-performers Igor Urzelai and Moreno Solinas[1]. During that time I've become curious about what might be thought of as principles – or perhaps *attitudes* – of choreographic practice and making. My curiosity has grown as a consequence of observing Igor and Moreno work, and finding ways to understand and express the kinds of conditions that underpin their working processes.

The following is a list of these principles. In order to make the list, the words 1) needed to fit any kind of choreographic making (including, say, conceptual performance or expanded choreographies); and 2) any choreographic methods must be able to be derived or adapted from these principles.

The list is not exhaustive, and indeed is comprised of ideas that are so general that they would hold for any kind of making. In such a way they demand that I consider to what extent choreographic making special at all. Perhaps the list might – as we continue to consider the nature of choreographic practices – help to provoke our questions, our processes, our methods and our choreographies.

In no particular order:

Emergent and adaptive

Choreographies come into being through processes of – and sensitivity to – change. A choreographic process cannot be linear. They require flexibility and adaptation.

Speculative

Bojana Cvejić[2] writes that we practice “standing-under” (support) before we “understand”. To speculate is to think again, and to invite the power and beauty of uncertainty. It is related to iterative processes.

Iterative

In which cycles of practice, watching, sharing, testing, change, re-practicing are ongoing.

Relational

Choreographic practice is always in relation to others (within the work, outside of the work)

Dis/organised

We are testing the limits, edges, and degrees of organisation and disorganisation.

Situational

Choreographic activity and problems “cannot be separated from the situation in which they occur” [3]. Context is, as they say, everything. There are no neutral situations or spaces.

Restless

Restlessness is a persistent desire for change and action; it is not being able to rest; it is cajoling and tinkering, and the willingness to keep pursuing what might be.

Attention

I like how we say in English that we are *paying* attention. It *costs us* to notice, to practice observation and awareness. The various sensory frames of choreographic practice determine what we might notice and what the materials of our observation might become.

Imagination and play

Principles of making are built on imagination and play. Together they invite surprise, unlimited – or unthought of – relationships or connections, and build an atmosphere of trust, openness and even love. I suspect that the other items on this list are made possible by these two.

Hacking and open-source

What are the tools for choreographic hacking? What is being pulled apart, and recombined, how is work being obstructed, reverse-engineered, restrained, interrupted and sold for new parts?

Cvejić states that choreographers are increasingly acknowledging “the open-source model for how ideas and performance materials are created and circulated” [4]. We can make no claims to originality.

Composition

I’m thinking here of the kinds of things that have infested undergraduate (and high school) choreography courses since such things existed: repetition, canon, dynamics, levels, time, space, you know the rest. They are the tick-boxes of A-level dance. This is not to say that these compositional tools aren’t important, but I wonder if they are a tail wagging a much more complex dog. What would the teaching and learning of

choreography be like if we didn't consider these tools to be the building blocks or basics?

Friction

With closeness and relational work comes the potential for friction. What might become possible with resistance, challenge, and difference? If we don't compromise, then we generate heat. Friction affords change or deviation.

Stewardship

A steward is someone who accepts responsibility for taking care of something that is deemed worthy of care. Stewardship implies a lightness of touch and time in which the steward might manage resources, frames or contexts, materials and even culture. A steward is accountable and responsible. The steward's brief or enduring encounters with a choreographic work are in striking contrast with the choreographer-as-genius who seeks to own something that cannot be owned.

References

[1] <http://www.igorandmoreno.com>

[2 - 4] Cvejić, Bojana. 2010. "The Ignorant Dramaturg." Sarma.Be. July. <http://sarma.be/docs/2864>. Accessed 20 April 2012.