

Jesper – Triple Report idea 17 January 2017, and dated/timed onwards writing (A: 8.30 a.m on the 18th)(B:..... Tom Wengraf

Let's start with an excerpt from the end of Jesper's subsession one of his BNIM Interview

Transcript p.25.- after the end of the initial improvised narrative – subsession one

Tom: Anything else you'd like to add?

" I think it's difficult to..(5 sec pause)..because I've been focusing on the projects I need to be focusing on, and reflect on..(7 sec)..but it can also be interesting, I feel like, so there's this desire to be working in the institutional context. There's all this, there's the motivation behind it, so I can also add that..(4sec)..of course the private Jesper, it's all the time on the, why do we want to be part of this, what's interesting of working there, or...so it's kind of (12 sec), or why didn't you continue there if it's...I mean there's lots of ..(11sec)..ambiguity in all this, even if I feel I've been talking *here, and then this, and then that*. It becomes partly difficult to take off this CVish thing (11 secs) and I mean, I think it could also be in a story about, like an emotional human being, what's the.. (4 secs)..attraction to all this, for example? What's the longing for sharing that process, or why this? – I don't know to add, but in general I think that's..(5 secs)..maybe..(7 secs)..what's interesting to work, even in an institution, you work very close and very hierarchical, so it's also, it's healthier to have a focus on the art, and to, this is also..(5 secs)..it could be, I think, fulfilling in many cases to ..(4 sec)..when there's more, well, all in all, I think it's a very hard and competitive environment, which..(4 secs)..takes a lot of, well, makes you vulnerable maybe, so this, I think, has..(7 secs)..which I'm missing, that's maybe what I wanted to say, I'm missing that..(4 secs).

Tom: Sorry, what are you missing?

Jesper: Erm, well, when explaining or presenting, that there is..(7 secs)..in my own presentation but in general in the environment, there is..(3 secs)..there's not so much room for..(6 secs)..why are you doing it like that? – or what's the... I'm not saying that it should be, what's the psychology of this, or what's your, but ..(8 secs)..I'm not sure if I can say it better (Transcript p.25)

- If you are interested in the working of the BNIM methodology, you could start with **column C** (right-hand) which is the one I started writing first, to provide a firm base for further thinking.
- If you are interested in my personal experiencing of the September-January process, then **Column A** (left-hand) would be helpful
- If you interested in my struggle to overcome methodological difficulties and write explicitly about 'Jesper in his world' based on the interviewing and interpretation, the **Column C** is probably the best to start with - you could even start at the end, with p.8!
- NB: Four-fifths of these notes were written as private notes just for me. I then decided (see Column C) to use them as the mode of reporting.....

• Me and subjective experience of J-project	B.BNIM HCE of the J-project, or rather (20 January 2017) a structural account with a variety of 'structural issues' arising from the interview.	C. The J-project and its illumination of normal BNIM under pressure and attractive subversion Anti-BNIM modifications cumulating
Added at the end of working on this column. After all my work with him, our work together, in the UK and in Oslo, I don't think I know Jesper. But I do know his world. Perhaps both these are his successes? The 'Jesper world' for me is a mixture of Kafka and the felt world of John Fowles's novel <i>The Magus</i> . More like the latter than the former. A sense of thinking you know the situation, and then it's upended and you have a feeling of not knowing where the 'perversity' of your situatedness is the product of bad negligence and absence of 'care for consequences' or the product of a deliberate strategy of a master-manipulator or a 'social perversity' characteristic of some aspects of 21 st century Western changes in the nature of work and social relations.	This should be standard J-history focus, but on his inexplicit self or the implications of his work? For the intra- and cross-category subjectivity of his work, is what the Assessors want. Can I explain this artist's pedagogic and innovative drive's together with its strange 'couple' with insufficient concern with art-users and maybe art-peers and other artists (except as a tutor-teacher)? If that is a fair comment and summary.	Project idea – an ordinary 'BN-case-history' of somebody who was a Norwegian artist.
		Unusuality of 'commissioning agent' of BN-Report. The commissioning agent was the artist themselves, which means that 'usual anonymity' of researcher and researched didn't happen.
	Is the J-biography well-known enough from other pages of his documentation to make my laborious piecing together of his lived-life rather redundant? If so, if well-known enough, do I focus on the line of development of his implicit 'art-project trajectory' with an appreciable (just) concern for the subjective experiences of the non-artist users, consumers, and passers-through of his transient 'set-ups'? I think so. But there must be enough 'biographic subjectivity' (even if speculative) about him, to make it not just another critical catalogue of a short 'history of his work in the last 5 years'....	Unusual 'open final user': the Report would be provided by the artist to the PhA assessors. It was not confidential to the artist, or to the commissioning agent, or even the Art Assessors. Hence confidentiality and anonymity were impossible, and this would impact on the 'frank candour' of the BNIM interview sessions.
Around the 'interview period' of (September), I was very uncertain as to whether BNIM – which pushes for in-PINs of lived experiencing – was right for what apparently Jesper wanted to use it for – namely to submit all the materials and processes to a 'public of peers and jury' in what I understood to be some sort of 'competition' in what I imagined and was later to be told was a 'competitive artworld market'. But Jesper had done the 3-day BNIM training quite recently, and I assumed that he was aware of the difficulties (see Column C right hand column) for spelling out the anti-BNIM conditions of non-anonymity and confidentiality of process and product) and determined to overcome them.		Control of SQUIN. I would have used the default personal whole-life SQUIN. Jesper wanted to restrict it to the professional life, and later made clear he wanted it to focus particularly (maybe fairly exclusively) on the professional life of the past 3-5 years. I accepted this, though with misgivings,
	Work out some phases and, from general earlier work with low level of detail, zooming quickly into much more detail in the last 5 years. But it is as the uneven and incomplete development so far as an 'arts-professional all rounder' that he needs to be depicted. For his own sake. + Weaknesses	Access to SQUIN. This is normally not known to the interviewee in advance, providing unsettlement and improvisation of a quite radical sort. Negotiations between J and me and his earlier experience of BNIM meant that he was not confronted by an 'unexpected SQUIN'.
As I start to write this column, I am starting to feel that my best contribution will be to submit the Transcript, the Sequentialisation, the BDA and TFA documents, and this 'Triple Column document' as my unorthodox Report which is not a report, or HCE, or polished structural account of any sort.	There should be an implication – not too clear – of sides he needs to strengthen, even 'bad old habits' he needs at least partially to overcome or at least alleviate....mystifying people is not the only positive achievement of a public artist... ----- Don't forget his 'quadruple tension' between (i) creating his own installations, (ii) as Arts School administrator fostering tours and not-just-Norway perspective; (iii) direct 'teaching' ?; (iv) ?? curating?	The subsession 1: There was not just an audio-recorder but also a video-camera which I had not expected. This intensified self-consciousness on both sides of the desk.
Given that I only have three or so more days to make some sort of 'document' for Jesper and the Jury, I can't hope to do more. In that sense, the 'denaturing and renaturing conditions of work' that Jesper's subjects typically find themselves in – see Column C – applies also to these ones. The quality and type of material that the Interview generated, my unfamiliarity with the non-artefact artworld and with Norwegian society and its institutions, makes it unrealistic for me to try to produce anything but these items plus a covering note. So I don't get paid, so what? It's certainly been a fascinating and rewarding (though very troubling) personal and professional experience.		The subsession 1: The presence of the two recording systems went along with the pretty constant presence of J's partner-collaborator as technical operator. This meant that even in-subsession sense of confidentiality was completely compromised. Normally, care is taken that no person other than the interview-partners is in the room while the interview proceeds. The session only came alive with the 'Coda'. (?)

<p>I think of it as a psychosocietal perversity, without the material that would let me distinguish in an HCE (History of the Case Evolution) how Jesper's personal/professional psychology and changing 'situatedness' produced these current effects. My BNIM psychosocietal panel can only note that I cannot yet exclude the most wild extreme hypotheses from my thinking.</p>	<p>Puzzles-is there a range of 'experiential feedback from users' methods that overcomes the difficulty of talking in words about nonverbal experiences? (lynn's visual matrix, and other allied methodologies/practices).</p> <p>The women who /went/were sent/given the opportunity/ to Paris; the 10 people who worked on the Saturday show in the museum, the people who went through the 'hand' sub-exhibition...who else? from 'volunteers' and 'paid labour' whether lay or skilled? What 'outputs' from the art-professionals who did something else instead?</p> <p>All these would be good questions for a frank ss3!</p>	<p>Subsession 2: Promise of the 'ss1 Coda' pretty completely unfulfilled. He "didn't have anything to say about subsession one". no particular memory of this, except that of finding Jesper very unusually unwilling to give evaluations of the stories he told. I remember great frustration over the 6 hours, because of no Evaluations (that would give his personal orientation away?) and I think not very many or not very rich in-PINs. My frustration was due to the non-provision of 'clear personal responses' to even the events in his professional life, worse because the personal life was 'excluded' anyway by the carefully designed SQUIN. The session only came alive with the 'Coda'. (?)</p>
<p><i>A. Wild Hypothesis of Personal Perversity.</i> My experience of this unusually long interview (normally they take 2-4 hours, Jesper's took over 6 hours) was of considerable frustration. Having done the course, Jesper knew that the methodological focus was on eliciting Personal Incident Narratives (PINs) in which the person at least partly relives the experience from his previous history being remembered, and tends to give his 'past Evaluation then' of what it meant to him then, and also his 'present Evaluation now' of what 'lessons' he draws from it now. Simplifying, when people choose to use BNIM, this is what they are trying to get to happen. Jesper was a knowledgeable commissioner and I believe he knew that this is what the method intends to do and normally does.</p>		<p>Ss1 and ss2 together were unusually long, and took I think three half-days. Over 6 hours of running time. This left little time for me as an interviewer to digest material...</p>
<p>I have indicated in Column 3 how Jesper knew that he was 'depersonalising' the SQUIN and trying to limit ss2 (and maybe my Report) to his 'professional life especially in the last three or so years. I have also indicated how he was determined/knew that the 'BNIM interpretive panels' would be held in Oslo, and that it would be other members of the 'Oslo artworld' who would be on the panels and be 'interpreting' him.</p>	<p>Perhaps an artist tries to produce new and hopefully good experiences for himself and other people; a researcher wants to find out what type of (good) experiences are produced in different people, and to what extent, and with or without longer-term outcomes. ' "Nobody is both a passionate artist and a passionate social researcher". Discuss.'</p>	<p>Ss3 – did not happen because of the unusual over-6-hours bulk of the first 2 subsessions, and because it normally takes a week of digestion after ss2 before thinking about what is needed for an ss3. Given the geographical distance, and my lack of access even to the audio-record, I think I wrote off exploring the need for an (almost certainly impractical) need for an ss3</p>
<p>He had also decided that the November panel was to coincide with the 'day' of the Jury visit, and said that Jury members would be/ might be/ part of the BNIM panel on that day.</p> <p>Either, he understood perfectly well how great the pressures would be on his frankness in the interview – but had the courage and determination to be 'frank and vulnerable' all the same (but pretty much failed completely).</p>	<p>18 January 2017 Art can get high-jacked and enrolled for social research purposes (perhaps debasing and contaminating it). Social research (BNIM) can be high-jacked and enrolled for artistic purposes (perhaps debasing and contaminating it). The 'unhappy coupling' of the latter is what I have in BNIM research terms. See appendix (column C of this text, just to my right as I type!</p>	<p>BDC: From the interview I gathered some material and from public and semi-public material I gathered more. I think I did gather material about his move 'out of the studio' and into non-art-object art, and other stuff.</p>
<p>Or, for whatever reason, he was determined to use me as 'BNIM operator' as another experiment in 'frustrated denatured working'. I was not 'outside his projects' doing proper professional observation and inquiry; I was 'enrolled in his project of experimental ethnography (the title of an article he sent me recently for possible joint presentation) of deceptive and precarious working in 21st Western society'.</p> <p>Somebody who knows very well what the intended purpose (moderately unique selling point) of a method is and then sets up all the societal conditions and arrangements (Column C) that denature it is being deliberately perverse.</p>	<p>Here will come eventually an HCE (and afterwards an SA (structural account) , if I have time to write it). To do that, do I have time (in 5 days) to lengthily construct...? No, I think I should move today to filling in the three columns preparatory to the HCE. The HCE itself comes after that, maybe tomorrow or even this afternoon. On another day, after digestion, any Structural Account – the four tensions and three (?) possible evaluations of ...what? Of the deficit of exploring the 'lived experience' of Jesper's processes, including the enrolment of myself and the Assessors in an apparently 'Outside Work'. So: today, I start outside <i>this</i> three-column text on the classic BNIM 3-columns. Printed at 8.30 a.m. on the 18th</p>	<p>BDA: the BNIM panel is normally carefully chosen by me to be 'structured for heterogeneity': one person like the interviewee; everybody else unlike the interview and unlike each other. The motivation is to be part of an 'interview interpretive' panel. No cash reward is involved. In Oslo, I was not involved either in the criteria of selection, nor in the actual selection from a pool. I had no idea of the panel members would be, and their motivation in some cases seemed to be just the 'wage' to be given. They did not seem to even know that they were coming to an interpretive panel: they were left completely in the dark ("dance on a table"?). Their motivation was kept purely mercenary, and their ignorance was pretty maximum.</p>
<p>The same somebody who knows the method and its 'pushing for PINs' drive in subsession 2 is in this case also the interviewee. Jesper was in both roles – (a) knowledgeable commissioner of a BNIM process using me as BNIM expert, (b) the person to be interviewed.</p> <p>As the interviewee, Jesper amazed me. As the ss2 developed, it was clear that I was going to get unusually-few PINs and unusually few Evaluations.</p> <p>Somebody remarked that the text had the longest pauses she had ever seen in a BNIM transcript.</p> <p>Either Jesper was struggling against his societal vulnerability which stopped him from making himself more vulnerable by admitting personal things (PINs, Evaluations) – there is some evidence from time to time that this might have been the case.</p> <p>Or, Jesper was determined to frustrate my professional drive towards exploring his personal experience. This would be part of his 'deceptive and denatured work' and the 'double ontology'.</p>		<p>BDA process: Again, there was audio and video-recording. Not certain how this was experienced.</p>
	<p>19th January 17.11 Intermediate target, a text of 5,000 words</p> <p>350 abstract (3/4 page)</p> <p>700 methodological purposes of BNIM, and conditions of doing BNIM work (unsatisfactorily (2 pages) and 'BNIM' as an enrolled work-work (see jury Protokoll on no genuine outsiders, Long and Long)</p> <p>500 at the end – conclusions (1 ¼ pages) which should show J's accumulated resources and potential, and areas of emerging focus (ethics, impact-assessment, relational detachment and attachment) -----</p> <p>1850 for the Jesper case (5 pages) – with an HCE and/or case account that isn't overloaded with detail elsewhere in the J-portfolio</p>	<p>Sequentialisation (TSS): This is always a long solitary process, and for the 6/7 hours interview was very long indeed. The absence of personal history and personal Evaluations made it also personally rather a drudgery for me. I can't at the moment remember much about it, except worrying that I wouldn't finish it in the 'small month' available. Given that it wasn't clear whether or not the research process would stop with the TFA panel on November 15th, I felt under-motivated myself to complete the TSS, searching for 'interesting-enough- but not-too-personally-revealing' set of adjacent chunks. But the 'best bit' might be in ss2....so I did complete the sequentialisation. I was worried about Jesper not realising how much could be learned by a good panel doing a TFA, and so I did a check for 'not-too-revealing' myself in his absence.</p>

<p>I can cite one 'fact' about the interview process that supports (does not prove) the interpretation that, from the start, Jesper had (fully consciously, semi-consciously, compulsively) set up a BNIM interview he was determined to frustrate.</p>	<p>20th January 10.00 a.m.</p> <p>The very reasonable conventional format I decided above, I'm not going to do.</p> <p>I've decided that basically I'm going to submit this 3-column document (together with the backup TFA, BDA, and possibly Micro-Analysis documents) together with a Covering Letter.</p> <p>One justification is the fact that I've put in much more work into Jesper's case than I have ever charged for, and that to do a proper BNIM job on materials which lack sufficient 'personal subjective dimension' for reasons identified in columns A and C to left and right would take me a lot more digestion time (and also many more days) than are currently available. A normal BNIM case takes 2-4 months to work on: PhDs normally in 3 years have 3 strong cases and at least as many satellite ones. Neither time nor money is available for this.</p>	<p>TFA in the November panel. The same problem of under-motivated and non-heterogeneous students and colleagues. I don't remember much about this.</p>
<p>In the whole six and a half hours, there is only one moment where Jesper appears to speak as a person struggling to be open to his own experience and to let this be known by me as interviewer.</p> <p>This is in the <i>Coda</i>, the end of ss1.</p> <p>Two pages of the 40-page transcript, pages 25-28 (10 minutes) summarised in the Sequentialisation pages 15-17, lines 25/4 to 28/27.</p> <p>Throughout subsession one, I have been unhappy at the absence of 're-lived experience' reporting in the session, but this is quite frequent in ss1. We call it "the official press release" subsession. It is also the menu available for "pushing for PINs" in subsession two.</p>		<p>The long delay from November-December. I didn't know in this period whether there would be a demand for a 'report of some sort' for me or not. It seemed to depend on the eventual Assessors' Response.</p> <p>In any case, I now realise that the absence of a clear CRQ for the research and a clear Research Report Requirement – together with non-confidentiality and the vulnerability of all this being for PhA Assessment purposes – that I did not have at any point my own clear dynamic (personal/professional) for completing the process (including a notional ss3) – to get a good-enough answer to my CRQ for a known-audience.....because I never had a clear CRQ and certainly never had a known-Audience/</p>
<p>After he has completed subsession one, I say (this is always done at the end of the subsession) "Anything else you'd like to add?", the invitation to use the 'Coda' space. The words I used were "What were your thoughts about ss1, how did you experience it.... anything else you'd like to add?"</p>	<p>Another justification is that, through Jesper, I've come to feel that I'm interested in art which isn't a conventional art-object. So this is analogous: a report on a BNIM interview which isn't a conventional polished interview-report object.!</p>	<p>Field-Notes all the way through. I made a lot of notes on the way through (including these ones) because of the degree of not being clear about Audience and CRQ-Purpose, and so becoming rather passive and unclear and non-proactive...as more and more conditions of good BNIM work were unavailable.</p>
<p>The key passage is on Transcript p.25.</p> <p><i>Quoted already at the top of the first page...</i></p> <p>"I think it's difficult to...(5 sec pause)...because I've been focusing on the projects I need to be focusing on, and reflect on...(7 sec)...but it can also be interesting. I feel like, so there's this desire to be working in the institutional context. There's all this, there's the motivation behind it, so I can also add that...(4sec)...of course the private Jesper, it's all the time on the, why do we want to be part of this, what's interesting of working there, or...so it's kind of (12 sec), or why didn't you continue there if it's...I mean there's lots of ... (11sec)...ambiguity in all this, even if I feel I've been talking <i>here, and then this, and then that</i>. It becomes partly difficult to take off this CVish thing (11 secs) and I mean, I think it could also be in a story about, like an emotional human being, what's the... (4 secs)...attraction to all this [??1:24:21 ref] for example? What's the longing for sharing that process, or why this? – I don't know [??1: 24:31] to add, but in general I think that's...(5 secs)...maybe...(7 secs)...what's interesting to work, even in an institution, you work very close and very hierarchical, so it's also, it's healthier to have a focus on the art, and to, this is also...(5 secs)...it could be, I think, fulfilling in many cases to...(4 sec)...when there's more, well, all in all, I think it's a very hard and competitive environment, which...(4 secs)...takes a lot of, well, makes you vulnerable maybe, so this, I think, has...(7 secs)...which I'm missing, that's maybe what I wanted to say, I'm missing that...(4 secs)..</p>	<p>So this unrevised text is my experiment in collage-like experimental ethnography reporting on a BNIM-interviewing experiment. !</p> <p>What do I need to add in this column?</p> <p>I think I should add:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 4-way roles (role-identities)(life-tensions) that the private Jesper moves between, the tensions that to me seem to organise his fluctuating 'concentrations and mutations' over his career course so far Structural hypotheses about different aspects-issues of Jesper-in-the-world as a situated subjectivity Any very rough sketch of subjective change over the life-career course that could be structural hypotheses for doing an HCE properly were the occasion to arise <p><i>As it turned out, of these 'three intended additions' only a slightly modified version of the second one was realised. I leave the 'intention' above as a record for myself and others.....</i></p>	<p>Commissioning the current Triple Report. Jesper was only able to tell me in very late December about he needed (and could fund) a short report by mid-January....by which time I was already in the middle of writing an early-December commission for a book chapter on BNIM and Psychoanalysis by the end of January. This I have only just finished. So now have space – about 8 days – to produce some sort of 'Report on J'.</p> <p>Around January 10th, he sent me the Protokoll report of the Assessors and I was heartened to find (though maybe I should not have been) that many of my frustrations with the J-Project were echoed by them</p>
<p><i>Tom: Sorry, what are you missing?</i></p> <p>Jesper: Erm, well, when explaining or presenting, that there is...(7 secs)...in my own presentation but in general in the environment, there is...(3 secs)...there's not so much room for...(6 secs)...why are you doing it like that? – or what's the... I'm not saying that it should be, what's the psychology of this, or what's your, but...(8 secs)...I'm not sure if I can say it better (Transcript p.25).....</p> <p>....I felt I was going through a lot of those things I expected to talk about, and which I wanted to bring in, so I wouldn't say I felt like an idiot....It's not autopilot exactly, but it's like my story, which I...(4 secs)...it doesn't surprise me much (laughs)</p> <p><i>Tom (he laughs)</i></p> <p>Jesper: But it seems very hard to see it from a different point (Emphatically).....</p> <p>(Transcript p.26)</p> <p>I remember thinking "Wow", he has become aware of, or ready to speak about, the "official press release style" of ss1. So, ss2 should be much better. We should get something of the 'private Jesper', more of the 'non-CV-speak.</p>	<p>Structural Hypotheses and Interests</p> <p>1. Managing – When working in the theatre group in France, he once accompanied the manager to some sort of negotiation-confrontation (with a municipality) (with "fart" on the way there!), and was very impressed and interested in that. The most recent example was in 2012? when he became a Study Coordinator for the MA in Fine Arts in Oslo, which seems to have gone well.</p> <p>2. Being a free and travelling artist – A remarkable feature of his biography has been the pretty constant impulse to travel to many countries as part of his personal and professional life. He did internships or equivalent in New York and Japan, went to Paris to become a 'struggling artist-to-be' and then stayed in a small French Village before going to study first in Montpellier and then in Prague. Several of his exhibitions emerge from such travelling (North Africa, Vietnamese, come to mind, there are probably others.</p> <p>At the moment, it feels as if he is operating simultaneously in Oslo and in the Czech Republic, doing work in both places. His impressive list of galleries and exhibitions shows him working in an extremely wide variety of (mostly European in the larger sense) places.</p> <p>His 'constant cosmopolitan vocation' may relate to his 'divided self' (my phrase) and 'double ontology'. Both positively and negatively.</p>	<p><i>Assessors Protokoll-Criteria Report.</i> Reading it this morning, it crystallised my sense of having shifted from doing an outside observer's job on J's experience while doing J's projects to starting to be at least partly enrolled <i>within such a project</i> (Work,work,work) in which the normal technical conditions of good scientific BNIM-work were being subverted and deflected. I had been attracted by moving away from routine BNIM-work into 'BNIM in the artworld', and had not realised how strong the steady erosion of my concepts of good practice had been. I decided to make for me a 'personal positive' about this unpredicted 'attractive strange subversion'. I would use it to as an 'ethnographic disruption' that would show what the normal unconscious assumptions and practices were disrupted and surfaced under these 'cumulatively unusual conditions'.</p> <p>I would then write this up in some way for an exclusively motivated BNIM audience.</p> <p>The notes I have written above so far in this column are a first BNIM-introspective lived experience of 'cumulatively worsening conditions for doing BNIM well'. I am enjoying writing them, but they/this column is not a justifiable purpose for non-BNIM people. I need to write the other two. But I hope that writing this 'private to BNIM' third column first has cleared the ground for writing the other two!</p>

<p>I was wrong- and this became clear right at the start of subsession two</p>	<p>3. Para-art, and the edges of the artworld/lay people overlaps Around 2001, he gave up the prime focus of producing art-objects (I don't know what they were) and adopted conceptual and maybe more 'relational artwork' as a focus. He did studies of Elders who had trained as artists and then done other things. He got BA students to get enrolled as MA Arts students (with false portfolios etc) to explore I imagine their experience in the Artworld. He set up a sub-exhibition where people who came to an another main exhibition found themselves organised into drawing their own hand to get entry, engaged in conversation with play therapists and others behind a curtain, and then found their 'hand-drawing' and a photograph of their hand at the last station of the sub-exhibition before leaving. There was also the work that involved women going to Paris for some purpose I can't recall as I write this.</p> <p>3. Lack (until recently) of interest or capacity to explore the consequences of his people-changing experiments. Very recently, he has shown some interests in the effects on 'ongoing participants' of his relational-experimental work, but for most of his career this has not been the case. Although he describes some of his work as 'experimental', he still shows only marginal interest in reviewing the 'results in people' of such alleged experimentation. This may be the formation of the classic 'artist', but to a social researcher like myself from the UK where exploring the 'impact on people' of public art in public spaces has developed a fair bit (Lynn Froggett: Visual Matrix) and where in media and cultural studies research into 'reception experience' and 'media impact' is several generations old, for me this neglect by Jesper was surprising. In his interview, he reported that recently he had interviewed 10 volunteers who had been involved in Warsaw in a set of weekend events that he had organised, but when I asked what he had learned from these interviews, he didn't say that he had learned much. This may be that it was too difficult to recall and tell me, or that it was part of the 'indeterminacy about himself' which seems such a strong feature. However, I thought it a good sign that he had at least <i>started</i> to explore the impact and experience of those involved in his 'art-events'.</p> <p>3. Pedagogy and constantly learning His summer school times at Saas Fee (European Summer School) intensified his taste for 'growth games' (check details) as practised by teachers, playworkers, social workers and similar. He spoke enthusiastically (one of his few PNs) about working with clay and the sensory awakening of the body to the non-verbal. As a Manager of Studies, it was striking how he identified with the students learning from travelling cheaply to other countries and arts centres (Alexandria rather than Paris or New York) and his concern for promoting groupwork by students (Grymov and the collective 'authorship' of short films.</p>	<p>18 January</p>
<p><i>bit</i></p> <p><i>Tom: OK, just quickly, any thoughts that you've had while, if you had, any relevant thoughts over the breaktime until now, about how it went, or about yourself, whatever</i></p> <p><i>Jesper: Yeah, no, I was thinking over, and...(3 secs)...yeah, I haven't any special entries or thoughts.....</i> And that was that.</p> <p>Straightaway, my hope of a break-through by the 'private Jesper' appeared erroneous, and this was confirmed by the (long) rest of subsession two.</p> <p>Looking at the text now as quoted, it is clear that he always decides to self-censor whenever he can. He admits that "he was thinking (it) over", but of the "yeah,no'", the 'no' wins again.</p> <p>He had said in the Coda that "there's not so much room" for "taking off this CV-ish thing" and being something like "an emotional human being", and, as I just said, in ss2 the 'no' wins again...the room is there, but he refuses it, perhaps "too vulnerable" in the "hard competitive environment" that will have access (he has organised it this way) to what he says in the interview. So:</p> <p><i>Jesper: Yeah, no, I was thinking over, and...(3 secs)...yeah, I haven't any special entries or thoughts.....</i></p> <p>Given the environment, the emotional human being, the private Jesper, is going to be kept carefully self-censored, however many long pauses it takes. We are not going to get at his "motivations" (which he mentions) and his "Evaluations" (which he doesn't).</p> <p>My tone in these notes is of frustrated bad temper or loss – as a failed BNIM interviewer (and now writer of notes looking back) – and I am aware that there are quite opposite and more generous and less Jasper-censorious ways of interpreting his interview practice.</p> <p>I will try to do them justice. But it will take an effort. What <i>I feel</i> is 'thwarted' by a self-guarding and self-censoring subjectivity. And, at times at least like this moment, I think he knows perfectly well what he's doing, it's very conscious.</p> <p>As a 'public intellectual in a competitive environment facing a jury process', I understand this. As a person and a BNIM professional, I feel manipulated and frustrated.</p> <p>Welcome to the world of work and a double ontology – that we all inhabit!!</p>		<p>Overnight, I've come to see that doing a BNIM interview with somebody in a precarious 'art market professional situation' surrounded by competitors and grading assessors, with the BNIM interview process generating a non-confidential and non-anonymous interview and then be subjected in its raw materials panel 'interpretation' (BDA, MA, TFA) to others from the 'art community', and that the TFA panel would include members of the assessors and other 'hierarchs'. And that then any HCE or Structural Account would then be submitted to hierarchs for 'grading' as part of the assessment dossier (as might the transcript, etc.etc)....</p> <p>It could not have been set up better to induce self-defensive practice which subverts BNIM practice and assumptions. Which it did.</p> <p>a.The insistence on 'professional life' SQUIN and not the personal – though BNIM is about exploring 'personal lived experiencing'</p> <p>b.The amazingly unremitting self-censorship during the BNIM interview of 'Evaluations by the person of the personal behind and underlying and learning from the professional experiments and practices'. A self-censorship at the opposite from what occurs in a normal confidential and anonymous BNIM interview and publication process.</p> <p>c.The 'public unselected panels' and my attempt to remove "anything too personal" and stick to the "last three years" in terms of the selection of materials from the already self-censored professional interview: (i) the selection of less-personal material for the TFA with assessors present, (ii) the 'unwitting paid-labour panelists' who (unbriefed/ misbriefed?) had no idea what they were there for ("dance on the table"?) and were not selected for intrinsic motivation of heterogeneity and appropriateness (I normally have social science university graduate type people or that level) – and the feelings of being "enrolled in a recorded and videoed event" that was not what it appeared to be (Jesper's artistic rival).</p> <p>e. The writing by me of some sort of 'HCE report for assessment' which remained a fluid option until December, and then had a 'January 4' deadline – now extended to the end of January</p> <p>f.My not having received any transcript or notes from any of the panel sessions of October or November, on which to base my 'HCE interpreting and reporting of the results of that first round of interpretive process.</p> <p>g.The fact that a specified 'report' was not the unarguable 'finality' to which end-product all earlier research-process was from the beginning oriented...was itself very unusual and disorienting.</p> <p>h. and now as I sit this morning with only five days to write an HCE Report for the Assessors Dossier, I'm realising the cumulative uncertainties and BNIM-inadequacies of preparation as starting to be re-articulated and clarified in this column.</p>

<p>So much for my wild hypothesis of 'personal perversity' aggravated by his decision to aggravate the pressures of a perversely competitive and envious society by 'making the BNIM process from interview to jury publication a public matter'.</p> <p>Column completed here on 20th January 09.45 a.m.</p>	<p>4. Emergent but committed to what I see as non-transparent and experienced-as-manipulative working.</p> <p>Perhaps this is related to his original short training in France as an actor and maker of dolls for a puppet theatre. ? The current Jury's Protokoll very perceptive (= congruent with my experience, see comments in left and right columns!) remarks about Jesper as turning everything, enrolling everything, into what feels like an 'obscurely manipulated theatre' are relevant here.</p> <p>It would fit sociologist Erving Goffman's (1960) magnificently titled <i>The Presentation of Self in Every Day Life</i>, and the whole 'as if dramaturgical' tradition in sociology. The 'breaching experiments' of the tradition founded by Garfinkel of practical ethnomethodology seem very apposite.</p> <p>However, judging by my own very limited experience, 'feeling manipulated and liable to betrayal' is a high ethical and emotional cost to at least some participants.</p> <p>In the supposed to be 'BNIM scientific interpretive panels' that had been organised for me by Jesper in Oslo on the 15th October and November 2016, it turned out that the participants had in the main no idea what they were coming for, and in some cases doubted the very existence of 'Jeremy'. The financial inducement seemed for several to be the only motivating reason for coming. One 'panelist' said that he had thought "Maybe I'll be asked to dance on a table". Another panellist (a colleague of Jesper) walked out of the room on the grounds of feeling that he'd been brought along under false pretences. The presence of audio and video cameras had clearly not been anticipated at least by some, and I had to be fairly categorical that the 'recorded material' was for private study only and would not be released without permission. Actually, I realised that I had no authority to believe that my assurance was grounded – and felt 'enrolled' in a deceptive operation myself!</p> <p>I also was taken aback when – having been asked to run a 90" introduction to BNIM – I prepared one but found an audience of only four people – two of which were Jesper and the video/audio-operator.</p> <p>Perhaps it was properly advertised and only two people wanted to come? Perhaps there was an 'experimental ethnography' based on the further frustration of myself as BNIM-worker? It is significant that I had these thoughts, that I don't know the answers and didn't try to find out. It's the sort of thing that can happen, I think I must have thought, in the cloudy non-transparent Jesperworld!</p> <p>I should say that the discussion was excellent, one of the best explorations of BNIM that I've attended!</p> <p>The Jury also expressed doubts in their Protokoll document about the 'emotional-ethical' costs of such non-transparency and double ontology.</p>	
		<p>I think I have to declare my professional autonomy and stop 'protecting' Jesper.</p> <p>(i) I have to do an HCE – at least today – of a relatively conventional sort, with the caveats about shallow and self-censored expressions of 'personally lived and evaluated experiencing'. This has to include the 'structural model of the four tensions' identified somewhere by me.</p> <p>(ii) I then have to write a methodological appendix summarising this column, and the unfortunate-for-science consequences of being commissioned as an 'outside about', and finding, like so many of Jesper's labourers, of actually being 'enrolled within' a "deviant work situation".</p> <p>(iii) I then have to write something about the 'directions of desired and undesired travel' of Jesper's work as seen from an avowedly 'lived experience of labouring/reception' in relation to his art-events, which will be methodologically normative about what he hasn't previously done (apparently, as told to me) but is now it seems to me moving towards.</p> <p>(iv) I can talk about the 'psychological stress' placed on his 'art labourers and consumers' by his 'deviant work' (direct experience of myself, attributed by me to others), but indicate that this 'troubling nature' can be seen as ethically dubious or a tribute to its "creatively insidious" good work (perhaps but this attributed 'reception' needs itself to be properly researched in a rigorous methodological way (not be hijacked for 'enrollment within a denatured scientific project').</p> <p>I think I'm totally committed as a Jesper-troubled (self)researcher to writing in this column (Foucault, a practice which incites productively to unstoppable self-torment).</p> <p>I think that I'm delaying the moment of starting to write in the middle column, the HCE+SA.</p> <p>Printed at 8.30 a.m. on the 18th What follows in this column is NOT in the first printing, but added a bit later</p> <p>"Feeling obscurely manipulated and denatured as a professional"...is this how working for Jesper is generating the lived experience of entering the paranoid world of late-post-modernism?</p> <p>Marx in the EPM – 'alienated from his product, from the process, and from his fellows', by his superiors and market-others. Should I start with a quote from Marx? Or something about Ogden's four tensions/positions....</p> <p>I thought I was going for an art-work, to do an art-work job, but now I find I've been manipulated into doing and being something else (as well, instead of). My lived experience is of something being 'manipulatively denatured and re-natured'.</p> <p>This extra bit of the column above was completed around 9.00 a.m. on the 18th.</p>

	<p>The justification of the minor sin of 'deception' by the greater good of 'science' is capable of being convincing, it seems to me, (a) when the emotional and cognitive impact on different participants is seriously explored by appropriate methods, (b) when a clear report is made by the researcher to some scientific community showing the insightful or humanly-useful 'greater goods' achieved by the (mild deception) methods involved.</p> <p>The interview suggests to me that Jesper is moving towards realising the ethical – not yet the emotional – problem, but hasn't got there yet in either the design of his 'experiments' or as far as I know in the 'aftercare of participants' (researched) or in the 'reporting of results'.</p>	
<p>Friday 20th January 11.48 Final Note</p> <p>Column C on the right was started first on the 18th and completed on the same day.</p> <p>Column A on the left was started (only a bit of material) on the 19th and completed early in the morning of the 20th.</p> <p>Column B in the middle was started hesitantly on the 18th, but the bulk of the work was completed on the morning of the 20th</p> <p>All columns were based on earlier work on the Sequentialisation and the BDA and the TFA – attached.</p> <p>The Transcript was briefly consulted about the 'Coda', to make sure that the Sequentialisation was accurate for my 'Coda discussion' in column A.</p> <p>I've now completed the middle column – and therefore all three, the other two were finished earlier – of this 'Experiment in Triple Reporting'. Together with the separate BDA and TFA columns, and with a 'Covering Note' still to be written later today, that concludes my current BNIM-work on Jesper based on his interview and taking into account my experience.</p> <p>I should say – despite quite a lot of my remarks above, which did not originally intend to go beyond my study desk, and were just intended to clear my own mind – that I've found doing the interview, sequentialising it, running the panels and presentation in Oslo, and then struggling with the task of writing it up.....very rewarding indeed. Like the ethnomethodological 'breaching experiments' of Garfinkel et al – or rather as an actual breaching experiment itself in so many ways – I learnt a lot about the conditions of best and worst working of BNIM interviewing and interpretation and reporting....invaluable. I also developed some ideas about art and the artworld which are also very valuable. And about myself and my limitations in this new quite challenging context.</p> <p>So I am very grateful to all those involved in enabling me to have these experiences and particularly to Jesper for his courage in inviting me to be a 'biographical witness' in his creation and presentation. This is a "hard and competitive world" in which he has quite consciously undertaken the experiment of "making himself pretty vulnerable". From his point of view, engaging me as an outsider to do the interview, run the interpretive panels, and write whatever report I chose was to be the subject of whatever report I wrote on my experiencing, an exercise in non-transparency itself with him at the other end of the 'experiment'.</p> <p>I've learned a great deal of great value from his experiment in 'being BNIM-ed'. I hope he feels he has learnt something from it as well, and that this Report – despite its own non-orthodox and vulnerable nature – will be of value.</p> <p>Best wishes to all.</p> <p>Tom Wengraf</p>		