

Assessment of the document REPORT CRITICAL REFLECTION - Jesper Alvær – Work – Work

What follows is an assessment of the document XXX¹ REPORT CRITICAL REFLECTION - Jesper Alvær – Work – Work, delivered as a .pdf under the title "Work, work May 1 Critical reflection Jesper Alvaer". This assessment is made by Carmen Mörsch, Andreas Siekmann and Dora García.

After the Committee's First Recommendation/Interim Report, (November 2016) which was approved, and after reading and considering the document described above as a way of evaluating the critical reflection (September 2017), we assess this critical reflection as sufficient and approved, therefore ready to go to the final phase of the fellowship evaluation, the Viva Voce.

However, we have important reservations about the written critical reflection titled "Work, work May 1 Critical reflection Jesper Alvaer" and feel the need to communicate them to the candidate, so that he can take them into account for the Viva Voce and for his work in the future.

Regarding the presentation and communication, the text is not structured, it is difficult to read (because it does not have a clear structure) and it is hard to assess where it is going. It does not really aim at a conclusion and could better be considered a form of personal diary. It seems not to intend to clarify to the reader the aims and method of the research process, but rather to clarify the thoughts of the author to himself.

Regarding how the project contributes to new insight, knowledge and/ or experience in the subject area, the committee would appreciate more effort to describe the position of the work in art history, artistic practice or the art community. There are no references to artists working in a similar field; the work seems to be completely isolated in terms of artistic landscape, no references are mentioned (although the committee can think of very clear and obvious references). Similarly, if we speak of the position of the research within the sociological and social sciences or cultural studies field, there is as well a lack of references and positioning, although the text uses terminology that could be understood as scientific. Two personalities who are named, Henri Corbin and a Raivo Puusemp, are just named and briefly quoted, and no context is given about who they are and what is their relation to the project.

Regarding originality, expression, and relevance: the committee has doubts about the concept of "exhibition as alibi" (couldn't this be rather an incapacity to renew the exhibition format to fit new forms of "relational" practice?); the committee perceives as false the oppositions presented, such as artist / non artist, participative audience / "transient voyeuristic passive spectators"; there is a rather reductive view of artistic practice, considered only as labour and object-producing, which leads us to doubt that the "public" in this research was ever really enabled to assume authorship and real agency in the different processes described. We as readers are often denied insight about certain processes, such as the inscription of the candidate in "all political parties" - we are left without knowing the why or the result of this action, and this puzzles us.

Regarding consistency: there is no index, no index of names nor of themes, there is no bibliography. We feel that, at the very least, this should be solved for the Viva Voce: we need a bibliography and an index of themes and terms.

In the archive <http://stagingdislocation.net/>, there is a great amount of material and information, but there is no guide to go through it, there is no way to know what we should look for. It is just classified by format and within the formats it seems to follow a chronological order. It would be necessary to offer an easier navigation to the visitor. This visitor should understand at first sight what this is about and where to find what.

Very often there is a justificatory tone in the way the text relates to the work. We wish there was a more engaged and at the same time more analytical and self-reflexive approach both to the work and to the text. The text often sounds as an administrative justification for the grant received. We wish we can hear a more passionate and conceptually sounded defence of both work and research during the Viva Voce.

We value very much the amount of work developed by the candidate during these grant years and the professional network he succeeded at establishing internationally. Therefore, even with our reservations about the text, we approve the research and look forward to the Viva Voce.