

The revolt of meek bodies

If we speak from the position of intentions of this performance, and not its finalised / finished form, we then have to start with a quotation: “*There, where the language is ending, it is the matter of words that is beginning, and not the unspeakable.*” (Agamben) And let us continue to derive from it: there, where the movement is ending, it is the matter of movement starting, and not the unmovable. From this matter, the performative matrix, ‘the meek bodies’ of the performers are derived and being developed in this contemporary passion play, which with its stationary visiting technique doesn’t perform anymore the suffering of the one who supposedly, in a myth of civilization often represented as the truth itself, died for us and was resurrected, but the existence itself, as it is. This for sure is a strongly exaggerated statement.

The existence, or rather being-living, is very likely impossible to fully represent, however it is possible to grasp and analyse it in individual arbitrary points (visits). This is why the performance works more around, what Foucault calls ‘*analysis of technologies of self*’, through which ‘*the process of subjection is activated and brings the individual to the point of committing himself to his identity and his consciousness and with that the authority of outer control*’. If we stay with the first part of the quote, that doesn’t include the knowledge of the ‘outer control’, we seize the performers in wish of the show, inside of which in individual locations (rooms) performers on their own skin, the skin of the spectator and on the surface of their contact, activate different technologies of self. They are not looking for a contact as a possible transcendence, at the same time they don’t want to realize the physical touch between two participants. The purpose of the visits, that the performers take their (non)random members of the audience to, is to only establish the closeness. And in doing that, they know that closeness is a pre-modern term, and that the contact, which is its consequence, is today always already mediated. But this awareness doesn’t prevent them in wishing to perform the closeness as that ultimate purpose, which grounds/bases a body not only in relation to another body, but mainly to itself. If we often say that a performative event is not actualized until in the presence of the spectator, in which the contemporary practices often even play on the inversion of both participants, or rather on the merging of all roles, including author’s, into only one (*spectauctor*), we have to say that a body- identity- self is identified, authorised only with the presence of another body- identity- self. The simultaneous presence of (two) bodies, identities, selves in only one closed space in itself always carries a possibility of an event, *event a*, as Badiou names it, as an interval and ‘*pure disappearance*’, not as an occurrence of beings or a merging of two bodies in only one, third body, which is an unreachable ideal that esoteric and pseudo religious practices aim at, and can be found also in performance art. The purpose of these meetings, which happen between the visits of the spectators- guests in the inhabited performative territories (flats, rooms, infrastructural buildings), is in this way not performing intimacy as the most inner and hidden self, and not even its exposure, but the manifestation of a definite interval and pure disappearance of both selves- but with an exactly defined reason.

Or differently: new eroticism between I and you, whose origins we can find in the far distant past of the almost fairytale like myth of *Romeo and Juliet*, which can’t be understood in a traditional way as an impossible meeting, but as an absolutely fulfilled impossibility of meeting, so as a realization of impossibility and not as an impossibility of realization, and that sets a fundamental difference; not taking place with a purpose of imprinting a sign (*signum*) or signature of skin of the performer onto the skin of the guest, but on the contrary, strengthens the interval and with that shows two things. Firstly, capitulate the self to itself, tear it out from the constraints of constant relations in which it enters on the basis of

communicational and cultural automatisms, and secondly, in this way catch in the act that which we left aside before, i.e. 'the authority of outer control'. Between me and you, mine and yours (world, body, self) is an unbridgeable difference, interval, which exactly because of that has to be strengthened, so that any kind of relationship between the two can be established at all. At the same time, when we enter the room for a visit, we have to allow in that outer instance/resort, which our self, with the practicing of political techniques, with which 'The state overtakes and includes in itself natural life of individuals' (Foucault), by its essence (meaning our bare life) is determined.

However, the performative practice, which is undertaken in the new production of EKG and is aware of the impossibility of closeness as merging, instead of that (naively?) speaks in favour of the possibility of energy flow, when it's possible '*without particular purpose [...] create the biggest possible intensity (as a surplus or deficit) of what is in it*' (Lyotard). Furthermore, allowing the possibility of energy collisions that are completely physical without physical touches, even physics like (as with primary school experiments in Physics class, where blue light is shooting from the electrified ball), with the possibility of measuring, and not the result of improvable transitory communication. This radically responsible performative paradigm is doing all this by evoking nomadic aesthetical practices, or rather articulations of inner and outer mobility, which are concerning as well outside and inside production mechanisms. The migrations from room to room, in the time of the performance, are blurring the boundaries of internal world, but only so that they could be defined in the performative process, which is common to the performer- host and the spectator- guest, as those areas that need to be integrated into the process of communication and eroticism, and seriously counted on. The foreigner has to be perceived as a foreigner, only then we can recognize ourself and enter into an equal dialog. And the migrations from territory to territory in the time of preparations for the show (which the participants could map as an alternative inner map of locations of performance art production in Ljubljana and its surrounding) not only erase the meaning of outer borders (which are determined by production circumstances, like unsure financial structure, constant changing of spaces, the lack of consistent cultural politics), but also try to deny them. The revolt against the state, which takes over and includes in itself the natural life of individuals, is then possible only as a constant denial, that knows, that when denying the state (authority, all outer), denies its own life as well, but can not survive without it- revolt.

This paradox of revolt brings us back to the beginning. The meek bodies of the performers (for which we know that mainly origin from the field of contemporary dance, which makes them even meeker) produce mildness also in the bodies of their viewers, but only in the meekness as an absolute (inner) tameness, from which one can then direct oneself into the (outer) world, grows the possibility of existential revolt. Only the performer's confession of vulnerability, which although avoids the status of a victim, meaning his own death, so that consequently the spectator could rise from it, and the consciousness that the starting position of humanity is human being as *homo sacer*, lead to the healing of the original wound in the activity of closeness. But this also must be an over-exaggerated and pathetic statement, which doesn't want to shun the identification with the original pathos of bare life, and grows from that matter of movement as initiational gesture or the invitation to the contact as a matrix of a performative event, recognizing self and/as the other.

Blaž Lukan