

INTRO- DUCTION

 **ANA GAGO**

Universidade Católica Portuguesa,
School of Arts
Research Centre for Science and Technology of the Arts
algago@gmail.com

 **JOÃO PEDRO AMORIM**

Universidade Católica Portuguesa,
School of Arts
Research Centre for Science and Technology of the Arts
jpamorim@ucp.pt

 **NÁDIA MOURA**

Universidade Católica Portuguesa,
School of Arts
Research Centre for Science and Technology of the Arts
nmoura@ucp.pt

INTRO-
DUCTION

¹ More information, programme and book of abstracts here: <https://www.porto.ucp.pt/graduateconference>.

² See <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000373530> and [https://icom.museum/en/news/museums-and-covid-19-third-icom-report/\(Lowy,2005,p.42\)](https://icom.museum/en/news/museums-and-covid-19-third-icom-report/(Lowy,2005,p.42)).

The 1st Graduate Conference on Science and Technology of the Arts (9-11 December 2021, at the School of Arts, Universidade Católica Portuguesa) focused on the intertwinement of the notions of motion and emotion through interdisciplinary approaches from and towards the arts and/or heritage. Contributions from the fields of Artistic Practices (Cinema, New Media Art, Digital Art, Music and Sound in particular), Artistic Studies and Cultural Studies, Heritage Studies and Conservation and Restoration were welcomed, in multiple formats: papers, performances, artworks and installations, posters, audiovisual, and digital essays (Gago et al., 2021).¹

The concepts of motion and emotion in the digital were at the centre of theoretical, political, and artistic discussions in 2021 due to the disturbances caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, whose impact was strongly felt in the arts and culture-related sectors.² Our relationship with the body and the material world has been transformed, following processes of digitalisation that were in motion before the pandemic but which, as a consequence, were potentially accelerated. Still in the aftermath of this paradigm-shifting experience, some of the discussions initiated at the conference have been extended to this double-blind peer-reviewed e-book, once more, experimenting on different formats, and addressing a wide range of topics.

The first chapter, *Art in motion. Aesthetic experiences in the context of the new digital media*, by Constança Babo, provides an overview of the use of movement in artworks throughout the 20th and 21st centuries with particular regard to recent contributions in digital media. Babo critically discusses how interactive and immersive artworks are transformative for museums, and how successive COVID-19-related lockdowns seemed to have opened the door to the accelerated affirmation of digital media within institutional art spaces.

As a parallel process (re)set in motion by the pandemic, either by exposing underlying fragilities or by questioning established practices, museums and other cultural institutions were forced to reconsider audience and public engagement, both online and offline. Confronted with a bleak scenario regarding the recovery of international tourism – a dynamic that has been placed at the heart of placemaking strategies (Choay, 2008; Barrère, 2014) in their association with cultural heritage (and often through the work of artists) (Fernandes, 2013; Stern, 2014) –, the focus was (at least momentarily) shifted to national and local audiences.

However, the acceleration of digitalisation processes, exacerbated by the pandemic, resulted in the accentuation of socioeconomic inequalities in terms of access to technology and internet, work, education, and cultural

INTRO-
DUCTION

³ See <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000380398> and https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/the-state-of-school-education_201dde84-en.

(and civic) participation.³ Facing lockdowns and their profound impact on their practice, artists spent those years developing strategies to reach audiences, with their work often reflecting upon spatial interaction and communal memory. Such is the case of Rosinda Casais, discussed in the chapter she co-authored with Filipa Cruz, *Time, sound and object as catalysts for thought, emotion and movement in artistic creation*. During this period, Casais developed artworks that explore methods of participation by creating installations in public spaces that either entered into dialogue with the community in lockdown or that required the audience's participation.

The (online) pandemic voiced the discussion of emergent topics, at a global level, such as climate change, gender and racial inequality, and (post) colonialism, revealing inherent tensions between cultural localisation and delocalisation processes. Moving forward, how can cultural institutions support equality and representation from/within increasingly glocal communities (Robertson, 1995; Gikandi, 2001)? Moreover, what can be the role of artists and a growingly number of different cultural heritage practitioners (Clark, 2019) to promote participation, inside and outside physical spaces, without reinforcing *folklorisation* and/or *tokenism* phenomena (Waterton & Silverman, 2010)? Addressing some of these issues, Milan Kroulík essays to problematise how fieldwork is intertwined with the researcher's life and proposes audiovisual research as strategy to represent and reflect upon that entanglement, in *Mediatized Movements Between Fieldwork and Life*. Further exploring arts-based methodologies and the possibilities they provide to incite discussions on pressing social issues, as well as to promote cultural participation (Camacho, 2020; VV.AA., 2021), Chiara Pussetti and Federica Manfredi present their findings in the chapter *The Hacked Barbie. A Workshop Series to (De)construct Contemporary Bodies and Social Pressure*.

Aligning with this interdisciplinary and (meta)reflexive approach, Doug Bailey proposes *Art Archaeological Interactions*, as a way to actively (and creatively) deconstruct archaeological *artefacts*, museum collections and archives, enabling discussions around the sociocultural narratives that they convey. Being aware of the potential of artistic intervention to reinterpret or even to *recreate* heritage, in *Transitions*, Ana Barroso presents an audiovisual performance of *affect* on the Monastery of the Dominicans of Batalha. Specifically using digital tools, Frederico Henriques and Mário Pastor present *Virtual Reconstructions of the Iconic Building Crystal Palace and the Industrial and Commercial Museum of Oporto (Portugal)*, as part of a bigger project to (re)discover popular memory of this historical and affective landmark.

INTRO-
DUCTION

Taking into consideration the implications of the digitisation of living (and artistic) practices, other authors focused their research on topics around the place for physicality and (i)materiality in our time. For instance, in *Monsters and Measures: Two Approaches to the Essay Film*, Sasha Litvintseva and Beny Wagner describe how their work engages with the disciplines of taxonomy and measurement to defy the standardisation that science and technology so often apply to the material world, in order to render it productive.

This predicament raises questions such as, how can the spirit of activism be transposed from in-person to virtual presence? In *Revolution: Audio-visual Essay*, Beatriz Albuquerque discusses examples of physical and virtual activist performances and reflects on the pros and cons of their digitalisation, from conception to implementation, highlighting its influence on interpersonal interaction. Complementarily, in *E-motion: readings of portrait and fugue*, Daniel Tavares contemplates how the concept of portrait, deeply embedded in the Western artistic tradition, has been reinvented in light of current technological constructs such as big data or algorithm. Both works provide insights into the understanding of the creation and operationalisation of digital-selves.

Nonetheless, it is through our bodies that we understand ourselves, others, the lived world (Merleau-Ponty, 2002). Hence, relationships between body and environment are significant for the perceptual and affective experiences shaping inner concepts, prepositions, and discourses. Physical impressions blend with cognitive processes as we think, understand, feel through our living (moving!) bodies, as claimed by embodied cognition theories (Varela et al., 2016; Leman, 2016). In *Alimentary Non-inscription: Desire and eating disorders through culture*, Carolina Baptista proposes that bodies facing eating disorders (i.e., obese, malnourished, anorectic) unveil the present cultural and societal panorama. Bodies reflecting self-control or restriction can, therefore, be looked at as representations of individual and collective traumas, adopting a de-medicalised view on eating disorders.

A similar perspective is introduced by Filippo Deorsola in *Bodily Performativity and the Score-as-Text: understanding musical Improvisation as a politically subversive force*, by claiming that if the performing body is a result of a given historical and cultural macro-structure, then it can also become the place where contingency emerges. The author presents a topography of practice based on the methodology of improvisation-technology which promotes the interplay between score, bodies, discourses, memories, and reveals the subversive possibilities lying inside each of us.

Bodily movement can also act as an inducer of emotion and mediator

INTRO-
DUCTION

of physical and virtual experiences, evoking the concept of motion as a link between past, present and future, unfolding in space and time. In *Liquefação/Liquefaction versus Endurecimento/Rigidification* – AR installation, Anna Rebecca Unterholzner presents a series of artworks that explore the representation of emotional and affective states that resort to AR, introducing motion to express fluidity.

The acceleration of the processes of digitalisation, in its present condition, leads to a social acceleration that is responsible for the compression of the present (Rosa, 2013), towards a state of constant and non-stop production (Crary, 2018). The contemporary overexposure to information and images causes innumerable cognitive and emotional transformations (Stalder, 2018), following the project of an economic system based around the production of isolation (Debord, 1967).

With the increase of screen time, propelled by addictive content and algorithms that foster the visibility of emotional and controversial content, our consciousnesses (and our data) become the main asset of the attention economy. Therefore, our ability to develop and engage with communitarian and collective structures and relationships is reduced. At the same time, following Stiegler (2018) proposal of the technological pharmakon, technology might provide the tools and perspectives to critically transform its negative impact into a critical practice of education and resistance.

We hope that this e-book might contribute to a critical and thorough post-pandemic discussion capable to discern opportunities and challenges, potential benefits and risks, on of the ongoing process of digitalisation in the arts and culture. Technological development requires constant reassessment to guarantee that it is driven towards positive social uses, as human and technological development are tightly entangled.

As a final note, we would like to thank the directions of the Research Center for Science and Technology of the Arts and the School of Arts at Universidade Católica Portuguesa for the invitation to organise this conference and publication; all the authors for their contribution and participation in the discussions during the conference and for their contributions to this e-book, in particular to the keynote speakers Doug Bailey, Marc Leman and Sasha Litvintseva & Beny Wagner; UCP Press for the publication and editorial support; and a special acknowledgement to all the members of the Scientific Committee that have generously given their time to review all the contributions for the conference and the publication.

REFERENCES

- Barrère, C. (2014). Les quatre temps du patrimoine. In *Économie Appliquée*, LXVII, 2014, 4 (pp. 9-44). http://www.asrdlf2013.org/IMG/pdf/C_-_Barrere_-_Les_quatre_temps_du_patrimoine_culturel.pdf
- Camacho, C. F. (org.) (2021). *Grupo de Projeto Museus no Futuro: Relatório Final*. Direção-Geral do Património Cultural. <https://patrimoniocultural.gov.pt/static/data/docs/2021/02/15/RelatorioMuseusnoFuturo.pdf>
- Choay, F. (2008). *Alegoria do Património*. Edições 70.
- Clark, K. (2019). Further Exploration: Ten Principles of Values-Based Heritage Practice. In P. M. Messenger & J.S. Bender (Eds.), *History and Approaches to Heritage Studies* (pp. 150-153). University Press of Florida.
- Debord, G. (2002). *The society of the spectacle*. Black & Red.
- Fernandes, J. L. J. (2012). Artes visuais, Representações e Marketing Territorial. In *Património Cultural e Paisagístico: Políticas, Intervenções e Representações* (pp. 213-234). Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra. <https://digitalis-dsp.uc.pt/jspui/bitstream/10316.2/11948/5/Patrim%C3%B3nio%20Cultural%20e%20Paisag%C3%ADstico%20-%202012.pdf>
- Gago, A., Guerreiro, J., Amorim, J. P., & Moura, N. (2021). *Book of abstracts for [e]motion - 1st Graduate Conference on Science and Technology of the Arts*. Universidade Católica Portuguesa. <https://doi.org/10.34632/emotion1>
- Gikandi, S. (2001). Globalization and the Claims of Postcoloniality. In *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 100(3), 627-658. <https://www.muse.jhu.edu/article/30720>
- Hartmut, R. (2013). *Social Acceleration: A New Theory of Modernity*. Columbia University Press.
- Leman, M. (2016). *The expressive moment: how interaction (with music) shapes human empowerment*. MIT Press.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (2002). Phenomenology of Perception. In *Central Works of Philosophy Volume 4: The Twentieth Century: Moore to Popper*. Routledge.
- Robertson, R. (1995). Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity. In M. Featherstone, S. Lash, and R. Robertson (Eds.), *Global Modernities* (pp. 25-44). Sage Publications.
- Silverman, H.; Waterton, E.; Watson, S. (Eds.). (2017). *Heritage in Action – Making the Past in the Present*. Springer.
- Stalder, F. (2018). *The digital condition*. Polity Press.
- Stern, M. J. (2014). Measuring the Outcomes of Creative Placemaking. In *The Role of Artists & the Arts in Creative Placemaking, MD – Symposium Report* (pp. 84-97). Goethe Institut, EUNIC. https://repository.upenn.edu/siap_placemaking/1/
- Stiegler, B. (2018). *The neganthropocene*. Open Humanities Press.
- Waterton, H.; Smith, L. (2010). The recognition and misrecognition of community heritage. In *International Journal of Heritage Studies - Heritage and Community Engagement: Collaboration or Contestation?*, 16, Issue 1-2. Taylor & Francis Online. <https://www.tandfonline.com/toc/rjhs20/16/1-2>
- Varela, F. J., Thompson, E., & Rosch, E. (2016). *The Embodied Mind: Cognitive Science and Human Experience* (Revised Edition). MIT Press.
- VV.AA. (2021) *Carta do Porto Santo. A Cultura e a Promoção da Democracia: Para uma Cidadania Cultural Europeia*. <https://portosantocharter.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/CartaDoPortoSanto.pdf>