**Tracing the Horizon: iLANDing as Radical Archive Practice and Pedagogy**

By Ann Holt and Christopher Kennedy

**Tracing the Horizon**

*We sit together in the foothills of the Taconic Mountains as dusk descends. The sounds of summer surround: cicadas, crickets and owls. Within the hour, the moon rises like a torch, bright and full of possibility.*

*Jennifer begins to walk toward a small ravine to the east and, instinctively, we all follow behind. Together, we enter the edge of the forest. The moon’s light begins to fade and it’s difficult to find sure footing.*

*We continue through a bramble and I can feel prickers catch my legs, spreading their seed, entering my skin. We emerge on a recently plowed cornfield. The earth is soft and supple. I’ve never seen the moon this bright before. Our shadows are suddenly noticeable and we begin to dance and move along each earthen ridge with laughter and excitement. A shadow theater of the land.*

*Soon the quiet of the eve deepens and Jennifer points to the horizon. All four of us intuitively form a line. She signals for us to begin a score; a transect or eye tracing score. Focus on a point on the horizon furthest from you. Slowly trace a line from that point towards you touching every surface as if your eyes were a magic marker.*

*We all trace the horizon with our eyes and I feel a deep calm extend through my body. We stand transfixed for what seems like an hour, noticing, observing, being in place together. As we enter back into the forest we whisper to each other, speculating on the sounds of insects and nocturnal routines taking place all around us.*

*While we had walked many of the same trail paths before, there was something about the eye tracing score that brought the land and all of its rich layers into sharp focus. The score had enabled us to be fully present in our bodies, opening a space for dialogue, for ecstatic encounter, and improvised movement - all with little or no verbal communication.*

**Interdisciplinary Laboratory for Art, Nature and Dance (iLAND)**

The purpose of this paper is to highlight an example of how a group of artists/educators/researchers involved in the Interdisciplinary Laboratory for Art, Nature and Dance (iLAND), conceptualize their practice as both users and producers of archives. iLAND, is a dance research organization based in New York City. For over ten years, iLAND has brought together movement artists and scientists, visual artists and designers for intensive arts-based research/performance residencies. While each iLAND residency is unique, residents often take a circuitous and ambiguous path toward a particular understanding of ecological phenomena, and how movement and dance can be used to further engage and make visible the ecological systems and networks all around us. These engagements are typically open-ended and participatory, requiring publics to critically confront their relationship to place, and to use the body as a radical pedagogical force for kinetic understanding (Ellsworth, 2005). Walking tours of lower Manhattan that trace original waterways; dancing with street trees in Harlem; foraging for mushrooms in Chinatown; dancing alongside migratory routes of birds in Corona Park are just a few examples.

*Listening and Movement Score*

With a partner, speaking in whispers, walk around the room facing each other trying to maintain the edge of being able to hear each other.

**Conceptualizing the iLAND archive**

The iLANDing archives project was conceived from an acute recognition of the fragility of ephemeral, site-specific, time-based movement data and its potential role of transdisciplinary contributions to the art historical record. Ten years of residencies has resulted in a robust collection of artifacts and materials that document creatively informed responses to changing environments, particularly significant in light of our descent into the “Anthropocene,” a geologic time period in which the earth’s systems are significantly altered by human activity.

To initiate these explorations, iLAND organizes creative residencies each year that are framed as forms of choreographic and movement research. Through this process, groups of scientists, dancers and artists investigate a local ecology and respond, in turn, through collaborative forms of inquiry that take the form of dance, field science, workshops, happenings, and performances.

The output of each residency are scores, which the organization describes as a set of instructions that illicit participation and which tune one’s observational senses to a particular aspect of an environment. This *attunement* within a highly charged and interfaced world is most significant in its ability to turn our attention to phenomena, which we might not otherwise notice, or be attuned to. This social practice of *making aware* while raising eco-consciousness allows for one to see and experience what they wouldn’t necessarily see or experience alone, putting archives within a unique framework of performative social practice.

Although the iLAND founders explain that the intention was never to develop a particular methodology, the residencies have created an integral body of documentation of knowledge on transdisciplinary collaboration and research that foreground somatic, kinesthetic and choreographic approaches in relationship to other disciplines. In this way, iLAND projects intersect critical art pedagogy with a kinetic understanding of ecological phenomena, where one can understand knowledge as a shared social-ecological system, or knowledge commons (Hess and Ostrom, 2011). iLAND diversifies the resource about critical art pedagogies, enhancing potentiality and possibility. The body/archive is thus healthier through diversification, and continued re-engagement.

Recognizing the value in these approaches, iLAND has conceived of multiple platforms to preserve and share this work as knowledge for future iLAND participants as well as artists, dancers, scholars, scientists and publics interested in participatory, embodied, and time-based methodologies. The first iteration of the iLAND archive is currently being developed as an open access physical field guide and website. The web platform in particular will be a dynamic and responsive archival device, using a poetic “taxonomical logic” to allow users access to past scores, while also inviting re-interpretations and adaptations. In the process of re-mixing, re-situating, and re-creating scores, the archive unfolds as something in-the-making, allowing new relationships and contexts to emerge.

The conception of the archive has sparked an interesting discussion amongst iLANDers on how to archive ephemera and experiences generated from iLAND residencies and projects. These questions about how the archive should be assembled, organized and conceived have also raised broader questions about the boundaries between ephemeral art and the archival processes used to capture it.

*Bone Tracing Score*

(In pairs) One partner holds still while the other traces the bones in the hand, arm or body of their partner using their fingers.

Let it be said that we, are *non-archivists*. We are two artist-educators, teaching undergraduate and graduate level courses in art and design education. One of us is involved in iLAND, and the other one is focused on possibilities and potentialities using archival materials on art and pedagogy. We do not intend to appropriate the term “archive” (Theimer, 2012). Rather, we seek to explore ways to engage and use archives representing embodied and transdisciplinary approaches to research ways that invite and provoke new interpretations, ideas, and responses. Therefore, from this position that encompasses a hybrid form of artist/teacher/researcher/scholar/user and producer of archives, we pose the following questions within the process of conceptualizing the iLAND archive: What is the radical pedagogy inherent in iLANDing? Moreover, how does the archiving of iLAND, a transdisciplinary practice of intervening into the city/land/body-scape, translate as radical archiving?

This article examines the process of creating and using an archive comprised of embodied data, and the potential of how the archive itself might operate as radical pedagogy. With all due respect to the archives profession, we define how we understand and use the term archive. Adapted from the Society of American Archivists (SAA, 2010), archives are sites for housing unique materials (primary source or, original documents and artifacts) to be preserved in perpetuity for continued use. The mere notion of an archive housed in perpetuity means that the materials are intended to be preserved over continuous time, outlasting the life of the creator of the materials, the users who interpret them, and the lives of those who steward the materials.

Indeed it is only through user engagement and interpretation that archival materials can be activated. Therefore, we are cognizant of the fact that archives are increasingly being defined in more expansive terms within the archival profession, in terms of how they grow (Krause and Yakel, 2007; Greene, 2002) as well as in context to the relationship between user, producer and archivist. We understand that archives are deeply embedded in social relations in that they function in terms of how records are created, used, and shared.

Our perspective in respect to iLAND, positions the archive as encompassing both inventory as well as what exists on the peripheral (usage); including contextual artifacts elsewhere, the content that the user generates, and the individual experiences users bring to shaping their understanding of an archive. Our perspective also acknowledges the affect of how archives users choose what they want to focus on as well as how/if they share what they produce from the archive—through writing, teaching, or other creative means. These factors affect understanding of the present, and can guide actions that shape the future, particularly actions, which affect people based on race, class, gender, and ability. In other words, users select choreography rather than be subjected by it. Users also choose how they represent themselves in the archive.

*Sound/Listening Score*

Noticing the textures and materials of the surfaces around you, use your body to make the softest sound you can gradually increasing to the loudest sound, then back to the softest sound.  Repeat twice.

**iLAND as radical pedagogy: Emplacement & Inter-corporeality**

What is radical pedagogy? While this is an ongoing and open question (Gaudelius, 2000), contemporary practices are turning to embodied and situated pedagogies, that draw from a range of evolving theories and concepts; from Merleau-Ponty’s (1968) theory of perception, to Bateson’s ecology of mind (1973), Lave and Wegner’s (1991) notion of situated learning, Ellsworth’s (2005) notion of pedagogies of sensation, Springgay’s (2007) concept of inter-embodiment, and more recent concepts of ecocentric slow pedagogies (Payne & Wattchow, 2009), and enactivism (Gallagher & Lindgren, 2013). These thinkers among others highlight some of the spatial, cognitive, and environmental conditions and phenomena, which are crucial to understanding how we learn through, *and with,* the body.

For instance, situating themselves within the literature on embodied learning, Fors, Backstrom and Pink (2013) developed a theory of sensory-emplaced learning, proposing an entangled connection between the embodied and environmental conditions through which learning unfolds. Learning in this way is not just embodied, but what they call “emplaced” denoting a wider “place-event”. Central to their argument is the idea that the environment is “something to be interacted with, rather than something to be acted upon” (p. 171). This Deluezian idea of relationality is steeped in a multiplicity of sensory, cognitive, and social exchanges through both our unconscious and tactile engagements with the world. The authors urge us to reconceive of place, of environment, as something open, invoking Massey’s (2005) idea of “event of place”, noting the political and socio-cultural layers through which places are composed, defined, and re-imagined.

Through one’s perceptual faculties and environmental stimuli, learning unfolds then as a “constantly shifting process that both happens within the event of place and contributes to its constitution [and thus] requires that we attend to the phenomenology of place, sensory perception, and cultural categories” (p. 174). Here, Pink positions learning as something necessarily political - having to do with an awareness of larger socio-cultural contexts and systems of power, while also acknowledging the ways in which we make meaning through our affective, cognitive, and embodied experiences. At the core of their argument is the idea that (1) learning is situated socially in a co-constructed activity that unfolds in our lived experience with self and other, and that (2) sensory perception should not be limited to the five senses, but rather our senses are intertwined in what Pink calls a multisensory process.

Pedagogically, iLAND residencies, and more broadly the iLANDing “method”, is a salient example of Fors, Backstrom and Pink’s (2013) multisensory emplacement. Through each residency a community of practice emerges, allowing artists and practitioners to develop an integrative practice that draws from a range of disciplines. The concept of movement-research offers a flexible container to structure this process, which aims to understand ecological phenomena through kinetic and somatic engagement. As the group’s investigation deepens, new knowledge and meaning begins to circulate.

*Diagramming Score*

Draw a diagram of how you got here.

Draw a diagram of your journey here this morning.

Draw a diagram of what supports you.

iLAND projects can be considered transdisciplinary in nature as they involve the integration of knowledges from multiple disciplines to critically and collaboratively explore New York City’s urban ecologies. Transdisciplinary practices here involve a transformative understanding of human relationships to ecology, inspiring creative modes of practice that are not based in one specific discipline but rather form new methodologies and knowledge. What is unique to a transdisciplinary approach is this idea of engaging across disciplinary borders transdiscip to create new ideas and artifacts that do not hold to any one discipline. These artifacts have the potential to continue fostering new works that open up disciplinary boundaries as they can appeal to a range of artists and scholars across disciplinary lines. Transdisciplinary methods involve the exploration of a topic from many disciplines simultaneously, including “what is between the disciplines, across, the disciplines and beyond the disciplines” (Marinova and McGrath, 2004), while emphasizing dialogue across specialized knowledges to creatively and collaboratively address real-world issues and problems (Leavy, 2011).

In creating a transdisciplinary framework that is process and research-based, iLANDing unfolds as a radical pedagogical device by resisting neo-positivist claims for how and why knowledge is created, circulated, and legitimized. This places a political context onto the networks and knowledge creation that emerges, one that recognizes the socio-cultural/ecological continuums that constitute power relations between humans/non-humans and the built environments we attempt to co-exist within. The issues invoked by simply looking at or attempting to understand how ecologies operate within a socially-constructed world thus produce a politic of stewardship that enables a particular kind of agency amongst the group and publics involved. Through embodied and somatic response, the intersection of issues such as immigrant/refugee rights, water and land use politics, air quality and habitat loss, of gentrification and capitalism become apparent.

What is unique to iLAND is that these issues are engaged in a way that is rarely didactic, inviting what Biesta (2012) calls “a citizenship of strangers” where freedom can emerge through processual play and provocation. This unstructured approach defies the logic of modern schooling and education, privileging instead a more intuitive somatic understanding of our relationship to the world around us. Ellsworth’s “pedagogies of sensation” are a salient touchstone in this respect, recognizing the presence of bodies, and their integral role in meaning making and knowledge production.

For instance, in a 2009 iLAND residency called Strataspore, participants worked with a mycologist, architect, choreographer, educator, and artist to investigate NYC’s hidden infrastructure through the lens of fungi. Mushrooms became a metaphor and material for the group to speculate on the invisible networks and latent potential beneath NYC’s cement exterior. The process began by foraging for mushrooms together in various parks around the City. They gradually learned the basic science of mycology, which in turn informed a series of workshops and dances created for the public. The hunt for mushrooms became an opportunity to bring people together and discuss larger issues facing NYC: soil contamination, ailing urban infrastructure, affordable housing, and water resources among others. They learned mushrooms could remediate soils, eat oil spills, provide insulation for buildings, and feed local communities. The group also learned that John Cage, a pivotal member of Fluxus and professor at the New School, was also a mycology enthusiast; and in the 1960s he led his students on mushroom hunts. This knowledge only emerged through shared exchange, and embodied encounter with the land.

Strataspore also included two dances, one at the Judson Church and the other at the Flea Theater in which choreographer Athena Kokoronis developed a set of scores inspired by weather patterns, chance, and the search for fungi. In hunting for mushrooms one’s body must move slowly through a forest with a keen sense of awareness in order to see a single mushroom. The act of slowly leaning down to pluck a mushroom, or wandering off trail paths, and scanning the forest floor became a source material for the piece. Gary Lincoff, the resident mycologist was also interviewed live during the dance providing an intimate and improvised soundtrack. Together the group danced, while mushrooms were cooked live on stage and fed to the audience.

*Latent Potential*

Wait until it rains.  The next morning, find a park or green area near you.  Walk slowly, scanning the ground.  Look carefully for emerging fruiting bodies (mushrooms).  Visualize the mycelial network below your feet.  Walking through the city, take note of the evidence of the infrastructural network below your feet (fire hydrants, street lights, manhole covers).

*Foraging*

Choose one square foot of ground.  Examine that square for an hour.

Go foraging for mushrooms in Chinatown.

*Oyster/Oyster Dinner*

Acquire discarded oyster shells from a restaurant in the West Village.  Fill them with oyster mushrooms.  Feed to guests.  Contemplate the connection between oyster mushrooms and oysters from the sea.

Although the experiences are quite different for each iLAND project, the pedagogical drive behind each investigatory process draws from a particular kind of embodied learning that seeks a radical reorientation of the mind toward the body, and the body toward the mind. In the case of Strataspore, fungi served as both a material and metaphor to explore larger concepts of rhizomatic connectivity and latent potential, and to view these ideas in relationship to NYC’s complex infrastructure and socio-political systems. As a Strataspore member explains, the project became “a way to look at the life force of fungi and how it’s different levels were not hierarchical but rather interdependent...a way to think, engage, and perform in a collaborative manner with each other.” The hunt for mushrooms became a way to bring people together, to reorient awareness to the unseen, and to move with intention through everyday environments such as parks, markets, and streetscapes. Through this interchange new meaning and interpretation of everyday places, settings, and environments unfold. This is by no means a linear process, but rather messy and indeterminate, rife with frustration and failure, with surprise and delight, with complicated connections that leave questions unanswered; and yet new inquiry emerges.

However, in considering the radical pedagogy of the iLAND process, issues of accessibility and legibility are key concerns. While iLAND residencies seek the co-creation of new knowledge, we have to remain both open and critical of its authorship, and consider who has access to this knowledge once it is created. As a mostly white organization, issues of diverse representation are ongoing. What’s more, the projects undertaken may assume a level of able-bodiedness that limits who can participate and how. The archive in many ways attempts to address some of these issues by making the scores and artifacts of each residency public and open to interpretation. This shifts power from the organization as the primary mediator of knowledge generated, to a diverse range of users. That being said, as iLAND continues its work, a critical examination of how the archive is accessed, used, and “read” across multiple public spheres will help to ensure its radical pedagogic drive and impact.

**iLANDing as a Radical Archive Practice**

What is a radical archive practice that is reflective of a radical pedagogy? Traditional practices of archiving, particularly with regard to time-based art, may seem to operate distinctly from the artwork itself. Typically the user contacts the archivist to inquire about the collection in question before planning a visit to the archive, where they will be greeted with boxes of materials to glean through. They are usually solitary visitors in the reading room, dipping into the contents of boxes, thumbing through folders, careful to leave it all intact—rarely is this experience one that is in connection to other users.

Digital repositories, although argued to lack a tactile experience (Latham, 2010), still offer many possibilities for participatory projects and pedagogy that are inclusive, democratic, and open. The representation in the archive of under-documented groups is a key concern. This is vital particularly for those unfamiliar, or less likely to pass through the doors of the reading room. In the virtual archive, participation is an invitation, particularly for non-traditional users. Participatory projects invite responses as participatory endeavors; the digital repository serves as a platform for exchange and ideas. Relationships between users, stewards of the archive, and others function differently.

In the case of iLAND, what seems to be in the making here is a set of materials that blur those boundaries between time, space, art and archive. The iLANDing archive serves as a repository for all ephemera connected to the iLANDing processes, however the organization has made a decision to foreground the scores developed through the investigatory methods undertaken as one of the primary ways that the user will engage and interpret the archive. iLAND has invited each residency group to distill their experiences into its essential scores, which will be supported by other materials like images, maps, and other artifacts.

While the scores are specific to the project, they are also open to interpretation. In this way, the scores become a source material that are meant to invoke some of the larger ideas explored through each residency, while inviting users of the archive to interpret and remix each score in different ways. The production of a feedback loop, enables the archive to be *living*, responsive and ever-evolving. In foregrounding a kinetic and indeterminate relationship to changing living systems, the work of creating scores and capturing moments is born from the archive, mediated temporally through the body as archive and then folded back, reframed, and refigured, into the archive. The “archive” encompasses a site, a body/memory, and an action.

The idea of a living archive is predicated on a notion of continuous growth (through its users) in a participatory archival environment where users generate new content from the collection, which then becomes part of the growing archive—with new possibilities (Holt & Esposito, 2013). As such, a living archive is dynamic. The collection lives and grows through generative use, and will continue to grow as users engage, repurpose, teach, and share the collection and their teaching processes inspired by the scores. This type of approach to archives is indeed part of an increasing trend inside and outside of traditional archival practice to re-imagine archives. These approaches see archives as interdisciplinary social resources being both produced and interpreted simultaneously (Kozel, 2013) or archiving processes that are being transformed by digital networked technologies (Kozel, n.d.). These approaches also position archives to encourage a diversity of users and creative interpretations, particularly in the performing arts (“Future Histories”, 2005; Motion Bank, 2010).

Considering both the challenges and opportunities of this kind of archival practice, how can the archive reflect iLAND as a living, participatory, and open organization that honors the complexity of living systems? Can this archive capture the multisensory experience of iLAND projects (i.e. dancing along the shores of Dead Horse Bay in the late spring)? How can we imagine the future user (voyager) amongst our materials of what an archive is, and can be, in this instance?

Here we need to think about what iLAND means by “participation” in the archive (as both user and producer) and the potential of how it might shape narratives about art education practices and theory. The concept of participatory archives practices through iLAND is focused on user engagement with the archive in relation to the processes involved in the preservation of and access to art and art education records. The scores are developed through shared practice and language and foreground modes of observation, perception and relationship. A score is an invitation to the archive for both novice and experts to generate, recreate both new and old insights. It acts as a container and support for focus/practice while relating to a location, community, or site. It is a mode of research.

In participatory archives, the institution supports multi-directional content experiences. The institution serves as a “platform” that connects different users who act as content creators, distributors, consumers, critics, and collaborators. This means the institution cannot guarantee the consistency of user experiences. Instead, the institution provides opportunities for diverse co-produced collections (Simon, 2010). The notion of participation also situates the archive as open, democratic, and inclusive. As a virtual space, iLAND scores are essentially available to every*body* to engage, translate, and modify. Mindful of who really has access to the archive as a social and pedagogic space, including the ability and confidence to participate in it.

*Movement Score*

Watch the water for 5 - 8 minutes.

The radical pedagogy of the iLANDING archive is then located in how it reflects a radical archive, through the data it generates and the possibilities and potentialities inherent in using the archive. First of all, the emphasis of the materials is on process. Scientists, dancers and artists collaborate to investigate a local ecology - and respond in turn through collaborative forms of inquiry. The output or “byproducts” of each project range from dance scores, photographic documentation, videos, websites, publications, and other written works. For instance, considering again the Strataspore residency as one example of an iLANDing process, over the course of six months the group developed a series of dances and public engagements, which generated a set of data including photographs, videos, movement scores, a multi-user blog (<http://strataspore.ning.com>), and a small publication.

The richness of these materials lie in their potential for public pedagogy, provoking radical relationships to natural systems based on an informed and embodied understanding of the environment built on new conceptions of ecology that are science and arts-based. iLAND allows for untested and emergent practices to develop in relation to a particular place, a group of people, and the wider public sphere of NYC. While each iLAND project is unique in its approach, a shared set of unfolding processes is apparent that draws from feminist and cross-disciplinary forms of knowledge-production where the inherent nature of iLAND infuses art movement and science, involving a pedagogy of reciprocity and replicability, and a way of knowing.

iLAND data (archived and made accessible) is open access and inviting to be re-activated through re-enactment and re-modification (Lepecki, 2010) of this research (replicability). The ideas explored through each residency become enmeshed in the very environments to which they seek to respond becoming a continuous and ongoing learning event for both iLAND residents and the publics they encounter or engage directly in the present, and future visitors to the archive through the interpretations that are generated.

*Listening Score*

Begin by listening to whatever sound catches your attention.  When you have listened to it completely, let another sound catch your attention.  Try to hold on to that sound until you have listened to it completely.

**In/Continuum: iLANDing futures**

  iLAND is a community of people from different disciplinary and cultural backgrounds who come together around shared interests in urban ecology, interdisciplinary collaboration and movement as a research practice. This paper set in motion the idea of iLANDing as an archive and evolving artwork. The challenges lie in creating a system that will reflect *the score* (i.e. the set of loose instructions that allow one to translate and adapt). This requires an attitude that embraces and necessitates a level of ambiguity, a zero-control of any one artist, an acceptance and willingness to be okay with precariousness. With this paper, we attempted to contextualize the archive within the realm of possibility, as pedagogical device, a system of call and response inviting disruptions of conventional understandings of archives and an explicit inclusion of participation, of intersubjective relations with self, others, and ecology.

 While the architecture to house the iLANDing archive is still in nascent stages, its intention as an open access, participatory and dynamic archive of transdisciplinary exchange and somatic understanding offers a salient context to consider alternative and perhaps radical approaches to archival process and practice. In positioning the body as both a pedagogical and archival device, we open the possibility for new conceptions of archives as living systems in the making.
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