For a topic of discussion that might intuit concepts of methodical workflows, algorithms, and perhaps most notably logic, these terms have featured surprisingly rarely in what has been presented. Instead, from what we have heard, process in and as music seems to present itself here as a series of polyvalent entanglements with generally multiplicities of dimensions in conceptual operation. This seemingly startling ontological paradox seems most beguiling indeed.

As such, and approaching to the question of definitions, it would appear that prioritising container over contents would be as grave a mistake here as prioritising contents over container. The frame that is put around it and the perspectival gaze that such a frame offers, as with so many things, has the ability to change the nature of that which is itself being contemplated. It is the dialogue between these two things that always interests me most.

Indeed, the manner by which this session has been orchestrated itself presents itself as this particular kind of entanglement. We have, after all, simultaneously been presented a set of manifestos of process and processes of manifestos to examine and this forms a rich tautology for us to unpick. What interests me is that which this particular collisional ‘doublethink’ appears to saying about its constituent parts, not so much in terms of definitions, but how the directionality of each mode of enquiry itself offers understanding of both the subject and object of study. It is precisely the directionalities of that which has been outlined here today that is perhaps most striking to consider.

To that end, what I now present embraces the entanglement of the situation. And for that I make no apology. From what has been already presented, I have identified four conceptual provocations that seem to operate in both these two lines of simultaneous questioning. What do these manifestos say about processes? And what do these processes say about manifestos? I have preliminarily identified four, although there may be many more and, for each, their titles could be read as applying to manifesto as much as process.

**THE MULTIPLICITY OF PROCESS** *(1)* is perhaps rendered most immediate in Richard Glover’s identification of the entanglement of pitch-class permutation and the processual emergence of bodily fatigue in instances of Tom Johnson’s *Chord Catalogue* *(1986, for solo piano)*. The inevitability of such multiplicity within processual movement is further by the comments made by Alastair Zaldua in relation to historicity – indeed the non-neutrality – of musical materials. Zaldua reminds us that the notion of musical material as substance for manipulation is a discursive act, engaging with a historical dialectic that, itself, may not be linear. Keren Levi and Tom Parkinson mesh processes of translation, appropriation and subversion into an entangled grey space, subjecting notions linearity within concept of process to a provocative state of questioning.

Likewise, whilst a notion of manifesto may itself imply a singular cause, what has been revealed by so much of what has been presented here today is the discourse it necessarily of the operational space in which it is presupposed to act. Does a manifesto seek to act on or within the discursive space in which it is situated? Should a manifesto, if successfully implemented, render itself obsolete?

**THE EMBODIMENT OF PROCESS** *(2)* is elegantly foregrounded in Lisa Busby’s work *I always feel like I have something hanging over me* *(undated, for a minimum of 20 performers)* where the body’s capacity to uphold and to support, is viscerally observed via a state of physical procedural collapse over the work’s duration. Sophie Stone changes the perspective of observation from performer to listener, observing the embodied listening demands of extreme durational music *(set against the normative backdrop of the iPod generation)*. But that embodiment is addressed directly in such comments belies the fact that it is felt throughout so many of the manifestos presented today, Glover, for example, makes the claim that ‘Music of gradual process helps us to see who does what’ *(emphasis added)*, the indefinite nature of this claim implying that it is to be applied to musical process as a whole rather than an individuated working practice.

Of course, that the nature of manifesto is also often an embodied process was introduced to us at the outset by Lauren Redhead. Redhead prudently reminds us of the work of Marinetti and the Futurists *(one could mention Cage’s *Lecture on Nothing* *(ca. 1949-50)* as well)* and therefore of the dimension of manifesto that encompasses embodied performativity. Under this guise, there seems to be the presence of a directional force within notions of manifesto, a will...
to movement. The word proclamation itself derived from the Latin clāmare – to cry out, with the prefix pro – forth or forwards. As such, movement as action – particularly forward action – seems so far embedded that, in as much as performativity can be understood as something that comes to be present through being of action, the experience of a manifesto appears to be performative, even if encountered in a written form (one need no further than to a particular example from Marx for further contemplation). Yet it must be acknowledged that not everything we have heard today seems to be acting in such a forward-aimed capacity, Stacey and Glover in particular seem to prioritise description over such projection. One is left, therefore, to ponder that which it is that separates manifesto from statement, if anything at all.

That process seems to have be entwined here with embodiment thusly opens THE POLITICS OF PROCESS (3) as an additionally emergent thread. Cara Stacey’s project regarding creative practice and appropriation within colonialized institutional contexts is perhaps the most visceral example we have heard, although the socio-political dimension within which notions of process have necessarily act has presented itself via a number of portals. Stone’s consideration of the technological socio-normativity of duration (with regard to work-length and attention span), for example, illustrates the entwinement of process, perception and sociality (a point also mentioned by Glover with regard to linguistic mechanisms). Zaldua takes this observation yet further, reminding us, via Benjamin, of the historicity of appropriation and the cultural politics such action involves, in a sense a return to Stacey’s own position.

The political attributes of manifestos in the sense of performative action, or indeed calls to action, should come as little to no surprise. Of course, notions of statement, as perhaps an act of territorialisation and encapsulation, do not escape such a lens either. Indeed, the act of compiling a manifesto in itself seems innately welded to the public domain, these are documents that surely define an identity for the author with or against the reader. Actions come little more political than that.

As such, THE VIOLENCE OF PROCESS (4) cannot be overlooked as an attribute of that which has been discussed today. It follows that if the nature of process is concerned with directionalities of kinds, then the limits of these travelling spaces will necessarily present themselves at a certain point. That a process can itself be a provocation has already been introduced in the work of Levi and Parkinson. Zaldua talks most eloquently about the betrayal of translation (in a variety of forms) and therefore of transformation direction (perhaps this at the heart of process itself) as a facet of damage. Numerous other violence have emerged today, violence against the body (Busby), to language (Glover), to perceptive stamina (Stone), and to identity (Stacey). As such, the violence of process can be understood perhaps has the inverse quality of process’s necessity for socio-normative spaces in which to operate (accepted syntaxes through which process can be witnessed). What is a queer process, I wonder.

That manifesto may be itself a violence seems a suitably provocative position on which to end. From the materials we have witnessed today, the manifesto seems to oscillate among speakers as a territorialised Cartesian space and a vectorial claim to movement. From what we have heard today, manifestos are not an act of photography, the claim being made is one of forces, forces of borders or the forces of movement. Yet, perhaps more uncomfortably, there seems something of the phallic originator in this manifesto-ing – is there an operational dynamic which presumes a superimposition of will (masculine) on to the formless (feminine) as a bringer of meaning. Is there a misogyny in our notions of manifesto? To what extent is a manifesto a manifestation of power dynamics?

Through the entangled presentation of process as manifesto, manifesto as process, the complexity of the space revealed has come to reveal itself. The terms simultaneously scrutinise and illuminate one another. In essence, at core of the numerous insights offered to us today – in both directions of the enquiry – what has been ultimately illuminated here in the wider sense are the complications inherent within notions of exposition and didacticism, and the scope of the knowledges that remain uncovered. That makes the task of this particular research group a particularly important one, as they continue to shed light on their labyrinthis subject.

**QUESTIONS EMERGING (PRE-PREPARED)**

**ON PROCESS**
- Is the manifesto a process?
- Is process ever monovalent?
- Is process a what or a who?
- What is a queer process?

**ON MANIFESTO**
- What is the difference between statement and manifesto?
- Is there such thing as a private manifesto?
- Is a manifesto reflective or speculative?
- What is a feminist methodology of manifesto?
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