Co-creation and Affect in Karoline H Larsen’s Collective Dreams

By Dorthe Juul Rugaard

Taking its point of departure in Karoline H Larsen’s art project Collective Dreams at ARKEN in 2015, the article analyses the two different kinds of participation that took place in the work, the co-creation that unfolded during the process of making it, and the affective participation that emerged due to the work’s performative, situational presence.

In March 2015 a group of immigrant women are gathered in a small workshop furnished with samples of their traditional handicrafts. They know each other and meet regularly. They have all chosen a large or small circle of electrical cable, and are now busy filling it with the acrylic string, ribbons and beads that cover the tables and floors. Some weave the strings carefully between each other, others make wild and spontaneous tangles, and a couple of the women use their forearms as knitting needles. A woman attaches a piece of embroidery to the middle of her circle. She has embroidered portraits of her grandchildren, and now it is to be part of her dreamcatcher. Some chat as they work, others concentrate in silence. Also present are the two ethnic Danes who run the group on a daily basis, as well as me and the artist Karoline H Larsen, who has
initiated the process and is already in full swing. We knit, weave, wind and plait our personal dreamcatchers for a large, joint installation.

Three months later I see a small group of morning runners jogging down towards the dunes of Ishøj beach. They slow down to take in the sight of hundreds of dreamcatchers. Each one is mounted to form a colossal net between the trunks and leaves of five trees. They are like moving soap bubbles, pulled by the wind and gravity. One of the runners points out a detail to the others. They continue on their way, and I notice that the colours and movements are very different to yesterday, when heavy clouds and a strong westerly wind blew the ‘captured dreams’ of the installation across the landscape. Today it is summery, and the net rocks gently back and forth behind a group of schoolchildren, who have left their bikes in the grass. The installation interacts with the landscape, changing according to the wind and light. It stimulates the senses of those that see it, generating new awareness of the site’s scenic qualities and the social acts that take place around it.

**One Artwork – Two Kinds of Participation**

In the summer of 2015 the area between Ishøj Station and the beach park behind ARKEN was filled by the works of ten contemporary artists
with diverse approaches to participatory art in public space. Under the umbrella of the exhibition title *Art in Sunshine*, they established a series of situations where everyone, including locals walking their dogs, visitors to the beach park, and the art audience could participate. The exhibition encouraged co-creation, movement and play. One of the artists was Karoline H Larsen. She made three performances in her *Collective Strings* series, and produced the temporary, site-specific installation *Collective Dreams* (2015). This article analyses the two forms of participation embedded in *Collective Dreams*: the co-creation that unfolds during the process of making the work, and the affective participation that emerges due to the work’s performative, situational presence in Ishøj beach park. The analysis of the two forms of participation focuses on the open and
performative character of the work. I will therefore start by turning to Umberto Eco’s poetics on the open work as a realm of possibility where formal features invite a participatory, performative and moveable reception. I draw on discourses that relate to both the ‘social turn’ and ‘affective turn’ in contemporary art, examining how through the participants’ and its own ‘performance’ a work like Collective Dreams can connect elements of both.

Methodologically, the article explores the relevance of embracing the elasticity of the concept of participation. My role as the curator at ARKEN who invited Larsen to develop a site-specific project on the basis of participation, has given rise to reflections on how the art institution creates possibilities for but also limitations on the artistic development of her project. What role, for example, do the funding, resources and time the institution can offer play in the artistic process? And what is the significance of the artist using the institution’s pre-existing relationships to local environments during the co-creative process, instead of working independently of them? Several issues arise concerning the implications of this kind of collaboration for the social role of the artwork, its aesthetic dimensions, and the participation of the audience. Here I focus on the relationship between the work, the participants and the artist, drawing on my privileged access to the process of creating the work.

**The Open, Performative Work**

Collective Dreams is an interesting case in the perspective of critical debates on participation and the ‘social turn’ in art, where the art historian Claire Bishop is currently a key figure. The work has a clear duality, and can be seen as both a social and aesthetic practise, consisting as it does of equal parts collective co-creation and a site-specific installation that does not invite co-creative participation. These two aspects of the work are successive, existing in phases that in different ways embody a high degree of performativity and participation.

Umberto Eco develops his poetics on “works in motion” in his classical text The Open Work from 1962. Here he argues that it is possible to experience any artwork as incomplete and open, because it is first completed by the viewer during reception: ”Hence, every reception of a work of art
is both an *interpretation* and a *performance* of it, because in every reception
the work takes on a fresh perspective for itself.”  

The open work is a field of possibility for communicative and social relationships between
the artist, the audience and the artwork, which opens the potential for
co-creation or what he calls the ‘performance’ of experiencing the artwork. One of the examples Eco uses is the composer Henri Pousseur’s
music, which consists of sections that the musician playing it structures themselves and that advanced listeners – once-removed – unravel and rearrange. Another example is the mobiles of Alexander Calder, in
which Eco discovers “a kaleidoscopic capacity to suggest themselves in constantly renewed aspects to the consumer.” The individual parts of the
mobile move constantly, assuming new positions in relationship to each other. Here Eco assigns ‘performance’ to the work due to its incom-
pletion, which is maintained by the viewer sensing the movement from
changing positions and in changing situations, something “which causes
the work to acquire new vitality in terms of one particular taste, or per-
spective, or personal performance.”

In the light of the ground gained by performativity theory in numerous
art practises during recent years, Eco’s ideas on the aesthetics of recep-
tion in the early 1960s were pioneering. This invites a parallel to *Collective
Dreams*, which like music is interpreted by the co-creating participants,
and which with its movable and moving form is experienced by the audience from their individual social and cultural context. *Collective Dreams* is
an open situation. With elements like movement and spatial changeability,
the work creates an affective ‘performance’ by the audience, generating
new meanings both socially and in the landscape. Here, Eco’s formulation
of how the poetics of the open work establish a new relationship between
aesthetic experience and the social utilisation of art is worthy of note:

”Certainly this new receptive mode vis-à-vis the work of art opens
up a much vaster phase in culture and in this sense is not intellec-
tually confined to the problems of aesthetics. The poetics of the
‘work in movement’ […] sets in motion a new cycle of relations
between the artist and his audience, a new mechanics of aesthetic
perception, a different status for the artistic product in contempo-
rary society. It opens a new page in sociology and in pedagogy, as well as a new chapter in the history of art. It poses new practical problems by organizing new communicative situations. In short, it installs a new relationship between the contemplation and the utilization of a work of art.”

The same quote is to be found in Bishop’s article ‘Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics’, where she points out that whilst Eco’s poetics can be seen as precedent for Nicolas Bourriaud’s relational aesthetics, there is a difference between – like Eco – being interested in an(y) artwork as a reflection of social conditions of existence and – like Bourriaud – seeing a (relational) work as producing these conditions. Due to its duality as co-creative process and aesthetic object, Karoline H Larsen’s *Collective Dreams* offers the space to consider both the producing and reflective/representative potential of the artwork.

**Performativity, Situation and Action**

According to the art historian Camilla Jalving, in her book *Værk som handling* [‘Art as Action’], the concepts of performance, the performative and performativity come from discourses ranging from the aesthetic field of theatre and speech acts to post-structuralist gender theory, and therefore embody highly diverse and even conflicting elements. My use of the concepts, like Jalving’s own, is fluid and overlapping. I use performativity as concept for the fact that *Collective Dreams* ‘does’ something, that it works through participatory situations, and that its participatory practises stimulate the production of identity, sociality, affect and new meanings. The work is not a performance in the sense of a time-based production or performance on a stage for and with an audience, but it has performance-like or performative features because the artist’s and participants’ production of the physical components of the work are part of the work’s performativity. Here the performative is a concept for the situational and for agency in the analysis of *Collective Dreams* as a social, relational process and an installation with its own agency in relationship to both the audience and the site. The work spans a broad, dynamic field from collective performance to the installational situation, which does not solely
represent the performing community’s productivity, but is also productive in and of itself. Whereas Bishop can be seen to use Eco’s poetics on the open work to critique Bourriaud’s promotion of the reality-generating, relational work at the expense of the representational work, I would argue that both forms of participation in *Collective Dreams* are relevant, aesthetic practises with the potential to generate meaning and experiences.

**Participation as Co-Creation**

I will now take a closer look at collective participation in relationship to the co-creation process of *Collective Dreams*. What realm of agency do the artist and participants in the group construct together? What characterises the communities that arise around the creation of the work? And what relationships arise between the co-creating individuals, the agents surrounding them, and the audience, which in Ishøj beach park become key participants in the performativity of the installation? (The last question presupposing that the work itself is seen as performative). The work creates a myriad of positions, situations, manifestations and relationships. In what follows, I limit my analysis to the central agents in the co-creation stage of the work, i.e. the artist, the participants, the participating social organisations, and the art institution.

In March 2015 Karoline H Larsen conducted a series of workshops with different groups. Some of workshops held were with women from the employment scheme and integration project ‘In Line With the World’ at their own premises in Vejleåparken, Ishøj and Rødovre. The rest were community meetings with the residents of the housing estate Vejleåparken, where the team responsible for the urban regeneration of the area invited local card clubs, knitting clubs, parents’ networks, young dancers from the local Urban Academy, and other residents. More than 100 people made dreamcatchers, and the names of most of them could be read on a sign next to the work in Ishøj beach park. Several of the women from the integration project in Ishøj helped Larsen to create the final composition of *Collected Dreams*, which they laid out on the grass as large mosaics before it was hung between the trees.

The artist used the dreamcatcher as a readily accessible form capable of overcoming the language barriers within the group. Using drawings
and sketches, body language, laughter and participants who interpreted for each other, in a matter of hours she turned a sensitive situation of scepticism about working with an artist on an improvised work made with rough materials for an art exhibition, into an experience full of intensity, trust and enthusiasm. Larsen asked the women if they knew the place where the work was to be installed. It emerged that only a few of them had ever been to Ishøj beach park or ARKEN Museum of Modern Art just two kilometres away, despite the fact that they had lived close by for years.

If we view Collective Dreams as an open, performative work where the co-creative process is an expression of the community’s co-interpretation of the artistic concept, it becomes clear that this process takes place on the basis of creative play, with the simple symbol of the dreamcatcher as a motivational tool for each individual to participate. At the same time, the process establishes a complex collectivity in relationship to creative
processes, inclusion and exclusion, power relations and intentionality. Plurality and heterogeneity are a condition of this community – basically, what the participants have in common is their mutual social and cultural differences. They also form mutually exclusive micro communities within the co-creative community, whether as women from the ‘In Line With the World’ initiative, as a passing group of teenagers from local immigrant families, or as an ethnic Danish family making a dreamcatcher together. Larsen steers the process, but is also open, curious and alert, ensuring that her artistic intention is maintained, at the same time as allowing the artwork to be permeated by subjective interpretations of that intention. But what does this mean for the art practise in Collective Dreams? Is the co-creative process, which swings between authoritative intentionality and collective participation, an expression of artistic utopian thinking? Is it about the individual’s personal potential for development in the creative process? Or is it about facilitating democratic citizenship and integration?

Utopia, Creativity and Communication

In her article ‘Mellem kommunikation og kreativitet – deltagelse som æstetikkens missing link’ [‘Between Communication and Creativity – Participation as the Missing Link of Aesthetics’], the cultural theorist Birgit Eriksson analyses participation with a critical view of contemporary culture. At a discursive level, she asks whether participation can represent a solution to the reduction of art’s privileged access to the utopia of democratic citizenship. Inspired by the French philosopher Yves Michaud, she argues that this crisis in art is a consequence of the increased social and cultural focus on art as a catalyst for individual creativity, devoid of any ideal of anti-authoritarianism or subversion. Instead, the differences between strong, self-realising individuals has become a condition for creativity. In this context, participation (as an ideal) can offer the possibility of building bridges between creativity and the artistic drive of communication and sociality. It is precisely this creativity and communication (verbal, bodily and visual) that are core concepts in Karoline H Larsen’s co-creative art practise and collaboration with, for example, the ‘In Line With the World’ initia-
tive. But it remains impossible to see the workshop situations that develop in the co-creation of the dreamcatchers as *either* subjective creativity – understood as the individual/asocial arbitration of taste in the face of insurmountable social disparity – *or* as positive, inclusive citizenship promoting equality. It was, for example, apparent at the workshop I attended that among the group of women sitting side-by-side with materials in their hands there were multiple small identity and language groups where each individual woman’s creative acts took place in relationship to other participants, and where there were varying degrees of adherence to the artist’s concept. According to Karoline H Larsen, my own participation in the co-creative process as a representative of an art institution was valuable for the other women, because they saw it as an expression of the art museum wanting to be part of their world. I, on the other hand, found it difficult to be part of the communication between them.
The Dual Agenda of Participation

According to the artist herself, *Collective Dreams* is not an integration project with the naïve, utopian hope of helping specific groups of citizens establish new relationships to the surrounding society. The co-creation is to a larger degree about contributing to a temporary community with material, bodily and communicative experiences that lie closer to personal development than any intention of social change, the relevance of which is open to question in the context of artistic intention. The artist uses affective terms to describe the co-creative process as something “moveable, soft and sensory”, a kind of game with fluidity between subjects. These aspects were something I experienced when, for example, the intensity in the room shifted when some women left early, or when one of them suddenly had a good idea for a creative technique or colour combination and drew some of her co-participants into the flow. There is also a dynamic in which individual agency and temporary groups influence each other in the specific social context, from the individual creative and aesthetic choices incorporated in the production of each dreamcatcher, to the linguistic and bodily conversations generated by their production. Here the work inscribes itself in Eriksson’s formulation of the dual agenda of participatory art: while the public participate in the work, the work participates in the social realm. According to Eriksson, the ‘success’ of a participatory artwork is conditional on it being able to go beyond its own utopias to deal with the inequalities, exclusions and conflicts of participants’ lives. Here she draws on Claire Bishop’s critique of participatory practises that suppress their own inherent conflicts and exclusions. Karoline H Larsen acknowledges such conflicts and inequalities in direct dialogue with the participants. For example, she invites the participants to be co-creators of the object that is the work, but does not surrender aesthetic authorship. This represents a conflict and unequal power relationship, something she makes clear in the workshops, for example by saying, ”I’m the artist and I’ll get the most credit. That’s how the art world works. But you have my respect and attention, you make your own choices during the process, and I’ll make sure your name is on the artwork in the beach park too.” In doing so, she enters an agreement with the participants, granting them a central role in both the production
of the work and its final installation, where all the participants are made visible in public space. She navigates the difficult terrain of inclusion and exclusion by inviting specific groups like ‘In Line With the World’ to participate, as well as inviting organisations like the urban regeneration team of the local housing estate to collaborate – who in turn invite a wide range of other social groups.

‘We’ and the Artwork

The general public can also participate in Collective Dreams, not in the form of co-creation and communication, but through their spectatorship and bodily experience of the work as an installation. Karoline H Larsen sees it as problematic that the work precludes co-creation by the broadest possible audience in this way, but for me this conflict is precisely where the potential of the work lies, opening as it does the possibility of a broader understanding of the concept of participation and the possibilities it has to offer.

A useful parameter to examine community and community participation in the open work is Irit Rogoff’s critique of the collective ‘we’, i.e. the performative situation that arises when we gather to participate in cultural activities like viewing art. Here I draw on two texts: ‘Looking Away: Participations in Visual Culture’ and ‘WE - Collectivities, Mutualities, Participations’. Rogoff encourages us to turn our critical attention away from the object (artwork, object of study, cultural field), because the dichotomous relationship between, for example, the viewer and the work make it difficult for us to find alternative ways to participate in the culture surrounding us and experience other, equally significant manifestations and events: ”The diverting of attention from that which is meant to compel it, i.e. the actual work on display, can at times free up a recognition that other manifestations are taking place that are often difficult to read, and which may be as significant as the designated objects on display.”

Through this ‘looking away’, we can distance ourselves from the established, normative and hierarchical structures of society that support cultural capital’s fixed categories like class, communities of taste and political affiliations, and instead experience ”the ongoing processes of low key participations that ebb and flow at a barely conscious level”.

---
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In this unknown terrain, another ‘we’ emerges, which being free of categorisations – including the art world’s exclusive categories of ‘viewers’, ‘art lovers’, ‘critics’, etc. – has the potential to productively change the formation of meaning in the situation we are immersed in when experiencing contemporary art. Meaning is thus something that emerges and circulates relationally between subjects and their bodies and actions. It is perhaps a form of co-created meaning, which in the case of Collective Dreams occurs not only in the creative process of making the work, but also due to its presence in public space as an installation the viewer does not solely observe but also experiences as part of a space they navigate with an awareness of other social actions.

I would therefore like to qualify Rogoff’s challenge to the viewer to turn their back on the artwork to see the world. I would claim that Collective Dreams does not stand outside, but is part of the alternative ‘we’ she draws our attention to. The agency of this ‘we’ unfolds in our speech and actions, and it lasts as long as the power constituted through it. Collective Dreams participates in this ‘we’ and this space by virtue of its performativity. As viewers we act in this ‘we’ together with the work and the many subjects who have created it – in the physical space of the landscape, as well as in the fleeting, abstract space of spoken, performed and felt actions.

**Affective Participation in Collective Dreams**

The cultural theorists Gregory Seigworth and Melissa Gregg describe the essence of affect as an “open-ended in-between-ness”, a question of “force-relations”, “passages of intensity”, “becoming and emergence”. In this “muddy, unmediated relatedness” that characterises affect as bodily experience, there is a close relationship to social agency, because affect can make us act differently and have an impact on others. Collective Dreams simultaneously activates the subject’s affective sensory perception and stimulates a form of social action or agency. The individual’s bodily exploration and sensing of the work is, however, tied to the social context they bring with them. As Camilla Jalving argues in her article here, herein lies an affective form of participation. I participate by virtue of what the work does to me and what I do in the vicinity of the
work. The dreamcatchers of *Collective Dreams* are not only aesthetic testimony to or a representation of the co-creation that took place prior to the installation. They also constitute an anthropomorphic body with an affective materiality of its own – an accumulation of connections and passages, a membrane that expands and contracts in continuous movement under the influence of its surroundings.

And of what use is all of this, beyond arguing that there is more to participation in art than meets the eye, or rather, that co-creation and affective participation can be identified as relevant and productive ways of practising and experiencing art? And what does it mean to say such forms of participation are ‘relevant’ and ‘productive’? Any reflection on this has to be based on an awareness that participatory contemporary art renounces or at least no longer attempts to stand under the promising banner of utopia, but can, at the most, be plotted onto the everyday landscape of the micro utopias of relational events and acts. I take inspiration from Rogoff’s argumentation for connectedness between subjects rather than between the subject and the artwork, and with affect theory’s understanding of the aesthetic experience of the body’s fluctuating connectedness with aesthetic and social realities. Both forms of participation can be understood as methods enabling participants to experience their own presence and agency as forces that enter meaning-generating connections with all the fleeting communities they slip into and out of. The contours of a strange parallel and tenuous promise emerge between the fleeting community and the space of affect, something I would like to end by outlining.

**The Social Aesthetics of Affect**

As mentioned above, Rogoff describes the ’ongoing processes of low key participations that ebb and flow at a barely conscious level’, which is part of the other ‘we’ she advocates for. This is hazy territory, where we are in our opinions and actions rather than having or doing them, and that we need to explore in the hope that this can result in a new social and political consciousness that goes beyond the singularity of the individual and closed communities. Parallel to this, Gregg and Seigworth point out that affect theory’s ”casting illumination upon the ‘not yet’ of a body’s doing” contains a hopeful yet fearful promise of an ”emergent futurity.”
This is an indication that affect – something we are in, not something we have – has the potential to not only generate an understanding of the processes of experiencing, but also to move us so we can participate in new, intersubjective social and aesthetic encounters. This parallel being in action and affect is important in relationship to the co-creation of an artwork, because this form of participation can thereby be understood as a practise where fleeting communities emerge not only to interact socially and bodily in an artistic context, but where the participants have the hope of sliding out of these actions and into new ones with a heightened awareness of the small shifts and new realisations they can generate.

The cultural theorist Ben Highmore uses the term ‘social aesthetics’ as a kind of umbrella term for the crossmodal investigations of affect theory, a term otherwise associated with the Bourriaudian discourse of relational aesthetics and criticism of ’the social turn’. Highmore asks directly whether politics has a place in the world of affect. His answer is yes, but not politics with a clear, progressive goal, rather politics as a possible performative transformation, ”a form of experimental pedagogy, of constantly submitting your sensorium to new sensual worlds that sit uncomfortably within your ethos.” He argues for liberation from the perception of aesthetics as a normative, Kantian discourse of ‘fine art’ that suppresses ”the fullness of human creaturely life” by focusing on encountering an aesthetically distilled end product instead of understanding ‘aesthetics’ in the original sense of the word – as a focus on the meeting between the body and the world and the sensing of everyday life and all its vital, incomplete experiences. Because this enriches affect as ”the messy informe of the on-goingness of process” with the potential to establish shared dreams in the form of small counter-measures against the structures of social reality. Highmore’s ‘social aesthetic’ pursuit of “a critically entangled contact with affective experience” is a challenge to participate in art as an open field of possibility with a heightened awareness of the bodily processes we thereby become part of.

A ‘Third Way’ for Contemporary Art?

Collective Dreams incorporates co-creative practise and an installational form that invites spectatorship rather than production. Nevertheless,
the artwork activates several forms of participation, which despite their discursive and practical differences hold a similar potential to support the micropolitical agency of the participants in the social intersection between the individual and the collective. I started by presenting the work using Eco’s vitalisation of the category of the open work. The co-creative process of the work, which unfolds around concepts of creativity, collectivity and performativity, has been analysed as an art practice and form of participation, which in its installation phase is replaced by affective participation in the work. Affect thus provides a
framework for proposing that *Collective Dreams* as an aesthetic form itself participates performatively in the space together with the viewers. Since in her work as an artist Karoline H Larsen is not driven by any utopian idea of participation in the project generating direct social change, no programmatic politics can be extracted from the work. What can, however, be identified is a field of possibility for micro-political agency – continuously emerging, continuously arriving.

In his book *Bad New Days*, Hal Foster warns against participatory art that bases its political practise on ”a shaky analogy between an open artwork and an inclusive society”. He argues polemically against what he sees as a muddy glut of performative and participatory art, where the activation of the viewer in cultural collaborations has become an uncritical end instead of a means. As he writes: ”This is to suggest that collaboration threatens to become autonomous as well as automatic; collaboration, like activation, is encouraged for its own sake”, and in the same breath this collaborative practise establishes an expectation of collectivity as a similarly automatic benefit. Following this logic, participatory art risks cutting the bough it sits on, and in the fall participation and collaboration are reduced to formal aspects of the work devoid of social relevance. There are, of course, examples of this kind of uncritical approach to participatory communities, just as there are examples of the opposite. Eriksson’s analysis of the dual agenda of participatory art cited above – that while the public participates in the artwork, the artwork participates in the social realm – acknowledges that the artwork also works ‘the other way’ or, to be more precise, in a third way, out there in fluctuating social spaces. With this analysis I hope to show that a third way beyond ‘means-and-ends’ thinking exists. The view of relational-aesthetic, participatory art as ‘better’ or ‘superior’ because it produces rather than reflects the world, should be challenged by an awareness that the experience of all the contemporary art we are not invited to co-create, activate or climb on – a significant portion, after all, of the art we see – has an equal and equally relevant social potential.
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