The professional sphere of contemporary art subsists within a larger economy of the production of material and immaterial cultural goods. This includes the media and entertainment industries, publishing, and software and design, along with a network of globally active galleries and auction houses that trade in art (traditional, modern, and contemporary) and antiquities. It is not a matter of dispute that a large number of people who train in art academies finally end up as wage workers (with regular or precarious employment) within the continually burgeoning culture industry. When art students graduate from their academies, they usually end up as “no-collar” workers in the industry by day and as artists by night in their dreams.

Contemporary art can also be a refuge from the relentless pressures of the culture industry. But it is the kind of refuge that makes no bones about the fact that it is also a secret internal exile. The young artist, who often begins professional life as an intern in the corporate setting of the culture industry, usually finds himself or herself in a simultaneous condition of internment within contemporary art.

All industrialization processes bring in their wake an enormous pressure for the new. The so-called creative industry is no exception to this rule. The logic of production itself is typically captured in the slogan, “Innovate or perish.” A great deal that is valuable in cultural and artistic life becomes a casualty of this entrepreneurial acceleration. Tenure within this industrial milieu comes at a price. What is lost is the capacity to reflect, to take time, to be critical of the world and one’s own practice. The no-collar worker by day is at war with the artist by night. The lives of contemporary art practitioners the world over are scarred by this battle.

Sometimes this double life can be traumatic. The fear of irrelevance, obsolescence, and marginality haunts many younger practitioners, and the pressure to exhibit as an artist is almost as lethal as the pressure to innovate as a cultural worker or entrepreneur. Coupled with this is the fact that the dissolution of a stable canon in the wake of the rapid global dispersal of contemporary art practice brings a certain disorientation to bear on the lives of most practitioners. No one quite knows what to do next to stay afloat in a swiftly changing world.

The question of what then constitutes an education that can adequately prepare a practitioner for a vocation in the contemporary arts is primarily a matter of identifying the means to cultivate an attitude of negotiation with and around this kind of pressure. Learning the ropes is learning to do what it takes to maintain a semblance of the life praxis of artistic autonomy. To think about the content of such an education requires us to return to some very basic questions.

A SOBER INTERLUDE AT SCHOOL

Education ordinarily presumes a retreat, or a period of waiting, so as not to burden the student with the distractions and demands of a professionally productive
life. The position of apprenticeship that education generally assigns to the student implies a withholding or a deferral of the fullness of practice, which is held out as a promise that can be redeemed once the student proves mastery over the rudiments of a calling. Being someone, and learning to be someone, are seen as two distinct moments, with the first following the successful completion of the second. While this may be true generally, it is difficult to sustain this understanding of art education as a phase that merely seeks its posthumous completion in the career of an artist.

Artists undertake to transform themselves continuously through their practices and throughout their working lives. For an artist, there can be no rigid separation between being someone and learning to become someone. The reason to continue to be an artist lies in an everyday rediscovery of what remains to be said or done. Being an artist is no different from learning to become an artist. This process of rediscovery of what it is that he or she needs to do transforms the artist on an everyday basis. The horizons of the artist’s self continuously expand to take in the incremental unraveling of what the artist still desires to inscribe on his or her consciousness and the attention of the world.

The day that an artist realizes that his or her stock of things left to think about and to do has depleted to a point where it measures less than what has been done already, that artist might as well stop practicing. This means that in order to continue working, the artist learns to constantly prepare for the unknown, for what remains to be done. An artist’s education is never finished. School is never out.

**WHAT IS A SCHOOL?**

Is school a place, an institution, a set of facilities, a situation, a circumstance, an attitude, or a constellation of relationships of the transfer of acquired, invented, and accumulated knowledge, experience, and insight from one generation to another? Perhaps a school or the idea of a school as a condition of learning, of being open to discourse and discovery, can also be seen as something that we might carry with us wherever we go, whatever we do.
is to insist on a mode of practice that is also reflective—that is, to insist on a mode of practice in which reflection is inseparable from practice. Here, making is thinking, and learning is what occurs at the instance of activity. Praxis is theory.

This second mode of intertwined practice/reflection, or praxis, is often difficult to sustain in the face of the current frugality and precariousness of institutional hospitality toward the non-instrumental activities of artists. That is why artists who choose this mode can often end up generating the contexts that make their work possible. For them, the work of art is not just about making art but also about making the conditions and initiating the networks of solidarity and sociality that enable the making of art. These conditions are not just the material and institutional circumstances that have to do with space, resources, and attention to the practical issues that underwrite the realization of artistic projects (though these are very important and require a great deal of energy). Most crucial, they are also about the diligent and enduring cultivation of the kind of intellectual ambience and the social matrix that allows the unfettering of artistic praxis and inquiry.

RIYAAZ

In Hindustani (north Indian classical) music traditions, riyaaz, or the everyday cultivation of one’s musicality, is a repertoire of exercises to keep the voice or fingers or one’s ability to play an instrument in good shape. But it is more than this. It is as much about the cultivation of a set of attitudes and sensibilities as it is about the honing of a skill. Riyaaz is an attempt to explore the boundaries of what one can do on a regular basis and of pushing these boundaries, again on a regular basis, so that the foundations of one’s practice undergo a daily renewal, so that one keeps becoming an adept. Riyaaz is a practitioner’s meditation on his or her practice.

What would constitute the riyaaz of the kinds of artists who busy themselves with the continuous generation of contexts for praxis? By way of an attempted response to this question, here are eight points for consideration that sketch a rudimentary set of contours for a hypothetical instance of an artist’s riyaaz—just as the eight notes (CDEFGABC) of a scale provide scaffolding for the riyaaz of a musician. Articulating these “notes” through practice means filling them out, embodying them with the experiential specificity and particularity contingent on different situations. The notes can be “sung” in any order and combination, with some repeated, some not, depending on the emphases that a particular situation may call for. No rules are mandated for their singing, other than that each note is given its due in a manner that the singer sees fit. No one instance of riyaaz can be identical to any other, and riyaaz constitutes a form of meditation, not a formula for practice.

(1) EMBEDDED CRITICALITY: The awareness that the cultivation of a critical relationship to one’s situation is a privilege that has to be earned by an intimacy with it, not purchased by a distance from it. One has to know reality with the intimacy appropriate to a lover in order to appreciate its flaws and be awake to its beauty. This means that the practitioner’s stance toward a reality cannot be compromised by an abdication of his or her entanglement with it. When the desire to create a new context for one’s practice takes hold, the practitioner reflects on how that context and the inauguration of that practice can respond with curiosity and generosity toward what already exists in the practitioner’s environment. This is also an acknowledgment of the corollary fact that the desired context cannot be built from materials other than those provided by the existing environment, given that the environment’s boundaries are seen to be flexible and open to redefinition through the practice itself. While there may be no escape from what exists, entire worlds can also open themselves out or be prised open from the coordinates of a street corner or a cul-de-sac.

Like the first note on the scale, which anticipates the next octave even as it founds one, embedded criticality acts as a tonic, providing the engaged practitioner with impetus—the slope of a trajectory as well as a destination.

(2) UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES: The willingness to be open to all the possibilities, including some that are neither anticipated nor intended. The capacity to experience the emergence of new desires of practice when confronted with new contextual possibilities. The education of intention in order to keep the will apace with changing circumstances, An abeyance of foreclosure. Recognition of the occasional unpredictability of the familiar and the patience necessary for surprises to go hand in hand. With an openness to unintended consequences, the practitioner remains alert, even to the unimagined.
(3) **RADICAL INCOMPLETENESS** follows logically from an openness to unintended consequences. Learning to be comfortable with the idea that the circumference of a work is always larger than the boundedness of its nominated authorship. The work of art is never done, and so there is always room for another author. And then another. Contexts gather people.

(4) **NON-(UN)EQUALITY OF PRACTICES:** Generative contexts attract many different kinds of people and their different kinds of energy. Not everyone comes with the same history. Class, gender, culture, race, traditions, belief systems, even nutritional histories are always at the practitioner's back and shape the content of every interaction. The fact that some people have more knowledge or information or appear to have more or are able to present themselves as having more should not distract from the responsibility of having to live with and address those who do not display the same bounty.

Everyone is communicative and knowledgeable, or not, depending on the context they find themselves in. Loquaciousness and reticence go hand in hand, just as knowledge and uncertainty do. Unequal purchases on the understanding of the world are apportioned in roughly equal measures. Some people may know a lot, but everyone is equally ignorant. So no matter how much knowledge an instance of practice embodies, it still does not know as much as any other instance of practice. This means that different practices, even when they are not equal to each other in terms of their communicative or cognitive strengths, are at the same time not unequal either. Learning this modesty is essential for practitioners who desire a sense of their own strengths.

(5) **MINOR MEDIA:** The differences between different kinds of practice are chromatic. They are differences of character, not of quantum. There may be major and minor media, but the differences are not analogous to the differences between greater and lesser or higher and lower practices. What matters in the end is not scale or impact, but acuity, affect, dispersal, resonance, and endurance. This allows different people to enter the field of practice in a manner commensurate with their histories and capacities (which, as we have seen above, are neither identical nor unequal).

Minor media are practices in a minor key. They introduce tonal alterations that rearrange the regularities made familiar by the repetition of major practices. They alter the mood or setting or emotional tenor of a practice by insisting on attention to irregular variations. They are ways of remembering, imagining, and accounting for things that do not get remembered, imagined, or accounted for in the ordinary course. At the same time, they are things that can be done every day. Although *riyaaz* is not the same as the making of a work of art, minor media are the practices that can be stitched into the folds of everyday *riyaaz*—observation, recording, alteration, restoration, arrangement, rearrangement, ordering, disordering—one step at a time.

Minor media are not masterstrokes and do not seek to produce masterpieces, and they are not necessarily worked on by great masters. What they do allow is a dense layering (by one person or by many over lengths of time) of the work of art with a multitude of surfaces that produce a context, rhythm, and texture of accumulative annotations. It is this accumulation that occasionally yields the sharp significance that is the unique property of a work done in a minor key.

(6) **INCREMENTAL RECORD:** Building an archive of works incrementally (whether they were done in a minor key or a major one) creates a record of the generative life of a practice even as it is in process. A history of the movement of a practice gets inscribed into the very terms of its expression, making visible all of its ideas—threadbare, discarded, extended, or transformed. This not only allows others to enter into the making of a work (if the work is, say, an extended collaborative process) but offers them the opportunity to become familiar with what has been said already. Of course, it also allows practitioners to revisit ground that they may have already covered in order to mine fresh insights or remind them of something that might have eluded their memory. The record and trace of a work's incremental evolution is something that has to be learned. It does not happen by itself.

(7) **INTERLOCUTOR:** The various kinds of accumulations that we have described, produced by the actions made possible through *riyaaz*, can take the form of complex assemblages. These assemblages demand mediation and
become arenas within which the artist acts as an interlocutor in order to fulfill his or her mediatory role. If the work is a boat, the artist-interlocutor is a sailor. An interlocutor is someone who speaks between different acts of speech by translating, annotating, mediating, criticizing, interpreting, and extending the contents of the different instances of articulation. The practitioner is not the owner or possessor of a work of art. Instead, the artist takes custody of what might have begun within his or her life, consciousness, and body, but the work is already on its way out into the world. The artist takes responsibility for the safety and integrity of the work during this voyage, making sure that it lands on some more or less secure promontory of meaning before embarking on other journeys.

(8) CONTINUOUS EXCHANGE: Neither the history of an idea nor the here and now of the moment of its iteration occupies a space of privilege. The net effect of the provenances, conversations, and the warp and woof of expressions and meanings woven into a work can only give rise to a space of a continuous exchange between memory, reflection, articulation, and action in which everyone concerned—practitioner, viewer, critic, curator, and enthusiast—contributes to the production and circulation of ideas and knowledge, which are based on a continuing encounter with the work of art. People learn from and with art, not simply from the speech of teachers but from the ongoing history of exchanges and conversations that embody the relationships and interactions that straddle the work of art over time. School may be an initiatory process of significance to some artists, though not to the development of others. Clearly, this process of continuous exchange is the transposed articulation in another key or the situation that we found ourselves embedded in critically at the beginning of this “octave.”

CODA: THE WISHING TREE

It is said that on an unmapped island, sheltered in the curve of a hidden bay, there stood a speaking tree. It was one of its kind. Some called it the waq-waq tree, the tree of tongues; some called it the kalpataru, the tree of desires. If you stood under the leaves of the speaking tree and named your desires, the wind rustling in the leaves of the tree would echo each utterance and the wishes that had names would come true.

The world is made as the things in it are named. Sometimes naming presumes knowledge; sometimes the name is a sign that we do not yet know what we name. We trust the name to make do while we hold our knowledge in abeyance. The creation of the world, the sustained and sustaining desire for the world, and the knowledge of the world—which is a tacit admission that we do not know and can never know all of the world—all end in the same set of consequences. The world and the things in it get reproduced by naming, knowing, not knowing, and desiring. This is what keeps things alive, and the world gets created anew with the expression of each desire. In this sense, an education for art is a school (a time set aside) for the production of desires, a space for the continuous generation of interpretive acts that also successfully constitute the world or a world among many.

The artist by night, in dreams, recovers what the no-collar worker lost by day.