

Introduction

0.1 On anonymity performance, critical practice, electronic pop music, and performance ethnography

*Field note 356 / First week of November 2011: The name Ursula Bogner appears on the German-language Wikipedia!*¹

In the early years of the twenty-first century, two compilation albums of German electronic music, released under the name ‘Ursula Bogner’ (Bogner 2008, 2011) were discussed in pop music media. Compiler Jan Jelinek, in the liner notes to the second compilation album (2011), alludes to a suspicion that has persisted since the first Bogner release (2008)²: ‘[W]hoever is looking for information about the “true” identity of Ursula Bogner in these opening remarks will be disappointed’ (Jelinek 2011:6).

Ursula Bogner is the name of the missing female link in German electronic music; a German Musique Concrète and electronic music enthusiast who would fit nicely into an international lineage of female electronic music composers such as Delia Derbyshire, Daphne Oram (both of the BBC Radiophonic Workshop) or Else Marie Pade (of Danmarks Radio) – all of whom have been re-discovered in the last decade. Is Ursula Bogner a historical person or a collective name for the countless (female) artists who remained unacknowledged by public media?

This study provides no answers concerning the ‘secret’ identity of Ursula Bogner, but instead investigates the critical potential of ‘naming the nameless’ and of anonymity as institutional critique of personality in pop music. While there are continuities with 20th-century avant-gardist critiques of the unitary artist-subject and with post-structuralist author-critiques, the critical practices of anonymity and a-personality in

¹ http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ursula_Bogner [23/11/2011].

² The first Ursula Bogner album, compiled by Jan Jelinek, was released in November 2008, the second, compiled by Andrew Pekler, was released in Oct. 2011.

electronic pop music specifically target the institution of the *star* personality in pop music. Not being identifiable as an individual opposes the dominating identificatory system of pop stardom and can thereby criticize the many exclusions that pop's star system produces.

Field note 1/ Aug. 2006: The Detroit dance music producer Moodymann, known for his obscurantist attitude, deejays at Berlin's Cafe Moskau from behind a sheet. In his performance the sheet draws our attention to the physical absence of the sound sources that we listen to, while at the same time it grants Moodymann a special presence.

Within electronic dance and pop music, practices of anonymity have been tested for their political and aesthetic³ potential since the late 1980s. In electronic dance music (EDM) the acousmatic quality of recorded sounds (the source of the sound remains unidentifiable due to the separation of sound and image in recording) formed not only the basis for practices such as white-labelling (i.e. anonymizing) records and the faceless⁴ (as opposed to star-centred) presentation of musical sounds in marketing and distribution channels, it also allowed for new hybrid musician roles such as the club DJ to develop and eventually attain central importance within the scene⁵. While subcultural electronic dance music (EDM) agents have intensified the general a-personality created by acousmatic, electronic sounds and collectivized the distribution and reception scenarios of pop music, other (electronic pop music) projects (for example Moodymann) more spectacularly perform the process of de-personalization and articulate their 'no' to normative practices of identification in a theatrical manner. In its exploration of anonymity as a politically and aesthetically

³ Mark Butler (2006:34) refers to an 'aesthetics of anonymity' in EDM.

⁴ 'When techno first emerged into mainstream British consciousness in the early nineties, it was disparagingly labelled "faceless techno bollocks". The Rising High label appropriated this, turning it into a defiant pro-techno T-shirt slogan' (Monroe 2003).

⁵ In mainstream media coverage DJs were the figureheads of techno.

idealized scenario of creativity emerging from the crowd, electronic dance and pop music has become notorious for (either substantially or spectacularly) eluding discursive and visual representation – by refusing to give individual author or interpreter names and portrait images or, by literally hiding behind a curtain. In light of these circumstances, when researchers endeavour to drag such music cultures into the realm of (academic) discourse, an experimental methodology is called for.

Field note 275/ January 2010: Swedish singer and electronic pop musician Fever Ray appears on a Swedish Music Award Show to receive her award for ‘Best solo debut of 2009’. She ascends the stage wearing an upper body- and face covering red costume. Taking award and microphone in hand to deliver the requisite acceptance speech, she raises the upper head-masking part of her costume only to reveal a second mask of abstract alien-animal form – from which she merely exhales a deep, throaty wheeze.

Fever Ray’s TV performance helped me develop a significant differentiation: I am not interested in whether Fever Ray substantially practices anonymity on stage, but rather in how she performs it. A focus on ‘practices’ is a perspective that was revived during the performative turn in the cultural disciplines of the late 1990s. While cultural sociology has undergone a ‘practice turn’ (Schatzki/Knorr Cetina/Savigny 2001), cultural anthropology has seen a performance turn (Conquergood 1991, Schechner 1999) and both fields have increasingly focussed on the ‘act’ of culture while shifting their analysis towards practices (rather than structures, texts or ‘webs of significance’ (Geertz 1973:5)). In line with both these developments, this study concentrates on anonymity practices as strips of activity.

The practice-based approach has a significant impact here. Whereas Fever Ray uses a visual symbol, the mask, a scholar might use the linguistic term ‘anonymity’ – according to socio-cultural practice theory both these representations, (visual)

medium and (terminological) language, are not merely constructions (in supposed contrast to the social practice itself which is somehow ‘real’). Social practices are factual and fictional, practical and theoretical. Practice theory locates practices both in subjective agency *and* in objective structures and understands them as unpredictable *and* contingent. In this sense, knowledge production on social practices must also reflect this double logic and dispel the artificial epistemological positions of subjectivism and objectivism (Hörning/Reuter 2004:13f). The practical turn in (cultural) sociology has notably not only extended the unit of analysis to social *actions* but also to the practices of theorization and knowledge production themselves (Knorr-Cetina 1999, Lynch/Woolgar (1988)1990).

The culture-sociological notion of practice also comes close to the notion of performance as used in performance studies. Performances are both generative and repetitive, but, crucially, performances also involve a ‘consciousness of doubleness according to which an actual execution of an action is placed in mental comparison with a potential, an ideal, or a remembered original model of that action’ (Carlson 1996:5 paraphrasing Baumann 1989). The difference between doing (practices) and performing (performances) therefore lies, firstly, in this doubleness. Anonymity performance includes a reflexivity towards the ideal of anonymity and the electronic music scene’s tendency of idealizing anonymity and a-subjectivity. Secondly, ‘a performance stands in and of itself as an event’ (Roman 1998:xvii) and the methodology of performativity focuses on singular actions while practice theory is predominantly interested in routines and frequent, periodic actions (Hörning/Reuter 2004:12).

The music projects I have gathered in this study act out reflexive and singular practices, i.e. performances of anonymity. In the pop music field, anonymity is an activity critical of individual-centred discourse and the institution of ‘star personalities’

in pop music, yet I am less interested in anonymity as a practice in the sense of a habitualized (sub)cultural routine (the substantial anonymity realized by EDM) than in singular performances and presentations of anonymity. My methodological anchor therefore lies in the paradigm of the performative, and I investigate anonymity operations as performances. These performances represent expert meta-engagements with anonymity enacted by electronic pop music agents, who have regularly positioned themselves rather on the fringes of EDM, as avant-garde projects, or as genre-crossers.

In the tradition of a ‘nomad’ (rather than a ‘royal’) science (Deleuze/Guattari (1980)2002:373), I ‘follow’ two such cultural expertise projects. In its original sense, ‘method’ (from Greek ‘methodos’, a composition of meta (after) and hodos (way, motion, journey), means nothing less than just such a ‘following’ (Deleuze/Guattari 2002:372). Nevertheless, a precision of methodology might be called for:

Field note 417. Nov. 2011. I finally read Jacques Derrida’s ‘Signature Event Context’ ((1972)1988) to its very end: at the end of this paper, in which he argues for the iterability and absence in writing, Derrida places his personal signature.

The image shows a handwritten signature in black ink, which appears to be 'J. Derrida'. Below the signature, the name 'J. DERRIDA' is printed in a simple, black, sans-serif font.

Fig. 1 Derrida’s signature in ‘Signature Event Context’ (Derrida 1988:23)

My notion of the ‘performative’ draws on Derrida’s ((1972)1988) deconstructive reading of John L. Austin’s speech act theory. Austin ((1962)1975) had called specific forms of language usage ‘performatives’ and declared them productive due to the radical presence of their speaker, Derrida (1988) deconstructed Austin’s

approach and instead positioned writing – a radical form of absence – as the basis of all forms of communication. Derrida locates the productive agency of language, which Austin had located in the presence of a speaker, in the general iterability of signs. Two elements of Derrida’s approach are of special importance to my project: firstly, by positioning the principle of repetition (in contrast to Austin’s principle of self-presence) as the condition of the possibility of any sign usage (Schumacher 2002:386), Derrida laid the ground for an extension of the concept of the ‘performative’ from the linguistic field to theatrical and social performances (cf. Butler 1988,1990,1993).

Secondly, Derrida notably applies the principle of the performative to his own writing. While Derrida had argued in his paper for radical absence, he doubles (and undermines) this statement at the end of the paper with an obverse flourish: the handwritten signature,⁶ which suggests that, contrary to his argument, Derrida also believes in an absolute presence in writing. With this paradoxical gesture Derrida enacts his approach to deconstruction: ‘Deconstruction does not consist in moving from one concept to another, but in reversing and displacing a conceptual order [...] with which it is articulated’; ‘it must, through a double gesture, a double science, a double writing – put into practice a *reversal* of the classical oppositions and a general *displacement* of the system’ (Derrida 1988:21).

Just as the engagement with the ‘performative’ has corrupted Derrida’s own academic writing, the ‘performative turn’ has infiltrated methods of research and writing in cultural anthropology and ethnography. Within music studies, I position my work within the field of cultural studies and specifically in music ethnography.

Ethnography is a method used in anthropology and ethnomusicology, yet since the *Writing Culture* debate (Clifford/Marcus 1986) ethnography has come to represent

⁶ Of course, in Derrida’s book ((1972)1988) and here in this text, the handwritten signature is photographically and then digitally reproduced.

not only a distinct qualitative research method but also a specific text genre. In music studies, ethnography is applied to various music cultures – from traditional musics, to youth (sub)cultures and to the world of classical music (Cook 2008). In music ethnography, music is, in the tradition of ethnomusicology, understood as cultural practice (of a group of people, a culture, a field) to be analysed by an ethnographer in a period of fieldwork characterized by a multi-layered methodology and eventually represented in writing.

The area of my research, ‘electronic pop music’, hardly forms a geographically or socially circumscribable ‘field’ as it is produced and consumed in global contexts, by individuals and groups who are both socially and geographically disparate.

Nevertheless, ‘electronic pop music’, insofar as it represents a pop music culture heavily determined by electronic modes of production, has a historical boundary: it grew out of the subculture of electronic dance music (EDM) in the late 1980s in Europe and the US and crossed over to the mainstream club culture of ‘electronic pop music’ in the mid 1990s. My methodology differs from a traditional fieldwork because, besides face-to-face interactions and participation in electronic dance music events and performances, I include archival material such as journalistic texts, videos, sound recordings and books on electronic dance and pop music along with theoretical texts and use them not as corrective materials but as a constitutive part of my data material (cf. Des Chenes 1997:76ff.). Therefore, I include video transcripts and theoretical excerpts in my fieldwork notebook. The performative turn, nevertheless, permeates my methodology also in a more radical sense:

Field note 418, Jan. 2012: Michael Taussig in his DOCUMENTA (13) publication on Fieldwork Notebooks (Taussig 2011:5): ‘[C]hance determines (what an odd phrase!) what goes into the collection, and chance determines how it is used.

(Imagine a social science that not only admits to this principle but runs with it!) This strikes me as an insightful way of portraying a fieldworker's notebook'.

Running with the principle of chance postulates a model of socio-cultural science that is itself performative. 'If the world is a performance, not a text', and culture 'a verb, a process, an ongoing performance' (Denzin 2003:11f.), this calls for a radical 'rethinking [of] ethnography' (Conquergood 1991). Although I associate myself with ethnography, my aim is not to represent electronic pop music culture holistically. Ethnography has, with its crisis of representation, seen a 'deep epistemological, methodological and ethical self-questioning' (Conquergood 1991:179). Yet even in critical ethnography 'reflexivity failed to generate new strategies, forms and norms of practice to encounter the more complex, parallel and fragmented worlds that many fieldwork projects must now negotiate' (Marcus 2010:84). While the 'field' of Malinowskian ethnography was understood as a place of marginality and alterity, today's fields resemble what George Marcus (2010:88) calls a 'mise-en-scène', a self-evidently dramaturgical product of ethnographer and 'ethnographees'. Marcus' concept of the 'mise-en-scène' reflects the fictional element that accompanies every topographical description (Bayard (2012)2013). Moreover, ethnographic practice and fieldwork turn into a 'collaborative performance of an enabling fiction between observer and observed, knower and known' (Conquergood 1991:190).

Deriving from critical ethnography, beginning in the 1990s performative anthropology established performance not only as a subject of study but as a method of research. A focus on performances lends itself well to my subject, since performance is 'a fundamental dimension for music's existence' (Cook 2008:58). My 'performance ethnography' on anonymity in electronic pop music understands its subject/object as performance: musical practices, in my case, anonymity practices on musical and social stages, are analysed as performances. Yet performance, as a method of

research, also affects my overall writing and my knowledge practice. Performance ethnography experiments with performance as research practice – in both the senses of theatrical *and* processual performance. Performance as a theatrical, staging activity manifests itself in this study by the implementation of ‘performance writing’; new ‘texts that move beyond the purely representational and toward the presentational’ (Denzin 2003:xi). The effect on my writing is that my research protocol itself turns into a theatrical performance. In the tradition of performance writing, my text aims to ‘evoke [...] what it names’ (Phelan 1998:13) and I use language in ways that ‘show [...] rather than tell [...]’ (Denzin 2003:93). My text includes visual material that not merely illustrates but performs an argument, and thus my text ‘looks distinctive on the page’ (Denzin 2003:94), – using special typefaces and graphical elements. In the later chapters, I also include other genres of writing, for example, borrowed from the encyclopaedia format, or, as in this introduction, from the fieldwork notebook. Furthermore, by use of the ‘I’ of the researcher and an ongoing research narrative my personal presence is woven into this text.

Performance as research practice further manifests itself in this study as a *processual* activity of the performance-researcher. The research matter of this study is processually transformed and re-perspectivized and this process begins with the delineation of my research matter: anonymity cannot be a transcendent object of investigation. On the one hand, anonymity ‘needs witnesses and relies on someone knowing that the proper name is being hidden or held in reserve’ (Gaston 2008:107 referring to Derrida 1987:46f.). On the other hand, one cannot know about someone anonymous without impairing her or his anonymity, without registering or making her or him known. Personal anonymity is ephemeral and ontologically precarious. Or put more generally, the knowledge of anonymity impairs its being. Nonetheless, like a

secret, anonymity's ephemerality exerts a potent attractive force on me as an observer. And as '[t]here is no such thing as a secret (Taussig 1999:7, IM), there also is no such thing as anonymity. A possible *state* of ,being without name and identity' would instead depend on an active not-knowing, existing only as a 'public secret' (Taussig 1999). Within linguistic discourse, anonymity 'won't stay still'; it puts forward a 'chain of substitution' (Caesar 2008:38) that helps one to realize the procedures of construction that are necessary to produce a factual, distinct (discursive) object. Rather than being a fully transcendental, universal object that can be acknowledged by the fully immanent (social) subject, anonymity can only be understood as what Michel Serres calls a 'quasi-object' (Serres (1981)2007:228) – both transcendent *and* immanent (Lash 1999). Following the deconstructivist interrogation of categorical oppositions, all cultural or anthropological things (including practices and material objects) can be understood as fabricated (albeit not arbitrary) things or as artefacts (of practices). But quasi-objects, such as 'anonymity', carry a specific, demonstrative hybridity with them, so that they inevitably corrupt all forms of distanced inquiry. Within the context of modernist, dualistic worldviews, which still dominate scholarly inquiry, these quasi-objects create noise. The quasi-object of anonymity destabilizes the assumed transparency of theoretical language and displays the performativity of knowledge production. How does one investigate such a corruptive research object? Having already stated that my research interest concerns anonymity performances (rather than anonymity practices), I can now provide the methodological rationale for this decision. The corruptive quasi-object of anonymity compels me to take a step back and to consider the fabrication rather than the (autonomous) fact of anonymity as research object, and to affirm the genuine *performativity* of cultural research objects: both present *and* represented, cultural research objects are substantial facts

and fabrications of the researcher⁷. With Latour (1999:281, IO), one can argue that ‘scientists make autonomous facts’, but in the act of fabricating them they can be ‘slightly *overtaken* by the action’, ‘surprised’ and are ‘not in command’. As a theoretical object, anonymity unmistakably displays this performativity and therefore prompts one to consider the process of fabricating anonymity, namely anonymity *practices and performances*. While Latour’s shift towards actions and practices highlights the *actions* of researchers, when one shifts focus to consider academic practices, one finds anonymity to be a rare theme: few studies on the topic exist and in the academic field “anonymity” seems to be an instance of what it names’ (Natanson 1986:23).

For these reasons, I have expanded the circle of research agents to include musico-artistic agents from the ‘field’ as ‘researchers’ and ‘knowledge practitioners’. Electronic dance music (EDM) has experimented with anonymity, through practices such as white-labelling or faceless media-presentation of recordings, since it emerged as a subcultural movement in the late 1980s. With (personal) anonymity EDM itself, as a movement, aimed to go beyond dualisms of subjects and objects. Within EDM, the strategy of choice centred on the avoidance of discourse-centred forms of communication and classifying language, while within the music itself, non-organic sounds emphasized the aim of fully collapsing the ‘human and artificial’ (Loza 2001:350). This was meant to help ‘dissolve [...] all of the other dualities’ (Springer 1996:34) – those pertaining to identity with its binaries of gender, race and sexuality specifically, and the dualism of subject and object in general. Much has been written on EDM and I will not be joining the queue of those who seek to answer the question of this movement’s success in these endeavours. I will also not be investigating non-personality in the forms that pop music theory of the last 30 years has been

⁷ While Latour (1999:140) introduces (and then rejects) the metaphor of the (theatre) stage, I find the metaphor of the performance stage most appropriate to understand the ‘scene’ of research.

immersed in – the approaches of theorizing sound and listening, describing non-personality as subject-less-ness theoretically or supporting the various motivations for anti-personality in EDM theoretically.

Instead, I depart from an investigation of anonymity as a substantial fact. Substantial anonymity – the state of being without a name or unlinked from other potentially identifying markers of individuality – has only ever been achieved by very few of electronic dance music’s producers and performers; nevertheless, it stayed with the genre and its successor, electronic pop music, as an aesthetic and political ideal.

Anonymity performances, in contrast, represent expert meta-engagements with anonymity and its history in the scene by electronic pop music agents. My interest centres on these peripheral, reflexive practices, which do not aim to achieve substantial anonymity, but perform anonymity. In an ultimately science-centred (not field-centred) transdisciplinary endeavour, I aim to make these field knowledges *about* anonymity productive for academic knowledge practice.

Instead of theoretically speculating on how to bring a (corruptive) research object into (academic) discourse, I conducted a transdisciplinary search for field projects that do not achieve full anonymity but *perform* anonymity – performing in the sense of processing but also staging (in discourse). The chosen projects stem from electronic pop music and are critical of pop music star personality, yet they do not refuse identification and subject constitution in discourse altogether, but perform personality in a critical, des-integrating manner⁸. In their performance of anonymity, these projects find alternative, and discursive, ways of practicing a critical a-personality.

They interfere with discourse, using written and spoken language and vocality in performances or engaging in public relations and journalistic discourse. These

⁸ Similar to institution-critical art, which criticizes the institutions of art while being displayed in galleries and museums (Fraser 2005), electronic pop music performances of anonymity use the discursive and media institutions of pop music while critiquing them.

electronic pop music projects, frequently positioned on the fringes of the scene, deliberately engage in linguistic operations and reflect the theatricality of discourse and discursive critique; but they also engage in language's processuality and release it from its representative functions. It is certainly clear that these musico-artistic 'research' projects have functions other than producing critical, discursive knowledge – however this is the aspect that is of most interest to me in this project.

In my transdisciplinary methodology these field projects serve as laboratory (not exemplary) cases of anonymity performance: they neither represent nor exemplify the field of electronic pop music – I do not describe a practice that is typical for the field – but these cases do provide a laboratory for strategies of performance that can be productive for the academic field. And exactly in their very ephemerality and indeterminateness, in their resistance to becoming an object of knowledge, lies their critical potential.

My research question for this study is therefore centrally concerned with method: how can one practice critical knowledge about anonymity performances and not objectify the ephemerality of these practices?

Before embarking on a transdisciplinary search for answers from within the field (in order to eventually transfer them to the academic field), the notion of 'critical' in this question must be clarified. Traditionally, 'critique' was linked to the position of distance between a subject of knowledge and its object(s); critical subjects delivered judgements about objects, they disclosed knowledge about objects. Yet due to major shifts in political and social power structures since the last decades of the 20th century this operation of 'disclosure' has become problematic. In today's society of control (Deleuze (1990)1995), rather than enclosing rules, it is flexible modulations, which exert power. Traditional criticality that calls for transparency, 'disclosure' and distanced judgement has therefore undergone a crisis. In contrast to such

contemplative, abstract operations of critical judgement, ‘critical practice’ (Butler (2000)2002) or ‘practical critique’ (Foucault (1984)2003:45) does not deliver critical knowledge ‘about’ but ‘with’ an object of critique (Huber et al. 2007:9). Critical practice as developed by Foucault and Butler does not investigate from a neutral and autonomous standpoint, but represents a knowledge practice that is self-transformational and ‘exposes the limits of [an] epistemological horizon’ (Butler 2002:217), while concentrating on the ‘invention of as many new practices as possible’ (Sonderegger 2008:673, TM). Critical practice is self-critical (i.e. it reflects the ‘knowledge-power nexus’ (Foucault (1978)2007:61) within every knowledge practice) and is delivered in a performative, artful form of practice.

With Foucault’s critical project and Derrida’s performative project in mind, critical practice will not only be an object of investigation in this study, but will itself be applied as research practice. A critical position – also towards one’s own work – has to be taken permanently; research as critical practice has to self-critically acknowledge its very own reductions. Instead of setting up definitions and applying them subsequently, in the course of this study and in dialogue with my laboratory cases, I develop and apply concepts (such as ‘persona performance’ and ‘fake’) and discard some of them later in the text. My theoretical musings alternate with analyses of the laboratory cases.

The processual character of ‘performance’ manifests itself in this ‘performance ethnography’ as a continual transformation und re-perspectivation of its research matter. This text documents a process of research through various concepts, only delivers potential solutions to the research question (i.e. a thesis) in its final stretch: forms of critical practice that academia can deduce from the field of electronic music. The tactic of ‘collaborative imagination’ is advocated here as a possible new format for ethnographic research into ephemeral phenomena and sensitive objects.

The structure of this study therefore more closely resembles a patchwork rather than a tree.

Outline

After this basic introduction, Ch. 0.2 draws together the historical reference points of practices of anonymity and their utopian and dystopian potential. It also refines my basic differentiation between anonymity practices: those that in effect produce substantial anonymity, and those that knowingly and spectacularly perform a-personality in discourse without necessarily effecting full anonymity – discursive anonymity performance will be at the centre of this study. Chapter 0.3 points to three potential forms of critiquing pop music personality: the critical investigation of star personality (as in the various disciplines of academic star studies), the (distanced) refusal of pop music personality (as in the anonymity practices of EDM) and the critical practice of pop music personality (as in the anonymity performances of electronic pop music projects examined in this study). Investigating an anonymity performance by electronic pop music artist Fever Ray, Ch. 0.3 distils characteristics of critical practice (against a backdrop of historical concepts of critique in theory), which is then itself taken up as the guiding knowledge production principle of this study and developed into a research design.

Chapter 1 represents the first laboratory case of this study. Here I analyse how dance music producer Moodymann studies the construction of persona and demonstrates the various (historical and medial) aspects of the ‘pop music persona’ in a live performance. Proceeding from Moodymann’s practice, in Ch. 2 I arrive at a summary of the approaches to practice and performance in (pop) music studies and

their applicability to electronic dance music. An excursion following Ch. 2 then introduces approaches to persona, which I present in a deconstructive format, a fictive encyclopaedia entry. Chapter 3.1 again aims to work out a definition of one form of critical anonymity practice in electronic pop music – the fake. The terminological and practice history of fake, in pop music and elsewhere, which I develop in Ch. 3.1, will then in Ch. 3.2 be discarded in favour of a more self-critical practice, as applied by the musical project ‘Ursula Bogner’. With this second laboratory case I then arrive at a point where I tentatively name this practice ‘collaborative imagination’. Finally, rather than defining this practice, I argue for transforming this critical practice into a methodology for researching sensitive objects.

Broadly speaking, Chapters 1 and 2 can be summarized as dealing with ‘practice and performance’, the axis of ‘critical practice’ as put forth by Judith Butler, while Chapter 3 and the conclusion concern themselves with the self-critical aspect of critical knowledge practices – the axis of epistemological critique in critical practice put forth by Michel Foucault.