
Experimentalisms in Practice

MUSIC PERSPECTIVES FROM LATIN AMERICA

Edited by Ana R. Alonso-Minutti
Eduardo Herrera
and Alejandro L. Madrid

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Luis Conde, the primary organizer of this renaissance, discovered MMM through an 18 September 2016 blog post by Victor Tapia, a 21-year-old Communication Sciences student at the University of Buenos Aires.⁹⁰ On his blog, Tapia presented MMM materials from a range of sources, including the text of one of this author's written interviews with Chavarri. Conde, born in 1965, is an experimental woodwind player and arts organizer who by coincidence has a studio in the same Conventillo de las Artes building where Chavarri and de Pedro had a studio in MMM's early days. Conde got in touch with original MMM members Larrain (with whom he had been acquainted since 2001), Pablo Zukerfeld, Chavarri, and eventually Gregorio, who was to be interviewed in the fall of 2017 in New York City by Conde and Argentine filmmakers Luciana Foglio and Luján Montes as part of an MMM video documentary project they began filming in May 2017.⁹¹ As Conde re-assembled these original members, he also began organizing events that would energize others, resulting in an ambitious series of new MMM actions, discussions, and performances that took place between August 10-31, 2017 at the National Bicentennial House, a venue "inaugurated in 2010 as a space dedicated to Argentine history," and sponsored in part by the Office of the Minister of Culture.⁹²

As Chavarri has noted about this surprising reinvigoration of the group, and their sudden reincorporation into Argentine history through a series of new performances at a state-sponsored venue, "the most valuable thing about MMM is not the vindication of our past, but a projection toward the future, embodied in young generations who share our passion for experimental art and collective participation."⁹³

13

AFTERWORD

Locating Hemispheric Experimentalisms

Benjamin Piekut

THE FIRST ADJECTIVE in the phrase "American experimental music" has, since its discursive consolidation in the 1950s, persistently if tacitly referred to the United States of America. After Cornelius Cardew met John Cage and La Monte Young at the end of that decade, *American* extended to the United Kingdom in a kind of special relationship cemented via Anglo-Saxon whiteness.¹ In his classic book *Experimental Music: Cage and Beyond* (1974), Michael Nyman declared: "Experimental music appears to have sprung up quite spontaneously in the early fifties: it was not the culmination of a long line of development, being largely without a linear history."² Of course, Nyman does list some precursors, including Charles Ives, Erik Satie, Luigi Russolo, and the microtonal experiments of Ferruccio Busoni, Alois Haba, and Harry Partch. But it is clear that he does not consider these precursors to have formed a coherent tradition, since he calls both Cardew and Young (born in 1936 and 1935, respectively) "founding experimental composers."³

Yet US composers and writers in the first half of the century used the term "experimental" frequently, though not without contradiction, to mark a distinction from the more common term "modern"; the way they did it tells a relevant story about

⁹⁰ <https://universoepigrafe.wordpress.com/2016/09/18/bondis-plazas-y-experimentacion-movimiento-musica-mas-los-olvidados-vanguardistas-de-la-musica-argentina/>

⁹¹ Luis Conde, email to author, August 20, 2017.

⁹² See <http://www.casadelbicentenario.gob.ar/category/la-casa> and <http://www.casadelbicentenario.gob.ar/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/gacetilla-MMM-FINAL-2.pdf>

⁹³ Norberto Chavarri, facebook message to author, August 21, 2017. Translation by the author.

¹ Amy C. Beal, "Negotiating Cultural Allies: American Music in Darmstadt, 1946-1956," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 53, no. 1 (2000): 105-139.

² Michael Nyman, *Experimental Music: Cage and Beyond* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, [1974] 1999), 31.

³ *Ibid.*, xvi.

hemispheric nationalism and its correspondence with shifts in the conceptualization of "American experimental music." For authors like Aaron Copland or Henry Cowell, the "experimentalists" were those composers working on the latest melodic, harmonic, and metrical advances; the notation of complex rhythms; or the standardization of terminology for complex musical techniques like polytonality and cross-rhythms.⁴ (In Copland's opinion, the best young moderns—Paul Hindemith, Darius Milhaud, Sergei Prokofiev, and Ernst Krenek—were not experimenters.) The quest for more new sounds and how to control and reproduce them marked experimentalism for Cowell, but he also wrapped the concept in a discourse of nationalism, one that seems relevant to the readers of this volume, given the historical mutability of the term "America" when counterposed to "Europe." For example, Cowell's introduction to *American Composers on American Music* (1933) outlines a fascinating taxonomy of what he understood to be American composers active in the first third of the century. Though not directly concerned with experiment per se, his eight categories advance a Pan-American nationalism imbricated with notions of originality: those who were developing "indigenous American" materials in an original way; foreign-born composers who had made America their home; Americans who wrote original music but maintained Teutonic influence; Americans who wrote original music but maintained French influence; Americans who wrote unoriginal music by taking indigenous materials and adapting them to European styles; those who were unoriginal and were writing European-style music; foreign-born Americans who composed in a European style; and young, original Americans who had not yet developed mature voices.⁵

From my perspective, Cowell's prized first category—Americans writing original American music—closely corresponds to latter-day constructions of the American experimental tradition, with "originality" substituting for "experimental." Aside from the slight dissonances of Colin McPhee and Roy Harris, Cowell's grouping—himself, Ives, Carl Ruggles, Charles Seeger, Henry Brant, Ruth Crawford, Carlos Chávez, Alejandro García Caturla, and Amadeo Roldán—would be familiar to students of "American experimental music." The inclusion here of a Mexican (Chávez) and two Cubans (García Caturla and Roldán) reflects Cowell's role as organizer of the Pan-American Association of Composers (cofounded by Cowell, Chávez, and Edgard Varèse in 1928) after 1929, as well as the emergence of an elite kind of hemispheric resistance to European cultural hegemony.⁶ Indeed, as Deanne Root has documented, the Pan-American Association of Composers may have included twice as many US Americans

⁴ Aaron Copland, "Music since 1920," *Modern Music* 5, no. 3 (1928): 16–20; Henry Cowell, "The Music of Edgar [sic] Varèse," *Modern Music* 5, no. 2 (1928): 8–18; Henry Cowell, "Our Inadequate Notation," *Modern Music* 4, no. 3 (1927): 28–33; Henry Cowell, "New Terms for New Music," *Modern Music* 5, no. 4 (1928): 21–27.

⁵ Henry Cowell, "Trends in American Music," in Henry Cowell, ed., *American Composers on American Music* (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1933), 3–13.

⁶ Deanne Root, "The Pan American Association of Composers (1928–1934)," *Anuario Interamericano de Investigacion Musical* 8 (1972): 48–70; Joel Sachs, *Henry Cowell: A Man Made of Music* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 154–156.

as Latin Americans, but Chávez, García Caturla, Roldán, and Heitor Villa-Lobos together had more works performed under the auspices of the organization than any other composer except Ives, who was the group's main source of financial support.

Almost thirty years later, in his preface to the 1962 edition of *American Composers on American Music*, Cowell wrote: "Today . . . there is no question but that those who were most determined and uninhibited in their 'experimentalism,' and who seemed so shockingly untamed in the Twenties, are now widely thought of as representing the 'essence' of America."⁷ American composers were only really American if they were different from Europeans. The way to be different from Europeans was to be original (in 1933) or experimental (in 1962); therefore, experimentality was intrinsically American. The precise *manner* in which Americans might set themselves off from European influence, however, was open to a wide array of individual choices, so Cowell published a book that was open to the many "different trends" of composition in the Americas. He marveled at this wide range of musics, and, again in 1962, wrote: "I have never believed that any one individual could speak for an entire continent, in all its variety of cultures and societies. . . . It seemed to me even then [in 1933] that to be American was to honor difference, and to welcome the experimental, the fresh and the new, instead of trying to establish in advance the road our creative life should follow."⁸ By the time he wrote these words, however, the Latin American artists had fallen off the lists of commentators on American experimentalism. As Amy Beal has demonstrated, Wolfgang Edward Rebner's 1954 lecture in Darmstadt, "American Experimental Music," had connected Ives, Cowell, Varèse, and Cage to a tradition that, in Beal's apt summation, emphasized "*sound* rather than *system*."⁹ Cowell's suggestive grouping notwithstanding, this lecture is the earliest known articulation of the notion of an experimental tradition. The narrow focus of the presentation meant that Cowell's Latin Americans, like most of his others, do not appear in Rebner's talk.

Meanwhile, Cage was developing a distinct position on experimentalism in essays such as "Experimental Music: Doctrine" (1955), "Experimental Music" (1957), and "History of Experimental Music in the United States" (1959), all of which turn away from Cowell's research-and-development model and toward something more Rebneresque: a kind of sound- and listening-based practice that highlighted spontaneity, process, graphic notation, and—a residue of R&D—magnetic tape. In "Experimental Music: Doctrine" (1955), Cage remained silent on the issue of precursors, influences, or a sense of experimental tradition, though he was clear that his subject was experimental music in the United States. This geographical limitation raised the possibility of an experimental music *outside* the United States, however, and "History of Experimental Music in the United States" would indeed make reference not to Latin American figures but to European experimentalism, specifically calling the tape music of Henri Pousseur, Luciano Berio, Bruno Maderna, Pierre Boulez,

⁷ Cowell, "Introduction to the 1962 Edition," in *American Composers on American Music*, x.

⁸ *Ibid.*, vii–viii.

⁹ Beal, "Negotiating Cultural Allies," 122.

and Karlheinz Stockhausen “more experimental” than that of their North American counterparts.¹⁰

Read in light of the rest of the article, however, the remark is strangely out of place, for the 1959 piece is Cage’s most explicitly nationalist statement on the experimental tradition. Reflecting on the pre-1950 (and then still current) understanding of experimentalism, Cage wrote: “If one uses the word ‘experimental’ (somewhat differently than I have been using it) to mean simply the introduction of novel elements into one’s music, we find that America has a rich history.”¹¹ By loosening his conceptualization of the term to include Cowell’s sense of material and technical expansion, Cage created a kind of non-European buffer zone that included himself (prepared piano), Brant (spatially separated ensembles), Crawford and Gunther Schuller (sliding tones), Leo Ornstein (clusters), Dane Rudhyar (“resonances”), Alan Hovhaness (“near-Eastern aspects”), Lou Harrison (tack piano), Harry Partch (new instruments), and Virgil Thomson (who used something Cage referred to as the “athematic continuity of clichés”). Of course, had Cage followed this meaning of experimentalism into the 1950s, as many other writers had done, he would have found himself on the margins of a world where composers understood themselves as researchers working with the latest sound technologies. Instead, Cage aimed to construct a useable past for New York School experimentalism that could stand in opposition to the domination of Europe, here symbolized by its evil twins Igor Stravinsky and Arnold Schoenberg. His buffer zone, he wrote, “are not experimental composers in my terminology, but neither are they part of the stream of European music which though formerly divided into neo-classicism and dodecaphony has become one in America under Arthur Berger’s term, consolidation: consolidation of the acquisitions of Schoenberg and Stravinsky.”¹²

Cage names these two composers no less than four times in his short essay, and insists that experimentalism—“what is urgently needed”—can only occur in the United States, whose “native musical resource” is its “capacity for experimentation.”¹³ In an unintentional but eerie reference to the emerging US global hegemony, Cage observed that it would not be easy for Europe to give up being Europe. “It will, nevertheless, and must: for the world is one world now.”¹⁴

I doubt that Cage was here referring to the massive postwar project of establishing US military bases throughout vanquished territories in Europe and the Pacific, an unprecedented projection of force that has continued to the present day. But the Marshall Plan—specifically its endeavors intended to demonstrate the United States’ credentials in cultural leadership—was a crucial part of the framework in which Cage defined his one-world/US nationalism.¹⁵ Significantly, Cowell’s Pan-American

¹⁰ John Cage, *Silence* (Hanover, NH: Wesleyan University Press, 1961), 74.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 73.

¹² *Ibid.*, 73.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 74.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 75.

¹⁵ Georgina Born has perceptively called this “the ideological conflation of ‘America’ with ‘the world’”; see Born, introduction to Georgina Born and David Hesmondalgh, eds., *Western Music and Its*

resistance to Europe had given way, by the time of Cage’s accounts of the 1950s, to a US-centered narrative that foregrounded the New York School.¹⁶

I provide this short (and ultimately inadequate) survey of groupings to suggest that Latin American music and musicians have not always been absent from a broader understanding of American experimentalism, just as Latin@s in the United States have participated in historical and contemporary experimental scenes. Although I agree with Beal that the notion of an “American experimental tradition” only coheres in the 1950s, a similar concept operated hazily in the decades before, when Latin American artists were audibly present in the proceedings. But I also wish to note the cultural ramifications of a shift in US imperialism from a hemispheric to a global scale following World War II. These emergent postwar historical circumstances provide the backdrop for the essays in this book, all of which consider events after 1950. In place of the shared New World nationalisms of the early twentieth century, the artists and intellectuals discussed in these pages navigate an experimentalism that runs up against other currents: countercultural cosmopolitanism and the Latin American New Left; international market conditions defined by World Music 1.0 and 2.0; US government- and foundation-supported research centers; new political valences defined through decolonization; and an academy ignorant of or flummoxed by the proliferating varieties of advanced music making in the second half of the century. Above all, as the editors and contributors make clear, they encounter an existing scholarly discourse that has foreclosed a hemispheric understanding of American experimentalism in favor of a largely US-UK version.

These essays help to build a better picture of the multiplicity of postwar reconfigurations of the global cultural field, and they avoid the discourses of belatedness and anachronism that have long shadowed discussions of modernism and avant-gardism outside of Europe.¹⁷ Contributing to the massive project of rethinking how we tell the stories of postwar music, the volume goes beyond offering an intervention into experimental music studies. But it does that, too, by inciting a tension about terminology that twists around the difference between the editors’ aim to localize experimentalism in the actions of knowing practitioners and their desire to bring these single cases into a dialogue under the umbrella of the term itself. In this sense, they participate in the search for a theoretical model that acknowledges differences as well as similarities in

Others: Difference, Representation, and Appropriation in Music (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 21.

¹⁶ Peter Yates’s introductory essay to John Edmunds and Gordon Boelzner, *Some Twentieth Century American Composers: A Selective Bibliography*, vol. 1 (New York: New York Public Library, 1959), also neglected mention of Latin Americans; see Amy C. Beal, “‘Experimentalists and Independents Are Favored’: John Edmunds in Conversation with Peter Yates and John Cage, 1959–61,” *Notes* 64, no. 4 (2008): 659–687.

¹⁷ On this subject, see Leon Wainwright, *Timed Out: Art and the Transnational Caribbean* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011); see also the synchronic curatorial approach of Okwui Enwezor, Katy Siegel, and Ulrich Wilmes, eds., *Postwar: Art between the Pacific and the Atlantic: 1945–1965* (Munich: Prestel, 2017).

local experimental practices. As art historian David Cottingham has written in another context, “this model would need to acknowledge discursive determinants and local variations, the tension, perhaps the dialectic, between commonalities and differential spaces.”¹⁸

I am less interested in a kind of linguistic nominalism that restricts us to the terminology and concepts of historical subjects than I am in cultivating awareness of the situated practices of experimentalism, as the editors put it, such that we can transform experimentalism from what Ann Stoler calls a “summary statement,” which precludes further analysis by posing as complete and self-evident, into a “working concept,” which we use provisionally to track variations and suggest revisions.¹⁹ Many of the authors in this volume closely follow the local usage of terms like *avant-garde*, *experimentalism*, and *vanguardia* in order to resist “any universalist claims about [experimentalism’s] stylistic sonic outcome,”²⁰ according to the editors. Indeed, the evidence collected herein demonstrates that Latin@ and Latin American experimenters adopted a range of positions on the work of people like Cage or Stockhausen or on the concepts of chance, improvisation, and politics. They adapted, ignored, revised, misunderstood, emulated, or rejected existing models and invented new ones with local discursive, material, and repertorial resources. Someone like Cage never had a monopoly on chance, of course, and music makers around the world developed their own artistic strategies quite independently from the US composer’s activities.

We might conceive of this experimentalism as a vernacular formation, one that is “spoken” in local dialects that translate imperfectly.²¹ Such a conception would emphasize use, adaptation, and process rather than the aesthetic contemplation of fixed objects prized by the cultivated arts. Moreover, it would insist that “global experimentalism” must be more than the simple sum of all experiments in sound, one that betrays a latent consistency across discrepant regional settings; instead, the vernacular helps to describe a network of inconsistencies drawn together in practice, across a host of differences.

Like any *avant-garde*, this vernacular one—wherever it manifests—confronts persistent aesthetic norms and cultural values against which insurgent challengers can define alternatives (often drawing on but renovating those same established vocabularies).²² In a post- or neocolonial setting, as art historian Nelly Richard points out in “The Problematic of Latin American Art,” these *avant-gardists* work at the crossroads

¹⁸ David Cottingham, “The Formation of the Avant-garde in Paris and London, c. 1880–1915,” *Art History* 35, no. 3 (2012): 596–621.

¹⁹ Ann Laura Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 206.

²⁰ See the introduction.

²¹ Since 1900, the global vernacular has been forged through classic Hollywood cinema and African American popular music far more than it through any *avant-garde*. See Miriam Bratu Hansen, “The Mass Production of the Senses: Classical Cinema as Vernacular Modernism,” *Modernism/Modernity* 6, no. 2 (1999): 59–77.

²² Perry Anderson, “Modernity and Revolution,” *New Left Review* 144 (March–April 1984): 104–105.

of two histories: one of foreign interference, another of local elites in search of an origin and continuity for current social arrangements.²³ But this aesthetic discourse draws only one ordinal point around which an *avant-garde* might turn. Its other vectors include the emergence of new communications technologies affecting modes of poesis and sensation, the imaginative proximity of real social change, and the encounter with distinct cultures and life experiences wrought by European colonialism.²⁴

As many of the chapters in this collection make clear, the production and circulation of recordings, like the geopolitical realignment already mentioned, established a new problematic for experimentalism in the postwar period.²⁵ Recordings and their transnational circulation had already existed for more than fifty years, of course, but the cheap manufacturing and shipping costs of vinyl LPs (compared with albums of three or four 78s), along with the rapid expansion of the recording industry, meant that more kinds of music made it onto musicians’ turntables in the 1960s than ever before.²⁶ It seems scarcely possible to imagine the multisited explosion of advanced musical techniques—open improvisation, noise, electronic music, psychedelia, and electroacoustic improvisation, to list those referenced here—without the generative role of the LP recording, which provides another perspective on the vernacular. Taught and learned by ear, and placing central importance on timbre and noise, the vernacular finds a certain kind of extension in the recorded form, where do-it-yourselfers gain access to a wealth of new sounds without the restrictive mediations of the score, seminar, or journal article that would have introduced them only one generation before.²⁷ In 1954, Rebner could not yet have had the circulation of LPs in mind when he noted the importance of sound over system in the American experimental tradition, but in a few short years, these consumer commodities would dramatically reroute the cultural flows of all music, experimentalism included. In the terms Pauline Oliveros used to describe her collaboration with Mexican electronic musicians from the Nortec Collective, these flows would now consist of “all audio both ways.”²⁸

²³ Nelly Richard, “The Problematic of Latin American Art,” in *Margins and Institutions: Art in Chile since 1973* (Melbourne: Art & Text, 1986), 86.

²⁴ Anderson, “Modernity and Revolution,” 104–109; George Yúdice, “Rethinking the Theory of the Avant-garde from the Periphery,” in Anthony L. Geist and Jose Monleon, eds., *Modernism and Its Margins: Reinscribing Cultural Modernity from Spain and Latin America* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 61; James M. Harding, “From Cutting Edges to Rough Edges: On the Transnational Foundations of Avant-garde Performance,” in *The Ghosts of the Avant-garde(s): Exorcising Experimental Theater and Performance* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2013), 136–158.

²⁵ For a consideration of some of the ways this problematic has been negotiated in experimental and improvised music, see David Grubbs, *Records Ruin the Landscape: John Cage, the Sixties, and Sound Recording* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014).

²⁶ Richard Osborne, *Vinyl: A History of the Analogue Record* (Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2012).

²⁷ Chris Cutler, “Necessity and Choice in Musical Forms, Concerning Musical and Technical Means and Political Needs,” in *File under Popular: Theoretical and Critical Writings on Music* (London: November Books, 1985), 19–38.

²⁸ Stephanie Jensen-Moulton, “Sounds of the Sweatshop: Pauline Oliveros and *Maquilopolis*,” in Benjamin Piekut, ed., *Tomorrow Is the Question: New Directions in Experimental Music Studies* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2014), 211–228.

The contributors also demonstrate that terminology itself, held at a critical arm's length, can be transformed into a tool to pry apart the assumptions built into relevant concepts. For example, the relationship between the avant-garde and institutionalism remains a fascinating, promising, and variegated site of investigation. As is well known, Peter Bürger advanced the critique of the autonomous art institution as a defining characteristic of the historical avant-garde.²⁹ How curious, then, that the emergence of an avant-garde in music after World War II would turn on its institutionalization by means of funding by the CIA and the US State Department, private US foundations, or other state-funded initiatives like Institut de Recherche et Coordination Acoustique/Musique (IRCAM). As Georgina Born has made clear in her classic study of that computer music facility, French avant-gardism has often drawn on a history of vanguard leadership by the artistic elite; the tendency embodied in IRCAM, she contends, is one bending toward institutionalization, not against it.³⁰ In a similar manner, as Ricardo Roque-Baldovinos and Alejandro L. Madrid suggest, Latin American avant-gardists in the first half of the twentieth century actively "collaborated in the development of cultural policies and the foundation of state-sponsored artistic institutions in their countries."³¹ Few music scholars have pursued this peculiar relationship; unlike in art history, for example, there is no ongoing conversation about institutional critique (or its absence) in the music disciplines.³²

Yet the complementary pair of chapters by Andrew Raffo Dewar and Eduardo Herrera in this collection highlights the multiple and contradictory positions of the avant-garde in a single historical setting: Movimiento Música Más and CLAEM both claimed this mantle from very different sites in the cultural field. And Susan Thomas's chapter on Grupo de Experimentación Sonora del ICAIC in Cuba documents that institution's support of experimental techniques in the face of occasional opposition from its governmental sponsors. Facing a different kind of constraint, Café Tacvba adopted techniques of estrangement in order to distance themselves from the most dominant musical institution of the last sixty years, the international recording industry. Meanwhile, as the cases described by Ana R. Alonso-Minutti and Susan Campos Fonseca make clear, the institutionalized academy continues to distinguish itself as a place where new forms of advanced music making find little purchase.

These thoughts on institutionalism—a primary concern for theories of the avant-garde but never a big one for scholars of experimentalism—indicate that my reading of this book might be broader than the editors intend, or perhaps that "experimental

²⁹ Peter Bürger, *Theory of the Avant-garde* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984).

³⁰ See Georgina Born, *Rationalizing Culture: IRCAM, Boulez, and the Institutionalization of the Musical Avant-Garde* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995).

³¹ Ricardo Roque-Baldovinos, "The 'Epic Novel': Charismatic Nationalism and the Avant-garde in Latin America," *Cultural Critique* 49 (Autumn 2001): 65; and Alejandro L. Madrid, *Sounds of the Modern Nation: Music, Culture, and Ideas in Post-revolutionary Mexico* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2009), 8.

³² In art, see Gerald Raunig and Gene Ray, eds., *Art and Contemporary Critical Practice: Reinventing Institutional Critique* (London: MayFlyBooks, 2009). Alexander Alberro and Blake Stimpson, eds., *Institutional Critique: An Anthology of Artists' Writings* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2009).

music" as a site of inquiry is too small or limited to hold these contributions. I have always thought that the limitations of experimentalism should not be brushed aside in favor of a more expansive counterhistory; experimental music was a specific historical network that, like any network, enrolled actors of various kinds as it excluded many others. Scholars can document these exclusions while peering beyond the outer edges of a limited network, as the contributors to this book have done, in order to describe and analyze what else was going on. Such an endeavor depends on following Cage's example by loosening our tactical sense of the term "experimentalism" in order to animate new research questions and avenues of exploration. It details and analyzes this multiplicity in a lateral rather than linear way, sensitive to the ruptures, disjunctures, and asymmetries across which discourses and techniques move or get invented anew.