

Bring It On -Absurdity, Quest for Certainty, and Practice-Based Research

Mika Hannula

Practice-based research is characteristically an activity faced with the dual task of developing and keeping up an ongoing practice and engaging with a critical yet constructive research process. In combination, it is the task of reflexive thinking, doing the thing that one does and contemplating within a practice in a relationship and in a connection to the means and the tools available and accessible in the context of qualitative research context.

This duality demands an ability to comprehend the ongoing process as a both-and strategy. First of all, there needs to be a strategy that allows and encourages digging deeper into the wide variety openings emerging within the practice. One central research issue is to figure out, which one of these numerous openings and emerging paths are worthwhile following and focusing. The second strategy focuses on the chances and challenges that research as a long-term situated approach can bring into realm of the artistic practice. The both-and part is where and when these two elements of the whole are brought into a give-and-take interaction and exchange, informing and sparring with one another.

Needless to say, this inherent duality, this dilemma of a both-and site and strategy is as tempting as it is demanding. This essay will propose that this dilemma, this both-and strategy, is the core, the main ingredient in the processes of practice-based research. This dilemma cannot be solved; it should not be avoided, not glorified, nor demonized. Instead, it must be met head on – with a clear comprehension of the all the necessary conflicts and collisions that will follow. Not as an abstract exercise, but embedded, actualized in each particular case, site and situation.

However, this open-ended strategy of both-and is not possible to be maintained without proper conceptual frame and structure. It is in immediate danger because it enjoys the act of trespassing from one field into yet another discourse. Some of the common players, the run of the mill gatekeepers dislike practice-based research because it fails to

be exactly or enough this or that, but the critique fails to recognize how the very point is not to be only this and that. Therefore, the aim of the acts of connecting the dots and not being too afraid of the consequences requires stamina, intellectual self-esteem, multiple food for thought and plural tools of the trade – emphasized here with the motto, and the word-play: take me out, please, but don't take it out on me.

This essays claims that these conceptual elements are embedded into the meta-level of any practice-based research that is willing and able to experiment and enjoy taking risks within its own field. Here, two central conceptual meta-level elements of qualitative research will be addressed. We will not try to cover these writers in whole, but the aim and idea is to focus on each case on one central concept and conceptualization. These roads into the past, this is the claim, give us a chance to link ourselves into the histories of contemporary evolvment at and emergence of critical thinking – into the alternatives and interpretations that do not hide behind the claim for universal objective truths and other such wild fantasies in connection to the content of practices.

At first, we take a closer look at the concept of absurdity as articulated in and through the writings of Albert Camus (1913-1960). With Camus, absurdity stands for the elementary conceptual realization of how we are and exist in the world, within its range and its limitations – and how are we able to both make sense and do something about it being unreasonable yet potential. Absurdity, the articulation and actualization of it, opens up ways of doing what we are doing in a new and more meaningful way – with greater sense and sensibility for integrity and intensity of the work.

Secondly, we link the task of the meta-level helping hand of conceptualization to the writings of John Dewey (1859-1952). Here, the focus is set on Dewey's take on the idealization and impossibility of the quest for certainty. For Dewey, this deep-seated quest is as understandable as it is highly counter-productive for the task of practice-based research. Instead, this type of a hands-on, practice based and lead research must get out of its safe havens, its well-customized comfort zones and it must be willing and able to move into realms where things and connections are not granted but made and shaped.

The final result is not an argument for either side of the known idiom of asking whether the glass is half full or whether it is half empty. Rather than participating in the empty promises of positive thinking, this essay argues for a realistic yet experimental way of doing both artistic and research practice that creates and generates something else, something different. Therefore, the glass in question is not yet in existence; it is still on the move; it must be on the make – with and within the processes of becoming a place that it eventually will inhabit and take. It is about to emerge, about to become, but it is not yet there. We imagine it, we have a hunch, and we do, we do leap forward. It is a never-ending process of facing our inevitable and constantly reoccurring dilemmas and making the best out of them.

Thus, no need to wait, no need to hesitate: bring it on, bring it on.

CAMUS

The English translation of Camus' *The Myth of Sisyphus* was published in 1955. The French original had appeared in 1942, in the middle of the WWII that had left its traces permanently on the writing and thinking of many, not least Camus himself. It is not the only

publication where Camus addresses the subject of absurdity, but it is perhaps the most focused and coherently argued – even if Camus’ argument in itself is far from a tight logical train of thought or even a loop. It contains many contradictions, views and assertions that pull apart and are in conflict.

As for the act of interpreting the content of absurdity that Camus was after, I will take my cue from the quote that he chose for the very beginning of this collection of essays, appearing both in the French and the English version.

“O my soul, do not aspire to immortal life, but exhaust the limits of the possible.”
Pindar, Pythian iii

As a contextualization, which Camus does not offer for the quote, Wikipedia fills in the facts. Pindar (522 – 443 BC) is an ancient Greek lyrical poet, writing at the dawn of the classical period, especially odes for victories. This quote is from a text composed in tribute to Hieron of Syracuse, honoring, in fact, a horse race won. It is not inflated in importance, yet the quote does not come from nowhere. Camus was well read in the ancient classics, and he studied them, recognizing them both in connection with theatre productions and in connection to myths and narratives in his essays and novels. These references are plural in his diaries, and the above-mentioned one is quoted in his diary early in the year of 1940. He finished this collection of essays in early 1941 and, as mentioned already above, it came out the next year. (See Camus 1963)

So how to read this quote and identify the message it carries? I will claim that we should respect the clarity of the position that Camus is offering. Alas, there is no hidden message, no camouflaged agenda. Camus is confronting, in his own times, in his own way, the modern dilemma of wanting, wishing for and aching for clarity in conditions of life that cause a mess, not to mention a permanent mess. We want to have security, but we are thrown into a turbulent chaos.

Therefore, Camus is asking: what to do? How to behave? In terms of the ultimate question, if there is no higher power that guarantees the well-being and survival of our soul, what should we do? Are we supposed to end it all? Camus, for his times and purposes, devotes a great deal of time and energy to this particular point; that is, the act of suicide. It is a fine point that introduces the depth and gravity of the task of comprehending life’s embedded absurdity. But suicide will not suffice, because suicide, in its clearest form, would offer a solution to a dilemma that allows no solution. (Camus 1975 p. 54)

In a bit less dramatic, but nonetheless active and acute way, Camus goes on to face the situation of absurdity. It is the ongoing act, the never-ending process of confronting our deep-seated and longing for clarity that is not about to disappear, while confronting the irrationality of the everyday. We are left with a profound nostalgia for unity, an appetite for the absolute and inherent need for clarity and cohesion. (Ibid. 23, 26)

Life is a mess. It is neither rational nor non-rational. There is no corner shop to fix it or the high court for appeals. Life is unreasonable, and that’s that. Sad, perhaps, but, well, inevitable, full of impossibilities and contradictions but full nevertheless. There is nothing beyond or after; no truth that could save or safeguard us. The important thing “is not to be cured, but to live with one’s ailments”. (Ibid 41)

There has been quite a lot of commentary to this positioning and proposition. Is it the view of glorifying fatalism and inaction? Is it a kind of a soul-searching and wrenched essentialist *carte blanche* for accepting everything and not trying to do anything about it?

For Camus this is not drawn without a certain bravado of dramatic sentences and poses. There are many parts that smack of a teenage riot, with shouts like “there is no future” or sounds bites that promote the pursuit of revolt of all causes and at any cost. And this is the so-called tricky part. But, I would claim, these are the theatrical clichés that we should allow to be not notified. Instead, we can take with us what he repeatedly states, and deal with the mess outside – that is, to deal with both the problems of fatalism and futility. What Camus is saying is this: There is a chance of living life without a greater good, and keep on moving without landing us in nihilism or cynicism.

“What is one to conclude, how far is one to go to elude nothing? Is one to die voluntarily or to hope in spite of everything?” (Ibid. 22)

At many places, Camus does not hint, he says it out loud and clearly. His view is not to be mistaken. “But the point is to live” (Ibid 63). Let’s repeat it, without quotes. The point is to live. And to repeat it, with purpose, and with the available performative joy and delight; absurdity as a realization of our conditions of conditions can’t be solved; it is a dilemma that must be lived, and the point is to live.

But how? Can we, to borrow from another source, continue trying to live a clean and purposeful life under difficult circumstances, in a dirty and almost impossible reality? Can we, should we? In all its essential fury, this set of questions frames a paradigm of its own kind. It is called, oh yes it is, a modern dilemma.

Here we come to the part of the how in terms of the act of continuity. Rather than submerging into a phlegmatic attitude of no-goes, Camus is strikingly well underlining the implication of the absurdity. Absurdity, for Camus, stands for revolt, freedom and passion. (Ibid. 62). There are hints of flirting with indifference and utter coolness of denying everything, but it cannot be overlooked how, in spite of all, Camus has the greatest appetite, the most passionate desire to do and to act.

It is more about anchoring and contextualizing all the above-mentioned there elements: revolt, freedom and passion. They are not abstract; they are located in the everyday life, the practices of doing what we do when we are doing what we do. This is the part of confrontation, daily, if not hourly confrontation of facing the dilemma of how to do these things that are important and worthwhile – both individually and collectively. It is then revolt, not as a pose, but as a means to find food for thought and the anger that provides energy.

It is then freedom, not freedom off or freedom as a power to remove something, but freedom to do and to act – to make a difference. It is not the freedom of choosing not to do, but rather to do, and to try, and to take up and carefully follow-up the chance that is emerging. Absurd freedom cancels the promise of an eternal solution, of an eternal notion of freedom (come to think of it, whoever would even wish for that?) and instead,

puts the magnifying glass on the potential, but not yet realized, freedom of action, the freedom of acting differently and choosing differently, the freedom of shaping and making and taking the lead from alternatives, their existence and incubation.

According to Camus, absurd understanding of life is not content with defiance, not with reconciliation, nor with over-stressed humility. Absurd life recognizes the limits and limitations, the morose and menacing daily tasks, but chooses to try to gain another perspective, to twist and shout and to exhaust the limits of the possible within the almost impossible. There is desire and there is disappointment and somehow and somewhat one clear cruelty is that it is not always so easy to make the difference between each side of the same whole.

This is the life that strives not for the best, but for the most possible, even most kind way of a living. It is a life, in the words of Camus that longs and aims for quality, not quantity. (Ibid. 59)

For Camus, absurdity, and here making the already up in the air hanging, the anticipated and expected connection to Hannah Arendt and the concept of *vita activa*, is a human condition. A connection that allows us to make the move and focus on how to live, right here and right now, and not to be captivated by the past. It is the act of amnesty, not amnesia. We move on in order not to be stuck in the events of the past, whether they are dramatic or not. We forget, and forgive in order to be able to do and to act in accordance to our needs and wishes. To act is not just to fulfill the expectations, it is to have the potentiality to do and achieve something unexpected and unpredictable, something that cannot be reduced from the set-up but is a result of the embedded activity itself opening up. (Arendt 2002, 180)

According to Camus, it is our condition, it is the nobility and hope of keeping on, the act of being aware and conscious of the futility of the acts that we do when we do what we do them, but nevertheless, in spite of the problems, the dead-ends and the struggles, trying, striving to do them to their temporary and contextual finality. (Camus 1975, 115)

It is about both the routes and the roots, the paths from the sense of sorrow to the uplifting experience of joy and back again. And then repeating again and again, but not by the act of hiding behind the problems and difficulties but facing them and confronting them one after another and one by one – making that difference, achieving the dent to the everyday rumble in da concrete jungle, and that surprisingly pleasant reason to be cheerful.

And yes – did someone wonder and ask what's the connection and point of life and absurdity in according to Camus with the practice based research? Did I hear it right, or wrong? What, where, when and how?

DEWEY

John Dewey had a task, a very pragmatic one. His task, the aim he set for himself, made him stand out both out of his time and very well ahead of his time. Dewey was at the same time looking back and gazing into the future. He wanted to win back something from the teachings and content of ancient philosophy while making it available and comprehensible for modern times. He wished that we would worry less about how things might seem, and enjoy more about what might come about and emerge when taking and following up

experiments and risks. Dewey was out there demanding and also arguing for the benefits of experiences and experiment, for creating thinking that is not afraid of mistakes – long before the managerial era and the age of bureaucracy with its performance reviews and time allocation surveys.

What Dewey (1859-1952) set to do was to revise the inherent connection between practice and theory, between knowing what and knowing how. He lived the life and certainly gave through his own acts and deeds, that is as in writings and all sorts of collaborations, a credible version of an open-minded inter-disciplinary work. (For a comprehensive intellectual biography of Dewey, see Ryan 1995)

The idea that Dewey set on to pursue was as old as it was simple. The idea was to focus on the skills that are developed in and through the acts of doing that thing that matters and is meaningful, and even more precisely, of actualization of that given practice right here and right now. It was not to use the notion of practice as a given, or natural, or unproblematic. Practice was the point of departure and return – it is where it is at, the action, and act of doing the things that matter. It was the very core, the heart of the matter, with all its complications and collisions.

The broadness and cleverness of the connecting of dots between then and now is still today a remarkable achievement. Dewey saw what was missing and pointed out where that missing part is to be found. Elegantly and so very well condensed, Dewey's book's subtitle says it all, already: *A Study of the Relation of Knowledge and Action*.

But the main title then brings the message home, without a shadow of a doubt. The main title *The Quest for Certainty* emphasizes the lack of understanding how production of knowledge in human sciences cannot be build upon certainty, universal truths and unchanging views. This book came out in 1929. The page references are to a Finnish translation of the book that came out 1999.

Therefore, we stand at a junction. Dewey stood there already almost a century ago, and we still keep bumping into this dilemma. Dewey's proposition is that, instead of following and seeking solace from the fairy-tale of security and objective knowledge in practice-based research, it is necessary to face the chance the uncontrollable elements that both drives and causes, intentionally or unconsciously – and to deal with each site and situation in the ways that it demands and it also deserves.

We are to focus on the acts of doing, and the experiences that are taking place in and through it and with. We must have the courage to look outside the box, and to experiment, to try out things, because due to critical yet constructive thinking with the process, there is a change of doing whatever we are doing in a bit better, meaningful and new way.

What this implies is the difference between an instrumental and utilitarian version of production of knowledge and a version that is based on the subjective experience linked to its tradition and the context. This is to ask how experimental knowledge can, instead of exposing the nature of things, or finding out the solid and stable truth; how knowledge can in and through the acts of the everyday, the very doing of the things that we care and strive to achieve; how knowledge, in the best of cases, grows deeper, expands and accumulates, not an sich, but in and through the actualization and articulation of the act, the thing, its thisness, that very potentiality of integrity and intensity.

Dewey was not only talking about what it feels like and how the everyday is so very unique and important. He has methods in mind, too. These would be then methods, the plurality of methods available and accessible to everyone with enough of an open-mind and commitment. The question is this: what are the criteria for choosing the methods to use in a given case?

This goes all back to the character of the issue at hand, the nature of the question or the problem. Thus, instead of static belief for a beforehand a priori set of rules, what methods are valid and what are not, depends on what is the question and problem, not the other way around. We must have a sense of reality, and the content and its scope before debating about the potentiality of whatever methods at hand or in fashion (Ibid. 112).

Dewey was acutely and vehemently clear of the dangers of letting the methods solve the issue before it is even addressed and openly confronted. His advice was solid, articulating how counter-productive it is to rely on them as if they would be the whole point of the action. (Ibid. 241)

It was not so that Dewey would have been insensitive to the wants and wishes, the dilemmas that feed the need for the fantasy of a certainty and security, provided by value-free and objective truth. Dewey recognized the common overall insecurity that breeds the wish and the need for certainty, but his point was that this is an illusion. This security that saves us from ourselves does not exist. It is based on a wishful thinking, and backed-up by prejudices and feel-goodism that in also dangerous. It makes us to concentrate on make-believe, instead of actually dealing with the mess and the contradictory claims and demands of everyday life.

What is at stake is nevertheless not without its weight and burden. It is no secret that it might look as if giving up the wish and aim for absolute and unchanging reality and its truths is a huge sacrifice, but it is not. It is the needed, the required step and move in order to be able to change, to do something else and do something different and do it differently. It is to activate and to use our imagination. It is the move from static and stale to something on the make, on the process of being actualized and articulated. We allow the possibility that things might change, and that reality is perhaps partly determined and fixed, but it is not completely ready and immobile.

In the end, following Dewey and his purposefully and elegantly positive, not by any means positivist strategy and feel for the chances and challenges, the task is to relate to, and to learn to live with the insecurities, and to trust the gravity and care of a practice. Insecurity breed the wish for certainty, however illusionistic or phantasmatic it is, but we have to deal and confront the prejudices that drive and support this.

There is no need to go looking for somewhere out there, or something extravagantly more. The practice, if and when it is maintained as a never-ending process, it is the very site, and the situation within which it is to become and to take shape. The task is to try out, to experiment, to apply, merge reflection with action and to learn from the relative falling outs and mistakes, to get up again and to open up the relational experiences and inter-exchanges – and let that then feed the tree: curiosity and pleasure of alteration and movement, emotions and motion in commotion.

Or, in other words: for god's sake, open up the horizon, and enjoy the clashes and collisions it brings on and about. Go on, go on, experiment and take those risks inherent in a practice – and make them happen.

Integrity vs. Corruption, an Interlude

What could then go wrong? We know what to do, we will focus on the practice, doing what we are doing, and keeping on keeping on, and well, swell that it is, it goes on, and on. And if that is so, and if the direction is given and we are making progress, inevitable progress, why do we need to recall and remember the writings of, for example, Camus and Dewey? Are they not, in the finest sense, not sensibility, so very yesterday?

The point and the solace is that if they were irrelevant, that would indeed be a fantastic thing. It would mean that these issues are no longer a burning and healing theme within the practices of qualitative research. However, and not only in connection to the tsunami-like increase of management studies and assessment of assessments, the dilemma and the necessary requirement of qualitative research are constantly questioned and in jeopardy.

Why? Partly because the inherent character of the activity is that it must be always delivered, actualized and articulated on the very site, there and then. Surely, and wisely, done in connection to the history of effects of the activity. Articulating this in terms of Gadamer (1990, 305), it must be always performed in accordance to the given site and situation, that very time and place.

The most acute and vital reason for the danger and the dilemma is the conditions of conditions within which each project of qualitative research is trying to become a place. It is, as anything we do, in the constant give-and-take, push and pull interaction between the inner logic and search of a the quality of the act, and at the same time, the pressures of the external logic of the structures at and through which a practice tries to do what it seeks to achieve.

This can be defined as the continuous battle between the integrity of the open-ended, critical yet constructive act of a practice against the corruption of external forces trying to have an effect on the practice and its internal logic of criteria and the good of the act.

In a very fine and condensed way, what we are dealing with, in the words of Alasdair MacIntyre, is this: “What is most urgently needed is a politics of self-defense for all those local societies that aspire to achieve some relatively self-sufficient and independent form of participatory practice-based community and that therefore need to protect themselves from the corrosive effects of capitalism and the depredations of state power.” (2006l, 155)

To put this in clearest possible language, and turning it on a sort of a shorthand, this is how it sounds, in comparison, and in unison. This is where capitalism stands for one-size fits all instrumentalized logic where everything is turned into a flat commodity of endless zeros and ones, lacking any quality of the touch, the proximity, the experience of being-with and feeling-with. And yes, on the other hand, state corruption stands for bureaucracy that does everything in its reach so that nobody is able to focus and deal with the content on the make, and instead, is busy, very busy building up fences and hurdles, rules and assessments that stop the process and make it sad, static and stale, prisoned in its own safe-haven of self-absorbed impregnability.

Learning by doing

So, what is to be done? Not in heaven, nor in hell, but there and then, here and now, in and through the practices that we have invested time, energy and passion to and with?

If and when the unique chance and the very point of a practice based research is to bring together at least two different types production of knowledge, or, two different acts of doing things, this setting has clear and immediate consequences. This combination of two things (in Dewey's words, knowledge and action) in one continuous process is something that must cause friction, has to be a demanding challenge, and it by its very own character, is something that is under constant negotiation and navigation.

In shortest possible definition, it requires a willingness and ability to engage and embrace these dilemmas and tasks, and not to try to escape them or envy some fantasy of a security or a pre-paid clarity.

In one concept, what this combination, what this act of joining, for example, an artistic practice with the histories of qualitative research and reflexive thinking means, is this: a loving and caring conflict. A sentence and a conceptualization that truly and duly owns a great deal to the comprehension of absurdity as argued for and by Camus.

Because this combination (art practice and research practice) brings together two strains of thought that should not be united, but should bounce off one another and inform each other, then it is a conflict, but question is and remains: what kind and how it is maintained and managed?

We get back to the very basics of any relevant, long-term and committed act. We are asking the same heart winning and breaking question, a question that would certainly bring a mile wide smile to Dewey's face: what do you do when you do what you do?

To relate to and to start digging deeper with this proposition and a set-up, we need to have as clear as possible comprehension of the background, of the conditions of conditions within which this process is taking place, both on the level of the individual and the institution. In the sense of Camus, this would mean to be able to relate to and reflect with the structures and expectations built-in into the absurdities of the everyday.

For this, and in order to connect the dots between Camus, Dewey and the demands of a contemporary practice based research, following guidelines are there to serve as a helping hand, as means to find and keep the focus for doing what you are doing when you are doing what you are doing.

This manual on the move starts with the realization that we are not dealing with a unity of rules and regulations, but a site and situation that is highly, if not extremely, time and space bound. It is a view of the world according to six c's: whatever we do, it is happening within the frames and parameters of 1) conflictual, 2) contextual, 3) contested, 4) constructed, 5) confused and 6) compassionate.

There are many paths, many views, many alternatives to be chosen, but they need to be chosen in and through the internal logic of a given practice. You talk and walk and fell with, not off or about. This rebounds and relies to the duality of the freedom and responsibility of the interpretation. This act of interpretation is linked to the already mentioned connection of historically effected consciousness of its location and articulation, both physical and mental. A locality that is embedded into the inter-vowed three level times lines of the past, the present and the future of that very act. This is to be aware of

where the act comes from, where and how it is now actualized and where is it potentially moving towards. There is no neutral view from nowhere. Instead, there is that sense and sensibility for a place, for the gravity that pulls and pushes, craves and embraces, aches and enables.

This interpretation is guided with the notions and elements of curiosity, empathy of feeling for, proximity of getting and staying closer to the act, to the theme and to the participants. It is interpretation as an articulation that is localized, situated, and committed – a passionate stakeholder. It is an experience that opens up, and an experience that strives towards the difference between production of information and production of knowledge.

And yes, to emphasize the point, and not to let this extremely important difference slide here or there, the very aim of any respectful and serious research is the latter type of a production of knowledge. It is an act that does both. It defines and it describes a site and a situation, allowing it to sink deeper while finding new ways of becoming a place – gaining and winning in its intensity and integrity.

This very act of combining, not two hostile, but two different ways of getting closer and staying close to a theme are only potentially alive and kicking when these difficulties and also at some level, the incompatibilities are acknowledged and respected. What is also required is a sense and sensibility that borders towards hard headed courage and stubbornness.

The act of combination of an art practice and the practice of reflective writing is the loving conflict within which the demands do not leaves us alone. They are there – without knocking, without an invitation. We have to be able and willing to take risks and to experiment. Not wildly, and not out of the frame, but within the direction of the process, the research and the practice. We must not be afraid of failing or not getting it together and right with the first 34 try-outs. What's more, we must face these problems, difficulties and dead-ends openly, embracing them with the desire to know and do more. We cannot go on hiding, either behind the practice or the reflective part. We must do the, not the math, stupid, but the act of bringing together and combining the dots and changing the perspectives.

Needless to say, this might hurt, and not only hurt so good, but at the same time, it is the essential notion of the core of the act that is available and potentially ours. We must confront the issues, not only by running against the wall (of questions and challenges of doing the acts), but also with courage, with cleverness and with the eye and touch for pleasures, for the pleasures that emerge from the acts of doing what we doing when doing them properly, situated and seriously.

This is, to underline the connection to both Camus and Dewey, this is living the everyday with the sense of an absurdity, but a sense that opens up, and does not over-burden us. It is, also, a sensibility that is embedded into the core of pragmatism – nothing worrying so much how something looks or seems, but trying to move and trying to stay closer to the content; the content that seems to slip away all the time you move towards it. It is, oh yes it is, it is learning by doing, and while doing the thing we do, we need to maintain the inherent pleasures and openings in and through them.

In its most effective way, it is the difference between wanting and being able to relate to and to take, make use of the production of knowledge with and within a practice so that, instead of using these acts as a buffer zone, a kind of a panic room, an illusion of insulation against the mess, we can live the life we live, and to jump into the game and to enjoy it.

It is to use and relate to these practices as a fine-tuned possibility for intensification of the ways of being-in-the-world, of dealing with the mess, our mess that we are always both part of the problem and part of the act, not solving, but coming to terms with the conflicting and confusing aims, wants, fears and desires that drive us and keep us keeping on.

We should, while learning by doing and making those partly calculated but not always only controlled mistakes, play the part of practice based research, and not only stand at the side-lines and be happy to be dressing up for the part.

It is an aim and an act, to yet again throw us off the security of a balance, and to alter the perspective and use another type of a vernacular, that is perhaps most condensed and most affectionately put in these words by a song that keeps on repeating the lovely words: get down on it, if you really want it, get down on it, get down on it.

Thus, the general frame of mind is not a secret. Kool and the Gang most certainly knew it – as we also know it. Deep down and attached, not detached. It is located very close and it is accessible, a potentiality that must be activated into an actuality. What remains to be done and to be activated is the part of how – as in what is that thing we want to do, who is the I that is doing these things, in what context and with whom are these acts done and realized, and finally, what is it that we want to achieve and how?

It is a proposition – applied and accessible at the drawing board, dance floor and the sites and situations of practice based research. It is a beautiful beginning of a beginning. A head start for happiness of a long-term committed and situated research. And as that, in its all due absurdity, it is all that we got, but as that, its already a lot, a hell of a lot.

Literature:

Hannah Arendt, *Vita Activa*, Vastapaino
2002 (original *The Human Condition* 1958)

Albert Camus, *Tagebuch* 1935-1942, Rowohlt
1963 (original *Carnets*, mai 1935-février 1942,
1962)

Albert Camus, *The Myth of Sisyphus*, Penguin
1975 (First in English in 1955, in original *Le
Mythe de Sisyphe*, 1942)

John Dewey, *Pyrkimys varmuuteen*, Tutki-
mus tiedon ja toiminnan suhteesta, *Gaudeamus*
1999 (original *The Quest for Certainty. A study
of the Relation of Knowledge and Action* 1929)

Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Wahrheit und
Methode*, Grundzüge einer philosophischen
Hermeneutik, J. C. B. Mohr 1990 (First version
published in 1960)

Alasdair MacIntyre, *Ethics and Politics*,
selected essays vol. 2, Cambridge 2006

Alan Ryan, *John Dewey and the High Tide
of American Liberalism*, Norton 1995