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The keynote speakers at the November 2009 conference had collectively and in dialogue during the two days, enabled a deeper focus of this ‘work’: of practice, secretion, openness, limit, hybridity, reconstitution, adjacency, documentary from Columbia. The production of ‘constructions’, of work which becomes integral to this ‘finite-eld-work’ is not neutral or a mere plaything- more contemporary cloud like conditions- recall some of wider earlier discussions. The lingering of constructed images through sound and voice are achieved with a close and practised relationship with particular tools- the microphone, recording equipment, and an implicit relationship with the subject- person and place. Oral fiel’d-work is a slow, yet open process, and as an opening up of questions of storage of the gathered material, and the openness of dissemination revolved around Ana’s orfenting question of the ethics of benefi and one. The lingering of Ana’s presentation on the subsequent keynote presentation up as an unexpectedly rich dialogue, where questions burned into the beginning of Can Akay’s contribution. Can, an architect based in Turkey, who works across the boundaries of architecture, art, urbanism, practice, and research, is an exponent of spatial practices, and acts as he has termed it, a spatial anthropologist. The responsive discussion with Ana was a case of tools and practices in the urban context, of working with the overlooked and understanding the generative potential of a carefully crafted observational output which might activate and perhaps change some aspect of the complex condition of the contemporary, contextual,public urban domain. He described his aims as exploring limits, tools and methodologies of existing modes and traditions of practice in the city, which both connect with worlds of pasts, and ultimately potentially create new futures. The lingering of constructed images through sound and voice are achieved with a close and practised relationship with particular tools- the microphone, recording equipment, and an implicit relationship with the subject- person and place. Oral fiel’d-work is a slow, yet open process, and as an opening up of questions of storage of the gathered material, and the openness of dissemination revolved around Ana’s orfenting question of the ethics of benefi and one.
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