

Published (in German translation) as 'Gillian Wearing's delegierte Performer. Schauspieler, Trinker und soziale Körper', in *Ortsbestimmungen: Das Dokumentarische zwischen Kino und Kunst*, edited by Eva Hohenberger and Katrin Mundt, Berlin: Vorwerk 8, 2016: 203-216.

ISBN: 9783940384805

Maeve Connolly

Gillian Wearing's Delegated Performers: Actors, Drinkers and Social Bodies¹

Introduction

Gillian Wearing has produced numerous works exploring the various forms of self-exploitation that have become commonplace in reality TV and so-called confessional media such as daytime television chat shows. In keeping with the conventions of such media, her work often involves a complex dynamic of withholding and revealing. This dynamic is neatly exemplified in *Confess all on Video. Don't Worry, You Will be in Disguise. Intrigued? Call Gillian* (1994), which documents a succession of troubling disclosures, presented on camera by individuals wearing masks. As Michael Newman notes, it is precisely because the participants' faces are hidden that their words seem believable.² Newman also alludes to another form of masking found in Wearing's subsequent video *Drunk* (1997-1999), which depicts a group of street drinkers encountered in the area near her London studio. Shot on 16mm film, and exhibited as a very large scale black and white three channel video installation, this work is composed and edited so that the faces and bodies of the drinkers

¹ This text incorporates material significantly revised from Maeve Connolly, *TV Museum: Contemporary Art and the Age of Television* (Bristol and Chicago: Intellect Books and University of Chicago Press: 2014).

² Michael Newman, 'Moving Image in the Gallery Since the 1990', *Film and Video Art*, edited by Stuart Comer, London: Tate Publishing, 2009. pp. 106-7.

are fully exposed to the camera, but also visually isolated against a white backdrop. The formal separation of these subjects from their physical environment means that their precise location cannot be determined with any certainty, and the removal of spatial markers tends to frame this work explicitly as an act of exposure, in which the social and physical consequences of street drinking are laid bare for the camera.

It should be noted that Wearing is not adverse to appearing on camera herself; she is one of the masked participants in *Confess all on Video*, and she is the central performer in one of her earliest video works; *Dancing in Peckham* (1994), shot in a south London shopping mall. She also appears on screen in *Self Made* (2010), her feature film debut, albeit in a very specific professional role. Directly addressing the relationship between staged performance and lived experience, *Self Made* records a training process in Method acting, undertaken by seven participants (two women and five men) recruited in response to an advertisement; 'Would you like to be in a film? You can play yourself or a fictional character. Call Gillian'. The film is framed and structured as an exploration of the relationship between personal experience and the Method, unfolding primarily through a series of acting exercises conducted in a windowless rehearsal room. *Self Made* was framed in publicity materials as 'bringing together a diverse group from the British public, non-actors every one, and offering them the chance to discover something about themselves through performance'.³ Its narrative structure closely echoes the formula followed by reality TV makeover shows; diverse participants are introduced and their story arcs are interwoven, unfolding through carefully-managed revelations of personal histories and motivations.

³ Promotional website for *Self Made*, [Accessed May 29, 2015]
<http://selfmade.org.uk/about/>

Wearing seems interested in the fact that the excavation and exploitation of personal histories to trigger an emotional response on cue might overlap with techniques used in psychotherapy, and several participants disclose traumatic events (abandonment, bullying, domestic abuse) in the course of their training. But *Self Made* does not propose to analyse or evaluate the merits of the Method tradition, whether in relation to acting or therapeutic modes of role-play. Wearing appears on screen as the director of several short film narratives, shot on location and based upon the experiences of the participants, but she is rarely shown interacting directly with the non-professional performers. Instead, the central figure in *Self Made* is a professional acting coach and Method expert, Sam Rumbelow (also credited as Creative Consultant), who guides the non-professional performers through a series of exercises that become gradually more ambitious, involving props, sound effects and supporting performances by professional actors.

Even though Wearing has produced much of her work for gallery contexts, her practice is routinely understood in relation to developments in television, surveillance culture and, more recently, social media. Many commentators have framed her gallery-based practice as a critical and self-reflexive response to changing norms of media production and consumption. Yvonne Spielmann, for example, argues that Wearing's videos (in common with gallery installations by Chantal Akerman and Eija-Liisa Ahtila) 'apprehend themselves as intervening in forms of media reality, which, like customarily television and public video surveillance, do not include their construction principles in their mode of presentation, but instead purport to show an "image" of the recorded reality, which can count as a

documentation and proof of events.’⁴ Spielmann locates the critical potential of Wearing’s work in specific formal strategies such as serial repetition, enlargement (through projection and other means) and audio-visual manipulation.⁵ This manipulation of form is certainly apparent in *Sacha and Mum* (1996), which utilises both over-dubbing and time-stretching, and also partially evident in *Drunk*’s larger-than-life imaging of human bodies extended across multiple screens. Catherine Elwes, however, reads Wearing’s work as relatively conventional, claiming that it fails to breach the ‘illusionism and narrative structures of mainstream media’⁶. Noting that the alcoholics in *Drunk* were invited by the artist into her studio, where they were ‘plied with drink’, she further states that ‘as onlookers, we remain implicated in the cruelty that has been staged for our entertainment’.⁷

Although the performers in *Drunk* are readily identifiable to most viewers as non-actors, Wearing’s work sometimes provokes confusion in this regard. *Sixty Minute Silence* (1996), for example, purports to show a group of uniformed police posing (almost) silently for sixty minutes, arranged in rows as though for an official portrait, and it derives at least some of its initial impact from the fact that it appears to involve a reversal of familiar power structures, by exposing ‘police’ to sustained visual scrutiny. While she emphasises that this work is concerned with ‘the metaphor of control that the uniforms represented’⁸, Wearing acknowledges that she initially planned to use real police officers, only changing her plan

⁴ Yvonne Spielmann, *Video: The Reflexive Medium*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2008, pp. 220-221.

⁵ Spielmann, pp. 128-9.

⁶ Catherine Elwes, *Installation and the Moving Image*, London and New York: Wallflower Press, 2015, p. 154.

⁷ Elwes, p. 154.

⁸ Gillian Wearing, ‘Gillian Wearing and Donna De Salvo, in Conversation, June 1998, London’, in *PressPLAY: Contemporary Artists in Conversation*, London and New York: Phaidon, 2005, p. 647.

when this proved impossible for logistical reasons. *Sacha and Mum* appears to show a woman violently abusing her adult 'daughter' by pulling her hair with extreme aggression, and in this instance, Wearing regarded professional actors as essential to the production process; '[Actors are] used to someone changing and controlling the camera angles. You can't do that with 'real' people, because it would seem completely illogical to them to make something aesthetic out of it. [...] it's totally contrived from beginning to end, it was heavily story-boarded.'⁹ Wearing points out that she never attempted to 'pass [*Sacha and Mum*] off as involving real people',¹⁰ but notes that many visitors to the 1997 Turner Prize exhibition at Tate Gallery (now Tate Britain) failed to recognise that the performances were staged.

It could be argued that Wearing's work seeks to mobilise – if not actually exploit – the potential for misrecognition, resulting from the pervasive visibility (and continually mutating form) of 'reality' aesthetics in contemporary media. In a text published several years prior to the production of *Self Made*, Catherine Elwes frames Wearing's practice as an exploration of the 'colonisation of the "personal" by reality TV.'¹¹ *Self Made* responds to this colonisation by reworking aspects of the reality transformation or makeover genre, deploying highly conventional strategies of editing and camerawork to create stable characterisations and legible narrative arcs, replicating reality TV's orchestration of confessional performances by (often vulnerable) individuals. As Elwes points out, certain form of 'self-reflexivity' are common in reality TV production, with camera operators routinely 'drawn into the fray'¹² perhaps anticipating Wearing's on screen appearances with crew and camera apparatus in

⁹ Wearing, p.653.

¹⁰ Wearing, p. 653.

¹¹ Catherine Elwes, *Video Art: A Guided Tour*, London: I.B. Tauris, 2004, p. 188.

¹² Elwes, p. 189.

Self Made. Crucially, however, Elwes underscores the limits to this formal reflexivity, emphasising that the broader economic and political forces that dictate both the style and content of television broadcasting tend to remain ‘hidden’ in reality TV.¹³ Similarly, there is no attempt in *Self Made* to reflect upon the economic and political (as opposed to artistic and technological) conditions of film and television production. Hence, we see Wearing at work on the film set, rather than in meetings with co-producers and partners that made the project possible.

Self Made’s production process also yielded a single channel gallery installation work, *Bully* (2010, 7 minutes 55 seconds)¹⁴, which was realised with the involvement of Rumbelow and centres upon the personal experience of James, a key participant in *Self Made*. *Bully* is structurally similar to one of the various training scenes enacted under Rumbelow’s direction in the *Self Made*, but appears to have been shot in a much larger rehearsal space, almost monumental in scale. *Bully* documents an exercise in which Rumbelow delegates his authority to James, one of the seven participants recruited for *Self Made*. James is encouraged to cast and direct a scenario based upon his own personal experience of being bullied as a teenager, selecting from a group of performers that includes professionals and non-professionals. Rumbelow then observes and prompts James as he instructs participants in their speech, gestures and interactions, as they dramatise a scenario from his own memory. As the action unfolds, James slips frequently out of his role as director, adopting an accusatory tone toward the bullies and witnesses, and in these moments he appears to play ‘himself’ as the authentic victim.

¹³ Elwes, p. 189.

¹⁴ *Bully* was first shown in the UK, alongside various other gallery installation works by the artist, as part of *Gillian Wearing*, Whitechapel Art Gallery, London, 28 March – 17 June 2012.

When viewed together, *Self Made* and *Bully* illuminate a complex process of delegation, from Wearing to Rumbelow and from Rumbelow to James. The relationship between these two works is also interesting because it suggests the potential repurposing of resources (including relationships cultivated with non-professional performers¹⁵) from one production context to another. As already noted, *Self Made* promised participants the opportunity to act in a film based upon their own experience, but in reality *Bully* is the only stand-alone ‘film’ actually realised through this process, and it was devised for a gallery rather than theatrical context. It could be argued that *Self Made* functions in manner somewhat similar to the series pilot in television production. In this sense, Wearing’s work echoes a broader tendency for artists to appropriate aspects of television’s serial economy, evidenced by the rise of multi-part production in artists’ film and video since the 1990s. The multi-part structure (exemplified by Matthew Barney’s *Cremaster Cycle*, and subsequently utilised in video works by Ryan Trecartin, Nathaniel Mellors and Melanie Gilligan, among others) allows for large-scale projects to be resourced, reconfigured and promoted across various platforms and exhibition contexts. More generally, it would seem that multi-part productions became more pervasive during the late 2000s and early 2010s, while the large-scale multi-channel installation (pervasive in the 1990s and early 2000s) seemed to decline.

Fragments of the Social Body

Despite their differences, *Drunk*, *Self Made* and *Bully* all seem to constitute examples of what Claire Bishop has termed ‘delegated performance’. Bishop uses this term to describe a

¹⁵ For a discussion of the emotional work involved in these relationships, see David Hesmondhalgh and Sarah Baker. ‘Creative Work and Emotional Labour in the Television Industry.’ *Theory, Culture & Society* 25, no. 7/8 (2008): 97–118.

range of artworks involving either live or mediated performance, primarily realised since the late 1990s.¹⁶ She cites projects by artists such as Santiago Sierra, Tino Sehgal, Jeremy Deller and Annika Eriksson where – in her view – ‘authenticity’ is ‘relocated from the *singular* body of the artist to the *collective* authenticity of the social body’.¹⁷ This social body is figured through the recruitment of performers who are specifically required ‘to *perform themselves*’ and, in the process, ‘to signify a larger socio-economic demographic, for which they stand as an authentic metonymic fragment’.¹⁸ Bishop’s focus on the performer as a demographic fragment seems to resonate with Patricia Clough’s widely-cited analysis of affect in relation to the biomediated body, which is increasingly the object of profiling, risk assessment, and other modes of informational or demographic analysis.

Clough’s account of the biomediated body¹⁹ integrates (among many other reference points) Foucault’s conceptualisation of biopolitics, Deleuze’s account of statistically configured ‘dividuals’²⁰ and Brian Massumi’s theorisation of ‘figures of affective capture.’²¹

Specifically, she describes a shift away from individual subjects of discipline and toward:

¹⁶ Claire Bishop, ‘Outsourcing Authenticity? Delegated Performance in Contemporary Art,’ in *Double Agent*, ed. Claire Bishop and Silvia Tramontana (London: ICA, 2009), 111. Bishop also develops her analysis of delegated performance in *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship* (London: Verso, 2012), 219-240, but my references are drawn from the 2009 text.

¹⁷ Bishop, ‘Outsourcing Authenticity?’, p. 111. Italics in original.

¹⁸ Bishop, ‘Outsourcing Authenticity?’, p. 118. Italics in original.

¹⁹ Patricia Clough, ‘The Affective Turn: Political Economy, Biomedicine and Bodies’, *Theory, Culture and Society* 25.1, 2008, p.1.

²⁰ Gilles Deleuze, ‘Postscript on Control Societies’, *Negotiations, 1972–1990*, trans. M. Jaoughin. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995, p. 180.

²¹ Brian Massumi, ‘Requiem for Our Prospective Dead (Toward a Participatory Critique of Capitalist Power)’, in E. Kaufman and K. Jon Heller (eds) *Deleuze and Guattari: New Mappings in Politics, Philosophy, and Culture*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998. p.54.

profiles of bodily capacities, indicating what a body can do now and in the future.

The affective capacity of bodies, statistically simulated as risk factors, can be apprehended as such without the subject, even without the individual subject's body, bringing forth competing bureaucratic procedures of control and political command in terms of securing the life of populations.²²

Although Bishop does not engage directly with the affective turn, as theorised by Clough, she describes changes in artistic production and performance that are broadly in keeping with the profiling and modelling of affective capacities as risk factors. Separate to this, Clough's reading of Massumi potentially allows for a thinking of affect and bodily memory together – a conjunction that seems pertinent to Wearing's exploration of Method acting techniques, which explicitly involve the mobilisation of 'sense memory' and 'emotional memory'.²³

Bishop seeks to identify connections between artistic 'delegation' and work practices involving subcontracting and outsourcing – practices that enable corporations to profitably divest themselves of responsibilities for their workers' welfare. She also describes an altered economy of artistic production since the 1990s, in which the location of production has shifted from the studio to other sites, such as the art fair. She notes that, while artists working with performance in the 1960s and 70s (she cites Marina Abramovic, Chris Burden

²² Clough, p. 18.

²³ For an explanation of these techniques, addressed toward actors, see Robert Lewis, 'Emotional Memory', *The Tulane Drama Review*, Vol. 6, No. 4 (1962), pp. 54-60. For further discussion of the Method tradition in context, see Judith Rodenbeck, 'Madness and Method: Before Theatricality', *Grey Room* 13 (Autumn, 2003), pp. 54-79 and Christine Cornea, 'David Cronenberg's Crash and Performing Cyborgs', *The Velvet Light Trap* 52, Fall 2003, pp. 4-14.

and Vito Acconci among others) often used their own bodies to produce work quickly and cheaply, delegated performance tends to be more costly and is often realised – in its live form – within contexts such as art fairs where its publicity value can be maximised.²⁴

Differentiating between artistic and corporate strategies, Bishop goes on to argue that the ‘best’ examples of outsourced or delegated artistic performance are ‘constructed situations’ that are not tightly controlled, and tend to maximise rather than minimise risk, in contrast to conventional wisdom in the domain of corporate outsourcing. It is, however, difficult to determine if she regards delegated performance as a critical response to the rise of corporate outsourcing or simply a concurrent development.²⁵

I am interested in the model of outsourcing proposed by Bishop, and its relevance to Wearing’s changing approach to location and mode of production – specifically, the shift in location from the artists’ studio (*Drunk*) to actor’s performance environments such as the film set and the rehearsal venue (*Self Made* and *Bully*). Wearing’s practice also, in my view, offers an interesting vantage point from which to consider the social body and its fragmentation. It is certainly possible to read Wearing’s street drinkers as signifying a larger socio-economic demographic, for which they stand as ‘an authentic metonymic fragment’, but I think Wearing’s work also speaks more generally to the changing status of the social body as a demographic form, composed of fragments. I argue that, if *Drunk* involves the figuration of a fragmented and damaged social body via the performances of street drinkers, then *Self Made* and *Bully* involve a somewhat different mobilisation of affect. In these latter works, the human body is not simply a medium through which psychic and

²⁴ Bishop, ‘Outsourcing Authenticity?’, 114.

²⁵ Bishop, ‘Outsourcing Authenticity?’, 119.

social trauma can be made legible to an observer. Rather, in the Method model, the body is conceived as a privileged storage site of affective data, which can – with the proper tools and training – be mined and repurposed.²⁶

In the case of *Drunk*, the fragmented body finds literal expression in the multi-channel camerawork and editing, which tends to flatten space, framing the scene as an image. At various points, individuals, pairs or small groups are contained within a single screen, visible from head to toe, absorbed in confused verbal or physical exchanges and largely ignoring the camera. But at other moments, mid-shots are used, or the action is split between the two peripheral screens, or all three screens are briefly integrated, so that the boundaries of this space are continually reconfigured. This is most pronounced when one of the drinkers walks across the width of the three screens, or when another is framed in a state of near-unconsciousness, stretched out on the floor. Through these compositional and presentational strategies, *Wearing* engages with her subjects both as atomised individuals and as a highly unstable social ‘body’, continually in formation. *Self Made*, owing its form primarily to the makeover reality TV genre, deploys a very different set of compositional strategies. Yet even though devised (like *Bully*) as a single channel work, *Self Made* continually alternates between sequences that highlight specific ‘characters’, each of whom might potentially be the subject of a one-off gallery installation (such as *Bully*), and various ‘exercises’ that involve all participants.

Projecting Symptoms and Performing Authenticity

²⁶ Lewis’s account of ‘emotional memory’ specifically describes the actor as a ‘storehouse’ of memory that can ‘fuel’ acting, p. 58.

As already noted, Wearing's work has often been theorised and contextualised through reference to histories and practices of popular media. But her work also betrays a debt to the intersection of video and performance during the 1960s and 1970s, and specifically to works realised by artists such as Abramovic, Acconci and Bruce Nauman. According to Joanna Lowry, these artists produced performances – often recorded on video in their own studios – in which they were frequently on the verge of a 'breakdown: weeping, shouting, laughing, confessing, and always in extremis'.²⁷ She states:

Recorded by the camera, the bare studio spaces in which these activities took place were at once a theatre and a laboratory. In this space all of the wider connotations of identity were stripped away and the subject was exposed to a more acute scrutiny.²⁸

Informed by the use of photography in the diagnosis and treatment of hysteria during the 19th century, Lowry proposes that the theatre, clinic and studio have long been intertwined in the cultural construction of a 'potentially hysterical self, peculiarly fragile and troubled'.²⁹ She frames Wearing's use of the studio backdrop in *Drunk* as a critique of this tradition, suggesting that this work specifically presents the viewer with a problem of categorisation, since the boundaries between 'authenticity'³⁰ and performance cannot be clearly determined.

²⁷ Joanna Lowry, 'Projecting Symptoms', *Screen/Space: The Projected Image in Contemporary Art*, edited by Tamara Trodd, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011, p. 98.

²⁸ Lowry, p. 98.

²⁹ Lowry, p. 94.

³⁰ Lowry, p. 103.

Lowry also observes that while the videos of Acconci and Nauman were often displayed on a monitor, *Drunk* involves a different mode of presentation (projection), which results in an 'architectural presence'.³¹ Consequently, she argues, this work presents the viewer with 'the spectacle of a clinical theatre'³² in which behaviour is read as a set of symptoms. Her analysis seems, however, to involve a misreading of the production process, since she states that *Drunk* was shot outdoors. She asserts that Wearing 'set up an improvised theatre in the street' with a 'white backdrop hung up against a wall to designate the studio'.³³ This statement is not supported by other accounts of this work and my own analysis of the audio track suggests that *Drunk* was most likely filmed in the studio environment, with audio of the city streetscape either recorded via an open window or (more likely) later added to the soundtrack. Regardless of the actual shooting location, *Drunk* does not seem to meet Bishop's criteria regarding the maximisation of risk, since the visual isolation of the drinkers from their surroundings enables a high level of compositional control and management. Lowry's analysis open up the possibility that *Drunk*, through its 'clinical' staging, might function in a critical dialogue with photographic traditions of scientific (or quasi-scientific) observation. But Wearing seems to veer away from a mode of photographic representation that might suggest, for example, those forms of observation and classification critiqued by John Tagg.³⁴ Despite her deployment of a supposedly clinical white backdrop, she actively avoids consistency in her framing of the bodies that pass in front of the camera, instead

³¹ Lowry, p. 104.

³² Lowry, p. 104.

³³ Lowry, p. 102.

³⁴ John Tagg, *The Burden of Representation: Essays on Photographies and Histories*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.

emphasising compositional variety and variability, an approach that is arguably more indebted to painting than observational documentary.

Drunk is in fact replete with painterly qualities and art historical associations. For example, Michael Newman reads the framing of the prone body, stretched out across the three screens, as a direct reference to *The Body of the Dead Christ in the Tomb* (1520-22) by Hans Holbein the Younger.³⁵ Painting also figures as a reference point in David Hopkins' discussion of the ethics of *Drunk*, and other representations of incapacitated (or dead) bodies, to which I will return shortly.³⁶ Focusing on the figure of the drinker in relation to urban space and sociality, Hopkins situates Wearing's work in relation to earlier, and more self-consciously critical, explorations of drunkenness and its representation. For example, Martha Rosler's now canonical work, *The Bowery in Two Inadequate Descriptive Systems* (1974), very evidently counters a longstanding tradition in which depictions of lower-class drunkenness serve a pedagogical function. Hopkins suggests that Rosler's work might itself be read as a response to Gilbert and George's performance of *Living Sculpture, Underneath the Arches* at the Sonnabend Gallery, New York in 1971. This work, he notes 'transposed the sunny alcoholic haze of two tramps living underneath the railway arches, as immortalized in Flanagan and Allen's music-hall song, onto an image of robotic civic conformity and outdated gentility'.³⁷

³⁵ He suggests that this association 'raises the difficult question of whether [*Drunk*] is an exploitation of street-people for aesthetic purposes, or respectfully attributing to them beauty and monumental grandeur', p. 113.

³⁶ David Hopkins, 'Out of it': drunkenness and ethics in Martha Rosler and Gillian Wearing', *Art History* 26.3, June 2003, p. 360.

³⁷ Hopkins, p. 344.

Hopkins emphasises that, in the decades that followed Rosler's work, drunkenness was often either 'dealt with textually, informationally', or explored through the use of actors (as in the case of Jeff Wall's work).³⁸ He proposes that, in contrast to Wall, Wearing escapes the 'anxiety of representation [...] by allowing her drunks to be excessive or slapstick'³⁹, mining the working-class performance traditions explored by Gilbert and George, while also deploying a quasi-documentary aesthetic. Although Hopkins acknowledges that Wearing may have manipulated and even fuelled the drunkenness of her participants, he nonetheless proposes that the street drinkers are permitted 'a flicker of social agency in terms [...] of the complex modes of class mimicry – and of self-mimicry – that are integral to British humour.'⁴⁰

Yet if there is humour here, it is intertwined with an acknowledgement of futility and loss, since Hopkins goes on to emphasise the dispossession of the British working class, reiterating their metaphorical and physical relocation from specific areas of London during the 1980s and early 1990s. He proposes that *Drunk* articulates this loss via an 'elegiac quality [...] allegorizing processes of social mourning and the longing for reinstatement of community, however abject the forms taken by the latter might be'.⁴¹ The elegiac tone is most apparent in the sequence that evokes Holbein's depiction of the (yet to be reborn) dead Christ. Significantly, while the 16th century painting creates the compelling illusion of a body laid out upon a single unified surface, Wearing's 'drunk' is a projection onto three separate screens.

³⁸ Hopkins, p. 346.

³⁹ Hopkins, p. 352.

⁴⁰ Hopkins, p. 360.

⁴¹ Hopkins, p. 360.

Conclusion: Method Actors and Mined Bodies

If *Drunk* alludes (obliquely) to the closure of public space, through its studio-bound production, then *Self Made* involves a different approach to the street as location. As already noted, the primary setting for Wearing's feature is a windowless rehearsal space, but various other shooting locations – including a theatre and a residential street – are used in the production of the short film narratives. When street environments are depicted directly in *Self Made*, they function only as relatively anonymous and generic backdrops to character-led narratives. One of these narratives, for example, centres on a random act of violence staged with the use of professional performers, props and costumes; Ash, a survivor of domestic violence, plays a character who kicks a woman (costumed to appear heavily pregnant) in the stomach. Significantly, Ash is later shown reviewing rushes of this performance on a monitor and he adopts the stance of a professional actor to rationalise his own obvious discomfort, stating 'I managed to use the training that I'd been given in an effective manner to achieve the task'. Although presented entirely without commentary, this sequence articulates a relationship to the body that is mediated not only through the camera but also through its reconfiguration (through training) as a resource that can be mined on command. So while *Drunk* refers obliquely to moral and pedagogic function of the drunken body through its painterly composition, *Self Made* and *Bully* directly address the processes of teaching and learning that can be used to access and reproduce affect.

Wearing's work clearly references long-established traditions of observation, investigation and testing, which (as Lowry notes) provide a point of connection between disparate architectures, linking scientific enquiry with artistic performance and production. In *Drunk*,

the bodies of the street drinkers, through their gestures and attitudes and their metonymic relation to a larger socio-economic demographic, communicate psychic and social trauma. But while the drunken body requires an architecture of display to become legible, the body of the trainee Method actor operates in a manner that is much closer to a store or reservoir. This is a body to be mined, not through verbal language but rather through interactions with other non-human things, including streets that function as generic locations. When considered together, *Drunk*, *Self Made* and *Bully* can be seen to articulate, if they do not necessarily interrogate, the complex processes and operations through which social bodies are constituted, depicted and mined. Whereas the architectures of theatre, clinic, laboratory and studio were once integral to the production and organisation of knowledge, made accessible through the bodily display of symptoms, works such as *Self Made* frame the body as a store of embodied knowledge that be accessed through choreographed interactions between bodies, using techniques that are internalised in studio-like rehearsal spaces, yet can be deployed anywhere.