"degristicated" is when something is almost broken. I use these words all the time now. For instance, America invented the words "klinertay" and "degristicted". "Klinertay" are the brown marks found on dying leaves, and the energy of children’s drawings is infectious and children also invent their own words (neologisms). My son hasn’t come in with pre-conceived notions of what art or music should or shouldn’t be, or can or can’t be.

It just felt like another potential for engagement. One of the main reasons for making the work that we make is to connect with people. Sound art, video art, installation work still feels somewhat inaccessible to some.

The Project
30 x 40 inches on cotton rag paper (selection)
Portfolio of 3 black-and-white prints, 2008
Courtesy of the artist

Score for Andrew (version 1)
Courtesy of the artist
Dimensions variable
Found objects, drawings, video,
Object as Energy Point,
2009

Score for Andrew (version 2)
Courtesy of the artist
8.5 x 11 inches (selection)
Portfolio of 7 chromogenic prints
7 Studies for Graphic Scores
Shifting or Sifting
in collaboration with Andrew Deutsch
Stephen Vitiello
24 February 2009
6-channel sound, DVD-Audio (15 minutes)
(Bowls, Bells and Bits of Glass)

Audio recording
Balancing Dust and Wind
2009
Andrew Deutsch
Courtesy of the artist
30 x 40 inches
rag paper
Giclee on heavy weight
Score for Andrew (version 1)
(continued)
INTERVIEW WITH ANDREWI DEUTSCH AND STEPHEN VITIELLO
BY ANNA CHÁVEZ, CURATOR OF CONTEMPORARY ART, THE WAREHOUSE GALLERY
Ania Chávez: You have collaborated with each other since 1999. How do you define your collaboration, and has this collaboration been different from past ones?

Andrew Deutch: It was 1993 that I first met Stephen. He was working with Tony Oursler and Constance DeJong on an interactive art-project. I was a computer operator. My first impression of Stephen was that he had total dedication to sound. It was clear to me from his performance that he believed sound itself should be on equal footing with any other art form. Years later, I had the chance to bring him to the School of Art and Design at the New York State College of Ceramics at Alfred University and our collaboration began at that point. About three years later I invited him back to work on a video project. In that collaboration I took care of the technical aspects while Stephen performed real-time image processing. The result is called Light Recording. After this we have worked together in music, and have exchanged sound files in the production of CDs (Product Music, Autumn Light, Visible Code). Stephen invests improvement in a way that I don’t, and it is this that lets our current collaboration happen. I would say John Cage, Stephen practices “non-obstruction.” He lets me carry my ideas while adjusting himself to the situation. Stephen has a very strong sense of what he wants, but he allows ideas to develop so that the possibilities are explored before any final decision is made. So far I think our current collaboration has been the same.

Stephen Vitiello: Every collaboration is different and every project has its own terms that I think we do our best to set at the on-set. There are projects that are really done as Andrew and I. I guess you could say we are “buddies” or “friends.” This collaboration has been ongoing since 1999, and there are times when our work has been close to each other, such as when we worked with the New York State College of Ceramics at Alfred University. I have come up to Alfred University a couple of times to make videos and Andrew in many ways acted as my producer. He made the technology available, taught me a great deal about analog video processing, and I would say there is no beginning or end, more of a weaving of sound. I made my scores first. I was eager to receive from the video artist was a score, a direction, or a series of hints, clues, ideas, moods to start working with. I don’t think either of us (Andrew or I) is expecting one very exact thing from the other, rather hoping to surprise the other. I am forced together, and veins of minerals are aligned. To me this is exactly the kind of thing that happens in second recording instructions. I actually describe myself as a composer. I think this is a big difference between Stephen and I. I have a subtle difference between sound art and sonic composition and it’s a rare occasion that I take the full plunge into sound art. I am very close to the artist Nam June Paik for a part of my life. I learned about Beuys from his books is incredibly stimulating. It’s the same with Beuys, except I would never want to take on the actions of a shaman. Katharina Stockhausen has been important, no music and writings.

SV: I don’t have the same interest in those figures. If you find that (I’m not interested), just invite me to your work and we will find a way to understand them. If you don’t find that, then I find a way to understand them. I would say that I actually am not fascinated with Shostakovich’s ideas. I am engaged with them. Reading Shostakovich is incredibly stimulating. It’s the same with Beuys, except I would never want to take on the actions of a shaman. Katharina Stockhausen has been important, no music and writings.

AC: Each of you created a score for the other. Is there a beginning and an end? Who started and why?

SV: I see (hear) our scores as really just suggestions of ways to work, neither of us approaches anything close to classic notation. We’re combining graphic scores with text descriptions. A lot of my background/training is in music notation system for. For me, this is really intuitive. There’s some sense of a personal synesthesia but it’s not one that I have a true notation. As I told you, my main way of working is to have some sounds. I’m also on my way to the Middle East tomorrow and Andrew asked me to get some “sand” samples from the Middle East, which I am doing. I can’t really say why, it just seems right.

AC: You have collaborated with each other since 1999. How do you define your collaboration, and has this collaboration been different from past ones?

SV: I actually describe myself as a composer. I think this is a big difference between Stephen and I. I have a subtle difference between sound art and sonic composition and it’s a rare occasion that I take the full plunge into sound art. I am very close to the artist Nam June Paik for a part of my life. I learned about Beuys from his books is incredibly stimulating. It’s the same with Beuys, except I would never want to take on the actions of a shaman. Katharina Stockhausen has been important, no music and writings.

SV: I don’t have the same interest in those figures. If you find that (I’m not interested), just invite me to your work and we will find a way to understand them. If you don’t find that, then I find a way to understand them. I would say that I actually am not fascinated with Shostakovich’s ideas. I am engaged with them. Reading Shostakovich is incredibly stimulating. It’s the same with Beuys, except I would never want to take on the actions of a shaman. Katharina Stockhausen has been important, no music and writings.

AC: Both of you are sound artists. Your work also shows that sound can be visual. How would you describe your collaboration, and is there an essence of the medium when responding to the score you received back from the other?

SV: I see (hear) our scores as really just suggestions of ways to work, neither of us approaches anything close to classic notation. We’re combining graphic scores with text descriptions. A lot of my background/training is in music notation system for. For me, this is really intuitive. There’s some sense of a personal synesthesia but it’s not one that I have a true notation. As I told you, my main way of working is to have some sounds. I’m also on my way to the Middle East tomorrow and Andrew asked me to get some “sand” samples from the Middle East, which I am doing. I can’t really say why, it just seems right.