

**Slippery Slopes: Artistic Research, Science, And Pseudoscience
Is a demarcation possible?**

The demarcation problem between science and pseudoscience is currently taking a stronger place in the general debate, a debate which seems to be dominated by idealisations and reliance on stereotypes.

My contribution relates crucial aspects of this discussion to artistic research. A critical discussion seems necessary, given that methodological and teleological complexity, artistic demands, and subjectivity, are often considered essential in artistic research, but seem to be at odds with standards separating science from pseudoscience.

First, we collect criteria from Michael D. Gordin's *On The Fringe: Where Science Meets Pseudoscience* (2021), Frieder Vogelmann's *Umkämpfte Wissenschaften - zwischen Idealisierung und Verachtung* (2023), and recent criticism towards artistic research from Josef Früchtl's *Artistic Research: Delusions, Confusions, and Differentiations* (2019). Key features of a scientific approach are the linearity of research, the objectivity of observation and method, and the commanding significance of the research question or hypothesis.

In an experiment, musical paraphrases by Romantic composers such as Tausig, Grünfeld, or Rosenthal are investigated as if they were artistic research projects, although not having been intended that way. By attaching a virtual research question to their work, we simulate the linearity of the project. Next, we combine fragments of these very paraphrases in another experiment to a musical collage, this time equipped with a different research question, framed as a artistic research project of the year 2024.

We must ask where we draw demarcations: Does the mere adding of a research question to a work, such as Grünfeld's or Tausig's, elevate that work to the status of artistic research, or does it 'downgrade' artistic research to a mere prop? Is the attempt to compile fragments in a pastiche sufficient to qualify as an artistic method? And, most importantly, is a research process valid if it appears linear but relies on a 'recursive linearity,' and/or must it be deemed pseudoscientific due to cherry-picking and methodical meandering?

My contribution closes with these 'slippery slope' questions, pointing out that we must address these issues to avoid an impression of artistic research as pseudoscience.

AEC European Platform for Artistic Research in Music (EPARM) 2024
Academy of Music, University of Ljubljana (Ljubljana, Slovenia)

Parallel Session



Jan Giffhorn, PhD
Music and Arts University of the City of Vienna (MUK)
Vienna, Austria
j.giffhorn@muk.ac.at

Jan Giffhorn studied music theory from 2000 until 2005 at Folkwang University Essen. In 2014, he received a PhD in musicology from the University of Music and Performing Arts Vienna (MDW) for his dissertation *Zur Sinfonik Leonard Bernsteins – Betrachtungen zu Rezeption, Ästhetik und Komposition*. Since 2017 he is a research fellow at the Music and Arts University of the City of Vienna (MUK) at the Centre For Science and Research (ZWF). In his work at the university, Jan Giffhorn engages, within various teaching activities, in the development of student final projects in the field of artistic research, primarily involving students from the music instrumentalist domain. Aspects of the philosophy of science in relation to artistic research and practice play a central role in his involvement in curricular committees at his university, in the supervision of final theses, and in publications and public lectures.

