

Organ of the Autonomous Sciences exists to derail the global institutionalization of artistic research. Our aim is to organize a science whose collectivity stands a priori to the institution. The Organ can be interpreted as a tactical reflection on the post-phallic forms of artistic research that actually exists, which, for a general view, seems pertinaciously preoccupied with a desire to define particular artistic practices, whether they be ontological (artistic research), epistemological (creative knowledge production), Scandinavian (artistic exhibitionism), interdisciplinary (practice-based research), bureaucratic (art-based research), or outright roundabout (research-based art).

Everything suggests that we are witnessing a field that strives for the undefinable, fluctuating, mobile and compositional, while nevertheless being monolithically enshrined in bureaucratic documents. This is the *contradictio in adjecto* of artistic research that even the declaration of a "postresearch condition" will never escape. The dividing line between innovation and revolution is whether to leave the theoretical control in the hands of institutions, or whether autonomous collectives will and can take over the productive forces. In the first case, innovation in artistic research will lead to increased discipline, expertise and professionalism. The second possibility is that a new science emerges.

To remain with the trouble of artistic research today, we suggest a leap beyond the ideological metamorphosis of 'institutional critique' into the 'Critical Institution', and to rally around what has been proposed as 'infrastructural critique': a kind of opportunistic-sycophantic practice that emphasizes the material and socio-economic conditions for any cultural uprising. Rather than aspiring for a mythological 'outside', the strategy, right here and now, must necessarily be to make something of the means of production and other economic forces. Autonomy is no longer under the beech tree with Bataille and all the other radicals. Neither did anything change from 'the inside', in contrast to what Hans, Andrea, and their lot believed possible some decades ago. Rather than sacrifice or complicity, we resort to a deserting form of egress and destitution - that is the instigation of a recuperation from the standpoint of an underworld. This only means that we are unearthing the true struggle: the organization of our inevitable victory.

Our regulative idea is to experimentally exploit the academisation of art academies and this process' further recuperation by universities in order to foster an emancipatory enterprise. This entails organizing the undercommon interests for autonomous and social knowledge production that remains existent between artists, academics, activists, curators, engineers, care workers, and whoever else that is getting lost in the striated field of a shrinking universe. Our desire concerns the co-production of an infrastructure that yearns for more than a state-funded golden age of cultural policy. In contrast to the Enlightenment ideal of a highly literate world republic, which objective of transparency the 'Institute', 'Academy' and 'University' cannot let go of, an 'Organ' is more ontic in scope; it concerns cultivating and mobilizing the reterritorializations that move the cursed, speculative work characterizing forms of labor that ultimately desire to abolish itself.

We are not merely inventing a science on our own, no, we organize the unredeemed by a general organology to unleash the cognitarians' idiomatic realities. How this is achieved without violating the autonomies that founded this Organ poses the structural contradiction that shall drive our work forward. For now, we suspend the urgency of whether to be for or against the institution. The bread must be broken in order to be shared. And one must bring something to the table.