

Guidelines for Reviewers on Furtherfield.

Hi there,

Firstly, a big thank you for considering writing reviews on Furtherfield.

This document is intended to answer some of the various questions you may be asking. Such as, what kind of artworks, projects, concepts and contexts Furtherfield is interested in exploring, as well as other useful details regarding the reviewing process.

Note:

To view a list of subjects, artworks, projects, media, culture, genres; we are currently investigating please scroll to the bottom of this page and read 'The type of work that we are interested in having reviewed', and see which titles refer to your own practice or interests.

About the Co-Editors and their Roles.

Marc Garrett & Ruth Catlow Co-Founders and Co-Directors are the main editors and system admin for Furtherfield site. Rob Myers and Olga Panades Massanet are also co-editors, both working mainly with Marc Garrett. Collaboratively editing, submitting and uploading material to the 'Content Management System' of the Furtherfield web site. All of us know how to use the technology, as well as in practice constantly, making and researching art, technology and social change, bringing the culture back for others to view and share at Furtherfield.

About Reviewers on Furtherfield and their Roles.

How many reviews a month?

All reviewers have different demands which can determine when a review is written and submitted. We usually suggest 1 review a month as a guideline. Yet, we are aware how busy life can be and are open to adapt according to your own time-line, everyone seems to find their own rhythms. Everything is negotiable.

Who to send Reviews to?

Send the reviews to Marc Garrett (marc.garrett@furtherfield.org) unless discussed otherwise. The texts will be viewed by the Co-editors then uploaded onto the web site. It is likely that you will be asked to have a final view of the review before it goes public. We usually ask for reviewers to respond as soon as they can and work with a deadline of answering within 7 days.

What is likely to be edited?

We tend to try our best not to change too much of the content of what is written, we value the voice and interpretations proposed by reviewers. We are more likely to change spelling mistakes and grammatical errors or add extra images, or replace (possible) bad images with better quality ones. This usually takes place with some form of negotiation with the reviewer.

The Reviewing process and options.

It is varied:

- 1 - we find the subject/work and then suggest something we consider is worth reviewing, according to your own interests. (this is recommended for newbies:-)
- 2 - you find something yourself and suggest it to us and we consider (mutually) if the context fits.
- 3 - you propose an interview with an individual or group.
- 4 - you suggest an article written by yourself and we consider (mutually) if the context fits.

Of course, how you proceed is really an open dialogue. You can choose any of the above, whenever it feels right. Whatever you decide, through experience we have found that the most productive results would usually reflect upon your own personal interests, practice and research.

Why have reviews at all?

Many works are presented on the Internet but, not always via a critical eye. One reason we decided to set up a review section on Furtherfield (a while back now) was, because we felt that there was not enough, dynamic and democratic representation, and debate, about much of the work being created out there, other than by more officially accepted academics for a few already 'noted' artists in hard-copy publications. We felt the need to break it down a bit and share it out a bit more, open it up; by offering a space for those who wish to have their work respected, considered contextually and taken seriously. This means including many of those who may not already be appropriated, accepted in traditional art historical canons or ignored by less progressive, on-line art portals. Of course, the perfect scenario is to have a mixture of practitioners being seen and presented on Furtherfield. It is also important that up and coming writers who are engaged in exploring contemporary approaches and ideas around the culture of art, technology and social change, have a place where they know the material they write will be read by a community interested in what they have to say.

Suggestions regarding how to approach reviewing a work.

We encourage critical questions when writing a review. On a few occasions we have had to ask a reviewer not to be so 'personally offensive'. So, if you feel an angst ridden haze, suddenly taking over your mental state of mind. Which may even feel relevant at that time, we may even agree with you. Please, be open to alternative options, suggestions or approaches in putting forward your argument.

Even though it is important to be challenging regarding one's own perspective, we must still remember that we have a responsibility to be fair. Many take the reviews on Furtherfield seriously and we are not interested in hurting those who may not possess any cultural weight to defend themselves. Of course, if you are critiquing a work/project/book/article/situation that comes from a political standing or position, or you feel that an institution, a government action or a local issue needs to be aired or challenged, this is a different matter. We advocate this – it is important that your voice is heard. Yet, it still must be balanced and fair, offering a clear and intelligent argument on the subject proposed. Having said all this, we are always interested in discussing and negotiating any suggestions that come about connected with ideas, opinions and approaches in writing reviews.

Do I get paid and are there other possibilities beyond reviewing?

We currently do not have the funds to pay all the reviewers on Furtherfield. Although, this does not mean that we are not looking for extra funds to pay reviewers, we are. In the near future we are expecting to include various reviews from Furtherfield for inclusion of (hard copy) publications. Of course, reviewers will be paid for their contributions when this happens.

Other information about Furtherfield community activities.

If you wish to find out how to join other platforms and community groups, blogs, platforms which are part of the Furtherfield neighbourhood, just ask :-)

General Pointers:

- please send a short bio (100 – 250) about yourself with a link to your site (if you have one) to ale@furtherfield.org - this will be added to the reviewers section
<http://www.furtherfield.org/reviewersbio.php>

- Word count ranges from 650 to 1500 (we are flexible).

- The format of submitted reviews can be either as, doc, rtf, txt. Although we prefer plain text.

- Reviewers must send URLs of what is reviewed.

- Reviewers usually send 2-3 images referring to what is written about. These can be jpg's, gif, png or even a flash file.

- We use 3 different operating systems Linux, MAC and Microsoft. Mostly Linux.

- Even though a submitted text may not necessarily be an actual review, we loosely use the word 'review' as a general term, but are specific to its context when referring to a review, interview or article, when publicized and on-line or referenced.

The type of work that we are interested in having reviewed:

Either on-line or in physical form as artworks, events, conferences, exhibitions, books etc...

Media art performance

Media Art (New Media Art)

Net Art (Net.art, Net-Art)

artist social networking projects

Eco-media (Ecology, Art and technology)

Open-Source Culture (preferably art related)

Games culture - activist or independent...

Situationist art

Hactivism - cultural or artistic

Networked Art

Folksonomies

Alternative media

Virtual art (Second Life etc)

Net_Film

Net_video

Software Art

Artware

Independent Networked Art Groups

Distributed Creativity

Real-time Media Art

Media Art Conferences

Art Blogs

Culture Hacking - Creative intervention and artistic hacking)

Creative Commons

Locative Media

DIY Culture

Free Culture

Social Networks

Mobile Technologies (Independent preferably)

Psychogeography

detournment

Cartography (Artistic Mapping using technology)

---please note that this list will always be updated accordingly.

We are also open to suggestions.

Welcome to Furtherfield & its Networked Neighbourhood :-)

<http://www.furtherfield.org>

If there are any more questions please do not hesitate to ask.

marc garrett.

marc.garrett@furtherfield.org