

Tagore, Pedagogy and Contemporary Visual Cultures

Workshop 4 Berlin

Alice Creischer and Andreas Siekmann's Studio, Berlin, 12 April 2014

Participants:

Natasha Ginwala
Anjalika Sagar
Kodwo Eshun
Adrian Rifkin
Ansuman Biswas
Gabrielle Schleijpen
Grant Watson
Andrea Phillips
Anshuman Dasgupta
Sanchayan Ghosh
Vivian Zihler
Alice Creischer
Andreas Siekmann

Introduction

Dear all,

Since this is the last time we will meet formally to discuss Tagore in the context of contemporary visual cultures (even though some join this particular group for the first time), Grant and I would like to propose that we use the meeting to do two things:

1. to connect our collaborative research on and via Tagore to pressing concerns that we all share for the future of arts institutions within a dominantly neoliberal artistic and curatorial culture;
2. to discuss practical ways in which we might develop our research through future joint projects and funding applications.

In order to start our conversation, we'd like to ask the following questions:

- What is there in the model of Santiniketan that we might use as a counter to neoliberal cosmopolitanism?
- What are the poetic forms that might emerge from Santiniketan (they might not necessarily be those of Tagore)?
- What can we take as a cosmopolitics for contemporary art, described by Bharucha as 'a field of economic, social and political forces' that works inter-culturally?

- What does it mean to think 'home and the world'?
- Where in the world today are alternative poetic-institutional forms being practiced?

Best, Andrea

Notes from the discussion

Grant: Connection with Practice International (<http://www.practiceinternational.org/>) which examines structures that artists set up in order to work internationally. Research about cosmopolitanism.

Andrea: Key terms from previous meetings: **Political poetics**, that Tagore proposed, but did not produce in his life time. Mainly located in his correspondence. Relationship between nationalism and cosmopolitanism. Bharucha: *Another Asia*. **No nation**, non-nationality as a proposition. Aesthetic and poetic politics are suggestions that hover above many institutions that we work in whose structures do not respond to those that are suggested by the practices of the artists and curators whose work is hosted by them.

No-curriculum. Pedagogy and its marketisation. Alternative ideas on pedagogy. Alternative infrastructures. Art education next to artistic practices as a sustained social methodology.

Grant: Santiniketan as a model. Difficult to extrapolate to the present. Antithetical to current institutions. Against professionalism, bureaucracy, commercialization.

Andreas: Nation branding. Culture production as the face for a nation. Kulturnation (German discussion in the 19th century).

Anjalika: Currently the art world is a reenchantment with authenticity. Before there was questioning, and resistance to exoticization, also within popular culture, and everyday relations between people of different cultural backgrounds. There were more ironies. There were reversed forms of anthropology being performed at home... Acquiring work from places outside the Western world, immediately producing stars that get circulated everywhere in the world. While there is a blindness towards the work of people living inside European cities who are immigrants.

Grant: Post-colonial theory was about this model of here and there, and we are back to that. Contemporary Indian art becomes an object ... without a connection to the experience of Indian diaspora in the UK.

Andrea: This crisis is also reflected in curating. People are uninformed, and bring together forms that are politically misaligned, thus producing ambivalence and intellectually violent, problematic situations, in which people miss each other's ideas, get mistranslated. The problem is institutional (people working in them that sometimes are forced to work in such a manner).

Anshuman: Talking about Santiniketan brings us automatically to that rift between the past and the present. Because the past lives in a form of a visual archive, imagined as a world that existed. It constantly changes, from the days we were students to the days we went into teaching.

The old model has been replaced by a new modular system of semesters and compulsory submissions and assignments. This systematically plugs into the general educating system. Imposition, which is a natural thing when you take the State's money. States will always impose parameters and want to generalize the entire education system. To calibrate it better, to be able to make it more accountable according to their own pattern, not according to the internal criteria that the school had.

The imposition of liberal cosmopolitanism onto erstwhile open and porous institutions like Santiniketan produces a one point perspective, a milling machine rather than a different perspectival paradigm.

Andrea: Can you describe that porosity as you encountered at Santiniketan as a student? What was it, and when did it change?

Anshuman: There are two differing aspects to it.

1) Problematic, as a school it was too much reliant on individual's capacities to deliver. At the moment individuals become lesser beings, people that don't want to give too much energy, experimenting with the paradigm of teaching, which was there. Left for individuals to cultivate. It was a very individualist modernist model of education that Tagore introduced. This model relies on the individual's capacity to deliver. The moment that capacity to deliver goes, the whole paradigm is likely to fall through.

2) We could rely on a few teachers, but not all. You could rely on many teacher's craft, but the principle between craft and discourse was not in every individual. Subramanyan was perhaps the most capable artist and teacher combined, because he believe on the scholar/artist model, which he borrowed from the Chinese tradition. With an overall vision, a perspective of the entire creative process. Benod Behari, and Subramanyan, a line of people learning from each other. But not everyone was like this.

Cosmopolitcs creeping, in a positive sense, into education. They were not contrasting their educational system with the West. Incorporated Japanese and also minor models. The folk come together with the high art. Art and craft cohabitation model was one major plan of the education model. Art and craft has a peculiar entanglement in India. There is caste hierarchy based on craft. It is also flexible in some cases. The image-makers are from lower class roots. They were untouchables in certain traditions.

Craft is associated with people who are underclasses. Weaving was also initially related to lower caste groups. Bridging that gap between arts and crafts is also bridging the difference between different statuses in society.

Santiniketan is not a production model. Is a production of paradigms that matter, not distribution, but constantly producing models. In a certain sense it was in contrast with Bauhaus.

Subramanyan writes to Benod Behari in 1951, we are trying to experiment with the Bauhaus model here. But in Santiniketan there is no production line. Johannes Itten, disheartened with the Bauhaus, applies for a job at Santiniketan, Tagore, politely dismisses his application. Santiniketan does not have sophisticated workshops; the pay is very little, ... He had an orientalist image of Santiniketan, of people who do Yoga, Tantra, etc. People might have had spiritual sides but Santiniketan is pragmatic oriented.

Andreas: Was there a desire for industrialization (like in the Bauhaus)? To set work free. Industrialization makes more time for other things.

Adrian: In the beginning of the Bauhaus there is this intense input of orientalism mysticism via theosophy... The questions of becoming professionalized, bridging arts and crafts. France 17th century... the charismatic teacher, it comes and goes.

Natasha: Economy of the school, being grounded in Tagore's persona and physical being. Before there is a State, Tagore's travels, his lectures, his presence, creates a structure to fund the school. To make the exchanges possible, to form a curriculum that is a form of narrative. In his letters he complains a lot about the money and the lectures.

Andrea: ... And how exhausted he is from the tour. He becomes the equivalent of the collections curator at Tate, asking rich people to donate.

Anshuman: The whole funding business is quite contradictory. In 1930 Tagore writes 'Don't give me philosophies, send me money urgently, otherwise we can't continue Santiniketan ...' The letters are illuminating. He got money from the king of Java, like a million rupees (today).

After the Nobel Prize he was a hero, there was market for his books. Translations. Several thousands copies of his books were sold. Dispersed funding. Occasional he would go to the begging bowl. Like in the *Post Office*, Amal asks his uncle: do you know the king well? How do you know him? This question appears several times. I go to him with a begging bowl regularly. Tagore, was going also with a begging bowl from place to place.

Natasha: attempting to attain a certain self-sufficiency

Anshuman: You need hard money to run an institution. Tagore seems to encounter this question of 'hard-cash'. Where does it come from?

Andrea: Self-sufficiency goes back to productivism: Sriniketan is a production model

Anshuman: Sriniketan is a production line.

Andrea: It is supposed to support self-sufficient agrarian reform?

Natasha: It was not productivity in the sense we might interpret now.

Anshuman: Santiniketan cultivated a non productive line, while Sriniketan was conceived as something that would compensate for it by producing things designed by students and teachers at Santiniketan. More like a guild than a modernist milling machine.

Grant: Money. State-funding vs. the begging bowl. Emphasis is always on expansion Santiniketan was based on not being expensive.

Anshuman: ideally it would not take any money from the students. Until recently the fees were amazingly low. Now are 200rs.

Sanchayan: but to live in Santiniketan now is around 4000rs.

Gabrielle: the money is state money?

Anshuman: absolutely.

Anjalika: Ke Lalita. Women writing in India 600BC... (Susie J. Tharu). The way the feudal state would operate to fund the arts, the British's taxes, the first thing to go were the arts. The arts were functioning before Santiniketan. The British were responsible for bringing really conservative attitudes towards the arts. The way the art functioning within India in different states, how colonialism destroyed all this, the role of women was very particularly different... Tagore going on asking for money is asking for money back. Due back.

Sanchayan: Tagore's personal initiative to generate something. After his death, Santiniketan moves to a state-sponsored institution. Creates difference on how the money needs to be invested, used within the institution. Giving back. Murals. Now everything needs to be approved. Need to apply for a project. Everything seems to be untouchable; the walls seem to be untouchable. Today funding becomes an issue itself, a stumbling block. Funds coming from a secondary system generated a kind of pedagogic freedom. How to balance this?

Andrea: is Visva-Bharati under pressure to get more students? Will the fees increase?

Sanchayan: There is pressure to become independent. Everything was subsidized. Everything was minimal, basic, pressure for the institution to sustain itself.

Grant: To make those works on the 1930s was inexpensive. Live very simply.

Sanchayan: Difference as well that people were not thinking that they were taking their work out to show. Working in a community. Flowing community. It was not targeted to taking it out.

Anjalika: homogenization, contemporaneity produced by this neoliberal art fairs. India has its own temporality before. How do the young artists at Santiniketan deal with (the pressures of the biennials, the market)?

Anshuman: they look forward to joining the club!

Adrian: Common in the art world. Dangerous way of using neoliberal, which names an enemy, the naming of which looks like a solution of the problem of what we should do. Neoliberalism is a completely useless phrase. Is a sloppy short-cut. What we are looking at is a complex process of incorporation of our will into state-structures, into educational structures, into national branding, which isn't explained by naming it neoliberalism. In a sense, by naming the enemy we exculpated ourselves from our own participation in it, is there a difference in Santiniketan for what we think we need? To what we think we need? Our art form is now the begging bowl. This has been set up on a begging bowl. 'Neoliberal' masks the problem.

Grant: Institutional perspective. There is a shift from the begging bowl where you go to the state to a privatization of these institutions. It is not exclusively neoliberal, there is a complex of different forces that are shaping institutions and making the conditions under which we work.

I am looking at an economy of means. Looking at Santiniketan as a model.

Adrian: but that is a problem of desire.

Andrea: I don't want to dismiss neoliberalism entirely; it is a process that is completely implicated within the state. We do need to think through in a very pragmatic way, as well as a conceptual and political level, the ways in which an institution might be able to work without those means. All state money is implicated within the same formations of corporate interests. If we say no money, what is the smallest possible way we can work together? What do we avoid and do we avoid anything?

Adrian: the economy of our desire is a starting point.

Alice: Our own desire is connected with hierarchies and hegemonies you have in neoliberalism. It is difficult to make a difference between your own desire to get visible, to make career, communication, and neoliberal structures. For example, Museum Reina Sofia and *conceptualism del Sul*. Reina Sofia is a communication platform to make research about conceptual art from South America. Now, the local hierarchy is reacting to the desire of Reina Sofia to do history writing. The local art historians are reacting. Reina Sofia is this big entrance door to Europe.

Andreas: Neoliberal pay. These groups are being incorporated in history but for free. For them this is the re-installment of the colonial tradition. To get it for free.

Alice: Desire to be visible is being mixed up with the desire to breaking the rules of solidarity. Reina Sofia only wants pictures like in ex-Argentina, making movements into art. What happens to them? The groups are scared about who will take the role of writing their own history. Desires are mixed-up. Capillary system of desires with very little money flowing.

Andreas: Franchising system. It is like a colonial attitude. They make the buildings; they curate the program for years. Guggenheim...

Grant: Structures which are very powerful inform or form your desire, but there is also the possibility of working with the self. Leela Gandhi writes of characters from the colonial period who worked against the colonial logic. Its not to say you are free, but what are the collective tools?

Adrian: Not just autonomy, but what forms of dependency do we want?

Andrea: Difference between being instrumentalized by the self or the institution and being happy to be an instrument, which is a dependence.

Alice: With projects like Principio Potosi, the most intense moments were when we really had to fight to have *time*. Fight for artists to have a voice. Artists themselves can come together to discuss and have their own hermeneutics. Chance to meet all the artists and spend time with them. Desire of content. Look how Tucuman Arde was presented at documenta! A huge history that was cut. It is not only about visibility but also content. Struggle with the institutions, to have time and money. To come together and discuss.

Andrea: Dependency. How did you two working in collaboration with other artists, how did you open that space? Why did it work?

Alice: You can be a really radical political group and then be invited as an alibi, if you don't criticize the institution. What does this mean to the artistic practice now, the relationship between artists and the institutions? Institutions don't like it very much if you don't reflect your own dependency.

Andreas: you need to build your own public. This global branding also reduces all texts. You need transparency. Contracts. Where is the transfer of images? Argue word for word.

Alice: refuse in case of hegemony. The different desires. Showing political art is the desire of who invites. That the sponsors' can sponsor critical art, how nice... it was a luxury to say no. But that is perverse. Artists need to be servile to the money givers.

Andreas: we were persona non grata for long time.

Alice: the title was 'Sponsor by by'. We did a lot of talks, the emergence of the neoliberal economy at that time. You cannot work outside the hegemony, you have to produce the conflicts inside. Ex-Argentina was an attempt at this.

Andreas: You need to be the owner of the project money, so you can decide how money is divided. It's never a lot of money. The best investment you have is time. If you have no money you have to invest time. A dialectic of strategies. A third part of this money needs to be kept so that the work that will be shown in Europe can be shown in Argentina, but that was never planned. But you have to do it. You need to contact every artist to say, I reduce my fee by a third so that with this money we can... but you need time for communication and to build solidarity. With *Principio Potosi*, Reina Sofia had no interest in showing this show in La Paz. Put it in Mexico city. No, it has to be La Paz.

The Goethe institute allowed us to control our own budget (Ex Argentina). If you have the money in your hands you have the decision.

Alice: money came from the German foundation, we were lucky, it was the first time. It was the summer of love.

Anjalika: double desire, to be critical and also be in the centre...

Andrea: *Potosi Principle*. In the experience of the exhibition you can feel this. Resisting one set of desires, but putting in place another set of libidinal motivations, and using the same material. The paintings that you show in that exhibition might also be shown in another institution whereby they would have a different relationship with money. Using the same material but coming at the material differently, displaying the material differently. Changing the modus operandi of curating.

Alice: You have a lot of artists who are doing this kind of radical shift, you have to work very hard to get some kind of political argumentation... if I have a reason then I can go to the institutions and get another impetus of demanding, it has a kind of logic. Intervention is the term used now. But it is very hard and long work to get to a good intervention. Sometimes from invitation to a biennial artists think they can quickly do an intervention...

Anjalika: I think it is pointless to do this institutional critique, take the money and do what you want with it, instead of pretending...

Grant: Dependency and autonomy. Periods of working in different ways, periods of working as individual artists, periods of making exhibitions as curators, periods being activities, this ability to change positions...

Andreas: because it is necessary. Also with creation. It is very exhausting in some projects, you make nothing else. You have to say no to the normal procedure. To

fight for the time. We go on strike. We need more time. Otherwise you make only effect art. There is no time, no money. You can extend time, but normally the fee doesn't change. You have to work longer for less money. A life decision! Afterwards you need time to go back to the studio, to write.

It is shocking that Reina Sofia can speak again for South America. And they are not relative in their position. It is the opposite of post-colonialism.

Adrian: Taking over South America again, is a recolonization. They are only interested in the Spanish ex-colonies. What about Brazil? It is a sinister phenomenon. Baroque artists. How did they work? What were those politics? Where is the politics of the Jesús painting in Rome?

Andreas: Europe was still the matrix, and these paintings were still the copy of something. The only criteria, was formalist criteria of development of perspective and figuration, development and color. But not a relation. In Madrid people were against this exhibition because they were the worst paintings they have ever seen. Again the central focus. This post-colonial thing is a concurrence for art historians. For money giving, for science, it is an ideological thing. They could not accept these paintings, also because we were artists, for them we have no idea about colonial painting. But they also did not, because they did not know these pictures. They ignore these pictures, but still they are the owners of history.

Alice: To be the owner of history is a crucial point for all of us. Through globalization, we come to a revaluation of history. It is a difficult thing. In Bolivia the indigenous movement wanting to own these pictures, only from an indigenous view... we felt de-legitimate, as German artists going to Bolivia to talk about these paintings. We said, look it would be if you would go to Germany and talk about Durer, how enriching that would be. We have to take this globalization seriously.

Andreas: we need to keep these projects of decolonization as very international projects. Because the paintings did not come only from Spain. The English invested in the mines of Potosí, and the Germans. They produced 250 000 pictures a year. Reproductions of pictures. To show a new history. Conquista done by pictures.

Andrea: Asking for more time. What would it be to imagine an institution that would be able to say to you, you can have more time? Will it have no money? How we might imagine that flexibility. Even the idea of the opening up of an exhibition presents a certain idea of a revelation that is built into the structure ... What would it mean to be able to say: when you are ready we open the doors.

Andreas: Spain was bankrupt. The relation to Bolivia, ex colony, guilt: they had to quit other projects to keep this one.

Alice: Institutions are capable of flexibility, outside the administration they are accepting this kind of administration emergency. When we are pressuring and demanding, solutions come up. So, sometimes we have to study the administration. What does it mean?

Grant: The case of Iniva. The organization went from being an agency to being a building. That had advantages, the organization became safer within that building, but the downside was that you have to start programming the building. The pressure to constantly providing content. It would be fascinating to see the artist's perspective on how administration works. It's normally the other way around.

Andrea: It's what the Artists Placement Group tried to do. Different generation and different political culture.

Vivian: it is a question of subject formation. It is like *Amal* asking: How do you know the King? How do you know you know through administration? You constitute yourself also, which is very interesting because to go to the question, what is neoliberalism, it is a set of material systems and networks, but I have always understood it as question about how subjects are formed. Biopolitical. Which is a question of what the Tagorian project is in terms of self-sufficiency. Project of reclaiming a kind of subject formation. The letters are so fascinating because they are social, written in travel, in moments of solitude. Within the letters to Java Tagore doesn't want to leave the ship. He doesn't want to embark upon the rigorous cycle of self-explanation, with the begging bowl. The artist as a solitary figure, that is somehow positive. The Tagorian modernity, the singular subject in a modernity, a paradoxical figure, different from the enlightenment figure.

Andrea: individualization fuels the biopolitical

Vivian: paradoxes after paradoxes.

Grant: we can see Santiniketan in this romantic way, it was probably an institution that did allow for time, did produce a certain amount of isolation in time, allowed for a subjectivity to shift. You were not disciplined into becoming a painter. In the original curriculum.

Anshuman: in a sense this is right. A construction that is based in a romanticized idea of isolating the self from the city (Kolkata). The tragedy of the post-colony is that the supplier got stopped. The organic production got stopped because of partition. The mills were in west Bengal, they start closing down gradually. Otherwise Tagore took a difference from this production machine. City as production machine. Instrumentalisation of labor. He wanted to create a different temporality within that industrial modernist is true of Santiniketan.

Andreas: Is it possible to make this exhibition now, since we are now in the fourth cycle of industrialization... industrialization 4.0. This kind of self-intelligent communication... Cloud industrialization. Is Tagore excluded of this processes?

Natasha: Relation between Tagore and Gandhi. Episode where Gandhi is visiting Sriniketan and Tagore was extremely nervous, very apprehensive. He was confiding that he thought Gandhi would hate the fact that they were not spinning Jute. Space

of worries as a decolonial tool. He did not use a unified symbol as a mechanism. For him the village was the space of the experiment. Not trying to solve anything.

Vivian: The villages are also cosmopolitan and modernist. Within Sriniketan the traditional agriculture and traditional crafts were practised but also they were sent to America for training, it was mixed, not only the romantic return to a tradition, to a pastoral ideal.

Sanchayan: the individual practice, there was a kind of, a group of people living locally, getting connected to individual practices and learning certain skills. It was merging. Reclusion but also close dialogue with people on the local villages. Evolved into this economic strategies, where things have to be standardized.

Anjalika: misfits. Recluses.

Sanchayan: many of them are not in arts anymore, they have moved to totally different kinds of disciplines.

Anshuman: choices, like migrating. Souza is an example, he has gained from migrating, but many people did not gain. We can say that they really got out as a choice, but maybe the desire was to make it big in the West.

Kodwo: What it means to situate a work, situate an exhibition, which is already in its third incarnation. In the industrialization 4.0. To situate that in the long German reception of Tagore. The exhibition is characterized by an avoidance of that question. It does not reflect on that history. Because it is quite a familiar question. Germany more than Britain was the place that celebrated him. Indophilia. Bengalophilia. Questions of industrialization, self-sufficiency, the rural, pan-Asianism, all of these things seem to fascinate the German intellectual classes (1920s). We moved from a history of British reception to Germany, to find it more intense.

Grant: NGBK wanted to deal with this question of reception. It was not my question. They did set up a project with a university in Berlin. But Antje and Elke thought that what had come out of it wasn't so interesting. Project in Dresden, of the Bauhaus.

Kodwo: In A Century Before Us (2014) we were trying to look at the exhibition as a cross-section of contemporary thinking, around this contested figure. You can see all kinds of references to machines, and to clouds. The text, there is a poem, which is address to the Lords of machines, and the poem is edited at this point: cloud. Computing. That work, and even in the name, is trying to allude at a century of reception to come. Its build from the VP quarterly, it is 15 issues from the 1930s to the 1940s. It is looking at this magazine that came out of the milieu of Tagore's studies, Tagore's thinking, the circle of scholars, poets, people who affiliated themselves to Tagore's project in its wider sense. The project is to look at the marginalia of that magazine, to extract element, and then build a kind of anachronistic network of temporal simultaneity, in which several years are compressed into one work. A form of social dreaming. 15 years shrunk into time. A

specialization of a temporal thinking where all kinds of allusions to the 20th century are coded. Some of the works, Goshka's and Anna's work, have this kind of anachronistic sensibility. In the sense of being out of its date. Here this notion of outdatedness is clearly affirmed, the work is extracted from its date and put to work in a separate time.

The work is trying to calibrate, calculate this material against its present. Register the temporal effect of Tagore's project. Anna's birds. The red sand, the crow's gold. Their acute looking, sifting the sand for something precious. Relate this image to the question of bureaucracy.

Mark Fisher, neoliberalism and the relation between the myth of bureaucracy and the myth of creativity. Bureaucracy is something done in the past by bad socialists, and what we do is to get it off our backs to be truly creative. Creativity is equally latent, as long as we get rid of bureaucracy. Andreas' question of the institution - 'why are you an artist interested in bureaucracy?'. If you're creative you shouldn't be interested in contracts, budget, etc. But it is crucial. The ongoing battle of the allocation of roles. As if artists work on moments of décor, turning out at the last minute, everything else as been decided.

Micropolitics of administration. Artist as curator, critic, writer. Shifting of fields. We also see this in the exhibition. Goshka's mimicking the curator's role. Artistic refusal to respect the division of roles, how does that show in the work itself? What form does that take? It has to show up as form.

Artists Placement Group. The group that went furthest in administration. Into the grey details of administration, and made an aesthetic...

Aesthetic of the handmade. Handmadeness. Refusal of an administrative aesthetic. Refuse the division of roles, but that does not show in the display.

Artists that write. Writing has to take its own trajectory, away from our art.

Grant: Staging of authority in exhibitions. Alice's piece *Apparatus for the Osmotic Compensation of the pressure of wealth during the contemplation of poverty* a machine for looking at colonial history (At Iniva's *Social Fabric* exhibition). Hand made as a kind of fallibility and subjective position. With the Tagore project my aim was to get out to the position of narrating Tagore, to deterritorialize Tagore.

Vivian: what is the status of the curator within this exhibition.

Grant: Landings and Anna, there is a synchronistic relation to the way you work. You are dealing with the very same material. Conjoining this play with the context of Santiniketan.

Andrea: Different skill sets. What is that work? Not only in terms of institutions but also in terms of a political strategy of being in the world. Subjective strategy in the world of a person who produces something that eventually goes on display. That we might call an artist or we might chose not to. Handmade. Anshuman describes the moment were the maker crosses caste. Parallel to this question of administration, and different forms of making. We need to focus on the managerial and the administrative and understanding them as processes of making, that need to be

inhabited. Where do we go next? How do we reformulate institutions? Management and administration are processes of making that don't require the same skills as artists, academics, curators, but migrating between those things is the political process that we need to be in control of, in order to be able to dictate the terms of the histories we want to produce in the world.

Adrian: that is my point about the term neoliberal. Administration is absorbed into daily life. People do a bit of everything.

Andrea: Caste, class in British terms. Art schools are incredibly powerful in the distribution of this myth, that emergence goes one way, you emerge and you stay there. What I like about Anshuman's story, is the acceptance, the humility of understanding the moments of visibility/visuality have one quality, one gestural being in the world, and then one has to remove oneself and put oneself in another situation. Can we find ways of thinking through institutions in that way?

Vivian: Marxist question. You always emerge up. What does it mean to interrupt that economy of desire that is teleologically ascendant?

Andrea: the use of the skill. Can we remove the colonial power plays; think about the mechanisms of up and down.

Anjalika: Elzbieta Walters was saying in relation to Tagore that the desire to be hypervisible all the time is exhausting. You need to work within the temporalities you want to work with, and not always fit in into the institutional demands. It is important to not always be producing. To retreat.