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ONCURATING
PROJECT SPACE
Once upon a time, the appellation “queer” named an opposition to identity politics, a commitment to coalition, a vision of alternative worlds. Now it has become a weak umbrella term for a confederation of identitarian concerns. It is time to move on, to confuse the enemy, to become illegible, invisible, anonymous. In the words of José Muñoz, “we have never been queer.” Says Jack and no, I don’t quote her surname right here, maybe later, because this is an invitation to an artists’ contribution. If I wanted to put out a contribution to philosophical format I would make the effort of and develop an ARGUMENTATION which comes with and through and by philosophical concepts - fuck arts’ PSEUDOACADEMIA - but here we go, what we have here is another genre. It’s too opinionated and too much angry polemics to be a conversation or a dialogue. It’s too tired for a manifesto. Maybe what this could be called is an after talk of a manifesto. Anonymous, obviously. Anonymous, but generous. Anonymous generosity.

I think what is also interesting and contradictory about the present moment is a certain schizoid two-hand over-identification and de-naturalisation of remaining colonial art institutional power and authority by ‘autonomous’ and independent practitioners for the purpose of the defense of infrastructures.

It cannot continue with the quoted identity politics from above nor go towards we have never been modern, even though both would pave a nice entrance for the question at hand since THE INSTITUTION is a modern thing and looking BEFORE or OUTSIDE modernity takes us outside the west and into the rest, as Stuart named it, and right in. BUT hold on a moment, how do you get outside the thing that made us, aha - it makes us stay in relation to where we are speaking from – ok then and SO no, I will not take the science fiction part neither but dwell a little around with good old EXPENDITURE and yes, TECHNOLOGY. It may sound old school but we haven’t mastered to think about algorithms yet and while people chase magick and turn retro for some answers, many forget to look in front of them. Expenditure and technology, if anything then - AS MAGIC - and what is inherent yet not yet at work in dominant economies and their ECOCLOGIES OF ATTENTION. Whaa-haat – for whom – and who does it serve – we do know our post-marxist feminist adage yet we have moved toward a somewhat more speculative terrain. YET stay with me, it's getting real AND SPECIFIC toward ANONYMOUS GENEROSITY. It could be a cousin of General Intellect I think. What was it I read with Mohammad the other day, yes
Thank you to bring forward performance in high times of crisis. «It's OK to be angry.»

Invent a system where, no surprises, but very efficient in their routine together. Remember that there is something hidden and often invisible. We can't change that, but we can get into it. The unknown and obscure can be very right. The unknown and obscure can be very right.

Thank you Michael. It stays wild because total recall is not possible. We can't forget that there is something hidden and often invisible. We can't change that, but we can get into it. The unknown and obscure can be very right.

Thank you. It didn't take too long until they all got bored with each other and stopped doing workshops. Like, if one takes it seriously, that's what I am talking about. Withonda, it may have been institutional critique that supported their relationship and fueled their passion.

We don't mind if we don't understand and actually, it's wonderful if something overwhelms and dissolves whatever had been known to me as me before. – Zzzzzzz

Wonder is a primary affect, says René. The unknown and obscure can be very right.

Thank you Danielle. Ah ja genau, really deciding to do it, it may have been institutional critique that supported their relationship and fueled their passion.

The unknown and obscure can be very right. The unknown and obscure can be very right.
ANONYMOUS GENEROSITY

Ja Genau, where we got started. It is about how an artist does or does not colonize materials - and therefore possibly 'a people' via their taking part through and as aesthetic experience. Which becomes a technology - that is, the making of a particular attention – and this makes way whether a position or a piece are more or less prone to the always more or less ENDO-COLONIAL mechanisms of an institution – any institution: be it marriage between people or marriage between disciplines, tendencies or trends, be it open relationships between curators and audience or be it flirtations or more profound connections between philosophical concepts, artistic propositions and materials, be it affairs or ONS with no consequences between working structures and material practices and/or FORM or a whole other set of serious engagements and commitment. Don't be afraid of form. If philosophy is statements of truth, arts are statements of form, thank you Marcus. But of course an ARTIST is not alone and if she is artist FOR REAL – and forget about putting quotation marks, times of irony are over there is a wind blowing of another kind – it hums and loudly sings TALES OF EXTINCTION - no fun to put THAT ONE in quotation marks – so FOR REAL means she will never be finished and therefore, something she is is something that she is becoming rather than identifying with, dividual obvi, thanks again Gills, and being-artist is nothing but a function towards an operation for the work of art COZ we DO WANT to give autonomy to the art work by CREATING BUFFER ZONES thankyou Kiguchi. Or let's just pause and stop answering open calls and head for an OPENING VIA STRUCTURAL COUPLING thank you Niklas, my first love ever.

IN THE END IT WILL BE SIMPLE: PUT YOURSELF TO SERVICE and forget about anything you already knew - forget what you identified with - forget about anything strategic or career FOR SURE and start to put yourself to DELEARN-ing and never stop insisting on changeability and ON WONDER yes that one – again - it's been called CONTINGENCY for the last 10 years or so, Niklas brought that up for me a long time ago though, and for now and more prominently - let's demystify that one too WHILE KEEPING DISENCHANTMENT OUT OF THE HOUSE when everything is under the logic of derivatives THAT WHICH PUTS US AT AWE is that which may or may not be already inherent AND COULD BE COMPLETELY OTHERWISE - the institution needs to take a step back and engage with the BASICS which is content content content via materials materials materials – there is NO SPACE FOR YOU there is no space for personal relating to something like 'YOUR WORK', it doesn't exist no more. There is only a negation of you and the negative space of identity which is GENEROUS because it doesn't take you too serious and in that sense, you can be or not, contingently, become what you may think or didn't think you weren't to be. And when in or with THE INSTITUTION – IT NEEDS TO LOOK TO WHERE IT HURTS and to what it has been and what it is constantly excluding. For this, the institution needs you to be FORMAL AND INHUMANE in order to go beyond the identitarian YOU – the one that is called individual and will always be driven by a desire for more power and private interest – AND THAT IS WHY then, THE INSTITUTION NEEDS to understand that the materials don't need it and that ART DON'T NEED IT but that the institutions need art and that ART doesn't come from individuals - btw also not from some romantic and sentimental idea of collective - BUT FROM THAT WHICH IS AND HAS ALWAYS BEEN AND CANNOT OTHERWISE but stay WILD. Forget about Nature. OR about culture, so to speak. Nature same same. ALGORITHMIC INTUITIONS. In times of SOUL EXPLOITATION which goes via IDENTITY PRODUCTION and overwhelming sociability yes, ruled by technologies, IDENTITY lives off affect and proves to be the most fluid and efficient currency YES let's look at technologies of and for the SOUL not because we lack another word but because it's a good one – an inhumane and formally indifferent soul THAT could be a tool in this task – DECOLONIZING THROUGH AN ENDO-COLONIZING FILTER and producing ANONYMOUS GENEROSITY.
«The territorial body has been polluted by roads, elevators, etc. Similarly, our animal body starts being polluted. Ecology no longer deals with water, flora, wildlife and air only. It deals with the body itself as well. It is comparable with an invasion: technology is invading our body because of miniaturization.»

THE INSTITUTION NEEDS TO TAKE ITSELF LESS SERIOUS AND REMEMBER THAT IT IS OF SERVICE TO THE ARTS. WHICH IS MAKING A PARTICULAR ATTENTION. THAT IS ITS MAIN TECHNOLOGY. IT DEPENDS ON THE USERS WHAT A TECHNOLOGY DOES. THAT'S WHY. EVERY STEP COUNTS. THE SAME COUNTS FOR THE ARTISTS WHO NEEDS TO TAKE THEMSELVES LESS SERIOUS AND NEED TO REMEMBER THAT ART IS OF SERVICE TO THE SOUL.

Which is a somewhat impossible formulation for most post post any isms, but therefore even more so important. Fucking get over your what you think are your SELVES and start to GET REAL:

AND a-1 & a-2 & a-1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8 SOUL WORKERS OF THE COSMOS > > > UNITE