

ETC



re: Quotes

Artivistic

Number 98, February–June 2013

Informer

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/68780ac>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Revue d'art contemporain ETC inc.

ISSN

0835-7641 (print)

1923-3205 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

Artivistic (2013). re: Quotes. *ETC*, (98), 23–27.

re:

Quotes

kevin: Hmm.
On further reading, I think I see what's bugging me, it seems like we are talking about/around what we are doing *it/something/our way/on construit*—whereas I think we need to find a way to use these quotes as the doing itself... does that make sense?

faiz: Yeah for sure, the doing itself. but we've only managed to get at it rather than puncture it, transverse it, transcend it, encompass it, recollect it, be in relation to it in hindsight or at least in contact, rather than just reach its proximity. at some point we have to just say, ok, that's the best we can do for now.

kevin: Yup, yup, keep workin...
it's important to be a little more generous to the viewer/reader, give them something to hold on to/start from... right now I feel a certain selfishness in our references, a sort of coded obscurity/vagueness, and also a bit of fear about tackling things concretely. What is *it*? What is *something*? ya know?

faiz: Re what is *something*, vince himself seems to have a problem with that one: "It must ((A)) expose the falseness of the commodity spectacle, and ((B)) it must give people a renewed sense of what is beautiful, and what is to be desired."

we do A just fine. we are hyper critical. I am to a degree that sometimes brushes complete and utter disconnect. I practically float off my gas. but B, you're right, we haven't defined—but not from lack of will—"what is to be desired," "something," something something something. in fact, it's not something, it's something. *everything*.

sophie: I think it would be more efficient if we defined our objectives with the quotes. Sayings on a wall can only go so far and we shouldn't try to make them do *everything*. Once we agree collectively on the aims, we can better judge whether it "works" or not...

I think what we value can be communicated in the other projects too... and because I trust our process (meeting every week and coming up with things together), I believe that relations/meanings will be created when everything comes together...

We kind of talked about this last night: we can focus more on why/how "something" is difficult to define, and understand that there are reasons for that, rather than "forcing" it.

Also, we know what "something" is: anticapitalist/antiauthoritarian practices, being nice, etc. But we don't want to call it that because it's been coopted already. It's so much more: it's also being funny when the time is right, being helpful when the time is right, being stylish when the time is right, being drunk when the time is right, being focused when the time is right, etc. Why would we want to reduce that in a saying?? Words can be so oppressive/deceptive/misleading, it's quite something to subvert them and I think we've been doing that... value but do not fetishize.

kevin: Mmmm...
Though I kinda agree, I'm also not so sure. I don't think that anyone will necessarily know what "something" is. As much as this process is for us, I think it's important as I mentioned to be generous to someone just walking in.

I understand the desire to not be oppressive/authoritarian in the statements, but that's exactly my point... if people don't have a point of entry into the texts, isn't that more authoritarian, or at least exclusive/elitist? I don't think it's actually a question of reduction, I think it's more about openness (funny, drunk, etc.), but each statement coming from a particular perspective (funny, drunk, etc.).

Anyways, I actually really like most of what you guys have come up with, I just think it's important to have more of a balance, as I find a lot of the statements a bit too "meta." If we want freedom, why do we have to hide it? there are reasons, but they should be good ones.

Which leads into our objectives. I think we want the statements to make people think/question about how important it is to build new systems of value, and how to enact that in the current fucked up world... heh. I don't think it should be about us.

sophie: Hmm, but I think it should be about us... that's part of the process of valuing... who are we to give people answers? that's so expected of us. (and a bit boring) in a way, the message might be: do your own process, talk to

people, read an effin book, you'll see it's worth it... if we want people to get a grip, it's by entering our own subjectivity(ies), our own process... necessarily by fragments. I don't want to say that we want freedom: I want people to see that that's what we've been doing, through our process, through the ways that we approach this exhibition (beyond critique). I don't want to tell people what to think, I want to make people think... anyway, I think we're saying the same thing but different things turn us on/off (I'm more interested in process-based art, or "meta" as you call it, than propaganda art) so, yes, balance...

The question of generosity is an interesting one... but it's something worth questioning too... what is elitist to you might be humble for another person... like some people say, the road to hell is paved with good intentions :)

kevin: This is a good conversation... :P
I didn't mean to say it shouldn't be about us, of course it should, you're right. I guess what I meant is that I feel it shouldn't only be accessible to us... the key being that we want people to be able or enticed (propaganda as it were) to enter our subjectivities, which I guess for me just requires a bit of rhetorical/aesthetic commitment/poetic tropes. beautiful maybe... I totally get the resistance to "propaganda," but there's a fine line to it just not being engaging.

It's nice to position it that "we want people to see that that's what we've been doing..." I totally agree, again along the lines of "something"... I guess I feel we need to make that more visible, because if I were an outsider, I'm not sure I would feel it...

I don't want to edit the doc without consultation, so here are a few comments/adjustments. see what you guys like or don't like...

sophie: Making it more visible, yes. I think we could work more on that for sure. or, at least think about it more (not just say it doesn't work but say why and then work on it together)... I think we will have 'succeeded' if the work speaks for itself (and not at people)... I'd like the space to convey a sense of experimentation... like hey, we're trying things. you can too. we'd like you to. I think that addresses the point about desire (cf. vince's definition). make it a fun, welcoming space.

I like your changes to the statements.
I really like our French quotes because they make French exotic but they also show that we 'master' the language... it's like reverse tokenism. tongue-in-cheek and sophisticated. *Dans ta face!*

faiz: touché

Le collectif ARTIVISTIC

Le collectif ARTIVISTIC is currently in transition, experimenting ways of being perpetually creative within a hostile political and economic context. Artivistic emerges out of the proposition that not only artists can talk about art, activists about activism, and academics about theory. Artivistic aims to inspire, proliferate, activate.

*Consensus
did not form*

SELF-ASSERTION ≠ SELF-REPRESENTATION



Artistic, Infrastructures entrelacées (Phase 2).
Skol, March-April 2012.

HUNGRY & | STRANGE | LIKE CASH

WE COULD BE

~~USEFUL & POETIC~~

Une chasseuse sachant chasser sans son chien
n'échange pas le produit de sa chasse,
elle le donne.



~~If you're poorer than you think you are,
then you're poor.
If you're richer than you think you are,
then you're rich.~~

Something,
Everything,
Anything,

Our refusals
× OUR DESIRES

Nothing.