

Janna Graham (2018) 'Where are we when we think?' Space, time and emancipatory education in galleries, in *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 37:1, 21-39, DOI: 10.1080/02601370.2017.1406548

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370.2017.1406548>

## **ABSTRACT**

Adult education in art galleries sits on a fault line, at once an apparatus upholding the affirmative aspects of museum culture cultivated by global elites, a propellant in the whirring of an increasingly dislocated set of events on trendy and consumable political themes, and a site for 'allyship' and other kinds of radical and socially transformative work. Resurrecting Hannah Arendt's question, 'where are we when we think?' this paper explores how we might move from a moment in which the 'space' of the gallery is replaced by the 'time' of the event (Helguera) and towards embedded space-times that attempt to address contemporary urgencies through situated practices that collectively analyse and respond to conditions. Drawn from examples derived from the author's practice, the paper argues for the use of popular education and anti-colonial pedagogies in the production of adult education in galleries, suggesting that such processes support groups in collectively naming and thinking through conflicts to re-shape both the galleries in which they have congregated and the worlds beyond their doors. This paper suggests that the re-construction and use of the often forgotten genealogies of emancipatory education are pivotal to doing social justice work in galleries.

CONTACT Janna graham [janna.graham@gmail.com](mailto:janna.graham@gmail.com), [jgraham@gold.ac.uk](mailto:jgraham@gold.ac.uk) © 2018 Informa UK limited, trading as Taylor & Francis group

## **KEYWORDS**

adult education; allyship; popular education; critical pedagogy; art galleries

## **Adult education in art galleries as a site of struggle**

In recent years, adult education in galleries, and the global contemporary art sphere more generally has been increasing in scale, scope and recognition. Discursive, public events described as the provision of 'platforms for discussion and debate', are increasingly prominent including workshops, lectures, conversations and research projects bridging the work that has historically fallen under the remit of gallery education departments, and projects initiated directly by artists, curators and academic researchers. As such adult education in galleries might equally be geared towards 'communities', the term often used for people of lower income and education or as the elaboration of an artistic or curatorial concept, engaging with 'publics' who are less defined but generally encompass middle-class, educated audiences. This implicit and problematic distinction demonstrates that adult education in galleries, though often couched in the language of the emancipatory and the democratic, exists rather on the fault line between liberatory trajectories of adult education and the traditional role of the museum in affirming the knowledges and values of corporate and cultural elites. Educator and curator Sally Tallant indeed suggests that this acceleration of discursive, adult education events has the potential to bridge these functions, pushing the pedagogical, the curatorial and the artistic – and therefore those working in the interests of communities, university knowledge production and aesthetic creation – into closer proximity, through what she describes as 'integrated' programming (Tallant, 2009, p. 1).

This article examines this fault line in gallery-based adult education, specifically examining the way in which time and space are configured. It draws from both the literature surrounding gallery education and examples drawn from my own practices of engaging with emancipatory pedagogy in galleries and social movements. It argues that the latter have much to teach the rapidly proliferating practitioners and audiences of adult education programming with regard to how we might wrench back the space-times of public debate towards effective collaboration around the urgent issues of our time.

### **The 'real estate' of time**

Though forms of adult education in art institutions has existed since their inception, discursive events such as these have proliferated more widely since the 1990s and have increasingly focused on social and political problematics. Prominent international arts events such as DocumentaXI, a large contemporary art exhibition that takes place in Germany every five years, Manifesta X, a roving European Biennial of Contemporary art, that changes its location every two years and talking 'marathons' at galleries, biennials and art fairs, have positioned adult education in this discursive form centrally within curatorial platforms, over or alongside the traditional exhibition display, and exhibition-driven lecture programmes, addressing such wide reaching political topics as democracy, climate change, urban conflict, migration and education. The narratives surrounding the growth of these kinds of adult education suggest that they are instances in which to engage in 'knowledge production' (Enwezor, 2002, p. 43), to enact a 'dialogue' (Kester, 1999/2000, p. 10) and part of a general move from the 'aura of artworks to publics' in contemporary art (Bourriaud, 2002, p. 58). Equally they are seen to activate moments of political and critical encounter less available in the increasingly privatised realms that were formerly assigned to public debate (Osborne, 2008).

Artist and curator Pablo Helguera suggests that this increase in discursive, event-based adult education marks a significant and experimental tendency in the field of contemporary art, shifting emphasis from space to time. Helguera suggests that where artist-run collaborative spaces were central to the organisation of alternative practices of the art of the 70s and 80s, discursive adult education events, necessitated in part by the difficulty in procuring and maintaining spaces in large urban centres, allow artists, curators and audiences to focus on the why – the urgent issues of our time – over the where of their organisation. Through the temporality of the event, artists and arts organisations can 'embrace their *raison d'être* more emphatically' as 'they are not rooted in permanence'. 'Today', Helguera suggests, 'time is our real estate, and learning how to use it productively is as important, and perhaps even more important, than how we use the four walls of a gallery' (Helguera, 2010, pp. 1–4). While this proliferation of discursive events or 'platforms' has been posed as an act of resistance to what curator Okwe Enwezor describes as the 'optics and visual logic of contemporary art' and its tendencies towards 'grand conclusions' (Enwezor, 2002, p. 43), a growing body of literature critically reads the movement towards the social, the political, the 'radical', the 'urgent' in arts institutions as problematic. It suggests institutions often fail to examine the contradictions between the questions provoked by politically themed events and exhibitions and the organising structures of the contemporary art world that they inhabit. In the context of the neoliberalised contemporary art world, such critics argue that the production of political rhetorics and sensations without the means through which publics can act and respond to these issues, results in a kind of marketisation of experiences or 'pimping' (Rolnik, 2006) through which cultural institutions, among others, produce a post-democratic theatre of political engagement (Holmes, 2004; Steyerl, 2010) rather than effective political action or antagonism. Blocks to political action, they argue, exists at the level of subjectivities produced by such events – in which audiences are relatively passive and in which they are

exposed to an excess of theory over practice – as much as through organisational formations like boards of directors, and sponsors who may actively or implicitly bar the production of political consequences. Furthermore, the particular emphasis on collective speaking and thinking in public that is favoured by event-based adult education programmes in galleries, has been problematised as an example of post-Fordist labour's erosion of public culture and its overemphasis on language production, what critic Paulo Virno describes as 'publicness without a public sphere' (Graham, Graziano, & Kelly, 2016, p. 230; Virno, 2004).

Others have suggested that the de-linking of political themes from political actions in contemporary art is not only a by-product of neoliberalism's tendency towards the overproduction of speech, but by now represents a systematic collusion between corporations, governments and arts organisations to 'artwash' their involvement in socially and ecologically detrimental projects (Evans, 2015, p. 13; Miranda & Lane-Mckinley, 2017). Recent interventions into biennial events including protests staged in the public programmes in the lead up to the 13th Istanbul Biennial, themed around 'public alchemy' and more recently in response to Documenta XIV's programmed titled 'the parliament of bodies' (Open Letter, 2017) have indicated a growing awareness of the distance between the political language of such events – their claims to open-ness, democracy, public debate and critically informed thematics – and their role within processes of gentrification, urban displacement and corporate expansion. In the word of anthropologist Elpida Rikou, 'Art production today has to think about the relationship between grassroots projects and the institutions that adopt the same language' (Puleo, 2017).

Attempting to navigate these contradictory tendencies, proponents of 'critical' gallery mediation or education such as (Mörsch, 2014, p. 9) suggest that gallery education, inclusive of adult education and the production of discursive events, operates as a 'dispositive' at the intersection of contradictory discourses. These discourses include affirmative and reproductive discourses that align with broader projects of colonialism and paternalism: the maintenance of the museum, gallery and social structures as they are, and deconstructive and transformative provocations aligned with emancipatory social movements that re-work galleries and society as they could be (Allen, 2008; Mörsch, 2009, pp. 9–15). Defined here as a terrain of struggle with conflicting and contradictory ideologies, Mörsch and others call for research practices that test approaches informed by praxes and histories of radical pedagogy and social justice to highlight and navigate the conflicts that emerge. In a collaborative facilitation of practice-based research at the international contemporary art exhibition Documenta XII, for example, such 'critical' gallery educators initiated and documented their own investigative processes, probing the degree to which interactions with the public, many of which in the form of adult education tour programmes could be understood as a sites of active research into institutional and social change informed by queer, feminist and post-colonial theory (Mörsch et al., 2009).

Though the 'unglamorous tasks' (Sternfeld, 2010) of gallery educators in general and those engaged in social justice work in particular, have remained largely unexamined, this paper builds on these 'critical' approaches to gallery education as well as on recent work in art criticism (Martin-Merchant, 2017, pp. 56–64) and Adult Education Studies (Clover, 2015; Clover & Sanford, 2016; Clover, Sanford, Bell, & Johnson, 2016) that highlights the significance of genealogies of radical pedagogy for the field of adult education in galleries. In it, I suggest that the re-construction and use of these often forgotten genealogies of popular education are a pivotal aspect of social justice work in galleries and in the field of contemporary art more generally. Engaging with them opens up the capacity to intervene into the problematic character of discursive adult education events and the critique that it is

unable to foster conditions of social justice and social change. More specifically, I argue that popular and radical education experiences and histories allow for a re-working of the conceptualisation of time and space offered by Helguera. Rather than replacing spatial with temporal concerns, adult education in galleries might be activated as a space-time in which to engage in interventions into both the means of discursive event production, i.e. the conflictual conditions under which they are produced, as well as the broader social and political questions that are inferred by the language of urgency mobilised in the proliferation of programming events. This mode of dual intervention will be relayed by way of my recounting of two attempts at emancipatory adult education programming galleries from my own experience and the genealogies with which they engage.

The first example emerges from the genealogy of popular education as read through Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Popular education is a term used by educators in Latin America to refer to radical education work and more specifically, 'a process of learning that begins with the experience of participants and that applies processes of critical dialogue to share, challenge and inform that experience in order to create new knowledge'. This definition is offered by the Catalyst Centre (2017), a site in which I was trained in popular education strategies in the 1990s. Here, I suggest the important insights offered by popular education to re-thinking the binary between space and time that often underpins the dichotomies between education and exhibition-making in galleries. I suggest that popular education lends language and praxes to working through a more conflictual and complex set of relations around pedagogical conditions in galleries. I draw from my experience as the curator of an off-site education and research space titled the Centre for Possible Studies, where we used popular education to unravel and respond to power relations within and outside of Serpentine Galleries who hosted the project. In this section, I draw both from my own memories and from notes taken through the process of group discussions used within the process but authorised by the group for external publication around the project.

A second genealogy is drawn from anti-colonial pedagogies that I experienced as a white, European undergraduate researcher working within indigenous communities in Canada in the 1990s in which I was trained in the 'pedagogy of allyship'. I chart the ways this pedagogy of allyship also provokes questions about the relationship between space and time, orienting towards practices of commitment and solidarity. Here, I situate this anti-colonial pedagogy within the attempt of a UK Chapter of a transnational black led anti-racism movement to work with a UK-based art gallery, where I was an adult education curator. The reflections presented in this section are based on my own diary notes through the process. Names and particularities of events have therefore been anonymised. These sections of the paper are written through the lens of my own experience. This is for two reasons: one, because many of the knowledges that are mobilised within gallery education in the contemporary art field are tacit, singular and interstitial, falling between fields of theory, practice and between personal genealogies and group processes. Reflective writing allows for a reading of gallery education at these intersections, though here situated within broader discussions and debates in the field. A second call to write from the experience of arts education emerges from critical gallery educators described earlier in this section, who understand situated practices in gallery education as sites of active experimentation and research. This is a practice-based notion of research that suggests that the work of adult education in galleries be self-reflexive and investigative making use of artistic, curatorial and pedagogical methods that may border with but rarely conform to research conventions associated with the social sciences. None of the examples used in this text, were therefore set up under the conventions or conditions of academic research and draw heavily from informal processes of note-taking, diary writing

and memory. Where necessary, the names of groups and persons have been anonymised. This way of working is implicitly written into the genealogies of popular and anti-colonial education themselves, whose methodological concerns are oriented towards practices of knowledge production for social change and not research per se. As such radical pedagogy, popular education and allyship are not here presented exclusively in their canonical or written forms, but rather explicated and performed as a set of lived and learned experiences that move between the collective, political lives of popular struggles and the individual lives of those who participate in them.

### **Where are we when we think? The space-time of popular education vs. the ‘nowhere’ of the event**

Before moving on to these examples, I want to return to Helguera’s proposition that discursive adult education events occupy the ‘real estate of time’ and that ‘learning how to use [this time] productively is as important, and perhaps even more important, than how we use the four walls of a gallery’. His suggestions of a movement in importance from space to time is echoed by others informed attempting to narrate more dialogical and social formats in the arts, including the notion of ‘durational aesthetics’ (O’Neill, 2014; O’Neill & Doherty, 2011) and the suggestion of a movement from the notion of public space to ‘public’ or ‘cohabitational’ time in adult-oriented art and education practices. Here, the ‘durational’ is seen as an alternative to spatial and representable forms that manifest in the enclosed spaces of spectacular exhibition formats and their entrapment of politics and social in what is perceived to be a hierarchically delivered and consumable state of exception from the world. Calls to ‘post-representational’ (Holmes, 2004) practices and to place emphasis on ‘the real estate of time’ over space, however, often pose discursive events engaging publics as a kind of alternative without delving into the various circumstances under which such events are produced, which in many cases replicate these same problematics of spectacle. Here, an engagement with popular education repositions a movement in emphasis from place to time – one that valorises the latter over the former – towards a time-space that questions of commitment and process. This is not to argue against the importance of thinking about time in adult education events, but to suggest that an overemphasis or over-valorisation of the temporal, or less representational aspects of education work often fails to recognise the particularities of location and therefore the concrete politics of production that implicate both institutions and the worlds beyond their doors.

It is here useful to resurrect a question posed by Hannah Arendt in her book *The Life of the Mind*, through which she asks ‘Where are We When We Think’?. For Arendt, this question is not easily resolved. In the first instance, she suggests, the where of thinking, is ‘nowhere’ (Arendt, 1971, p. 197). Collective thought and thinking take place, it would appear, as argued by Helguera, in time over place. However, as Jeff Malpas suggests, this nowhere of thought is still very much located in a space-time, a moment in which one (or ones in the case of adult education events) attempt to navigate a location between the past and the present, or the ‘presence of what is present’ (Malpas, 2015). Here, the present is understood not only as the now of the contemporary, but as a located set of conditions in which a struggle is situated. Within the collective thought of adult education events, then, it could be argued, one is located in the struggle between the past and the present, in a movement that sees thinking as a contentious encounter with conditions of past and future in both time and space.

This alliance of space and time is importantly considered within the writing of popular education theorist Paulo Freire. For he and other popular educators, the work of popular

education does not take place in time or space but rather, Freire suggests, in an effort to temporalise space. To illustrate this he quotes the writing of Pierre Furter as follows: The goal will no longer be to eliminate the risks of temporality by clutching to guaranteed space, but rather to temporalise space ... The universe is revealed to me not as space, imposing a massive presence to which I can but adapt, but as a scope, a domain which takes shape as I act upon it. (Freire, 1970/2000, p. 92)

So, while he suggests that the work of popular education must surpass the enclosures of space, through what Freire describes as 'authentic dialogue', he does not abandon the question of location, but suggest that it be temporalised. By this he means, oriented towards actions that might manifest in a future that antagonises and overcomes the oppressions of the present. Beyond the positioning of space over time, he suggests that what mobilises this movement of temporalised space is commitment to acting upon the conditions of the present. Without such a commitment, he suggests dialogue produces 'alienated verbosity'. (Freire, 1970/2000, p. 71) Equally, action without thought, that is, without reflective time and space, is 'mere activism' (Freire, 2000, p. 65). The locatedness of a group's coming together in dialogue in response to its 'historical conditions', like in Arendt, understands location not as a reification of those conditions but rather as an opening onto the future, through action that is both antagonistic and propositional: to oppose and propose, as Freire suggests.

This shift from a debate between time and space to a prioritisation of the commitment to a contingent relationship between collective thought and action is useful in the face of those suggesting that a move to temporal considerations in adult education in galleries necessarily allows groups to focus on the 'why' of urgent social issues or work against the 'fixity' of location. It suggests that without querying the commitment and preparedness to act of those engaged in adult education encounters, those characteristics attributed to space – fixity, lack of experimentation, avoidance of urgent questions – are easily replicated. In Freire, the question of commitment in the temporised space of popular education, moves through time and space by way of a situated process. Displacing another dichotomisation produced in the discourses surrounding contradictions in the art field more generally, that argue for movement from the representational to the 'post-representational', Freire suggests an endlessly looping movement between the two, through recurring practices of 'codification' (representations of oppressive conditions) and de-codification (discursive unpacking of these conditions) (Freire, 1970/2000, pp. 113–124).

To argue this in more detail, in the next section I will outline how both of these elements – commitment and situated process – shifted the frame of work an analysis within my own orientation towards contemporary adult education programme.

### **Popular education as 'naming the moment'**

I introduce this first example by way of my own engagement with popular education, through working with the Catalyst Centre, a radical education and resource centre in Toronto that drew from anti-capitalist and anti-colonial struggle across from Latin America under the term 'popular education'. As suggested by the definition offered in the introduction to this paper, popular education does not refer to education that is popular with students or addresses popular culture as it is proliferated through mainstream television or music. It is rather the practice of coming to knowledge by those most impacted by a situation. In the 1980s and 1990s, the movements of popular education in Latin America met with existing grass-roots education practices in North America through the cultivation

of initiatives like the Alforja network, who subsequently created tools and workshops on the facilitation of popular education and research processes for use by groups working across national borders on anti-globalisation initiatives. During my involvement in training workshops drawing from these networks in the late 1990s and early 2000s, the Catalyst Centre was an important meeting space for those working on anti-globalisation organising, to learn from the intersection of existing radical education and research practices in North America, and those that emerged from activism in Latin America. I went to support my involvement in anti-globalisation movements, but also because I was navigating the tensions between my background as an activist and my first job as an art gallery educator at a large-scale gallery in Toronto. I was there that I delved deeply, for the first time, in the *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, the title of a book written by Brazilian educator Paulo Freire, and the name, as I learned it, given to the practices and processes espoused by groups who had used it as a reference. These groups were not constituted around single authors, but produced their own resources from struggles in which they worked through the ideas of Freire and others, so my use of the term equally references their labour and contribution as Freire's documented work.

At that time I was struck by the tools provided by advocates of popular education and the *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. They moved very quickly between registers of change in the world and change in the group and its relations of power. They supported an analysis of the contradictions that I and the groups – young people, indigenous theatre groups, etc. – were experiencing in attempting to use an art gallery for social justice work. They gave language to the process of analysing and acting upon conditions of power and they provided a space in which to think the inter-connections of movements and moments. Of particular interest were practices associated with what was described as 'naming the moment'. In a workbook titled *Naming the Moment: Political Analysis for Action*, for example, the notion of naming as the conjectural analysis of the complex conditions of space and time in which a group is situated, was particularly useful in helping us to understand that the question of urgency could not be determined by an artist, or a curator, or an exhibition at the gallery, but from the conundrums we encountered in relation to the complicated space and time that constituted our moment. While the notion of 'the moment' is temporal, the workbook offered insights into how a group might come to such a conjunctural analysis through its analysis of the time and space of current conditions. For example, by representing a social or political problematic as a tree, groups could move from the tangle of experiences, into the contextual and historical roots of an issue. Through the creation of a shared timeline or 'river' of our own histories with social change and their turning points could bring existing knowledge of our place and time together. Through collective production and analysis of photographs we could understand how social inequality manifests in particular spaces and times and the power relations that produce them (Barndt, 1989, p. 30). 'The moment', as revealed by engaging with these practices, existed as the production of intertwining of knowledges about the group, its own conditions of subjectivity, the commitment and knowledge found within it and our shared inhabitation of hierarchy, elitism and racism that structured both the museum and the broader society's vilification of young people in the city. Both the representational aspects of these experiences that had been codified, and our work to de-codify our experiences, suggested a model for how artists, educators and galleries might be re-positioned towards the making of reflections that supported the work of social justice more broadly and the way in which we might understand moments beyond the timeframe of the 'event' and towards deep analyses of the conditions and conflicts we inhabited in the present. This cyclical movement of reflection, analysis and action, and of dialogue continuously feeding into action named by Freire and other popular education practitioners, also named our own aspiration to move beyond the production of events that we were increasingly

called upon by the gallery to generate, and rather towards 'naming the moment', and the conflicts and struggles we encountered both in the gallery and outside of it.

Freire's cyclical notion of action and dialogue – in which action without dialogue is simply 'activism', that is, unthoughtful response, and dialogue without action is seen to be akin to 'alienation' – is underpinned by questions of commitment. Naming here goes beyond the creation of new terminology – something also valorised obsessively by many event-based approaches to adult education in galleries – and moves into the cultivation of actions, which again are the subject for reflection. Commitment, in this context, has both spatial and temporal dimensions. It extends over time but also comes to bear on the spaces in which a collective trajectory is initiated. This commitment is often the source of conflict, as it suggests a different relation to spaces and times allocated for pedagogical activities in galleries.

It is here where emancipatory popular educators can be understood as distinct from the many 'participation' and 'engagement' practitioners who use popular education methods and tools to secure state and corporate power and the global distribution of capital (Zibechi, 2012). Where for this latter group, popular education provides a set of tools within existing conditions, for emancipatory educators, 'naming the moment' and 'naming the conflicts' that emerge suggest a commitment to the radical contestation of oppressive structures in alignment with those who experience them the most profoundly.

Years later in 2008, I began working in an urban neighbourhood in London's Edgware Road area as a curator and adult educator. Here, I was entangled once again with an art gallery, this time one situated in a park adjacent to a major through-fare, and an area home to some of the wealthiest people in the world alongside some of the most precarious. The gallery that was the Edgware Road project's host, the Serpentine, has both a historical relationship to poor and migrant residents, these so-called 'hard to reach' or vulnerable people, (as they were referred to in funding documents) but an even stronger affiliation with the wealthy class of land owners and developers seeking to 'regenerate' the neighbourhood to the exclusion of all others.

This area is commonly referred to as representing the Middle East in London (due to the migrant communities who have developed its local culture), sits on land that was bequeathed by Henry the VIII to two great paradigms of Euro-western culture: The Church of England and the aristocratic property developers, the Portman Family, who together continue to own the majority of land on either side of the Edgware Road. Three regeneration schemes in the area aim to displace the poor, all interested in how contemporary artists, curators and public programmes can support them in executing a 'strong curatorial vision' for the area, where 'strong' and 'curatorial' are equated with top down, tidy paradigms of social cleansing. Equally, the Edgware Road, has always been the site of the production of other we's, minor histories: of sex workers, of the poor, of migrants and refugees.

Amongst this complicated terrain, myself and others (artists, area residents, students, archivists and activists) who worked on the Edgware Road project sought not to wash away the unease of this position, but for what Isabelle Stengers describes as an 'ecology of practices' (Stengers, 2005), practices that could address this unease of our positioning as a constituent component of our work. It was our hope that such an ecology would enable practices of solidarity to emerge with those whose shops, homes and livelihoods were deemed dispensable in the development process, while at the same time skirting around, below, above and away from the gaze of these organising entities. It was our aspiration to listen for and with the quiet and less audible encounters, of lives lived and



crossed, of unpredictable constituencies and coalitions between human and other than human things, to fight against the quiet violence of urban dispossession.

In 2009, we created the Centre for Possible Studies as an archive and community resource located in abandoned buildings on and off the Edgware Road with a strong commitment to social justice. For the community groups and artists who worked as part of this itinerant entity, the study and praxis of popular education was a central feature and guided us in thinking through how we might make considered and critical interventions into the contradictory forces at play in the shaping of our work. Over the course of seven years, those involved engaged in the collective practice of 'naming the moment' and 'naming the conflict' with migrant and non-migrant people through theatre workshops, which came to be known as Implicated Theatre. As a core and on-going group at the Centre, Implicated adapted strategies of popular literacy and popular theatre to create projects that analysed the different and overlapping issues facing the group's precarious migrant people and cultural workers. The group's name, 'Implicated', emerged through the use of Augusto Boal's Theatre of the Oppressed to create images, Boal's term for gestural tableaux – that is 'pictures' of a particular situation of oppression sculpted from bodies, used by group members and wider audience to analyse the situation. In one such image of oppression it became clear that the formulation of oppressed/oppressor did not adequately reflect the ways in which the group experienced their own power, nor that of oppressive forces. Rather than a scene or image of oppression, the group produced the image of a chain of oppressions in which everyone was implicated. Where in Boal's work there is often an expectation that the entities of oppressed/oppressor be distinct, in workshops based on contemporary conditions, the oppressor was here multiple, with its many faces, and a life inside of each of member of the group. Translated into the many languages of participants, 'Implicated' was the term that the group used to both describe this condition but also to indicate the group's desires to be 'implicated' in one another's lives through acts of solidarity.

Implicated as a term was produced out of the conjuncture of both the time and space of our work together, developed out of a shared sense of the moment in which we were in, the trajectories of lives and immigration politics through which we had come together but also the spatial dimension of where we met, an offsite space hosted by an art gallery, that shaped particular conditions of power, hierarchy, privilege and positions such as 'leader', 'artist' and 'participant'.

At this conjuncture the group named a number of conflicts related to migrant experience, developing theatre pieces to support London-based campaigns, including the anti-raids network, a migrant-led coalition that develops tools and direct action interventions against state-sanctioned immigration raids; Justice for Domestic Workers, a group working for better conditions for migrant domestic labourers; and the Unite Hotel Workers union, a fringe division of the Unite union that works from migrant worker experiences to develop new tools for organising in the hotel sector.

Through the work of codifying these struggles and de-codifying them through group discussion, implicated inevitably began to 'name' the questions of its own internal power relations and distribution of resources instigated through its relationship to its 'host' organisation, the Serpentine Gallery. Various positions were revealed by these naming practices. Some members in the group were unfamiliar with the Serpentine and the context of contemporary art in London, and others aware and very critical of its role.

The dynamic between these positions was 'codified' in a performance that addressed the various constituencies in the project: cultural workers, gallery staff, middle-class audiences, migrant rights organisations in thinking through the conflicting terrain of this relationship. This performance, titled *The Embassy Ball*, drew for an improvisation activity outlined in Boal's book 'Games for Actors and Non-Actors' in which delegates at a high end diplomatic function are drugged by the waiters and proceed to reveal the hidden desires that drove them to maintain their positions of power. Using this configuration of power as a base, and drawing from the dynamic at play in our project – in which the bourgeois taste-making apparatus of the Gallery was providing an opportunity for those who would usually constitute the class of cleaners and flexible catering service workers of such places – we began to craft, or codify and name the various conflicts that emerged. Parodying the dress, atmosphere and speech-making procedures of the high-end events of the gallery, guests to the theatre piece (re-positioned as guests of this private party) bore witness to the staging of mini rebellions in the proceedings based on worker experiences, with discussions about the very conflicts that enable such projects to occur. The making of this theatre piece was based on weeks of workshops on our own implications in these enabling contradictions. Questioning the distribution of power and resources, we began to unravel the micro effects of the gallery's organising principles – that projects be instigated by curators and artists for participants in the name of 'training', that resources be distributed accordingly, that those artists be identified with the project more prominently than 'participants' who are often not acknowledged at all, that 'participants' supply stories, while aesthetic responsibility is held by artists and representatives – which in spite of conscious decisions to collaborate equally, often crept into the working practices of the group. As a result of this process of naming our own conflicts, we began to re-shape these practices. Collective budgeting was undertaken to determine fair compensation and organisation of tasks, 'participants' studied to become facilitators and decision-making was collectivised. This was and is not simple, bringing about a number of core debates: whether gallery funds should be used to engage in support and solidarity of members, i.e. emergency food and housing, whether everyone should be aligned with the political 'causes' we worked with (i.e. some in the group had more positive relationships to the police than others). These questions enabled us to confront the broader oppressive contexts came to reflect on the instituting practices of the group and the desires and necessities that hold them in place. For example, most funders of pedagogical projects require that a 'problem' be framed for a constituency in advance, and most commissioning projects require that funds be distributed to what is seen to be 'artistic' work and not to the re-distribution of wealth, aesthetic responsibility and organising power as was the group's desire. In order to contravene such requirements, it was essential to build sufficient trust to be very frank in collective conversations. The process also challenged the time frame of the event that often underpin adult education programmes in galleries, suggesting that a long-term commitment to the space and time required to engage in such a process must be provided.

Identifying and acting upon conflicting agendas had some (though minor) broader impacts on the gallery, the most pertinent one being its politicisation of staff members (namely, within the programming department) who worked to revitalise the gallery's internal trade union and began to question its hegemonic organising practices more explicitly. This certainly did not instigate revolutionary changes to these practices, but began the process of opening up spaces for collective discussion and action, with much more work to be done in directly engaging the gallery's core donors in dialogue about conditions for migrant workers.

The work that we undertook on naming our own conflicts and contradictions at the juncture of the space and time in which we encountered them, deepened the work that we undertook in support and solidarity with groups in the broader struggle around the conditions of migration in the UK, which continue to this day.

In the movement between the codifications of our conflicts, the de-codifying moments, the actions we took to change power and the moments we reflected upon them, we activated something beyond the event culture that underwrote our time together. While we engaged in performative experimentation and occupied the 'real estate of time', we did so with a deep grounding in our located-ness, both physically, on the Edgware Road where a war against migrants was in everyday operation, but also in the 'location' of our enabling conditions, the gallery and its own relation to migrant workers and education 'participants'. Here, events with the public were used to explore these contradictions in the wider sector and recruit allies in the struggles of migrant/cultural workers.

The 'conflict' revealed through this process was complex. Its shape can be seen not only in its individual impacts suggested by Implicated's group members 'analysing oppression and our relationships as a group'; 'learn[ing] a lot about rights and other people's experiences', or 'finding hope in the very difficult situation of things you cannot do'; but also in the collective experience of being framed by a gallery [the Serpentine] deemed by some to present a 'brutal and violent model of cultural production that is utterly de-humanising' (Graham, 2014). Here, a fracture in interests between group members with existing experience of the context of the art world, for whom questions of the gallery's framing were much more pertinent than those who participated in the project with no relationship to the art world at all, for whom the mutual support offered was far more pertinent. The disjuncture in the kinds of critiques, driving factors and basic conditions for those involved in the group is a constituent element of the project and reflects the contradictory terms under which such projects are instituted. It is through a continuous process of reflecting on how dynamics of oppression produce such discontinuities – rather than trying to rid ourselves of them – that we have created the ground for affinities and acts of solidarity between cultural workers who have experience within the art world and those who are deemed to be its outsiders. These solidarities begin to map (or as one group member suggested 'rehearse') the contours of what another, future model of cultural work might look like.

### **Pedagogies of allyship**

The story of my second example begins in 1995, when I was an undergraduate student of geography at a Canadian university and engaged in my first encounters with post-colonial theory. We were naming our moment in a different way, through classes dedicated to, what theorist and activist Gayatri Spivak, described as interrogating the failures of decolonisation, to provoke the question of the 'who' of decolonisation so as to understand the re- and neo-colonisations of the present (Spivak, 1995).

I encountered this more theoretical questioning while deeply embedded in a solidarity project with the Ardoch Algonquin First Nation and Allies (AAFNA) in central Canada. We, students of the university, were invited into AAFNA by Bob Lovelace, the Aboriginal student counsellor on campus. He had been brought to teach on our course by the feminist geographer Evelyn Peters. This experience, while not situated in an art gallery, and a period of time that came before my own work in gallery education, came to be a pivotal role in it. In particular, it demonstrated the way in which questions of space, and time, or in the language of AAFNA 'territory' and 'time immemorial' when convened together require that

the privi- leges of particular positions be dismantled to necessitate practices of solidarity and allyship.

Bob wanted to move our experience of aboriginal approaches to questions of space and power from the classroom into the space-time of action. He asked for volunteers to join him in his involvement with a land claim struggle in the community of Ardoch, some 70 miles north from the university. More specifically, he asked us to become allies of AAFNA in the most recent of a long history of battles with provincial government over the right to their land. Howard Perry, a then sixty year old member of the Ardoch community and the descendent of the only family to remain in Ardoch after a century of active colonial dispossession, had illegally (by colonial law) hunted in the surrounding area to ignite a court case. The case would push the recognition of his Aboriginal right to use the land, a recognition that had been withheld due to the designation of Ardoch Algonquin people as 'non status' Indians for their refusal to cede territory to colonial authorities (Court documents, 1996). This legal denial of his community's Aboriginal claims to be carers of the land and the manomin (wild rice) of which they were the historical custodians, along with other practices of displacement such as residential schools, had rendered the community of Ardoch Algonquins disparately located. Harold's instigation of his own arrest built on momentum from successful protests in the 1980s to save the wild rice from commercial harvesting and brought energy and community back to Ardoch in the form of AAFNA (Wong, 1996).

Our role, as students who had grown up in white settler culture, was to be allies. While never defined in words, the role of an ally, and in our case, white allies from European descent, was to support AAFNA in the translation of their experience to the courts. Our university background and white privilege – even as undergraduates with much more to learn that to lend – afforded us a credibility that in the face of the sheer racism of government representatives could be mobilised in the negotiations. Harold was asked again and again, by the courts, the lawyers of the ministry of natural resources, the press and indeed by other activists, 'Who is AAFNA, who do they represent, and by what authority? Are we at the table with representatives of the people?' Where are 'the people'? Apart from the audacity of the question, given that 'the people' had been effectively disappeared by the very same authorities, the question was a demand for a performance of a 'we' that could be read, heard and examined through and by the colonial paradigm, a we that was comfortable and predictable in its performance of colonial subjecthood, a we that was no matter for the birds, the rice or the paddle that moved through the lake, no title for an emerging constituency whose histories and indigenous background had remained a secret for most of their lives, and no word for the definition of territory understood by Harold and his family in the language of 'time immemorial' or the unpredictable naming of rivers whose waters changed the shape of that land with each passing day. By no accounts was this 'we' to include a bunch of undergraduate researchers learning to be committed to social justice, a paralegal who had been adopted by Harold, some white settlers and the reuniting families of Ardoch who until recently had never met. From the colonial perspective, we, the allies, were experts, witnesses, observers.

For AAFNA, who were guided by the consensus process that was inherited from Omàmiwinini ancestors (the pre/non colonial word that was anglicised into Algonquin) and facilitated by temporary custodial leaders, terms like 'community' and 'expert', 'outsider' were rejected. Such terms were reflective of a colonial notion of 'we' enshrined in Canada's Indian Act (defined by blood through patriarchal affinity) and other colonial processes that had violently expropriated land, resources and practices. Rather, allies were part of a diverse membership system including those whose families had historically

occupied the land, those adopted into the community from different cultural and geographical backgrounds, and allies, who partook in the teachings and the custodial responsibilities of the community, while not assuming the role of community leadership or decision-making related to land or resources. Like Freire's outline of the convening of space and time in favour of commitment and action upon the future, 'Allied membership' as the AAFNA website says today, 'carries with it the same responsibilities as Omàmiwinini membership, in that individuals are expected uphold the guiding principles and to work with Omàmiwinini members to create a sustainable future for our children and grandchildren. Allies are united through both the space of a fluidly defined territory and the time immemorial that includes a life of custodianship (AAFNA, 2017).

While at times Harold, Bob and ourselves deemed it politically necessary to stage this performance of the 'we' demanded by the courts and the government, to produce documents of group meetings, cultural events and kinship and to perform the act of witnessing that would render the 'community' visible in their terms, we at the same time developed other means for constituting ourselves.

Harold led us in what might be described as a pedagogy of allyship, exploiting privilege, while at the same time, asking us to account to different standards, different paradigms and practices. This pedagogy of allyship was a critical occupation of the present. We 'named our moment' by finding ways to work together in the face of the difficult knowledge of the colonial past and the unevenness of our experiences with it. It was an aesthetic education whereby cameras were passed around, to produce 'codified' forms of knowledge to which we could respond, legal documents were assembled, timelines illustrated and discussed, but equally through which we could explore 'de-codified' activities, rice harvested, historical teachings learned in relation to traditions based in land, silent sharing of time, eating together. Like the example of theatre work with Implicated, here the interrogation of a broader social justice movement – the struggle for land and recognition – could not be undertaken without an analysis of our own conditions of production, in which there were to be no white heroes, no saviours. In its place was a demand to dismantle colonial power relations, to collectivise the resources of our work together – the cameras, narratives and documents we produced and, for us to be led by the desires of the struggle for land that Harold and his family had begun to embark upon. This pedagogy of allyship was not simple. It was uncomfortable. It made past knowledges feel strange, it forced allies to discuss the undiscussed privilege of settler cultures, it brought out the untrusting, the stereotypes and the contradictions that were at the heart of what the years of colonial process had cultivated to secure us as subjects constituted by our separation. To be together otherwise we had to learn this uneasiness, understand its dimensions and contours, let it become a fundamental aspect of our learning. We had to work on ourselves while we worked on the world. While allies had tremendous agency and were extended great respect in AAFNA, we could not, importantly, take control. As white students, privileged by our education, we learned that there were two ways of being, one in which our privilege was mobilised to support Harold and his family, and another whereby we were to leave it at the door. Though we had a say, we spoke and were listened to, in both cases we were led by Ardoch community's interest and desire.

I will forever feel shaped by the education Howard and Bob extended to us, an education that we were in no way entitled to. Being an ally in this movement was a quiet reckoning with my own histories, a micro- and macro-political de-centring of the colonial knowledges I grew up with, one of which I have rarely spoken so as to not want to claim it back as my own as I do here with some discomfort, but also a feeling of the urgency of the approaches we learned in Ardoch to the present concerns of thinking about adult educations and how they respond to the time-places we occupy in the present.

Here again, time and space are revealed as necessary allies in the assertion of commitment to both the trajectory of historical struggle and the interrogation of our process as a group working together to achieve towards change.

### **Allyship today**

Fast-forwarding some twenty years and more easily into the topic at hand, the question of allyship re-emerged in the context of my role as a curator of public at a contemporary art gallery in the UK. The question was instigated by Conrad, a non-university-based researcher and local resident who had attended many of the gallery's past public programmes. When, in my first days in this role I asked for comments from those who regularly attended the gallery's events, Conrad approached me to report what he felt to be a fundamental contradiction: amidst a sea of events and exhibitions about the American civil rights movement, about the Black Panthers and others anti-racism and social justice groups of colour, he had observed that he was often one of the only people of colour ever in attendance. This observation had instigated his own independent enquiry on questions of representation conducted across a number of European cultural sites. He and I had many discussions about possible approaches to this question. These discussions resulted in very simple actions, my meeting with those involved in grass-roots anti-racism and civic campaigns, asking about where the gallery sat in their feelings about the city and their movements. Some felt that the gallery had been elitist, that its food was inedible, that it was not a place for them. Other community groups had good memories of its room and facility rental services offered to local groups at a low rate, but had had little contact with its programming apparatus. Due to emergent family issues and the fact that Conrad wanted to remain independent and not an employee of the gallery, he reduce his involvement. But working with both community organisations and partners from a department at the local university, we began to imagine a collaborative project: a conference of the organisers from a Black-led trans-national movement that would be the first ever gallery event to privilege only people of colour in the public programme and, we hoped, its audience. In planning the event, local activist, scholar and community organiser Kerrie Tatum, myself and others were concerned that it not replicate that circumstances described by Conrad, in presenting 'black issues' for white people or other academics. Kerrie suggested that a second day be held for members of the local community to engage with organisers at the conference and its implications for the city. These terms 'local' and 'community' are so overused to not quite reflect the specificity and intelligence of Kerrie's organising process, which was to build momentum and excitement for the event through community radio, and to mobilise an existing constituency of anti-racism, community organisers to re-ignite those involved with a mobilisation instigated locally the year before. This specificity was reflected in what happened next, which was the founding of the first chapter of this trans-national movement in the UK as a direct response to the gathering of activists and scholars who had been a part of the gallery's education programme.

Unlike Conrad, for whom autonomy from this space was an important principle, the group decided and demanded to continue to meet at the gallery. This demand was not as a part of the adult education programme, but to be users and programmers of its spaces. They articulated this demand as reparation, for the gallery's historical whiteness and the overall white orientation of Britain's funded cultural landscape that it represented. In meetings the question of allyship emerged regularly. What would be the role of the gallery, the university and other 'white' institutions in this emerging movement? How could they respond to Black-led approaches and their own histories of racism? But how, in the meantime could the group remain autonomous from them? While it was important to claim the reparative space of the gallery and the university, it was crucial for the group that they not re-orient towards the value espoused by them and rather adhered to their feminist, queer

orientation of the broader 'leaderful' project. For me, this meant participating but stepping down from a decision-making role, supporting through reproductive work, guarding the time and space of the unknown that we as a group were navigating, holding programming slots and spaces without knowing what would be presented, allowing free access to meeting space, food, attending meetings in non-gallery community spaces, maintaining a position of support and generally listening and, later, instigating processes to reflect on and transform racism within the gallery's ranks. As with my first experience with allyship in AAFNA, this did not mitigate against white privilege but opened up the space to work through its violence and discomforts, led by those who were both generous but clear in their desire to practice relations otherwise.

The discussions around our movement drew from, debates within current Black-led movements, which have fore-fronted the question of ally-ship (Bean & Peterson-Smith, 2015). Within these discussions allyship, has been defined as 'aligning yourself with a person, cause, or movement with whom/which you don't [personally] identify' (Chen, 2015). It is on one end of the spectrum is considered a sustained activity, 'proven through continuous and active engagement' in serving a community (Chen, 2015). On the other end of the spectrum, it has been accused of being a practice of 'mere identification', leading to the appropriation of struggles into one's personal terrain (McKenzie, 2015). Activist Mia McKenzie has described this latter, more appropriating definition of ally behaviour as 'ally theatre' and 'part of an ally industrial complex' that in the worst circumstances results in personal profiteering from collective struggle, and in others the refocusing of energy and attention from those in struggle to those allying with them.

The risk of ally theatre is one that strikes significantly at the question of whether adult education programmes in galleries can be understood as a process informed by popular and radical education, a space to work through the problematics of white privilege and of re-orienting gallery resources towards the unknown but deeply committed work of political struggle, or whether this work becomes 'mere identification', as is often the case in the staging of political problematics and groups within galleries in the form of the 'event', without the intention to act or enabling action upon them. The involvement of Black-led movements led to an attempt to do the latter, in both supporting the group without conditions, allowing time and space for 'naming the moment' and 'naming the conflicts', and, in the end, by instigating a broader enquiry, a funded two year investigation into the practices of decision-making with regard to communities of colour in ours and other local cultural institutions. Led by co-director of the Centre for Research for Race and Rights Karen Salt and community-based co-researchers, some of whom are involved in local movement organising, this research moves away from configurations of communities of colour as 'hard to reach' or 'dis-engaged' and towards actionable processes for re-distributing resources and power in and beyond cultural institutions. This, in turn will turn the question of 'public' in adult education, onto the private and organisational realm of institutions, asking what specific processes produce white privilege in the organisational realm of galleries and what can be changed about them? Here, it is desired, that the public in adult education moves away from the fiction of a 'general' public, which espouses a liberal sense of open-ness but in fact serves a privileged and inevitably white constituency, to the publics that are situated in struggle and whose struggle can and does provoke change within and outside of the institution. Of course the road to this kind of internal change is long, and will not be complete until the central contradictions, who sits on boards of trustees, and who is deemed 'hard to reach', have been transformed. Nonetheless, allyship in both cases has the capacity to provoke both changes within and beyond the walls of the gallery in its spatial and temporal dimensions.

## **Opposition and proposition**

If in naming the moment we learn more about the historical time places in which current social struggles exist, by naming the conflicts, we understand the politics of the production of adult education as a micro-cosm in which these struggles shape our own work. Working in this way, it should be noted, is disruptive and provokes a shift beyond the 'experimentation' with time and formats suggested by Helguera and others. It asks that we approach the question of the time-spaces of our moment with an openness and commitment to radical change in the way in which positions are approached, organisations are structured, decisions are made, resources used, and commitments articulated. Popular education and anti-colonial pedagogies, then, suggest a profoundly different articulation of culture, its uses and its institutions. Adult education within it abandons its history of institutionally affirmative practices and suggests itself as the agent of institutional change, through which groups most marginalised in society both access resources and re-work organising practices. Such practices often appear to be audacious in the current climate in which both arts organisations and socially marginalised groups are frequently asked to affirm and reify their positions, to produce and produce more, and not to ask complicated questions. Nonetheless, if we are really to occupy the 'real estate' of time with the practices of a critical gallery education, if we are really to focus on the 'why' that this permits, inhabiting the moment, including all of its contradictory locations, times and commitments is necessary. What such radical pedagogies provide goes beyond politically themed events and slogans and offers plausible processes for institutional and social transformation.

**Disclosure statement:** No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

### **Notes on contributor**

Janna Graham is an organiser, artist and curator who works at the intersection of critical pedagogy, curation and gallery education. She has occupied positions at the Art Gallery of Ontario in Toronto, and in the UK Whitechapel Gallery, Serpentine Galleries and most recently Nottingham Contemporary. She is a member of the 12 person international sound art collective Ultra red and currently a Lecturer in Visual Cultures at Goldsmiths, University of London.



## References

- AAFNA Membership (2017, December 15). Retrieved from <http://www.aafna.ca/applying-for-membership/>
- Allen, F. (2008, February). Situating gallery education. *Tate Encounters*, [E]dition 2.
- Arendt, H. (1971). *The life of the mind volume one*. San Diego: Harcourt, Brace & Co.
- Barndt, D. (1989). *Naming the moment: Political analysis for action: A manual for community groups*. Toronto: Catalyst Centre.
- Bean, B., & Petersen-Smith, K. (2015, May 14). Fighting racism and the limits of 'ally-ship'. *Socialist Worker*. Retrieved February 24, 2017, from <https://socialistworker.org/2015/05/14/fighting-racism-and-the-limits-of-allyship>
- Bourriaud, N. (2002). *Relational aesthetics*. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel.
- Catalyst Centre. (2017). *Facilitation*. Retrieved September 30, from <http://www.catalystcentre.ca/consulting/facilitation/>
- Chen, M. (2015). Blogpost 'Getting Real About Allyship' on BCRW Blog, a project of the Barnard Centre for Research on Women. Retrieved February, 2017, from <http://bcrw.barnard.edu/blog/?s=allyship>
- Clover, D. E. (2015). Adult education for social and environmental change in contemporary public art galleries and museums in Canada, Scotland and England. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 34(3), 300–315.
- Clover, D. E., & Sanford, K. (2016). *Lifelong learning, the arts and community cultural engagement in the contemporary university*. Manchester, NH: Manchester University Press.
- Clover, D. E., Sanford, K., Bell, L., & Johnson, K. (Eds.). (2016). *Education, museums and art galleries: Animating social, cultural and institutional change*. Rotterdam: Sense.
- Court documents related to Harold Perry's case. 1996. Retrieved December 15, 2017, from <http://www.usask.ca/nativelaw/factums/view.php?id=357>
- Enwezor, O. (2002). 'The black box' in *Documenta 11\_Platform 5: Exhibition, Catalogue* (pp. 42–55). Germany: Hatje Cantz.
- Evans, M. (2015). *Artwash: Big oil and the arts*. London: Pluto Press.
- Freire, P. (1970/2000). *The pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Graham, Janna, Graziano, Valeria, & Kelly, Susan (2016). The educational turn in art: Rewriting the hidden curriculum. *Performance Research*, 21(6), 29–35.
- Helguera, P. (2010). Alternative audience and instant time: The public program as an alternative space. In *Ours, and the hands that hold Us: Playing by the rules: Alternative thinking/alternative spaces*. New York, NY: Apexart. Retrieved December 15, 2017, from <http://pablohelguera.net/2013/02/alternative-time-and-instant-audience-2010/>

Holmes, B. (2004). 'Liar's poker. Online text. Retrieved from [http://www.springerlin.at/dyn/heft\\_text.php?textid=1276&lang=en](http://www.springerlin.at/dyn/heft_text.php?textid=1276&lang=en)

Kester, G. (1999/2000). Dialogical aesthetics: A critical framework for littoral art. *Variant*, 9 (Winter). Retrieved December 15, 2017, from <http://www.variant.org.uk/9texts/KesterSupplement.html> Malpas, J. (2015). "'Where are we when we think?": Hannah Arendt and the place of thinking. Retrieved from [http://www.academia.edu/8325368/\\_Where\\_are\\_we\\_when\\_we\\_think\\_Hannah\\_Arendt\\_and\\_the\\_Place\\_of\\_Thinking](http://www.academia.edu/8325368/_Where_are_we_when_we_think_Hannah_Arendt_and_the_Place_of_Thinking)

Martin-Merchant, H. (2017, January). 'Engaging publics with arts institutions: The frameworks of a feminist pedagogy' in n.paradoxa. *International Feminist Art Journal*, 39, 56–64. (Organising/Organisations).

McKenzie, M. (2015, November 4). How to tell the difference between real solidarity and 'ally theater'. Blog Black Girl Dangerous. Retrieved February 24, from <http://www.blackgirldangerous.com/2015/11/ally-theater/>

Miranda, M., & Lane-Mckinley, K. (2017, February 1). Artwashing, or, between social practice and social reproduction. Blog Blade of Grass. Retrieved May 9, 2017, from [http://www.abladeofgrass.org/fertile-ground/artwashing-social-practice-social-reproduction/#\\_ftn6](http://www.abladeofgrass.org/fertile-ground/artwashing-social-practice-social-reproduction/#_ftn6)

Mörsch, C. (2009, Documenta12). At the crossroads of four discourses. Education: Between critical practice and visitor services. Zurich: Diaphanes.

Mörsch, C. (2014). Time for cultural mediation. Zurich: Pro Helvetia. Retrieved from [http://www.kultur-vermittlung.ch/zeit-fuer-vermittlung/download/pdf-TfCM\\_0\\_Complete\\_Publication.pdf](http://www.kultur-vermittlung.ch/zeit-fuer-vermittlung/download/pdf-TfCM_0_Complete_Publication.pdf) Graham, J. (2014, February). Interview by Janna

Graham [iphone recording] with members of Implicated Theatre at Cockpit Theatre. Research undertaken as part of the Edgware Road Project, Serpentine Galleries 2008–2014.

O'Neill, P. (2014, January 6). The curatorial as constellation: Durational public art, cohabitational time and attentiveness lecture. Norway: Critical Issues in Public Art.

O'Neill, P., & Doherty, C. (Ed.). (2011). *Locating the producers: Durational Approaches to Public art*. Amsterdam: Valiz.

Open Letter to the Viewers. (2017, April 10). Participants and Cultural Workers of Documenta 14 on e-flux conversations, Open Forum. Retrieved from <http://conversations.e-flux.com/t/open-letter-to-the-viewers-participants-and-cultural-workers-of-documenta-14/6393>

Osborne, P. (2008, January 19). Opening remarks at art and immaterial labour conference. London: Tate Britain. – Recorded by myself.

Puleo, R. (2017, April 10). The messy politics of documenta's arrival in Athens. Hyperallergic.

Rolnik, S. (2006). The geopolitics of pimping as posted. *eipcp.net*, 10.

Spivak, G. (1995). Can the subaltern speak? In B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths, & H. Tiffin (Eds.), *The post-colonial studies reader*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Stengers, I. (2005, March). Introductory notes on an ecology of practices. *Cultural Studies Review*, 11(1), 183–196.

Sternfeld, N. (2010, March 14). Unglamorous tasks: What can education learn from its political traditions? *e-flux Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.e-flux.com/journal/14/61302/unglamorous-tasks-what-can-education-learn-from-its-political-traditions/>

Steyerl, H. (2010, December 21). Politics of art: Contemporary art and the transition to post-democracy. *e-flux Journal*.

Tallant, S. (2009). Experiments in integrated programming. *Tate Papers*, 11. Retrieved from <http://www.tate.org.uk/download/file/fid/7285>

Virno, P. (2004). *A grammar of the multitude: For an analysis of contemporary forms of life*. Los Angeles, CA: Semiotext (e).

Wong, C. (1996, September 1). Hunting rights of Metis and non-status Indians upheld by court. *Windspeaker*.

Zibechi, R. (2012). *Territories in resistance. A cartography of Latin American social Movements*. New York, NY: AK Press.