

## Elvira Dyangani Ose

1974, Córdoba, Spain

Elvira Dyangani Ose is a lecturer in Visual Cultures at Goldsmiths, University of London and curator of GIBCA 2015. She is also member of the Thought Council at the Fondazione Prada. Dyangani Ose has worked as a curator at Tate Modern, the Centro Atlántico de Arte Moderno, and the Centro Ardidur de Arte Contemporáneo. She has served as Artistic Director of Rencontres Picha, Lubumbashi Biennial (2013) and Guest Curator of the Triennial SUD, Salon Urbain de Douala (2010). Main curatorial projects include: *Ibrahim El-Salhi: A Visionary Modernist* (2013), *Across the Board* (2012–2014), *Carrie Mae Weems: Social Studies* (2010), *Arte Invisible* (2009, 2010), and *Olvida Quien Soy/Erase Me From Who I Am* (2006). Dyangani Ose is completing her PhD in History of Art and Visual Studies at Cornell University, New York.

# A STORY WITHIN A STORY, WITHIN A STORY, WITHIN A STORY...

**If openness and indeterminacy are true possibilities for the production of history, how then does history make its subjects? If the search for historical truth leads to ambiguity, then why don't we simply make up the past according to our own convenience? And, if one were to do so, who or what would be the collective subject of history? If given the opportunity to be such a history-teller, how does one make relevant the collective memories, personal narratives, inner worlds, stories, and protagonists located within the margins of history? Furthermore, would this reconstruction of the past ever challenge current historiography – its methods of inclusion and omission?**

*This is a story within a story – so slippery at the edges that one wonders when and where it started and whether it will ever end.*  
– Michel-Rolph Trouillot<sup>1</sup>

## A story

*It is not enough to write a revolutionary hymn to take part in the African revolution; it is necessary to act in the revolution with the people – with the people and the hymns will come of their own accord.*

*In order to exercise authentic action, it is necessary to be oneself a living part of Africa and its thought, an element in that popular energy which is totally mobilized for the Liberation, progress and happiness of Africa. There is no place outside this one combat either for the artist or the intellectual who is not himself committed and totally mobilized with the people in the great struggle of Africa and of suffering humanity.*  
– Sékou Touré<sup>2</sup>

## A story within a story...

Imagine history as an *open work*. A network of limitless interrelations in which uncertainty is a positive feature. Imagine its openness, its incompleteness. Imagine history as a *work in motion*, displaying an intense mobility and a kaleidoscopic capacity to suggest itself in constantly renewed aspects to its consumers.<sup>3</sup> If, in enquiring the meaning of history, one were to follow Umberto Eco's notion of the *open work*, history would be set to validate a poetic principle, a series of acts of conscious freedom.

In 1962, Umberto Eco coined the term *open work* to describe the aesthetics inherent in the work of composers such as Karlheinz Stockhausen, Luciano Berio, and Henri Pousseur; the kinetic sculptures of Alexander Calder; and the literature of Stéphane Mallarmé. The connection between these practices resides in the fact that the authors have arranged their work so that the audience – or the performer, in the case of a musical composition – is exposed not to a single definitive order, but to a myriad of possibilities. Audiences are exposed, in short, to an “unfinished” work, which they are invited to complete. The *open work*, as Eco points out, has a halo of infiniteness, forever open and always promising future perceptions. It radically changes the nature of the relationship between an author

and his/her public, demanding from the latter a higher degree of collaboration and awareness throughout the creative process.

So, if one were to imagine history as an *open work*, who would be the author and who its audience? In fact, would there be a need for these categories at all? If one were to consider history as a *work in motion*, one would be requested to embrace the possibility of its incompleteness, against the customary belief of history's certainty and objectiveness. It could be argued, in effect, that history writing does not always obey the facts, for it is affected by social systems of power in the time and place of a particular experience. Michel-Rolph Trouillot calls this ambiguity of history “two-sided historicity.” In other words, for Trouillot, history represents:

both the facts of the matter and the narrative of those facts, both “what happened” and “that which is said to have happened.” The first meaning places the emphasis on the sociohistorical process, the second on our knowledge of that process or on a story about that process.<sup>4</sup>

Knowing that occasionally historiography reduces “what happened” to “that which is said to have happened,” opening up the narrative of the facts to speculation, why should it seem so arduous to accept uncertainty as a category from which to confront history writing? And why, on the other hand, have we accepted as truth the deceptive compilation of historiographical evidences, shaped by ideologies and systems of power, which do not always translate into historical truth? This critique is hardly new. Whereas philosophy has tried for centuries to explore the various ideas behind progress and meaning of history essential in the ontological formation of humankind, postcolonial theory has made its goal to deconstruct and rewrite Western certitudes regarding its meanings.

Susan Buck-Morss, for instance, questions the meanings and politics of history writing in her seminal work *Hegel, Haiti and Universal History* and observes how historians such as Paul Gilroy “recognize[s] not only the contingency of historical events, but also the indeterminacy of the historical categories by which we grasp them.” Buck-Morss continues:

The collective experiences of concrete, particular human beings fall out of identifying categories of

“nation,” “race,” and “civilization” that capture only a partial aspect of their existence, as they travel across cultural binaries, moving in and out of conceptual frames and in the process, creating new ones.

In his groundbreaking work *The Black Atlantic*, Gilroy succeeds in challenging those overbearing categories with the notion of *hybridity*, but even so he remains trapped in the term’s cultural form and metaphorical character. Conversely, Buck-Morss suggests *porosity* both as a conceptual umbrella and as a semantic paradigm. *Porosity* seems more appropriate in the production of the narrative of a collective experience, for it aims to depict the particularities of determinate collectives involved in such a narrative, acknowledging their respective histories and recognizing the experiences and values they all share.

If openness and indeterminacy are true possibilities for the production of history, how then does history make its subjects? If the search for historical truth leads to “dizzying ambiguity, [and] if time is nothing but indeterminacy and flux,” as Susan Buck-Morss claims, then why don’t we simply make up the past according to our own convenience?<sup>5</sup> And, if one were to do so, who or what would be the collective subject of history? If given the opportunity to be such a history-teller, how does one make relevant the collective memories, personal narratives, inner worlds, stories, and protagonists located within the margins of history? Furthermore, would this reconstruction of the past ever challenge current historiography – its methods of inclusion and omission? Lastly, what could such an attempt add to future processes of history making?

Trouillot observes this possibility and claims that alongside professional historians, there are other participants in the production of history that, even though they might not destabilize systems of power, add complexity to its production. Trouillot insists that there have existed, and still exist, silenced episodes in which only non-historians might emerge as actors and narrators of history. The potential participatory aspect of history making has, in the reinterpretation of Eco’s poetics, an invaluable opportunity, even if only in aesthetic terms. Consequently, one cannot disregard the inevitable question of how such openness, such indeterminacy can acquire collective and political dimensions.

Buck-Morss’s notion of *Porosity* provides us with the reintegration of the sense of plurality in the telling of the collective experience. However, a ‘porous’ narrative is still restricted to the time and place of such a particular experience. Édouard Glissant’s notion of *opacity*, on the other hand, incorporates a new feature for the narrative of the collective experience to overcome the limitation provided by the overbearing cultural frameworks mentioned above. For *opacity* effectively incorporates heterogeneity, uncertainty and change.

The right to *opacity* carries further our right to difference, beyond the constraints of a confined singularity. As Glissant points out, we are not limited to a time and place once and for all; we can change, with the other while being ourselves; we are not one, we are multiple.<sup>6</sup> *Opacity* refers to the possibility of every individual to be plural and mutable. In that respect, we are in one way or another single islands in an ‘all-encompassing world’, a meta-archipelago, centreless and boundaryless.<sup>7</sup> That rhythmic personality has its inception in the aesthetics of the *chaos-monde*; an aesthetic neither constituted by norms, goals, or methods, nor subject to passive participation. Quite on the contrary, such an aesthetic is participatory and “embraces all the elements and forms of expression of this totality within us.”<sup>8</sup> Its poetics, that of the *Relation*, is “latent, open, multilingual in intention, [and] directly in contact with everything possible,” allowing us to take in uncertainty as a positive feature.<sup>9</sup> For a world in *Relation* “remains forever conjectural and presupposes no ideological stability”<sup>10</sup> – a world in which chaos is rhythm and stands for a sequence of “spiraling and redundant trajectories.”<sup>11</sup> *Opacity* here is formulated against the restrictions of transparency, hierarchy and certainty that have mostly dominated Western readings of universalism and multiculturalism. *Opacity* – not obscurity – is “the thing that will bring us together forever and make us permanently distinctive.”<sup>12</sup> The right to *opacity*, therefore, is essential to the formulation of the *Poetics of Relation* as imagined by Glissant, for a world in *Relation* is a world exposed to a totality in “evolution, whose order is continuously in flux and whose disorder one can imagine forever.”<sup>13</sup>

One could argue that *Relation* is the condition of possibility for a new ‘universality’ to emerge. A notion of ‘universality’ that, as Stefan Jonsson states in his ‘in conversation’ with Premesh Lalu and Tracy Murnik – published in this book,

hinges precisely on the ability of us all to find, in common, ways of articulating the universal – again, not as a value, or culture, or ground, but as a practice of living and working together in modes that are dialogical, participative, and radically egalitarian.<sup>14</sup>

To this end, history making, or the production of history, will not only be presented as a phenomenon marked by the events of the past – whether acknowledged or silenced, but rather revealed as an extraordinary tool to understand the present. It is this kind of radical suggestion of re-imagining the writing of history as an *open work*, as a *chaos-monde*, as a participatory experience, to which the eighth edition of the Göteborg International Biennial for Contemporary Art is devoted, and the context out of which this book develops.

### A story within a story, within a story, within a story...

Embossed onto a light blue silkscreen, some acronyms written in white appear to be floating, in a sort of constellation. All of them represent strong political ideologies. Some of them sound familiar, particularly to a reader aware of the history of the struggles for liberation against colonialism by Asian, Latin American and African countries that claimed their independence during the middle decades of the twentieth century. Platforms such as MPLA, *Movimento Popular de Libertação de Angola* (People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola); FRELIMO, *Frente de Libertação de Moçambique* (Mozambique Liberation Front); FATAH, *Harakat ur-tahrir al-falastiniyy* (Palestinian National Liberation Movement); FNL, *Viet Cong* (National Liberation Front for Southern Vietnam) and SWAPO (South West African People's Organisation), among others, epitomized the so-called *Bandung Spirit*, which germinated during the first Afro-Asian meetings in Bandung, Indonesia in 1955, and in Cairo, Egypt in 1961.<sup>15</sup> These revolutionary movements were at the core of the formation of the Third World project and prompted one of the first chapters of the history of its people: namely the anonymous individuals and recognized heroes who assembled behind those deeply charged acronyms, and who represented a key moment of shift in recent human history: a moment deeply invested in utopian belief.

There has been no other time, and no other place, in which the significance of those connections and the visibility of that revolutionary network was more vividly apparent than at the First Pan-African Cultural Festival that took place in Algiers, Algeria in 1969. At the time, Algeria had already gained its independence from France, and one of the leaders of that battle, Houari Boumédiène – a military commander under former Premier Ahmed Ben Bella – delivered the opening speech at the Festival as the second president of the new nation-state. It was a speech deeply charged with a socialist agenda determined to promote a foreign policy in clear alliance with liberation movements around the world. The event, at least in its political aspirations, perpetuated the Bandung Spirit and emulated the ethos that defined two other essential platforms in the Third World's struggle against imperialism and in favor of the establishment of a new economic world order: the Non-Aligned Movement instituted in Belgrade (former Yugoslavia, now Serbia) in 1961, and the First Solidarity Conference of Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, known as the Tricontinental Conference, in Havana, Cuba in 1966. From a cultural perspective, the Festival was preceded by two indisputable forerunners of a very different nature: the First World Festival of Black Arts in Dakar, Senegal in 1966, and the Cultural Congress of Havana in 1968, where the multidisciplinary exhibition *Del Tercer Mundo* took place. According to artists María Berrios and Jakob Jakobsen – whose work *The Revolution Must Be a School of Unfettered Thought* (2014–2015) is based on that event, *Del Tercer Mundo* was “a pedagogical exhibition [...] intended to map and reflect on the contemporary immiseration of the world as well as offer a dynamic portrayal of popular rebellion and resistance.”<sup>16</sup> Moreover, the Cultural Congress of Havana symbolized the visual interpretation of the revolutionary ideals of Ernesto Che Guevara and Fidel Castro's Cuba, as well as the attempts of other Third World countries' leaders to commence the process of decolonization of the Third World. The Festival in Dakar, on the other hand, signified the consolidation of the so-called “Black World” and the transformation of the philosophy of *Négritude* into unprecedented political, cultural, and educational undertakings. Overall, the Pan-African Cultural Festival signified the representation of a political *enthousiasm* expressed in aesthetic terms.<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, the *enthousiasm* provoked by that historical experience, and that popular energy

– as Guinea’s first President Sékou Touré would have put it – was not only exercised by the members on those platforms; it was a response from the people that observed and interacted with them, and that cheered them on, to the First World’s regime of fear, violence and social injustices.

Observed in present time, those acronyms tell another story. A story of “growth and hope – then disillusionment” as Tanzania’s former President Julius Nyerere pronounced at the Non-Aligned Movement Summit of 1986 – on the eve of the dissolution of the principles behind the Third World project that its leaders were ultimately unable to enact.<sup>18</sup> Or, the story of nostalgia for a time that never in fact took place or existed: a time deliberately paused at the moment in which the change and ideas of progress and freedom still felt possible; a time in which nostalgia carried with it a political aim. In the hands of Ines and Fadi, however, the protagonists of Bouchra Khalili’s *Foreign Office* (2015), history is being rewritten beyond nostalgia.<sup>19</sup> Their hands, which are moving photographs of the major radical thinkers of the Pan-African Festival – such as Huey P. Newton and Kathleen and Eldridge Cleaver – and beyond – Malcolm X, Franz Fanon, Amírcal Cabral, Nelson Mandela, Kwame Nkrumah – establish a rhythm, which by virtue of the montage, presents us with an open-ended narrative that aims to carve through language, both filmic and literary, into our historical consciousness.

Those acronyms and their historical presence seem to have faded into oblivion in contemporary Algiers. And yet, in the constellation into which Khalili has inserted them in *The Archipelago* (2015) the blue silkscreen mentioned above, they become part of a metaphorical cartography; “a sort of poetic transposition of what used to be international solidarity: an ‘All-World’ as defined by Édouard Glissant, composed by solitary islands which form a bigger and all encompassing world.”<sup>20</sup> We navigate the spaces in between those “islands,” just as we would have done on the streets of Algiers’ Medina, if emulating Eldridge Cleaver’s peripatetic journey around that city forty-five years ago. In the earlier scenes recorded by William Klein in his documentary of the Black Panther, Cleaver contemplates, while interacting with children, youths, and grown-up men, freedom, his political concerns and his reluctance to stop fighting.<sup>21</sup> For a moment, Khalili, like Klein, focuses our attention on the people reading history from a certain distance, from *that*

side of the table, from the seats in the stadiums; from both sides of the road. And Ines and Fadi stand for the cheering crowd, for the people.

There is a recurring portrayal by the artists and projects featured in this biennial of the crowd – or individuals within it – as a visual representation of the new social imaginary emerging from those specific historical junctures. Crowds appear, for instance, in the numerous photographs that illustrate Maryam Jafri’s iconography of certain episodes in the history of African and Asian countries’ independence in her work *Independence Day 1934–1975* (2009–).<sup>22</sup> In this ongoing series, which Jafri has been developing from years of research into the national archives of formerly colonized countries, she provides the viewer with an extraordinary visual essay that exhibits comparative modernities, and into which we are able to read crucial episodes of those countries’ official proclamations of liberation via various scenarios – namely, “Prologue,” “Negotiations,” “At the airport,” “At the stadium,” “The New Flag,” “Parades,” “At the parliament,” “Celebrations,” and “Address to the nation.”<sup>23</sup> Jafri’s transnational narrative effectively demonstrates the fundamental role of art and visual cultures in shedding light on the historiography that aims to signal the relationships, moments of solidarity, and shared experiences that characterized those five turbulent decades. Here, the crowd – the people – embodies the promised sense of togetherness anticipated by the new nation-states and their leaders. That togetherness, as Boris Buden points out in his essay “Sharks Laugh Last,” published in this volume represents, “the historical ‘We, the People’ [...] which] always implies the quality of being a refuge or shelter, of providing protection from some sort of danger.”<sup>24</sup> In that respect, one could argue that *Independence Day 1934–1975* (2009–) provides us with a sort of “All-World” in its most vivid formal expression, a sort of visual “creolization” in which Glissant’s notion of *chaos-monde* – of the will of an articulated and emancipated crowd tenaciously seeking to protect and shelter its people – still felt possible.

The extraordinary narrative of those experiences constitutes the core of some of the projects that are part of GIBCA 2015, and that occupy us here. These projects urge us to examine the tactics employed by systems of power that have forced certain events and their protagonists into historical oblivion. Those systems have silenced the spirit of conviviality and togetherness that all the

events mentioned above manifest, and have prevented us from observing those historical events beyond a seeming nostalgia for the opportunity they – their spirit, their potentiality – provided for us to imagine ourselves and the world in *Relation*. In fact, even though works such as *And all is yet to be done* (2015) by Petra Bauer & Rebecka Thor and Anna Lundh's *Front-time Reworkings #2* (2012–2014) are anchored in different periods and geographies – namely, the 1920s Soviet Union, as seen from the point of view of a group of Swedish Socialist women; and the two mass demonstrations in New York city, the first in 1968, against the Vietnam War, and the second in 2011 and 2012, against the social and economic inequality that led to the formation of the *Occupy Wall Street* movement, respectively – they scrutinize the grammar of various sociopolitical junctures, bringing unknown subjectivities and politics to light; highlighting aspects of an international comradeship; and seeking to open up and expand the readings of contemporary history.<sup>25</sup> Ultimately, one could hope that a thorough scrutiny of those narratives would lead to the formulation of alternative societies. And yet, it is keenly recognized here that all aspirational projects are also “undone by failure of self-critique,” as Kerry James Marshall reminds us in his reinvented pastoral take on George S. Schuyler's novel *Black Empire*. Schuyler wrote this series for the *Pittsburgh Courier* between 1936 and 1938, at the time of the Ethiopian occupation following the Italo-Abyssinian war, bringing to the modernist Black American imaginary a story about “a successful African American-led conspiracy to liberate Africa from the European colonial powers and establish a black empire that [would] unify the continent.”<sup>26</sup> Schuyler's story develops in parallel to the real Ethiopian debacle, years after the consolidation and dissolution of the heydays of the Harlem Renaissance and following the darker years of Marcus Garvey's *Back to Africa* failure. In his new series of drawings, Marshall explores the idealisms, fantasies, and realities characteristic, as we have read above, of every account of people's struggles for equality and freedom.

The Third World project was in its most intrinsic sense a participatory experience. The nation-states, as Vijay Prashad reminds us, “frequently honored the sacrifice of the untold millions in the struggle for liberation.”<sup>27</sup> Representations of unknown revolutionaries were spread and made visible through public space: through

murals, prints, and other forms of art with political aims. That imagery accompanied the celebration of the leaders through large portraits and statues.

Artists have always been better equipped than historians to tell “not things the way they really were, but the way they really *felt*,” as Yaiza Hernández Velázquez points out in her contribution to this publication, “Archiving to Oblivion.”<sup>28</sup> They have effectively made up the past according to their own convenience, creating open-ended narratives that presuppose as both individual and unique, and multiple – if we are to follow Glissant's poetics – the collective subject of history and its addressee, namely, we, the people, the emancipated crowd. Artists have taken on the role of history tellers, proposing unconventional viewpoints from which a story may be told, while – due to their distinctive license to remember – still incorporating into that account the collective memories, personal narratives, inner worlds, stories, and protagonists located within the margins of history. And in so doing have claimed also their contribution as storytellers.

Even so, the question still persistently remains as to whether such reconstruction of the past ever in fact ultimately challenges current historiography – its methods of inclusion and omission? In *The Mystery of History and His Story in My Story* (2015), artist Theo Eshetu seems to put that question to the rest. In this work, Eshetu presents a visual essay in the format of a family photo album constructed using images obtained from the archive of the Museum of Yugoslav History in Belgrade.<sup>29</sup> Eshetu, grandson of Ato Tekle-Tsadik Mekouria (1913–2000), an historian, and Ethiopia's Ambassador to the former Yugoslavia, lived with his grandparents for a year, unaware that some of the most critical events of the Cold War, including threats of nuclear war and atom bomb testing, were happening around him. Mekouria was entrusted to handle Ethiopia's affairs in Belgrade by Emperor Haile Selassie I, at a time in which President Josip Broz Tito granted honorary citizenship to the Emperor. Eshetu uses the memory of a fragmented autobiography – himself as a nine-year-old boy – to bring back unknown and intriguing aspects of a much-told story. Eshetu's narrative is not the only one to be revealed here, though, but also that of Tito, Selassie, and, in particular, Mekouria, as moments of previously concealed intimacy are presented to a general audience for the first time. Eshetu also refers to the unnamed

crowd in his critical excavation of the archive – a crowd confronted face to face with the unknown episodes of the writers of their story, the proclaimed architects of that familiar reality. Here, the individual's subjectivity is inserted into the production of history to add complexity to a sociohistorical process that resists the destabilization of its structure. Likewise, the tremor in Shilpa Gupta's voice, incorporating the subjectivity of the individual citizen into the words and desires of President Jawaharlal Nehru in his address to the nation, reflects not only upon the re-appropriation by Nehru's peers of that longing for self-determination. Instead, *Trust with Destiny* (2008) questions the capacity and wisdom of every citizen to grasp the opportunities that emerged with independence and their accepting the challenges of the future.<sup>30</sup> For "freedom and power bring responsibility," as Nehru states. A responsibility that in many respects resonates in the conversation between Premesh Lalit, Stefan Jonsson, and Tracy Murnik in this publication, which considers history, memory and citizenry and their representation within the arts. In their dialogue, one thing seems to stand out, Premesh Lalit's notion of "becoming post-apartheid," which is in turn, as stated above, resonates with Jonsson's expectation of a more participatory, egalitarian and effective engagement with a new understanding of "universality." "Becoming post-apartheid" echoes in its multicultural aspirations, Glissant's creolized identity and Marshall's self-critique, for it is a structure of feelings, a condition of possibility for human understanding and solidarity, beyond race and ethnicity, beyond the "event" in history, beyond its cultural specificity and its locality.<sup>31</sup>

### Epilogue

There are number of works in the eighth edition of the Göteborg International Biennial for Contemporary Art that particularly call attention to the way in which history has made its subject through devices such as the archive, the museum, and the history of art, and criticize history's utilization of overarching cultural categories and static canons. There are other works that firmly claim, purely and simply, the space for an individual story to be heard, and remembered. The latter, although clearly invested in the imagined aspects of those narratives – stories that are sometimes dazzling, sometimes severe – are a persistent reminder that fiction is constitutive to *all* history.<sup>32</sup>

Storytelling as a possible means through which to observe history as a radical act is the ultimate objective of *A story within a story*... In that respect *House of Words (HoW)* is decisively its most socially engaged feature, operating as a social platform for participatory experiences and storytelling during the course of the Biennial. Moreover, it is arguably the synthesis of this entire project, for it is open, multiple – in part as a trial towards a *Poetics of Relation* – and unauthorised – even if you are able to read somewhere below the list of names and roles of people involved in this initiative. *HoW* is a temporary pavilion built by Santiago Cirugeda and his studio Recetas Urbanas, together with individuals from various communities from Gothenburg and elsewhere, with artist Loulou Cherinet tasked with the difficult job of activating the space through an unprecedented artistic project involving all kinds of cultural producers, along with members of civil society and public authorities. *HoW* engenders a strong activist component that ultimately aims to interrogate notions of a collective imaginary and publicness from transnational and trans-historical perspectives, questioning the role of artistic and cultural experiences within the processes of history making and social change.

Cherinet's proposal aims to question and reverse the notion of "utansjöskap" – in English, "outsider-ship" – used since 2006 by Sweden's conservative party to define communities at the margins of an established status quo. She does this by creating an open and pluralistic dialogue in which she examines the impact of such a policy, and media rhetoric around it, on the fabric of specific communities. For, as Glissant would put it, we can reach *Opacity* "only by understanding that it is impossible to reduce anyone, no matter who, to a truth he would not have generated on his own."<sup>33</sup>

*HoW* owes its metaphorical significance, at least in part, to my memories of being a child in Bata, Equatorial Guinea. There, in the middle of a forest, or at the center of a neighborhood, there was always a space, arid and empty, where all kind of rites, rituals, and storytelling used to take place. The "House of Words" – in Spanish "La Casa de Palabra" – was effectively a space that members of the community would activate when trying to solve issues affecting the group or individuals in that community. There the ritual of storytelling was a sort of institution, part entertainment, part vehicle for moral instruction and education. It was an organic tradition deeply rooted in social practices. A social experience,

which taught me to distinguish myself from the other within a crowd, but which at the same time enabled me to see the other in me, to be part of that “revolution” – to be part of the crowd. For the crowd, more than the celebrated heroes, is the protagonist of an art engaging with the politics of everyday life. Its presence embodies *enthusiasm*, the popular energy that forces the world to embrace chaos and uncertainty, the emancipated crowd that adopts, as Glissant urges, a poetics directly in contact with everything possible. A poetics of *Relation*, a poetics of the *open work*.

- 1 Michel-Rolph Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2007), 1.
- 2 Sékou Touré, “The Political Leader Considered as the Representative of a Culture,” *Presence Africaine: Second Congress of Negro Writers and Artists* (Rome, 26 March–1 April, 1959) 24–25 (1959): 120.
- 3 Here I use some of the characteristics of Umberto Eco’s notion of the *Opera Aperta*. Eco makes references to both “open work” and “work in motion” interchangeably. See more Umberto Eco, *The Open Work* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1989). Also reproduced in this publication in pages 54–78.
- 4 Trouillot, *Silencing the Past*, 2.
- 5 Susan Buck-Morss, *Hegel, Haiti, and Universal History* (Pittsburg: University of Pittsburgh Press) 2009) 139.
- 6 I’m paraphrasing Glissant’s words in “Édouard Glissant in Conversation with Mantha Diawara”
- 7 Édouard Glissant, Mantha Diawara, Christopher Winks, *Nike: Journal of Contemporary African Art* 28 (2011) 4–19.
- 8 Antonio Benítez-Rojo refers to the notion of meta-archipelago as a reference to the non-chaotic chaos in clear connection with Glissant’s *chaos-monde*. See *The Repeating Island* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1996), 9.
- 9 Glissant, *Poetics*, 32.
- 10 Glissant, *Poetics*, 32.
- 11 Glissant *Poetics*, xv.
- 12 Glissant *Poetics*, 194. “For Opacity” is reproduced in this publication on pages 90–96.
- 13 Glissant *Poetics*, 133.
- 14 Stefan Jonsson in “Stefan Jonsson and Premeh Lalit in Conversation, moderated by Tracy Murtink,” published in this volume on pages 208–219.
- 15 This passage makes reference to Vijay Prashad’s definition of the *Banding Spirit*, in the essay “Planetary ‘Thinking’” published in this volume on pages 198–207. My references to the Third World are inspired by the work of Prashad in his seminal book, *The Darker Nations: A People’s History of the Third World* (New York, London: The New Press, 2007).
- 16 Maria Berrios, e-mail message to author, May 20, 2015. See list of works in this volume.
- 17 Jean-François Lyotard, *Enthusiasm: The Kantian Critique of History* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009), 21–42.
- 18 Vijay Prashad, *The Darker Nations: A People’s History of the Third World* (New York, London: The New Press, 2007), 276.
- 19 See list of works in this volume.
- 20 Bouchra Khalili in “The translation of a translation: A conversation between Bouchra Khalili and Thomas J. Law” in *Bouchra Khalili: Foreign Office*, (Paris: SAM Art Projects Collection, 2015), 72.
- 21 William Klein produced two films during the Pan-African Cultural Festival of Algiers, *The Pan-African Festival of Algiers* (1969) and *Elbridge Cleaver Black Panther* (1970). Films were produced by the National Office for Cinematographic Trade and Industry (ONCIC in French). Both films are available in single edition on DVD from Are Editions. Source: Olivier Hadouchi, “African culture will be revolutionary or will not be” *Third Text* 25 (2011): 117–128.
- 22 See list of works in this volume.
- 23 Images in Maryam Jafri’s *Independence Day 1947–1975* (2009) illustrate the independence of Algeria, Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ghana, India, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Madagascar, Malaysia, Morocco, Mozambique, Philippines, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syria, Tanzania, and Tunisia.
- 24 See more in Boris Buden, “Sharks Laugh Last” published in this volume on pages 186–197.
- 25 See list of works in this volume.
- 26 John C. Gruesser, “Review: George S. Schuyler, Samuel L. Brock, and Max Disher” *African-American Review* 27(1993): 679–686.
- 27 Prashad, *Darker Nations*, 191.
- 28 See more in Yazza Hernández Velázquez, “Archiving to Oblivion” published in this volume, pages 180–185. Previously published in *cadernos Sec. Vidéovariál: Uss da memória* 10 (2015) 14–21.
- 29 See list of works in this volume.
- 30 Jawaharlal Nehru addresses his speech “Tryst with Destiny” to the Indian Constituent Assembly in the parliament, on the eve of India’s independence, on 15 August 1947. See more at “Nehru Memorial Museum & Library,” last modified November 2013, <http://www.nehrunemorialmuseuin/en/component/content/article/79-nmmil/214-tryst-with-destiny-speech-text.html>. See Gupta list of works in this volume.
- 31 Here I am paraphrasing Premesh Lalit in “Stefan Jonsson and Premeh Lalit in Conversation, moderated by Tracy Murtink,” published in this volume on pages 208–219.
- 32 Hernández Velázquez, “Archiving,” 180–193.
- 33 Glissant, *Poetics*, 194. “For Opacity” is reproduced in this publication on pages 90–96.