

## Two-Way Patch

### Q+A

For this occasion, we have asked four contributors to answer questions via email. Whilst some questions are directly related to the themes presented in Melanie Gilligan's *The Common Sense*, others speak more specifically of how public art collections (such as Contemporary Art Research Collection) respond to the shifting landscape of art collecting. Contributors include Kirstie Skinner, Harry Weeks, Emily Rosamond and Karen Gregory. This will also be available in our upcoming catalogue exhibition, accessible via Blurb.com. Date TBA.

### Kirstie Skinner

**You are the Director of Outset Scotland, which is a branch or 'chapter' of Outset Contemporary Art Fund, a charitable organisation that champions artists, curators, and public museums. Could you briefly describe Outset and its mission?**

I established Outset Scotland in 2013 in order to encourage philanthropic support for contemporary art in Scotland, just as sister Outset chapters have done internationally. Raising financial contributions from a community of supporters allows us to respond to what artists and curators really need. We champion artistic ambition by funding new commissions, and we enrich public collections by gifting art works.

**Could you describe the significance of 'curatorial leadership' in collecting contemporary artworks within public institutions? And what its impact is within the larger art world?**

The more I talk to curators, the more I am convinced their collecting activity and work with contemporary artists should be seen as a form of praxis: an institution 'thinking' through its collecting.

If we understand a public institution as something more than its physical collection of artefacts – as a discourse that frames those artefacts and is in turn shaped by them – then we should see the people, the ideas, and the relationships around collecting as fundamental to the institution, not merely adjunct or in service of it. The best curators are driven to question inherited and habitual thinking, and they relish bringing historical shifts and dialectical cultural tensions into view for contemporary audiences. Curators who work with living artists learn through their mutual exploration of the institution. Illuminating this exploration through exhibitions and collections displays makes these ever-evolving perspectives more vivid and accessible for audiences.

Works of art (material or otherwise) offer propositions that activate collective and reflective conversations. Once acquired for a collection, a work is brought into a special relation with other collection works – all 'held' in perpetuity – and each new acquisition transforms the whole. Layers of conversation and relational significations accrue around a work, and curators draw these out for audiences with a variety of presentation strategies.

Thus, in our current research project, Curatorial Leadership in Collections (in partnership with Scottish Contemporary Art Network and 8 museum partners from across Scotland) we argue that collecting is vital to an enriched re-thinking of an institution, and that collections curators have a unique role to play in meeting the twin institutional challenges of our day: sustainability and representation.

Partnership working is critical in addressing both challenges. We believe that curators' expert understanding of their own collections enables them to establish meaningful common ground with any external constituencies they wish to serve or work with - genuinely generative partnerships will depend on this.

Crucially, though, sustainability is not just about securing more financial stability in a time of austerity, it is also about ensuring relevance and diversified agency. Curators should be at the vanguard of addressing the sexism, racism and heteronormativity in our collections.

We need to acknowledge that populations and potential audiences are much more culturally diverse than institutional narratives allow, but we need to tackle this in a way that asserts the intersectional nature of identity and allegiance, rather than atomising society into sectional groups. Making these nuances visible through contemporary collecting will gradually make historic absences appear more obvious, absurd and untenable.

**I see this (Gilligan) exhibition as a project that aims to connect multiple disciplines across the University of Edinburgh, and beyond.**

In the case of the University of Edinburgh, it was an inspired choice to identify 'social reproduction' as a theme for its new contemporary art research collection. In *The Common Sense*, the collection's inaugural acquisition, Melanie Gilligan brilliantly dramatises the tension between having a voice and being subject to over-determination by others. She foresees the counter-intuitive relationship between technologically enhanced empathy and an increase in the atomisation of individuals.

The curators are able to seek out works that bring experiential power and emotional force to explore the effects of globalisation, which is of urgent interest to virtually every research discipline in the university. At the same time, they interrogate their own cultural and institutional practices as collectors and - most importantly - make that interrogation visible to audiences.

Harry Weeks

**You have written extensively about the concept of community in your '*A Unique Epochal Knot*' *Negotiations of Community in Contemporary Art*. Could you briefly describe your notion of 'community as such' versus 'this or that community' and how this relates to artworks centred around Claire Bishop's idea of 'the social (re)turn'?**

I actually borrowed the categories of 'community as such' and 'this or that community' from Dutch philosopher René ten Bos. They seemed useful in differentiating between two ways in which we tend to use the word 'community': more abstractly (as in 'a sense of community') or more specifically (as in 'the

Jewish community'). While there are commonalities between these two senses of the word, it was helpful to clearly distinguish between them.

One of my arguments was that the social turn has primarily been conceived of formally – that is through the various forms entailed by art practices (participation, conversation, dialogue, collaboration etc.). As a result, community has tended to be implicated in its 'this or that' sense. An artist might engage a particular community through a participatory or site-specific project. Art historian Miwon Kwon even uses the term 'community specificity' in her discussions of socially engaged work from the early 1990s. My claim was that what has united much of the social turn has not been a desire to engage particular communities, but to negotiate the concept of 'community as such', a concept which seemed particularly destabilised around that time by both the fall of communism and the hegemony of global neoliberalism which prioritises the individual over the collective.

**You mention in your text that, “There is a shared belief amongst most of these theorists that there exists some pre-existing notion of community within society’s collective unconscious, that it is ‘commonsense’, ‘overgeneralised’ and yet now ‘inapplicable.’” How does Gilligan’s film challenge this?**

I think what the film points to, as I allude to above, is that our received understandings of community are insufficient as means of comprehending our current situation. In my thesis, I was discussing the destabilisation of these received understandings in light of the fall of communism and the rise of neoliberalism, but the subsequent developments of neoliberalism, not least towards the gig economy and datafication, present further hurdles for our understanding of community to overcome. This is why contemporary art, with its fixation on negotiating 'community as such' in various ways, seems such an urgent field of practice. We don't want to, and shouldn't, entirely let go of the concept of community, and yet we know it needs to be rethought in light of our current contexts.

**Much of the contemporary artworks and art practices engage with the subject of community in a more physical manner, such as, through art projects with a specific community or with participation from community members, yet Gilligan’s work seems to stand out primarily because of her medium (film) and the narrative or performative elements therein, all with a sci-fi backdrop. Would you agree or disagree to this?**

An upshot of my argument that the social turn has been motivated by a drive to rethink 'community as such' is that the formal aspects of artworks (medium, for instance) became less significant. A sci-fi video work, or a set of diagrams (as in the work of Dean Kenning, which was a major case study in my thesis) are just as apt means of negotiating 'community as such' as a 'community-specific' work, once we take the question of 'this or that community' out of the equation. Doing this really expands the breadth of what might be considered part of the social turn, and identifies a clear reason why it was that so many artists and institutions since the 1990s have suddenly become so invested in the social.

**Gilligan’s first film in this trilogy, namely the *Crisis in the Credit System*, has been a timely arrival appearing immediately after the financial collapse in 2008. Has there been a shift in the topology of the 'community as such' within contemporary art practices since the crash, that is markedly different from pre-2008?**

I think one very direct (and fairly localised) way in which the crash altered our relationship to 'community as such' was via the Tory's 'Big Society' agenda that formed the basis of their 2010 election campaign. The idea was to devolve state responsibilities onto local communities, drawing on people's voluntarist spirit and the powerful rhetorical tool that is the word 'community'. In reality the Big Society ended up predominantly functioning as a cover for widespread cuts in public spending, in response to the financial crash. It withered away as a slogan, replaced by the ubiquitous 'austerity' as the justification of the diminishment of state functions.

Its brief moment in the sun, however, did offer the chance for the concept of 'community', which seems so fluffy and harmless, to come under some serious critical scrutiny, and I think the years since 2008 have been generally characterised by a more sceptical attitude towards the term and its instrumentalisations, both within and outwith the art world. The 'art-as-social-work' paradigm as exemplified by practitioners like WochenKlausur or Suzanne Lacy, which seemed in a sense almost immune to critique on the basis of the good intentions underpinning their projects, can quite easily be viewed now as operating on a continuum with Big Society-type policies and projects. I think in general, within art, practices which unambiguously celebrate community have been less prominent since 2008, with more practices engaging community in a more critical sense.

**In the film, an unborn baby can share its mind with its mother and a third party, and so I believe her film challenges the very notion of the 'unconscious'. How do you traverse or negotiate the terrain of 'community as such' in a hugely digitalised and datafied, bio-political world which Gilligan's characters live in?**

Gilligan's work problematizes the concept of community as being inherently emancipatory or the source of some revolutionary politics. There's a moment in *The Common Sense* where they are looking back on the early days of the Patch, when it is mentioned that there was initial naïve hope that the kind of communal empathy that it would bring about could be the source of a radical collective politics. That doesn't pan out, of course.

'Big Data' opens up a new chapter in the narrative of freedom vs security that has long defined discourse around community. Zygmunt Bauman's work on this is great. He argues that freedom without security, and security without freedom are both equally unpleasant prospects, and so whilst seeking 'community' will always be a societal aim (on the grounds that we desire security), we are unlikely to find in community 'the pleasures we savoured in our dreams' as our freedom would be impinged by our admission into a secure community.

Datafication seems to update this dialectic in all kinds of ways. Data is collected and stored so often on the grounds of its function as a means of ensuring security, albeit at the expense of freedom. But security for whom? Certainly not everyone. And the gig economy of piecework that *The Common Sense* focuses on is based on the individualisation of labour, giving us the apparent 'freedom' to work when we want and do what we want. The Scottish Government's research into the 'collaborative economy' – or gig economy – identifies 'increasing choice and competition' as a key opportunity for the collaborative economy. The price paid is (job-)security and the possibility for solidarity between workers, despite the fact that in *The Common Sense* their labour is made possible by the 'community' enabled by the Patch.

## **Emily Rosamond**

**Whilst at first glance your artistic practice and Gilligan's appear vastly different from one another, I also feel that both of your practices share common concerns. For example, your on-going project *Weathervane* (2014) and *The Common Sense* both directly or indirectly elucidate the economy of desire in different modes. Whilst Gilligan emphasises her characters' desire to connect and exist inside technological connectivity, your work explores the desire to know the future, and you also explore its strategic connection to the capital. How would you situate your practice in relation to hers?**

That's an interesting question. Of course, on the face of it, our work is extremely different. While I greatly admire artists like Gilligan, who can take a really direct approach to their subject matter in their art, it's not how I work. I would never build up a plot in the way that Gilligan does, or work with filmic tropes. As a theorist, I take on topics such as the importance of credit as a neoliberal social logic and regime of accumulation head on, which have to come out indirectly in my artwork: through an engagement with materials, and the cultivation of an idiosyncratic "voice" that, I think, enacts both a rejection of the neoliberal logic that I'm writing about, and also total complicity with it at the same time, through desire.

I think you're quite right to say that the similarity between Gilligan's work and mine is in desire – even though desire might function quite differently in each of our projects. As Jasper Bernes points out in his terrific response to Gilligan's work, *The Common Sense* speaks to the need for a new distinction, not between individuality and community, but rather between different kinds of community: the 'community of capital' – social relations beholden to the ways in which capitalism itself produces communities – and the 'human community', which is resistant to capital. In an age in which 'sharing' and social networks have been put to service by capitalism, it's important to understand that the desire to connect with others has been thoroughly co-opted, and how to assert forms of community that resist this is a very difficult question.

Gilligan's subjects' desire to connect with one another has been thoroughly co-opted, and it has also been infused with fear – here, a meta-emotion that speaks to these people's relationship to the system of 'patched' emotion itself. Yet their (enhanced, yet thoroughly compromised) way of relating to one another still contains a hint of possibility of something different: a desire that could lead to another form of community. In a similar (if far more indirect) way, the persona that my work enacts embodies an analogous sort of conflicted desire: the predictive desires of data culture, replayed through an uncertain, decision-fatigued persona who wants to "know". This relationship between the predictive desire and decision fatigue is thoroughly complicit; but it also perhaps contains a hint of potential for what Joshua Ramey, in his terrific book *Politics of Divination* (2016) referred to as "decolonizing divination": taking predictive practices out of their state of co-optation by neoliberal capital.

**In the film, an unborn baby can share its mind with its mother and a third party, and so I believe her film challenges the very notion or the boundaries of conscious/unconscious'. How do you**

**traverse or negotiate the terrain of ‘community as such’ in a hugely digitalised and datafied, bio-political world which Gilligan’s characters live in?**

Yes, the fetal subject in the film is quite interesting. It’s curious to compare how the fetus in Gilligan’s work relates to fetal imagery in some other contexts, as a way to think through what’s most unique about *The Common Sense* on this front. I immediately think of a character in Frank Herbert’s *Dune* (which I read as a child) who ingests a hallucinogenic drug during pregnancy as part of an initiation ritual, so that both she and her child’s consciousness are fundamentally reordered, and the baby immediately says, “I love you” when she is born. This imagined fetal intervention echoes a 60’s psychedelic sensibility, which has to do with widening and heightening consciousness.

By comparison, the “patch” in *The Common Sense* widens the scope of shared *feeling*, but not shared consciousness. This seems to produce an image not of a baby’s becoming part of the adult economic world, so much as the mother (and also her boss) becoming fetal – becoming thoroughly entrained subjects, who send and receive feeling-signals, but are somehow infantilized in the process. There’s a strong parallel to Lauren Berlant’s work here on “fetal motherhood” as an important, imagined site for the production of citizenship (1994) – which she subsequently developed in her analysis of the role of the fetus in American national discourse (plainly visible, for instance, in the Republican obsession with the rights of the unborn fetus, which often seem to outstrip the rights of citizens who have already been born):

“...the fetal/infantile person is a *stand-in* for a complicated and contradictory set of anxieties and desires about whose citizenship – whose subjectivity, whose forms of intimacy and interest, whose bodies and identifications, whose heroic narratives – will direct America’s future” (Berlant, *The Queen of America Goes to Washington City: Essays on Sex and Citizenship* [Duke UP, 1997] p. 6).

In this book, Berlant explores narratives of national citizenship that act out “an optimistic desire to create a posthistorical future in which all acts take place in a private space of loving citizen discipline, a space in which, meanwhile, public political life is demonized...” (*ibid*, p. 23). Though Gilligan’s work focuses on corporate citizenship over national citizenship, there are clear parallels here in thinking about the ways in which sharing feeling produces an infantilizing ideal for participating in a community. Emphatically, the fetus may have feeling, but it cannot have emotion – which, unlike feeling, requires a relationship to biography and the conceptualization of emotion. (For instance, if a baby feels hunger or sadness, it simply cries; this does not require any self-awareness or understanding. If adults feel sadness, they will reflexively understand that they feel sad, by relating their feeling to their biography, and a conceptual understanding of the emotion of sadness that develops over a lifetime.) Gilligan focuses our attention on the *recursive* effects of shared feeling, and deliberately brackets out the *reflexive* aspects of emotion; this is part of her dystopian view of the value of patched feelings. The glazed-over expressions of the characters exemplify on an even more intimate level what Berlant refers to as the ideal of all aspects of citizenship taking place in a private space in future. This space of shared feeling is indeed still private – in spite of the shared flow of feeling.

It’s also interesting to compare Gilligan’s representation of fetal proto-subjecthood with Huxley’s stunning image at the beginning of *Brave New World*, which presents a factory-line production of fetuses, grown according to formula and then tampered with, such that their intelligence levels would

perfectly match the jobs associated with their class. Huxley imagines a brave new world in which biological motherhood has been rendered embarrassingly, even profanely passé. Gilligan presents a somewhat softer, more flexible 'gig economy' rendition of bio-reengineering compared to Huxley's production-line imaginary; but the dystopian vision is not so dissimilar in tone.

**One of the characters Jesse, looking distraught, confesses to the teacher. "I made this mistake today that might cost me my contacts ... I forgot to return it, a sense of thanks and appreciation." I think we can relate to this, particularly when we feel guilty of a delayed thank you email to someone. The patch communication exaggerates this claim, where your performance level and reputation evermore strongly correlates the speed of your response. Can you talk a little about this in relation to your recent article "All Data is Credit Data", where you explore the relationship between 'characterisation' and the credit system?**

This is a really interesting aspect of *The Common Sense* – and quite prescient as well, given many recent scholarly writings, literary works and television shows that have been exploring the immense performative pressures of quantified emotional labourers and online socialites. When I think about the constellation of writings and works that *The Common Sense* relates to, Arlie Russell Hochschild's book *The Managed Heart: The Commercialization of Human Feeling* (1983) immediately springs to mind. This was a pioneering study about emotional labour, in which Hochschild closely follows flight attendants and analyses the pressures they were under to personify the attitudes of the companies they worked for. Hochschild notes the extreme difficulty that many flight attendants had in "turning off" their at-work displays of emotional sensitivity, and concluded that such service industry work involved a commodification of emotion.

Of course, in what Carolin Gerlitz and Anne Helmond famously termed the "Like economy" (2013), such performative pressures are arguably even stronger – both in and outside of work – and as we know, Silicon Valley companies have invented new ways to profit from expressions of online emotion. As Alison Hearn has noted in a wonderful essay called "Structuring feeling: Web 2.0, online ranking and rating, and the digital 'reputation' economy" (2010), there has been an enforced "smiley-faced" disposition to many online rankings and ratings – as if many online reviewers rank one another highly, in fear that if they don't, they may be rated poorly in return. (This essay predates the rise of trolling culture as we know it today.) This anxiety-ridden, "smiley-faced" disposition in the face of the pervasive quantification of emotional labour and social worth has been the focus of a number of recent works of fiction. Dave Eggers' *The Circle* (2013) (his novel parodying Google) depicts employees' extreme pressure to reciprocate on customers' requests for them to add value to their social networks – and to be a social media influencer who exemplifies "transparency" as a company value. Gary Steyngart's *Super Sad True Love Story* (2010) paints a picture of a dystopian near future in which shoppers' credit scores flash up on credit poles when they leave a shop, and as soon as they enter a pub, everyone immediately knows exactly how they rank for, say, "male hotness" in the room, because everyone constantly rates one another on a RateMe Plus app. Similarly, in *Black Mirror's* "Nosedive" episode (2016), everyone instantly rates every transaction they have with everyone else, so that one bad score from a high-ranking individual is enough to send someone into a tailspin, and prevent them from being able to book a flight, take a taxi, or rent a desirable flat in real time. Of course, credit scoring has been an institution for some time already, and has already both measured and modulated financial opportunities based on past performance. As I've written about in my "All Data is Credit Data" essay, new, big data-driven credit scoring methods emphasize even more the ways in which algorithmic judgements of online character

and reputation can determine the scope of one's financial and social opportunities. With the rise of China's national Social Credit System, set to become mandatory by 2020, such real-time modulations of one's opportunities based on their overall "sincerity" is perhaps not so far off. Already, there are early reports of activists being barred from purchasing train fare.

In light of all these works, one thing that stands out for me in Gilligan's work is her quite nuanced focus on the recursivity of feedback on employee emotion. If the employee gets a bad score because they haven't sufficiently projected the requisite emotion, receiving the bad score will thus set off an even greater negative feedback loop; their emotions of panic and even feeling sick are proportionate not to the social transaction that has taken place, but to the extremely high stakes of the negative feedback itself (which could cost them their job). The scene in which the factory manager considers stitching his employees to the two-way patch is instructive. A high-up 'patch' executive assures the manager that two-way entrainment between managers and employees would make employees would be 94% more likely to adjust their behaviours to please managers. ("It gets straight to your employees' limbic system. They'll do anything to make the manager happy.") The manager asks about the potential that emotions managers do not wish to pass through the system might transfer over to employees – it sounds unpredictable to him, as managers can't control what they feel. The exec assures him that "limited wave entrainment only shares what we want to share"; she encourages him to "select a slim band that includes displeasure, and selected happiness for when work goes well". As becomes clear elsewhere in the series, there is always the danger that something unwanted will slip through, and the logic of the "slim band" – the assumption that only certain desired types of emotion will be shared – remains thoroughly in question. This also opens up a series of questions about who gets to choose which "bands" of emotion will be entrained, and who remains at the mercy of others' choices. Managers are exempt from the level of emotional sharing on which employees' very livelihoods depend.

Writing about online shaming (2016), the media theorist Wendy Chun asks: how might it be possible to promote a culture of fore-giveness online? How might it be possible to change the culture whereby one mistake in a social network can cost us everything? The vastly disproportionate relation between an employee's lack of appropriate expressed emotion and its punishment in Gilligan's fictional world raises a similar set of questions.

### **Karen Gregory**

**Previously you have mentioned that "...Data without social context is dangerous data. Big data analysis runs the risk of mistaking that data for social meaning". Within this context, could you expand the notion of 'data for the social' and 'data as the social'? And do you speculate that the very definition of 'social' can or is already transforming into 'data-based population' synchronised with the capital, as is witnessed in Gilligan's dystopic film?**

I'm following Kate Crawford and danah boyd here when I suggest that data, particularly big data, taken out of context loses meaning and can be potentially dangerous. This means you might not fully understand the meanings, intentions, interactions, cultural gestures or any number of social signposts that helps shape how we understand and interpret information. For example, you might "like" a Facebook post in anger or to be sarcastic, but how we would know this from simply looking at the data



point. Another example might be student data—we are obsessed with collecting “analytics” from online learning platforms, but these data can give wildly incorrect portraits of student behaviour, let alone actual learning.

The deeper issue here, however, is not simply that we need more data or “more context” to understand the data we collect, but that data comes to be seen as entirely representative of “the social” or that is it treated as something that, along, can “reveal” the shape of the social or the structure of social life. On the one hand, while researchers may want to understand that structure (say, to understand wealth inequality in labor markets), big data and the ubiquity of data (now coming from voluntary and involuntary sources) are giving rise to the use of data as a way to pin down social life and to “predict” it. This is the fundamental mistake—data does reveal locked and fixed laws of sociality. Yet we are building a world premised on that falsehood. While Gilligan has created a dystopia, this future is already here in the form of predictive policing systems, where racial bias may be built directly into the system, or in systems such as the emerging Chinese credit score, which purports to create a ranking for citizens that is already being used to ban individuals with bad credit from planes and trains (if you want the reference for that it’s here: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-china-credit/china-to-bar-people-with-bad-social-credit-from-planes-trains-idUSKCN1GS10S>)

**In Gilligan’s film, the patch malfunctions and makes it clear that the students do not know how to operate outside of their ‘data-selves’ (the fragmented versions of ourselves, as opposed to individual self) – they go into a shock, unable to communicate. The big data as the bio-political tool creates a cyclical process whereby it advances the existing ‘data-selves’ by creating new forms of data every day that can aim at predicting behaviours, and thereby exerting more data, more control. What do you speculate to be ‘new forms’ of data that can arise and spread in the context of Internet of Things?**

I think we will see an expanse of sensors for environments, the increased desire to make environment “smart”, which means gathering more data and using the data dynamically to adopt and adapt those environments. We will see more “care”-based things, as this is a fundamental part of what is being sold through something like Siri or Alexa, the idea that the data (and by extension, the corporation) can know us better than we can know ourselves and can provide for us. I also think we’ll see an expansion of wearable tech, particularly in classrooms and workplaces. Indigestible technology is also on the horizon and will, most likely, reshape the contours of health and medicine.

Also, all of this might be a bit broken, despite sounding like a new utopia of convenience. I fully expect that more venture capital money will flow into the development of these systems, but I don’t see much in the areas of maintenance and the labor required to service this new world.

**“If you are not paying for it, then you are the product”, is something we hear a lot. How will capital and technology continue to necessitate the ‘human’ in the ‘human capital’?**

Humans will always be part and parcel of the value production process. While there is a tendency in capitalism to reduce labor costs and to make labor more and more invisible, humans will still be needed to circulate capital, either in the form of data bodies, consumers, citizens or workers. The real question is, what kind of quality of life does this suggest? Your question is pointing to the issue of rights,

protections, leverage, and other ways in which humans who will be caught up in the contradictions of capital will be able resist and refuse their own degradation. As I mentioned above, the IoT fantasy of smartness requires a tremendous amount of labor to maintain and upgrade and service. Humans will still be needed here, but they will most likely work in much closer relationship with machines, robots, data-driven systems. This also means increased control and surveillance. I don't think humans will be put out of business, but looking back to the histories of labor, we may also be facing a very bleak future that is human, all too human, but lacking fundamental rights, legislations, and social formations capable of resisting.

**Economisation of academic institutions has entered many debates across the UK universities and beyond, in the form of cognitive capitalism and intellectual labour. How do you feel your subject of 'digital scholarship' and the soft skill of 'resilience' may participate in this?**

Digital scholarship, to me, is about helping students and scholars see their labor and their relationship with the digital and with data. It is, fundamentally, about doing scholarship differently, asking who owns our work and labor, where is the university, and who is it for? In the current moment of UK higher education strikes, these questions could not be more timely. We need new literacies to be able to understand the world that is being built, but also new critical thinking capacities to intervene. Digital social science should be the place where one learns not just to question predictive policing systems, but also how to dismantle them.

### **Contributors:**

**Angela Dimitrakaki** is a writer and Senior Lecturer in Contemporary Art History and Theory at the University of Edinburgh where she co-directs the MSc Modern and Contemporary Art and the Global Contemporary research group. Her books include *Economy: Art, Production and the Subject in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (2015, co-edited with Kirsten Lloyd), *Gender, ArtWork and the Global Imperative* (2013), *Politics in a Glass Case: Feminism, Exhibition Cultures, and Curatorial Transgressions* (2013, co-edited with Lara Perry), *Art and Globalisation: From the Postmodern Sign to the Biopolitical Arena* (2013, in Greek). In 2016, she co-edited a special volume on Social Reproduction for *Historical Materialism: Research in Critical Marxist Theory*, and in 2017, a special issue on Social Reproduction and Art for *Third Text*, for which she is now co-editing a special issue on antifascist art theory, forthcoming in 2019. In 2017, she was the recipient of an Academy of Athens award for her fiction writing.

**Karen Gregory** is a digital sociologist, ethnographer, and lecturer in the Department of Sociology at the University of Edinburgh and Programme Director of the MSc in Digital Society. She is currently working on a research project that examines the possibilities for solidarity in a digital economy, conducting interviews among Deliveroo riders in Scotland. Her current research interests include the notion of "resilience" and the ways in which everyday working people navigate shifting economies and technological terrains; new and emerging digital research methods and research ethics in digital scholarship, as well as issues of digital labor in higher education.

**Emily Rosamond** is a Canadian artist, writer and educator. She completed her PhD in 2016, as a Commonwealth Scholar in Art at Goldsmiths, University of London. She is Lecturer in Visual Cultures at Goldsmiths, and Joint Programme Leader on the BA Fine Art & History of Art. She exhibits individually and with the collective School of The Event Horizon.

**Kirstie Skinner** established Outset Scotland in 2013, in order to encourage more philanthropic investment in contemporary art in Scotland. Prior to this, Kirstie devised education and curatorial professional development programmes for various institutions, including National Galleries of Scotland, Collective Gallery, Glasgow International Art Festival, Scottish Arts Council, and Contemporary Art Society. She taught for many years at the University of Edinburgh and at Edinburgh College of Art, where she submitted her doctoral thesis, *Spectres of Minimalism*, in 2010. Dr. Skinner is also a founding editor of a website on the subject <http://www.collectingcontemporary.org> built in collaboration with the University of Edinburgh while serving as their Fellow in Contemporary Art Theory and Curating 2015/16.

**Harry Weeks** is a Teaching Fellow in History of Art. He was previously a Postdoctoral Fellow of the Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities, University of Edinburgh (2015-16), and was awarded a PhD from the University of Edinburgh in 2014. His thesis, entitled “‘A Unique Epochal Knot’: Negotiations of Community in Contemporary Art”, examined how art practices since 1989 have contributed to a rethinking of the concept of community. His current research interests include community; socially engaged art practice; the autonomy of art; art and the city. He is co-editor of a forthcoming special issue of *Third Text* entitled *Anti/Fascist/Art/Theory*.