4Cs – From Conflict to Conviviality through Creativity and Culture

Interim Evaluation Report and Recommendations

Alastair Fuad-Luke, 31 December 2020

Prepared for Luísa Santos and Ana Fabíola Maurício, FCH-UCP (lead partner) and the 4Cs consortium

Introduction

From 2017 to the present day, the eight partners of the 4Cs consortium have engaged an impressive array of individuals, communities, organisations and institutions in their respective territories, across Europe and internationally. The extent and depth of the initiatives and projects is recognized by the author and seems to meet, in general terms, the proposal accepted and evaluated by Creative Europe. However it is not the intention of the author to evaluate how successful the initiatives and projects undertaken to date by the 4Cs consortium have been in addressing the objectives of the original proposal; this evaluation should be made at the end of the project, now officially extended to 31 December 2021 as a consequence of Covid-19 restrictions and other factors. Rather, this *interim* evaluation aims to stimulate the 4Cs consortium to consider how best to revisit the original conceptual framework, develop a framework of analysis and new shared language for the (very) diverse projects and initiatives in order to effectively engage and communicate with audiences to transfer knowledge gained and the (best) practices developed. This means that different actors and stakeholders involved in different cultural contexts with different notions and types of conflict should be able to effectively navigate and make sense of the work undertaken by the 4Cs consortium then apply approaches, methods and tools in order to catalyse transition of *their* conflicts towards convivial actions. Finally, it is hoped that this evaluation also enables the 4Cs consortium to reflect on the original objectives and intended impacts specified in the proposal and, if necessary, modify these and/or set new trajectories and ambitions for the final 12 months of the project in 2021.

Developing the original conceptual framework and shared language

In the light of work *actually* implemented to date by the 4Cs consortium, the conceptual framework articulated in the proposal to Creative Europe[1] should be revisited along with its central definitions of conflict, conviviality and culture. The author believes other definitions need adding to the conceptual framework to strengthen its relevance to the initiatives and projects of the consortium and its partners, collaborators, stakeholders and shareholders. In particular, a position should be taken on how the consortium views participation in contemporary arts practice and how a redistribution of power helps address conflict within and without the consortium's own institutions and with whom it has worked during the 4Cs programme. In this regard the 2018 review of participation in contemporary arts by Anne Douglas within the AHRC's Connected Communities Programme[2] and Viviana Checchia's Forms of

---

[1] 4Cs - From Conflict to Conviviality through Creativity and Culture Submission to Creative Europe Culture – Cooperation Projects 2017. Ref. EACEA/45/2016, 21st November 2016, 5-8.

[2] Douglas, A. (2018) 'Redistributing Power?: A Poetics of Participation in Contemporary Arts' in Facer, K and Dunleavey, K. Connected Communities Foundation Series. Bristol: University of Bristol/AHRC Connected Communities Programme.

Action[3] are most relevant. Both publications reference the cultural critic Henry Giroux's concept of 'border pedagogy'…'devoted not only to the creation of new objects of knowledge but also to addressing how inequalities, power, and human precarity are rooted in basic institutional structures'[4]. In particular, the consortium should consider what kinds of participatory modalities were adopted by the actors, collaborators and participants (see next section) of their initiatives and projects. The consortium might also reflect on how they define 'action' in the context of the 4Cs, and how action sits with the concept of 'agonistic pluralism' (after Chantel Mouffe) cited in the original proposal[5].

Developing the framework of analysis

Each initiative and project by the 4Cs consortium partners involved a range of actors (people who act – decide, plan, implement, mediate and communicate), collaborators (people who act with the key actors) participants (people who inter-act with the actors and collaborators) and stakeholders and shareholders (people who have a stake or share or an interest in the initiatives and projects) [Note: You can set your own definitions here; these definitions are only as a suggestion]. Mapping the actors, collaborators, participants and stakeholders for *each* initiative or project by *each* consortium partner *while trying to empathically define their needs* (in the context of the 4Cs funded project and/or beyond) might suggest better ways to understand the linkages *between* the activities of the consortium, who has been contributing to knowledge generation, the (diverse) audiences and their engagement and how best practices can be documented and transferred. Furthermore, it might provide a better framework for understanding the impacts of the work in relation to different audiences.

Paying attention to the voices of the diverse cultural agents (e.g. curators, artists and others) engaged across the activities of the 4Cs consortium seems important. Their feedback should be solicited on their initiatives and projects and they should be asked to comment on the emerging framework of analysis.

Revisiting the original objectives and intended impacts in relation to audiences

In the meetings attended by the evaluator (June and September 2020 – see sections below) certain tensions became apparent between meeting the needs of the institutions of the 4Cs consortium, the network of actors, collaborators and participants and, most importantly, the key audiences as identified in the original proposal, especially migrants, refugees and local communities[6]. So this seems to require a re-evaluation by the consortium as to their priorities in terms of stated objectives[7] and intended impacts[8]. For

---

[3] Checcida, V. ed. (2017) FORMS of ACTION. Glasgow: Centre for Contemporary Arts (CCA). Published on the occasion of the exhibition Forms of Action at the CCA, Glasgow, 27 January -12 March 2017.

[4] Franceschini, Silvia. (2017) 'The Pedagogical Unconscious', in Checcida, V. ed. (2017) FORMS of ACTION. Glasgow: Centre for Contemporary Arts (CCA) 29. Published on the occasion of the exhibition Forms of Action at the CCA, Glasgow, 27 January -12 March 2017.

[5] 4Cs - From Conflict to Conviviality through Creativity and Culture Submission to Creative Europe Culture – Cooperation Projects 2017. Ref. EACEA/45/2016, 21st November 2016, 6.

[6] 4Cs - From Conflict to Conviviality through Creativity and Culture Submission to Creative Europe Culture – Cooperation Projects 2017, 9-12.

[7] 4Cs - From Conflict to Conviviality through Creativity and Culture Submission to Creative Europe Culture – Cooperation Projects 2017, 2-3, 15-16.

[8] 4Cs - From Conflict to Conviviality through Creativity and Culture Submission to Creative Europe Culture – Cooperation Projects 2017, 28-30.

example: What are the priority objectives and aims in the context of each institution and the migrants, refugees and local communities that they have access to, or wish to/did involve and/or can affect? How important is it to assess the starting position of each institution and if, and how, that position has changed? It is important that the consortium formulates its own questions here to better understand what its activities and actions have been doing and how these could be directed more effectively in 2021, including the Summer School and associated events or activities.

Reflections and recommendations from the June 2020 meeting

These reflections and recommendations originate from the first contact of the evaluator (the author here) with the individual representatives of the 4Cs consortium partners. during the two-day zoom meeting attended on 22 and 23 June. Notes from the meeting were compiled by Michaela Crimmin, RCA - see Appendix 1 for the author's thoughts, suggestions and recommendations. Here are the key recommendations which interweave with those made in the sections of this report above.

Accessible language is essential to engage, encourage participation, build trust and communicate effectively. Developing a lexicon of terms, phrases etc with the key audiences will help generate ownership of the project and its activities.

It is important the consortium develops together the approach and methodologies for analysing the activities and synthesizing the outputs and outcomes while understanding how that impacted on the 4Cs consortium institutions and the key audiences.

What really has been learnt and how is this learning best shared and communicated within the 4Cs consortium institutions and with the key audiences of the 4Cs programme? Developing a handbook of best practices might not only originate from the activities of the Mediation Labs but from the 'inreach' and 'outreach' activities of the 4Cs consortium.

Reflections and recommendations from the September 2020 meeting

This was a short meeting of the 4Cs consortium partners via zoom on 09 September 2020 to update each other about ongoing and near-future activities. Key observations from the author's point of view included:

An urgent need to develop criteria for cross-mapping the diverse initiatives and projects.

Acknowledging the value of people's difference and similar experiences in executing initiatives and projects, responses to the situations created by the Covid-19 pandemic and acknowledging the nature of the relations between the 4Cs consortium institutions and the artists they engaged.

There is a need to think out of the box for the artists residencies and staff exchanges between institutions not yet initiated. How can the Covid-19 situation be seen as an opportunity to implement works differently but still be focused on the overall objectives and desired impacts of the 4Cs programme?

Reflections and recommendations regarding the web platform

The development of the web platform was a key part of the communications strategy to disseminate the activities of the project partners and other partners, collaborators or people contributing to the artistic and cultural outputs and potential impacts of the project[9].

The rich and diverse content generated to date is acknowledged but the web platform lacks a coherent means for different audiences to easily navigate it in order to access relevant information and content. Reflecting on who the priority audiences are and the appropriateness of the visual, textual and other modes of communication for these audiences is now a *critical activity* for the 4Cs consortium. Revisiting the original audience classification in the proposal in the light of activities completed and in relation to better understanding the needs of key audiences seems urgent. For example, a curator from a cultural institution might find the logic of the menu enables them to access types of events and content that appeals to them and is organized in a way these professionals would understand. However, a professional from a social support organization to migrants or someone from a minority ethnic background might that is looking for inspirational ways to deal with conflict might find it difficult to navigate easily to content that appeals or is of direct relevance to their needs. Accessible language is essential here.

Each project partner should identify a typical representative of the key audiences[10] they wish to reach through their activities and get them to comment on each section of the web platform as listed in the menu at the left hand side of the frame. This should allow the creation of different "personas" representing the key audiences. The needs of each persona should be clarified by feedback from each audience.

Accessibility of content could be improved if each article is tagged with specific keywords. Keywords can relate to categories of information that are of interest to the needs of the key audiences. This would require adjustments to the Content Management System according to the categorization and keywording of the articles – this exercise should be done across the project partner group and should be a priority for early 2021.

As the partners have been compiling their contributions to the interim report on the project it is probably an ideal time to reflect on the organization and communication strategy for the web platform. Table 1 below raises issues regarding the web platform related to the different sections.

---

[9] 4Cs - From Conflict to Conviviality through Creativity and Culture Submission to Creative Europe Culture – Cooperation Projects 2017, Work Package 5. Communication Plan, 86-92.

[10] Key audiences are named in various sections throughout the web platform e.g. Residences "The art-based research residencies are aimed at researchers, artists, curators, writers, musicians, and performers working with the specific social, cultural, economic, and political contexts of each partner"; Conferences "A premier interdisciplinary platform for researchers, practitioners, and educators, the conferences produce and exchange knowledge on conflict, conviviality, and creativity". Identify the key audiences for a short feedback questionnaire or interview survey.

Menu listing	Notes and suggestions
Project	Revisit the original description of the project submitted to Creative Europe then reflect on what has changed throughout the lifetime of the project as content was generated. The description on the website should better reflect what the project has become not what was intended on paper. For example, the text "The 4Cs aims at responding to the challenges of migration, security, and freedom of expression by raising awareness about the role of creative and cultural work in the strengthening of European identity and European citizenship in a project of peace and conviviality" raises expectations for someone about to view the website, but is this where the project is today?
	Under Activities, follow the order of the list in the menu. Shorter descriptions might be fine here with more extensive descriptions under each section. Again, reflect on what has changed over the last 3 years.
Partners	Clear and to the point regarding the organisations but would it be useful to give portrait images and brief descriptions of the *key* people involved for each partner then list members of each team. Rename as Partners & their teams?
People	While this page demonstrates the diversity of people involved in the 4Cs project, it does not clearly show the role(s) people had as partners, collaborators, co-producers or other kinds of contribution. How does the list of PARTICIPANTS differ from the category "Participants" on the Map link? If the TEAM section is placed under PARTNERS above this appears to be a simpler arrangement. This section could then be called PARTICIPANTS.
Calendar	Quick access to see the events of the current and past months. Consideration should be given to colour coding the events to reflect the type of activity e.g. conference, exhibition, workshop etc.
Conferences	OK, target audiences clear.
Film Programme	OK, generally accessible.
Mediation Labs	"The main goal of these mediation labs is to engage with the local communities, create and develop new audiences that usually do not attend art exhibitions and cultural events" – so this section appears to address the mediate of art rather than the mediation of conflict through art, though clearly some of the content is doing exactly that. Again, reflect on what the mediation labs have actually been doing and revisit the text.

Multi-chapter Exhibition	This "distributed" exhibition permits partners to respond to their local/national cultural context and the framing of the 4Cs project. Seems to work well but consider how different audiences might want to access this content.
Residencies	OK, again consider how different audiences might want to access this content.
Summer School	OK, but how does the Summer School pick up on the knowledge generated by all the other events? Is the Summer School a chance to weave together different stories, best practices and emerging recommendations from the 4Cs project?
Workshops	How do the Mediation Labs and Workshops provide different contributions to the Handbook? The Handbook is for which audiences?
Map	This shows the country participation according to four categories: COUNTRY, PARTICIPANTS, EVENT TYPE and YEAR on a world project. The main message is that the 8 project partners involved 57 countries and 249 participants but it is not clear how they were involved (through participation of cultural organisations, artists and/or other collaborators or partners and in what type of project they were involved).
Blog	Blog posts are diverse and many but how does one navigate better? Can this be achieved by using tags, a word cloud and/or a way of categorizing and coding the very different kind of events that the 4Cs project has initiated and hosted. Can someone from a different audience (again categories can be made – are you a curator, museum or gallery director, community youth organizer, migrant?) be asked to "identify" themselves so that key posts can be presented through a filter?
Participate	Again, with reference to the key target audiences the options to participate (or "collaborate" at the text says) do not seem very directed or personalized to these audiences. The language and propositions here need to be more precise and "talk" directly to the kind of participants the project is aimed. This page needs a complete rethink once the consortium has agreed on their conceptual framework of participation (see above in this report).
	As the participation of different cultural agents and people from the special target groups (migrants, refugees, local communities) is a priority for the project then this call to participate might be better positioned at the top of the web page with a clickable button, rather than lost in the main menu.
Digital Library	The main questions of the 4Cs project should be repeated in the short introduction to the digital library. This section of the web platform is incomplete and poorly organized. There is an extensive section on Black History and Anti-Racism, publications listed from some

	institutions as pdfs or issuu platform publications but many of the partners have not contributed anything. This section needs a rethink. Can it be presented more as a reading room with selections from the project partners, artists and other collaborators i.e. elicit a wider contribution through participation.
Communication material	This is mainly press releases and materials to publicise the events of the project, so probably better labelled Press material.
Publications	Arranging the publications by a list of partner institutions does not do justice to the variety and relevance of the publications or assist the target audiences to find the most relevant materials. Again, this needs to be rethought.

APPENDIX I

Notes on the 4Cs partners' meeting

22 and 23 June 2020 hosted by the Royal College of Art on zoom.

Attendees (please note that not everyone was able to stay for the entire two days)

FCH|UCP: Peter Hanenberg, Adriana Martins, Luísa Santos, Ana Fabíola Maurício, Maria Duarte, Ana Cachola

Tensta Konsthall: Cecilia Widenheim; Hanna Nordell

SAVVY: Elena Agudio

Fundació Antoni *Tàpies*: Linda Valdes

Vilnius Academy of Arts: Egija Inzule; Monika Kalinauskaitė

Museet for *Samtidskunst*: Birgitte Kirkhoff Eriksen; Magnus Kaslov; Fillip Danstrup

ENSAD: Anna Bernagozzi; Ludivine Zambon

Royal College of Art: Michaela Crimmin; Peter Oakley; Emma Matthys

<mark>4Cs Evaluator: Alastair Fuad-Luke</mark> input highlighted in yellow.

Luísa welcomed Alastair Fuad-Luke to the meeting.

During updates on each activity, a number of comments and clarifications were made:

Studio Visits and Staff Swaps

Studio visits come from the partner's exhibition budget.

It is permitted to host more than one partner at a time, especially given the impact of Covid-19.

It is essential to complete each and all of the activities, including at least one Studio Visit to another country, although two were originally specified.

If travel is prohibited, Studio Visits may now have to be conducted online.

Fillip said future staff-swaps would benefit from the active participation and engagement of the guest partner in the host's activities. This might be in the form of a presentation or another type of active role.

Cecilia suggested planning and/or coordinating some of the activities between partners in order to benefit from the exchange of ideas, especially during Covid-19.

Online Platform

Maria was thanked for all her support and her role in managing online data.

Contributions to the Blog continue to be very welcome, either from Partners or people in their networks.

There were a number of questions and ambitions for ongoing consideration:

- How can we bring in the participants, show co-production, and give a voice to co-producers, beyond listing them online?
- Who is the website for and how easy is it to use?
- How to make the website more interactive and more accessible?
- Elena suggested running an online radio station and inviting participants to contribute. This would allow different voices and languages. SAVVY has the technology and experience for this. She also proposed the use of podcasts.
- Alastair suggested considering using Creative Commons licensing for certain outputs to encourage others to expand upon the original works. See https://creativecommons.org/.
- The possibility of introducing map/graphics onto the 4Cs website was raised. An online map of the project's geographical reach (with all contributors listed) is already being produced.

It was agreed that the 4Cs website is a valuable resource as a legacy and archive, with a caution being that ongoing maintenance after the close of 4Cs will have to be factored in.

Alastair suggested building a lexicon of new words as a potential way of changing and progressing the dialogue. This would also add vibrancy to the website.

Handbook

Please see the format for the final Handbook at the end of these notes, which was presented by Luísa at the meeting. Alastair suggested we looked for commonalities and differences within the activities carried out, as well as to highlight the mosaic of cultural backgrounds of each partner institution as a guideline in making the handbook.

Publications and Videos

Fabiola and Maria asked Partners please to send all overdue documentation. They will be talking to everyone in turn about what is missing.

There was a suggestion to have one edited video of the highlights of the activities.

Summer School

Luísa said that this is an annual event held by FCH|UCP, with the title for next year's Summer School being 'Convivial Cultures'. The audience will include junior and senior researchers and also be open to the general public. It will include the following:

- Up to six Keynotes. 4Cs partners are invited to suggest speakers and chairs for these.

- A parallel programme of papers selected from responses to an Open Call. 4Cs Partners are encouraged to disseminate information, to be circulated nearer the time. An award will be presented to the presenter of the best paper.

- There will be two Master Classes for MA and PhD students. 4Cs Partners are invited to propose running one of these if they are interested in doing so.

- In addition, there will be a private view of an exhibition of work by artist in residence Rouzbeh Akhbari; and everyone will also be invited to exhibitions and film programmes taking place in Lisbon at the time.

The Summer School will take place at the end of June 2021. If Covid-19 continues to restrict events it will be held online, with the partners' participation. The final partners meeting is due to take place at the same time but may be delayed until September 2021 if the 4Cs programme is suspended due to Covid-19 (please see below).

Final Partners Meeting and Reporting to Creative Europe

The agenda for the final partners' meeting will largely be an evaluation of the 4Cs programme. It is currently planned to take place over two days following immediately after the Summer School. Luísa suggested that if we have EU approval to postpone the project, it would be best to delay the partners' meeting until September 2021. Lisbon will confirm the dates when they hear back from the 4Cs EU Project Officer.

In the final formal report to the EC there is no provision for addressing challenges and making policy recommendations. Therefore, a separate report will be submitted to cover these which Luísa will begin to prepare later this year. She asked for views on format and invites comprehensive feedback to include: the identification of best practice; information on how the original aims may have altered over the four years; the challenges that have been experienced (for example on the difficulties of obtaining visas); and suggestions for policy change. Comments from co-producers, participants, and members of audiences are welcomed.

There was discussion about bureaucratic structures and to what degree these and embedded attitudes emanate from "secure institutional territories" that potentially impede freedom of movement, access and equality. How to fight systemic discrimination and the debilitating effects of capitalism? Monika raised an issue with terms such as 'everybody' since she felt this did not allow for difference. A multitude of perspectives have been involved and the imperative is to collect feedback and evidence from co-producers and participants.

In collecting evidence for the report, Michaela speculated on the possibility of having shared questions as one means of seeing where communality and also difference has taken place; with Alastair suggesting a 'diverse scape' (see below). The meeting agreed that there should be a relationship between the narrative and the technical and financial aspects, combining the political and the organisational.

Further consultation

It was agreed to have a Zoom catch up and quick planning session in early September.

Questions, Reflection and Analysis

4Cs: From Conflict to Conviviality through Creativity and Culture (4Cs) is a transnational cooperation project that responds to a need amongst European cultural institutions that share a common challenge: to explore how training and education in art and culture can constitute powerful resources to reflect on emerging forms of conflict, as well as to envision creative ways to deal with conflictual phenomena, while contributing to audience development through active participation and co-production. The project wishes to advance the conceptual framework of intercultural dialogue and enhance the role of public arts and cultural institutions in the promotion of togetherness through cultural diversity and intercultural encounters.

The main priorities of this project are the following:

1) Capacity building: training and education

2) Audience development

He acknowledged and commended the significant activity across the different parts of the programme and made a number of suggestions with respect to going forward into the final year of 4Cs, with an imperative to focus on dialogic reflection and analysis. The following questions and comments were offered for consideration across the Partnership.

Analyse and synthesise the activities. "Think together; share ideas."

How to make sense of the quantity of material that has accumulated? How has the project progressed 4Cs ambitions? What are the key issues; where is the focus? Who are the main protagonists and can these be mapped for each project to build a common framework for comparison and analysis - the key actors and stakeholders? Who were the co-producers? Who were just receivers? How does the host/guest play out in each activity? With respect to the studio visits, for example, how were these selected? What was the scope and reach of the landscape? Define 'cultural agency' in terms of your own institution. Is there a common definition? What part has research played? How to manage complexity? What are the narratives/stories and how are they being told? What channels of mediation are taking place? There has been a lot of outreach, but what was it for and how does it meet the priorities of the project? It is not clear if it is/has been engagement, or impact.

How do you know audiences are being reached, and developed? Are they co-creators or co-receivers? How does an audience become part of change? What does the project enable and emancipate? How does the project become part of change? Is there a balance between remaining in your own place and going to those of others? Are you an activist with people outside your institutions? Who were the key actors in the activities? Who has been/is being part of the project besides the organisers and the artists/creators? And

how was the selection of artists informed by the contextual and conceptual framework of the 4Cs project in relation to local needs, agendas, opportunities, audiences etc?

What has been learned? What has been particularly special? What were the downsides? What were the tensions? How do we know, that we, our organisations, the participants, and our audiences are being developed / changed? What was the starting point of the individual partner organisations in relation to the aims of the 4Cs project and how has 4Cs itself facilitated change (or not). How to challenge art and design-based practice? How transferable are the best practices? What commonalities and differences are occurring in the different parts of the project? Inreach as well as outreach: reflect on your own institution. How are you reaching, and potentially changing, your colleagues and institutions? Have attitudes changed? How is feedback given to your organisations? Is organisational change taking place?

All activities can be reflected upon through the mediation of the actors/stakeholders involved, the setting chosen, the narrative of the activities, the mediation channels to disseminate the project and so on. For me these all connect to audiences, active co-creative, passive and other kinds. (Note from Alastair in the Chat line)

Decide how to collect and collate material to account for change in the process of 4Cs. For example, use reflective diaries and notes. Alastair suggested asking co-producers what we/they had hoped to achieve; and then afterwards follow up with a question about how this related to their actual experiences, and to try and apply the same logic with audiences. To take into account local eco-systems, as well as wider general and shared contexts. Log attendance at events and other activities. With respect to publicity, we could literally build on Rancière's concept of the "distribution of the sensible" and think how our extended ecosystem/network of participants and co-producers can give publicity to the 4Cs project by allowing them to co-brand publicity.

Question resilience in the context of 4Cs, with a reflective ethnographic dimension. Acknowledge the different starting points – each institution is in an existing cultural context with a particular history. Are these leading to a preferable future? What are the "layers of the onion" that are being investigated? Alastair used the term 'diverse scape' as the project began, compared with it now. What were our different starting points and where have they led us? A suggestion doing an initial contextual mapping. Alastair suggested that for the last year of the project we should co-create activities that accelerate our learning, drawing on effective practices from the first 3 years. This would demonstrate how cross-institutional practice delivers positive outcomes and impacts in direct relation to the key aims of 4Cs. Given the changes during the past three years including 4Cs staff changes, Covid-19, the BlackLivesMatter agenda, and Brexit among them, how have these affected ideas, activities and goals?

Alastair suggested using/referencing:

-   Jacques Rancière's *The Politics of Aesthetics* – including Rancière's concept of "distribution of the sensible", the articulation of modes of thought / perception / action / production - as lenses through which to look at our activities.

- Sherry Arnstein's 'Ladder of Citizen Participation', originally published in 1969, later reproduced in *The Citizen's Handbook*, which lists 8 steps: 1. Manipulation; 2. Therapy; 3. Informing; 4. Consultation; 5. Placation; 6. Partnership; 7. Delegation; 8. Citizen Control.
  Which rung applies? In short, examine the ability to let go of power, have an equity of power. Reflect and point out differences.

- Claire Bishop, *Artificial Hells [Extended note after the meeting.* Also look at Bishop's chapter in *Living as Form,* Nato Thompson, ed. 2012. Her chapter, entitled 'Participation and Spectacle: Where are we now', promotes the necessity of maintaining creative tension between aesthetic practice and social practice. She offers alternative frameworks to Arnstein's ladder to think the aesthetic and artistic simultaneously – the transversatlity of artistic practice as described by Felix Guattari or the consitutively contradictory nature of aesthetic regimes who mediate experiences through objects, again by Rancière].

* Handbook

HANDBOOK OF MEDIATION PRACTICES – TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION