

The book cover features a vibrant yellow background with a marbled, organic pattern of dark, almost black, veins and spots. A white rectangular box with a thin black border is centered in the upper half of the cover. Inside this box, the title is written in a classic serif font. The words are stacked vertically: 'THE CLIMATE' on the first line, 'THE WORRY' on the second, and 'THE DANCE' on the third. The letter 'C' in 'CLIMATE' has a decorative flourish extending to the left, and the 'D' in 'DANCE' has a flourish extending to the right.

THE CLIMATE
THE WORRY
THE DANCE

COLECTIVOS PLÁKA

The Climate, The Worry, The Dance
Edited by Mårten Spångberg
Publisher: Filipa Ramos
Galleria Municipal do Porto, 2023.

The Climate, The Worry, The Dance was published in Portuguese and English.

Isabela, Vera

Isabela, Vera, Teresa and Vera,

Isabela, Vera, Teresa and Vera,

THE CLIMATE, THE WORRY, THE DANCE

Mårten Spångberg

Nowadays, when people use the term "ecology" it is automatically associated with global climate change, the outdoor world, disappearing rainforests and disasters. It is always the world that needs saving and the entire Earth that is going under. That's fair enough, but since when did the term "ecology" become synonymous with climate change or macro-perspectives — and am I the only one who has this feeling? — or the faraway? It's always the ice in the Arctic that is melting, or the forests in Brazil that are burning, hurricanes that are happening somewhere else or endless amounts of beef that are exported to China. What we do locally is almost exclusively at a domestic level: we eat less meat, we separate our household waste and we use an app to rent an electric car. But what else do we do? How do we engage, especially if we're over-16 and can't really take part in Friday manifestations?

How do we engage except by using social media platforms to re-post something about how much plastic there is in the ocean or wildfires that devastate celebrity mansions? Or not even that? It's somewhat tragic how a social media conscience has become a substitute for the real deal or for simply admitting one's ignorance.

Every relationship carries and practices an ecology, such as individuals' relationships to themselves, or their relationships to plants, seasons, smoking, automotive industry, Swedish people or to rave culture. In short, one could say that ecology is that which exists between components, forming a relationship. And relationships are dynamic, always sliding between different forces, from micro- to macro-ecologies, from relatively simple to vastly complex ecologies, whether mainly mental, relational or environmental.

Another way to understand ecology is as a mentality, mindset or attitude, through which one's mind, relationships and environments are perceived and approached. Mentalities that are specific to every relationship but at the same time can be traced back and correspond to shared narratives and conventions, at local, national and global levels. Mentalities are never one's own, or individual. They are always produced, often unconsciously, through complex grids of relationships, but often through pressure and lobbying that is initiated and funded by different powerful institutions, markets, communities and individuals.

For some communities, it can be crucial to generate strong and watertight mentalities, in order to keep the community intact or to withstand external pressure, as a means of acquiring visibility, induce fear or avoid despair. Football fans, poets, Hells Angels members, middle-class mums, stock market brokers, you name it — all of them have felt a need to generate strong mentalities to claim their positions. Other communities are not given permission to practice mentalities, or ecologies, as they desire, and instead often develop alternative models to share their modes of relating.

In order to save the world, the Earth and/or the planet, it's not nature that we need to preserve, it's not the oceans that we need to clean, it's not tariffs on CO2 emissions that we need to introduce. We need to do all that, and quickly. But as long as our mentalities towards the world, at a micro- or macro-level, are upheld, all those efforts and endless amounts of money used will only save us, at best, for an extra 20 minutes or whatever — a tiny sliver of time.

One doesn't need to study the 2015 Paris Agreement for long to understand that politics and politicians, companies and CEO's will never take anything other than token actions for the environment. It's quite simple. Too many excessively influential powers have too much to lose, and hence every page of the Agreement reeks of concessions to avoid pissing anyone off. Parliamentary democracy is a wonderful way to make sure that power doesn't coagulate, but as long as it remains a matter of national governments there will never be a sufficiently large consensus to save anything at all.

Perhaps a new religion could be a solution. A secular religion without a creator, etc., but which still demands some form of commitment. No, I don't think so. It takes time to develop a belief structure, and one for a world whose population will soon top 10 billion? Should its headquarters be in Geneva? Probably a bad idea to install it anywhere in Europe or the US. Better to find a solution somewhere in the Global South. As far as I can see, there is no way of getting around global climate change and its multiple ramifications, other than by creating a huge pile of money and regulations that no-one will want to oppose because of the severity of the punishments. But that would also pave the way for serious inequalities, cheating, black markets, resistance and war.

During virtually the entire history of mankind our problem has been that we are too weak, small and few to be able to stand up against nature. For this reason, humanity has formulated relations between work and nature that protect us from the brutality of its powers. Our work ethic is ultimately the result of how to tame nature, temporarily and partially, to generate forms of collaboration or simply strategies for survival.

In the 20th century, humanity learnt how to master nature, to step up and create some sense of equilibrium and thereafter create technologies that can inflict harm on nature to the extent that it will never repair, or at least not within our time on the planet. The problem is not technology or that people are evil or don't care. The problem is that the relationship between work and nature has not been revised or properly thought through. In fact, we still view nature as something that is stronger than us, which can wipe us out on a whim. We need to change the relationship, or mentality, that has been established between work and nature, between two forces. Humanity has developed technological tools that can also be used to support nature, to generate resources or develop sustainable materials, but unless our relationship to work changes, this can only happen by force.

Humans and their societies have lived in harmony with nature for millions of years. Not always pleasant harmonies or harmoniously, but nonetheless in harmony. Depending on one's perspective, something began to change between the 15th and 18th centuries. If we choose the earlier date it is because we place colonialisation and its violations at the centre of this development. Alternatively we can consider that the starting point was the invention of the steam engine in 1784 (more precisely, a specific patent that made the steam engine more reliable). Both colonialisation and the steam engine are related to de-personalisation or autonomy of manpower, either through enslaved labour or the steam engine as a substitute. The ability to produce things on an industrial scale, whether through enslaved labour or machines, implies a radical change to our relationship to the world and Earth. Humanity thereby gained the ability to exploit the planet's resources, in particular coal and oil, with a power so intense that the world has never recovered. In order to support and justify these formations and the revenue thereby created, new political, governmental, ethical, legal, social and economic practices needed to be articulated and established. The economic organisation consolidated into capitalism, through various steps. As much as capitalism needed to adapt to science and social organisation, the opposite trend soon grew exponentially, in terms of power, influence and manipulation. As we all know, capitalism has developed and consolidated highly precise protocols in relation to property, ownership, land, rent and debt, taxation, patents and so on and so forth. These have been installed to protect already powerful interests.

It goes without saying that power generates more power, which of course is also correct when it comes to establishing legislation, conventions, punishment, law enforcement, the military, education, migration practices, gender, racial politics, inheritance, sexualities, body ideals and so much more. In other words, the first thing we need to discard in order to save the planet is capitalism, as well as the accumulation of wealth.

Unfortunately, there is a small problem. Capitalism is not going to relinquish its grip, no way. Never. Especially since capitalism is a machine that has absolutely no conscience, whose ideology is survival at all costs, that always advances with the wind in its sails, turning its coat, and is absolutely opportunistic. There is no way of discarding capitalism, as if we could open a door and step to the other side, or send it back to Amazon. This is primarily for three reasons. We already know the first: capitalism is extremely malleable and sensitive to change. The second, an extension of the former, is that too many too powerful people have too much to lose, and won't relinquish their power or wealth. The third reason is somewhat more convoluted. The first rule of capitalism is expansion at any price. When a resource, market or dynamic becomes saturated, capitalism will find something else to expand into: waste handling, death, war, depression, debt, storage of nuclear waste, memory, grief, resistance, attention, performativity, sharing, time, the future, even possibility, the list is endless. A scary part is that over recent decades capitalism has also subsumed language. It has assimilated language to the extent that language itself has become a financial asset. Even more scary is that capitalism has become ubiquitous to the extent that it has transformed human imagination into a capitalist imagination. Whatever we imagine, accentuated by the fact that language has been subsumed, it is imagined through a capitalist comprehension of life, the world and everything else. To conceive an escape route from capitalism will inevitably be a capitalist conception, and we will escape into more capitalism, perhaps with a more humane face but nonetheless capitalism. To quote Fredric Jameson's oft-cited phrase: "Today, it's easier to imagine the end of the world than the end of capitalism"; indeed, this is inconceivable given that capitalism has assimilated imagination or when the end of capitalism equals the end of the world. And it does this, since we cannot imagine any alternative.

For art, and dance, this is somewhat irritating. If imagination has been assimilated by capitalism, it seems impossible to create any dance performance that ultimately doesn't run capitalism's errands. Even anti-capitalist dance must be anti, against, or resisting, in ways that are compatible and favourable for capitalism? Every provocation that is created through dance or art can always, even in advance, be calculated in respect of its market value. This is not worth the trouble, or hmm yes, not bad since it will upset the right kind of people, only in it for the money. Whatever art we make is always capitalist art or at least a potential financial asset, in the world of capital. It is no surprise that artists, art worlds and all the rest have become so deeply cynical. Or, if not cynical, have turned to post-hippie practices, where spiritual, mystical, magical, ritual, tarot cards, palm reading, silent retreat, witchcraft, shamanism, healing, etc., all perform a kind of smokescreen or duplicity, in order to create the illusion that there is something out there that hocus-pocus will set everything right again.

So, come on, is anybody so naïve that they think anything will actually change, regardless of how many electric cars we rent with a smartphone app, that global climate change will alter course because we separate our household waste into I don't know how many different plastic containers, or if we stop flying, buy our laptop second-hand over the internet or have cold showers? Don't worry, capitalism can make money on that as well. It may be great to drive an electric car, but in terms of the climate or save-the-world issues, it's like celebrating busting an immigrant who is scattering a few tiny bags of grass on the street corner as the first step to taking down the drug cartels. It doesn't work like that.

Art and information are an infected combo. Art informs about many things; a dance performance informs the audience about the fact that it is a dance piece. It also informs us that it is more or less one hour long, because it ends after 60 or so minutes, and so on. But that is different from being a conveyor of information. A dance piece or any artwork, has no obligation to inform the audience about anything at all, which is just a little bit different from, for example, a newspaper or a red light. The moment art becomes a question of information, it opens a door to a difficult dilemma. A newspaper is more or less optimised in order to convey its content as efficiently as possible. A red light is the most efficient way of ensuring traffic safety. We value red lights for their efficiency not for their aesthetic quality, and we don't discuss what exact vibe the red light should have. It should be red — plain and simple. But what happens to an artwork when it gets stuck between being appreciated for its aesthetic qualities and the efficiency with which it communicates and conveys information? This involves the clash of two juxtaposing modes of evaluation and appreciation. Aesthetic evaluation and efficiency — affect — on one side, and effect, on the other. They are two entirely different, incompatible capacities. To place affect and effect in one bag would be like asking a car dealer how many horsepower the engine has, and he responds, "Oh, kind of darkish green", or to move closer to an out-of-focus painting by Gerhard Richter whilst mumbling: "I can't really see what it is?"

By the way, a newspaper or a red light exists to convey information. When their job is done, we forget about them or put them in the recycling bin. A newspaper is not something you keep in order to come back to and spend some more time together. After all, the news is old; but we keep coming back to artworks, on the other hand, at least some of them, perhaps compulsively or against our will, but we come back. For me, it's Caravaggio's 1606 painting, *Supper at Emmaus*. It just doesn't leave me alone and I don't know why. A 400-year-old painting of five people around a table, ridiculous. It can certainly not be because of the information, but exactly about an affective response in me.

It is of course tempting to fill one's dance, or art, with information, to pass on injustices or asymmetries in the world, to help people, or to scream at the top of our lungs "The world is dying and it's our fault". But, if you want to save the world, is making art really the most effective means? If you want to save the world, why dress up the message in poetics, paint or have a few people dancing around? If you want to save the world, why do you want your work to be hung in a museum, or, even worse, sold by a gallerist or presented in the autumn programme of some random dance festival, when we all know that those kinds of places are designed to neutralise anything harmful or upsetting? If you want to save the world, what happened to your passion for the encounter with art?

This was really cool in the early 1990s and a few years before or after. The museum and theatre or dance venue as a place where forms of intervention could take place that set people back. The museum as a work place, the staging of *Othello* which transforms the stage into a refugee information kiosk with free legal counselling, a performance where the choreographer exposes, next to bits and pieces of Wikipedia info, spoken as if they were her own thoughts, all her household waste from an entire year, or a gallery installation that mimics an airport security check. But today, seriously? Time has caught up with this kind of art, really. Today, every museum director loves and has to include stuff that enlightens the audience about this or that aspect of the programme, preferably with a bit of interaction, performativity and experience economy. Today, every art council, based on policy documents from higher up, distributes resources in accordance with how efficient a project (not an artwork) approaches an exposed community and how positive the result is. Today, which was not exactly the case in 1993, every government wants to know their art institutions of whatever kind will deliver numbers, and forgets about showing art because it's touching, enigmatic or just lovely, or ugly, fun, festive, disgusting, ambivalent or dark.

The crisis that is currently being experienced by art is the desire from power and influential forces to transform art into culture. Art is not culture, even though it is created, shown and distributed in cultural contexts. Art is conveyed by autonomous voices that insist even if they are not heard; culture is an orchestra of mumbling and a murmur trying to please. Culture is great and a necessity for life, evidently, but it's not art, which is not necessary, but passes on the promise of change.

For whom do you make art? It can't really be for myself because I really like to show it, at least to some people. Yes, sure I do it for my own well-being, but the rush happens when it goes live.

It can't really be for the audience, can it? If that was the case, why stick to dance and insist on experimentation and change? If it was for the audience, perhaps I should hire a dramaturg (LOL) or ask a bunch of reliable spectators what they are into? Perhaps I make art to be loved? Probably, but then why make it so terribly difficult and not write a series of really dense historical mystery novels?

Personally, I haven't been able to articulate any other answer than, I make art, in my case primarily dance, for the sake of art, for dance.

Not for my art to be better or more successful, but for art, and dance, in general. I make art in order to keep art alive, flourish, change, transform, kick ass, and most of all in order to make me sleepless, irritated, confused, hopeful, smile and to challenge my reasons for making art. My contribution to art is to make sure it remains complicated and never bends, insists on autonomy and never relaxes.

Presumptuous I guess, but fuck it, maybe I'll crash and end up a bit of a laughingstock. But at least I also kept it up when the ship was going down.

It seems impossible to make art, or dance, about ecology. Informing the audience about the dangers that coming generations will face if we don't shape up, asap. Making dance doesn't reach a lot of people. So, if your mission is to save the world, change your expression. Go big.

If you nonetheless insist on making dance about ecology, for whose benefit is it? Is it perhaps primarily for yourself, since you know that the audience has probably also read between 1,000 to 2,000 articles online about ecology, just as you have done? Is it possible that you want to make dance about ecology — a bit too obviously — in order for the audience and the art council to consider that you are really a responsible person? Are you doing it for yourself? And when you make dance about something, whatever it might be, isn't that a little bit of a betrayal of dance, since it means dance becomes secondary to what it is about? Ouch!

Even more embarrassing would be to make ecological dance, of whatever kind. Only using candlelight? Obviously not travelling by plane. Sure, take the train but don't congratulate yourself for taking it, especially not when your entire audience just spent the weekend in Barcelona, or returned from a business trip or a golf vacation in Tenerife. Don't pride yourself with solely using second-hand clothes for the costumes or skipping the evening programme because printing a bunch of A4 papers will raise the global temperature. Really, give me a break, those highly inventive strategies are nothing more than showing off. It's so obvious that the world will get hotter because we are all blushing.

I believe we just have to admit that dance in this respect will not play a central role in the climate drama of the future. Maybe this is a good insight, since it can open up something else. Dance doesn't have the power, in terms of quantity, to change something in the world, but one might consider the possibility of approaching dance in ways that challenge, undermine, blur or even propose a different ecological mentality, by using dance, and the ways of being with dance, being attentive to dance, working with dance, etc. Simply to be the playground for those motivations.

Can we analyse and reflect dance, in a wide sense, and discover our ecologies related to dance and shift them? Different ways of dancing already propose different ecologies vis-à-vis the body, the ground, relation, intimacy, individuality and so much more. The ways we work with dance, in respect of rehearsing, authorship, decision making protocols, etc., are already ecological practices, and practices that perhaps repeat and consolidate how humanity treats the Earth.

Dance that practices ecologies in a different way, bypasses both "about" and "ecological", maintains its artistic dignity, and at the same time opens up the possibility of approaching life in a different way.

We all know that art has never been free. Of course it hasn't and perhaps that's a really good thing. Art generates, moves, cancels, renews all kinds of relations, and all of them in some or other way propose forms of dependency. Economy, space, authorisation, benefactors, kings, the church, the state, art councils, museums, theatres, archives, parents, partners, colleagues, competitors, enemies and friends, all of them are relations — nice, open, loving or whatever — but they always ask for something in return, if not just reliability and a little bit of respect, and more frequently for reports or proof and the product is aligned with the guidelines or the supporters profile.

Recalling calls for the freedom of art. I think a small glitch has occurred. *Ein, zwei, drei, die Kunst ist frei*, was not really about saying it is free, but rather that art always has the responsibility to strive towards its freedom, even though, and especially since, this is an impossibility.

Art can be more or less free, more or less fettered, and however much it can be a resource or imply forms of violence, the fact that art has something to struggle against, or for, is also part of how it generates promise, takes new directions and forces us to perceive reality differently. An art that represents something inevitably gives up on the possibility of generating a sense of promise — not promise as in "I will arrive on time", but rather an abstract promise, that perhaps can also be viewed as a form of hope; not promise in the sense of performative, but as being — and instead becomes a kind of command.

It is further important to recall that it is art itself that should be free, *die Kunst*, not the artist. The artist as any other person is obviously responsible for his, her or their actions. The artist is subject to the same ethical, legal and economic circumstances as everybody else. An ecologically-responsible artist is an artist who separates their household waste, transports artworks in an electric car or takes the train, and of course doesn't wrap their paintings in bubble wraps but uses recycled materials and environmentally friendly paint. Perhaps the dance company agrees to lower the temperature in the studio by 1 or 2 degrees or turn off the AC, or buy second-hand computers for the office. There are endless adjustments we can adopt to contribute to the climate. It's only up to us to be innovative, discuss and share our relationship to the planet.

But it is perhaps a bit dangerous to equate the artist and the art. An artist's work is not a causal extension of his, her or their psyche, politics or identity. It is of course never entirely independent, but it is downright dangerous to judge a person in respect of what his, her or their work portrays or looks like, the atmosphere they issue, whether there are plastic bottles on stage, or whether the dancers took a flight to get to the show.

It is certainly difficult to know where to draw a line, but perhaps this is exactly the reason why we need to be extra careful, and every artwork evidently operates within complex networks of different and even contradicting forms of responsibility. Art should strive for its freedom, but that is not the same thing as the artist being free to be an asshole or forget to pay taxes, and a programmer or curator is not free at all, given that on the one hand, they may represent a state funded institution's relation to society, while at the same time being a guardian for the artist and most of all of the autonomy (the freedom) that an artwork must be given the opportunity to struggle for.

Michel Houellebecq isn't necessarily a bad person or a fascist because he writes about horrible things, Francis Bacon didn't nourish a desire to kill all Catholic people just because he painted deformed popes, nor is Clint Eastwood a gun freak just because he shot people in some movies or has directed seriously violent ones.

This is certainly a simplifying argumentation and each situation needs to be gently evaluated. Personally, I think it's unnecessary to write books about certain topics, to make movies where violence is graphically in-your-face, stage plays about domestic violence and dances where women are naked and men are not, but that's a somewhat different story compared to ethically judging the person or team that made the work, or even worse to propagate such ideas, in order to blacklist them.

Nevertheless, we should remind ourselves that freedom is not synonymous with irresponsibility, or some fuck-the-police punk attitude; on the contrary, the more freedom somebody or a population is given, the more responsibility falls on the person, her-, him- or themselves. The opposite is also true — an increase of regulations, norms and prohibition implicitly suggests less personal responsibility. Why does a population support fascism? One reason is indisputably the desire not to have to take decisions, to be held responsible.

Furthermore, freedom cannot be one-sided. An art that claims freedom cannot ask to be protected, listened to, supported or funded. In other words, an art that demands its freedom is at the same time making itself sovereign, and liberating the audience, viewer, spectator. Which in turn means that the promise that art carries is the promise, with all its bliss and fear, of nothing else than freedom.

*

Every society has the art it deserves. Art reflects the society in which it is created. Art is not culture but the culture that made it possible is implicitly visible in the art. Similarly, every society needs an aesthetic that is correlated with its general modes of production, distribution of wealth, property, power and so on.

It is no coincidence that a new aesthetic regime was developed and established in the 18th century. The appreciation, value and temporality of art needed to be correlated to extensive changes in society. With the end of feudal or aristocratic society in favour of modern capitalism, it was necessary to create new models for how to conduct life, and this included art. The models proposed might not have been the most accurate or elegant, but the ones that suited society best. The aesthetic regime that was authorised was the one that best benefitted the general modes of production of a certain moment in time.

The aesthetic regime that to a large extent we work with today was established in the late 1700s, first and foremost in Immanuel Kant's 1790 book, *Critique of Judgement*. It is a delicate and highly complex outline which, although never touching upon the issue, suggests a terrain for art that makes it untouchable in respect of conventional forms of value. In particular as Kant successfully argues for the autonomy of the aesthetic experience, i.e., the potential intensity carried by an artwork. It is not the artwork itself that Kant declares to be autonomous, but the possibility of a form of experience to which there is no relation. One could say, an experience that is full of its own emptiness, and it is the encounter with this emptiness that carries — what we previously have touched upon, as an abstract notion of promise — autonomy or "unconditional" freedom. The experience of being a free individual.

Kant's elaboration of art has been contested for 230 years, for many reasons, or even endless reasons, which naturally have changed over time, as society has undergone transformations. Yet, it is still Kant's view of aesthetics that rules the world, kind of – indeed also colonial. A central complex in the challenges to Kant's aesthetics is the tension between autonomy and engagement. Kant argues that the artwork must be contemplated without interest, which means that it cannot at the same time convey a political proposition, content or in any way articulate a social or political engagement, especially not in respect of primary representation. At the same time, as long as art insists on disinterested contemplation, it can claim certain forms of freedom; however, the moment it claims a political space it becomes responsible, like any other information-carrying entity, participant or product. From a Kantian perspective, aesthetics and ethical judgement are incompatible, and must remain so.

From the perspective of art, artists, etc., it is easy to detect a to-and-fro pendulum movement between the desire of autonomy and political engagement. Autonomy as a means to claim special treatment or freedom, but dismissing political engagement, political engagement but risking to lose privileges and becoming social or community work or perhaps simply propaganda.

Now, as mentioned, Kant developed his aesthetic theory alongside huge changes in Western society. Hence, in order for his philosophy to become "successful", it must have been in some way beneficial for power structures in society in general. These powers needed its temporal philosophy, social theory, political models, you name it, to justify their interests and behaviours. Reciprocal relations certainly, cross fertilising each other but never devoid of interest. Kant's philosophy, including his aesthetics, needed to justify interests in respect of colonial power, non-regulated extraction of resources from the planet, burning of fossil fuel, exploitation of workers, accumulation of wealth, consolidation of gender roles and so on. Is it then far-fetched to suggest that as long as we adhere to a – generally speaking – Kantian aesthetics, we are also implicitly supporting the continuation and strengthening of forms of societies, social and political orders that deliberately destroy the Earth?

Our problem is also that similar to capitalism, Kant's philosophy of aesthetics is really sticky and won't let go, because indeed, if nothing else, we can't, after 230 years of indoctrination, imagine an aesthetics that is not either Kantian or anti-Kantian, which in the end is one and the same. It appears impossible to manoeuvre one's way out of the deadlock proposed by Kantian aesthetics, not least because there are overwhelmingly strong forces and economic interests behind maintaining and strengthening the established aesthetic regime. After all, the amalgamated value that art possesses today is safeguarded by the aesthetic regime, and if the understanding of art shifts this value will possibly deflate, and that's not just economic value but, above all, value in respect of all kinds of institutions – private, public, shady or not.

But if we can't conquer them, or even fight them, perhaps there is an option to strive to achieve changes in the ecology of art, the mentality through which we generate, perceive and value art. We can't make art, we can also not make anti-art. We can of course stop making art, give up and do something reasonable, or, at least in the first instance, we can embrace the impossible task of changing the mentality of art to something that simultaneously is and isn't, both art and not art.

This is an art that must be speculative, that doesn't confirm the initiator nor the recipient, that won't have a double spread in any art magazine. It's certainly not avant-garde, and maybe not experimental (at least not in respect of its appearance). It's an art that cannot be made for the artist – in order for it to be properly speculative it can't confirm the maker as the maker – nor for the audience, because the audience, structurally or vis-à-vis knowledge, cannot identify with it; but it is an art that is created, a process initiated, for art, art in general. In order for art to remain alive, flourish, change, transform, make us sleepless, confused and hopeful. An art that insists on the promise of freedom, the hope that life can be conducted in harmony with the planet, the Earth and the world.