

Raqs Media Collective Practising Collectivity: What is possible and not yet forbidden?



Art :
Re-
Enchant-
ment of
the
World

RAQS MEDIA COLLECTIVE

WALK IN THE SHIFTING TIME HORIZON

FROM
SUBJECTIVE
PERSPECTIVE
TO SPACE

Proposal

Many forms of
Cooperations

Offline
online

Art:
Re-
Enchant-
ment of
the
World

built micro
milieus

blur
artistic &
curatorial
milieu

SOURCES

GEOMETRY
OF RAQS CREATING
NEW SPACES

SHAPES

NOT NUMBERS
BUT RELATION
SHIPS

INVITING

a reservoir
of memories

SETTING
the
SCENE

ABANDONED PLACES
COMMON GROUNDS
HIJACKING!

MAKING
THINGS
Possible

What is
possible - not
yet forbidden



Raqs Media Collective (Jeebesh Bagchi): It's a long journey: from the beginning of Raqs in 1992 to an intensification of practice and milieu with us setting up Sarai in 2000, to today. As a collective, we start on specific threads by generating an axial moment or theme, or by drawing in a source, and then we try to think of the various "shifts" that this produces. One of the questions that has occupied us since our inception is that of the "arena". We are interested in looking within the "arena" at infrastructures and relationships that bring people together, as well as the knowledge, sentiments, thresholds, and affects that are produced from it. Two more concepts important to us are what we call "minor practices" and "infra-practices". "Minor practices" are practices that keep "infra-practices" in operation, that transform infrastructures.

Raqs Media Collective (Shuddhabrata Sengupta): We were always very interested in thinking about ways of setting the stage for actions, for people to gather, for things to happen, what Jeebesh calls the "arena". For us, this was a process that occupied a lot of our attention from 1998 onwards. There was a certain transformation going on in India at the time; people were finding new modes of talking to each

other, the economy was changing, new technologies were being introduced, new media communication technologies became present, etc. Together with two other theorists, Ravi Vasudevan, a cinema historian, and Ravi Sundaram, a historian specialising in popular technologies in the urban environment, we formed a space, a programme and an expanding cluster of relationships that we called Sarai. The Sarai programme[1] at the Centre for the Study of Developing Societies was both a platform where different kinds of practice, intellectual work and research could meet, but also a place for making things. It's a space for reflection, for production, for learning, for asking questions and for making.

For us, the most important part of being in a collective, and this goes back to when we started after our film school days, is not numbers but relationships. We have written an essay, called "Additions, Subtractions: On Collectives and Collectivity" [2], which talks about collectivity as a mode of being in a collective. We claim that there's an important distinction between collectivity and geometry. You can take any number of people, any accumulation – but this doesn't in itself produce a sense of being a collective. What differentiates one

accumulation from another is the evolving shape of the gathering. For us in Raqs, this is what we call the triangulation between the three of us, between our three interests, our three individual, very different lives and curiosities that then intersect with other “ships”. The geometry of Raqs is in flux and it is also in interaction with many other geometries, creating new spaces, creating new contexts for being, creating new contexts for making things happen. I think this is the first distinction that we must understand when we talk about collective curating. It’s not just about putting people in a room together and asking them to curate, it’s about trying to find a geometry of thought, a way of being and expressing together.

Sarai was a geometry box, it was a toolkit for making different geometries. One of the things we did was institute a set of independent fellowships. By the end, there were more than 600 fellowships that occupied many different areas of practice, ranging from technology to theatre, to dance, to culture, to contemporary art, to historical research, to archiving. And it was the conversation between these practices that created a certain atmosphere and energy that produced a milieu. We also had

a publication programme that produced The Sarai Readers ^[3]. The final Sarai Reader, Sarai Reader 09^[4], was a book that became an exhibition and an exhibition that was also a kind of publication.

There was always an ongoing conversation through online gatherings. In a sense this is what we are all doing today, because we have offline constraints, we have online possibilities. In the early 2000s, there was an interesting inversion of this, there were online constraints and offline possibilities. By online constraints, I mean that the Internet was very new, broadband was very slow, attention spans were different and people were not used to the idea of meeting and interacting in virtual space. So Sarai deliberately created a conversation exploring what it meant to be online between these new technologies, as well as finding constant, intensive, frequent possibilities for physical interaction. We always had this ambidextrous practice between online gatherings and offline intensification, and it produced many possibilities. We did labs in working-class communities, publication programmes, we worked with language and with different forms of practice that became artistic ones. Many of the contemporary art

forms that we see in South Asia today were in some ways seeded during that period. At the time, they were not necessarily recognised as art or as curatorial practice. We ourselves were ambivalent about the fact that we were considered to be artists. We came into being artists through that process. We also did not know then that much of what we were doing had curatorial implications. This process of finding energies, gathering people, creating the context for collaboration, making things possible and then nurturing them over time, we now understand is connected to curating.

Jeebesh: One of the things that we understood and developed back then, and which is now becoming increasingly important for us, is the idea of the perennial presence of each other, the importance of that creative environment where people can be present for sustained periods of time. How does the moment of intensification occur? What type of conditions do you create at the moment of intensification? Perennial presence requires a very light structure, one that anybody might participate in with a basic Internet connection. It could appear simply as a link that allows one to look at and be with others. At Sarai we set up a simple protocol: if you were a fellow of Sarai,

we would be working with you, we would be in conversation with you, and we would also bring you together with the other fellows of Sarai.

We were part of an experiment in building forms of co-presence; there is not one kind of co-presence but many, and you just need to set up the conditions for that co-presence to occur. I remember one of the fellows, now a well-known artist, asked: “What are we supposed to produce?” And I had said: “Come here and spend time with each other, and production is not mandatory, just enjoy being an artist. One can surely have six weeks of being an artist without producing!” I think this still haunts his practice. This comes from the idea that an artist is more than someone who only just produces works. It is something that has carried on in our discussions, and in environments, which we have gathered. We did an experiment, for instance, in 2012-13 in Delhi/Gurugram, where we created an exhibition process involving a hundred artists over nine months, which opened **empty**^[5]. As in, the public was invited to a space without works, but there was one caveat — every artist had given a proposal of what they would do over the months in the space, and these

proposals were available in the space for all to read. Reading each other's proposals, we would see how works developed their own rhythm and grew in a cooperative way. It was chaotic and anarchic, and it produced exciting micro-models of doing, both curatorial and artistic work. When the role of the curator and the artist gets blurred, micro-climates are fostered.

Shuddhabrata: One of the next things we did was to produce an exhibition in Delhi called **INSERT2014** ^[6], which was an insertion into the contemporary cultural life of the city. One of the propositions that we made was, that part of being connected to the collective life of the city is also discovering what the city makes possible or what is latent. We researched spaces that were either unbuilt, abandoned or disused in Delhi and tried to list them in terms of what possibilities could emerge from them. This list of spaces was then handed over to a group of invited artists, intellectuals, architects, writers and they were asked to imagine, what is the possible life or afterlife they could see there — the imagined life of these spaces? It was a way of saying: “We live in this city which is full of possibilities, there are all these spaces that are actually

open to reinvention and reuse if they were to be occupied by artistic presence, if they were to be inhabited by the life of culture and imagination.” And this process produced a very interesting constellation of an imagined but very real city, because these were not fantastical spaces, they were present in the city and the curatorial process consisted in making them manifest. We called it “Common Ground”, the idea being that their discovery and the entrance of the artistic presence into these common grounds actually makes them part of the imaginative commons of the city.

If we are making an exhibition in the city where we are inviting artists from different parts of the world, we are also inviting the city to discover a part of itself through the research, presence and intervention of artists in how they propose and how they reimagine the city's structure. You have to work with available resources, especially in societies where infrastructure is not a given, where everything is not laid out for you, as it is in South Asia, as it is in a city like Delhi. This was something that we encouraged in Sarai, not to romanticise lo-fi, but instead to never think in terms of impossibilities. It's very easy in many cultural contexts, whether because of resources or

because of censorship or because of other constraints, for artists and curators to quickly turn to the question of the lament, of what is not possible. So we decided to do this the other way around, let's always think in terms of what is possible. Many of the things that are possible are not yet forbidden, and what is not yet forbidden is a space of openness where you can push the frontiers of what culture is, what contemporary art is, what intellectual life is, what can be thought and spoken and said in a city.

Jeebesh: I will briefly touch on the idea of the “infra”, which I initially referred to as “infra-practices”. In 2015 we were invited to curate the eleventh [Shanghai Biennale](#) ^[7], and in a biennale you have a carte blanche, to a certain extent, to set up your own team. There are constraints, but the part that is great fun is that you set up a team and create a group of people who will work with you and who will be in conversation with you. So, we asked ourselves, “What exactly is curatorial authorship?” In order to fully understand authorship, you have to first understand the conversation that any authorship needs to be part of. To engage with this, we invented the idea of “infra-curatorial”. We invited seven people, all of whom

were engaged in different forms of curatorial practices, and all of them took our invitation and wager to completely new levels. We outlined the space and shared ‘sources’ that we were thinking with, as well as conversational annotations and materials from the time spent walking through Shanghai. In the exhibition, each infra-curator had an authorial signature, but it also extended as a co-authorial tendency with us. This doubling of the curatorial creates an intense thicket, where there are certain consistencies, currents, distinctions, demarcations, and, at the same time, densities emerge. The curatorial contains and expresses its own dissonances and inconsistencies. Certain artistic works emerged which could not have happened otherwise. These kinds of possibilities are what “infra” allows us to unravel. It's that specific conversation, the thread that somebody amplifies in a certain kind of historical specificity, a certain kind of geographical intensity that cannot be framed otherwise within the larger play. Here it is not the individual artist who is doing the staging, it is a certain curatorial density that is staging a whole scenario from different zones. In connection to this, also within the Biennale, we did an experiment called the Theory Opera. How do you speak about theory? That's



a question that always comes up in contemporary art. You have the exhibition and the seminar – the classic contemporary art separation. The seminar is where logos speak, the exhibition is where affect comes in. And this is the delusion, this separation that has become the formula. It didn't start as a binary, but it has become so. Through our Theory Opera, we wanted to test this partition.

CURARE participant: I was just wondering if you could talk a bit more about the role sources play in your work.

Shuddhabrata: I think, just to complicate the question, sources enable an interesting set of manoeuvres. It's a bit like, if you're a farmer and you're throwing your seeds in different places and you're gathering your seeds from different plants, there's a kind of give and take between your environment, you and time. Sources actually allow you to completely transform an itinerary. They allow you to create a map that allows you to create a journey. At the Shanghai Biennale, sources became very interesting for us. They ranged from a science fiction novel written in China called *The Three-Body Problem*^[8] – we were a three-body problem, the Raqs Media Collective – to

a film set in 1970's Bengal called "Reasons, Arguments and Stories". These seemed to suggest a certain set of moves that one can make with art, with literature, with culture or with anything you create, you make arguments and tell stories. This method of actually finding different works or different moments, which become points of reference, points of departure, things to argue with, things to quarrel with, things to fall in love with, is a different kind of collectivity. It's not a collectivity of people, but it's a collectivity of points of reference and points of departure. We did the same thing with the show at *MACBA*^[9], and in a sense, even approached the curation of the *Yokohama Triennial*^[10] in a similar way. When you invite other people to your table, when you lay out these sources, then they produce many different combinatorial possibilities. It allows you to go beyond the simple one-line statement and it is that simple one-line statement, which is often the bone of contention. It's impossible then for the censor to ask, what is this about? What are you doing? You could always throw in another source and change the contours of that conversation. That's why a diversity of sources helps to keep a conversation open-ended. Curatorially we found this method to be adventurous as well as useful.

Jeebesh: Sources allow a certain movement in cultural and intellectual life that un-stills dominant barriers. We can move from a 15th-century text to an early 20th-century text; I can move to an image from the 16th century and not bother about whether it's contemporary or not, because the idea of knowledge formation, the idea of how knowledge is produced, is open-ended. We try to open up the field from which today's knowledge is to be built. Another question is: "How do you deal with the hierarchy of knowledge?" In Yokohama, we learned about a dockworker, a precarious dockworker, who in a conversation with an anthropologist over a period of a few years was talking about his voracious reading and making sense of the world, and he was just brilliant. And then we placed him, a daily wageer rethinking the world through his voracious reading, next to a Nobel laureate, and next to a literary theorist from Harvard. We drew from this non-rivalrous gathering the sensibility of a luminous care of friendship. What it does is, it is producing a new language, a new intellectual genealogy of care, producing new topographies, not necessarily arising from a specific space or kind of thinking. Present hierarchies become decentred. This becomes the ground on which we build

relationships with artists and the basis for curatorial moments. It is not your knowledge, it is not your ability to mobilise certain things, it is about developing something together through the things we have in common, but also along with what both of us are ignorant about. It is something we have in common, but we don't know all its dimensions, and it is as alien or as complex to me as it is to you. It is that movement between ignorance, non-mastery, and non-hierarchy. The worker's ruminations are not a rival to the Nobel laureate's treatise. Slowly, we've come to understand that infra-curatorial moves that we had been making were dependent, in a way, on which sources could be navigated and how they are brought and read together. I am learning the source by your reading and you are learning the source from my reading. That's what we call the self-didactic or the autodidactic process of the curatorial. Both of us are learning together about a very complex question that none of us had encountered before. That is why new collectives are formed. And exhibitions are temporary collectives. Together, we find collectivities that we didn't anticipate before. And that's what links us, our mutual exploration of something that is intangible at one level and tangible at another.

CURARE participant: The sources were chosen between the artists and the curators?

Jeebesh: What happens is that, in the process of making an exhibition, artists are continuously gathering, and some artists become part of your conversation. It is an entanglement. We are interested in procedures, and also a heterogeneity and a multiplicity of sources. Instead of thematic unity, we try to proliferate and build a ground of sources for the contemporary. It's about the building of contemporary sources of culture, sources of intellectual life, and thinking the contemporary by multiplying, contaminating, and building together. This is a process that may start in an institutional context, move into a non-institutional context, and go wherever conversational micro-environments are produced. It is the confidence of micro-environments that fosters new confidence in sources.

Ioli Tzanetaki: Thank you for taking us through this journey with you. How have you dealt with conflict throughout your practice? When working together for so many years and with people outside your collective, it is inevitable that

conflict arises. But conflict can also be positive, it can actually help you progress the conversation.

Jeebesh: Conflict is too big a word. We call it disagreements, because in the curatorial-artistic environment, there are disagreements and then there are conflicts of scale. I use the word 'scale', because the scale of an idea or the scale of a conversation are often not available before the conversation. If a conversation starts, I don't know the scale to which the conversation can go, and the person I'm having the conversation with, doesn't know this either. There is a misrecognition of scale sometimes. We know that we have to be open to unpredictability and a potential loss of control. You often find yourself in unpredictable environments, and sometimes that can give rise to very public quarrels. This has happened between us, and on occasion with other artists, though that has been very rare. Another reason a disagreement can arise is because of care for a work. Sometimes what happens is that one is being too fastidious, both in their curatorial and in their artistic work. Our solution to this is that we keep the ends un-concluded – there is no end that is fixed from the beginning. But exhibitions, as

you know, are fixed entities, books are fixed entities, so sometimes choices are made and sometimes artists may feel they have not been heard. What we do in situations like that is to move to new terrain. We don't stay with the problem in the same terrain, so that the articulation of the problem enriches all of us. I think that, usually, most disagreements happen between the artists and the fabricators where curators are engaging with a very complex world of labour, a deeply intangible, immaterial labour that is bringing something to the world and, at the same time, a highly manual, tangible labour. Between the three of us, we know now that disagreements come first before anything else.

SHO: We're now sitting in a situation because of the pandemic where the formats we can use, at least in Germany, have changed. We are looking at public space, outdoor presentations, and intimate one-to-one meetings in the gallery space. And we are also looking at a world that is changing rapidly both economically and ecologically. Do you, from your part of the world, see any changes in the role of artists and changes in formats that are not only limiting but also inspiring to you?

You started off by saying that you were using the technologies available very early on, to create a wider community, more connections and you mentioned that you spoke to more people than ever this year. Can you see a change in the role of the artist and new formats emerging? Can it also be inspiring for your work?

Shuddhabrata: I think we've always enjoyed the opportunity that curation gives us to create new contexts where different kinds of energies can meet and interact with each other. We think of curation as the work of setting the stage, of invitation and of creating a context where you are the host and you create a protocol by which people have these conversations. Sometimes these are formal, sometimes they're accidental, they're not necessarily saying what you plan for, but they are part of the serendipity of the unexpected.

I'll give you an example of an informal, unplanned process that began happening during the Shanghai Biennale. We were all staying in one of two hotels that were state-run hotels in China and every evening after the installation process, all the artists would gather in the lobby and start drinking and telling

each other stories and singing and reading poems to each other. This became very noisy, and the hotel management decided that the sitting and meeting each other would have to stop, so they removed the furniture from the space. What they didn't realise is that the people would continue sitting on a blue carpet that was still in the room. Gradually we realised that the blue carpet itself became a kind of modus of gathering, which we actually still carry with us. That's an example of the relationship between what is ephemeral and what is perennial. When the conditions of COVID-19 made sure that we could not actually meet in physical space, some of those artists who were also part of the Yokohama Triennial said to us: do you remember the blue carpet, we should return to the spirit of the blue carpet. So the opening of the Yokohama Triennial was actually a walk that happened live by the artists for the artists, by the curators and by the museum staff. We called this an extended blue carpet conversation. Its audience were the artists themselves and of course, other people could join, but the point was that – even though there was a constraint and we could not meet in person – we had a memory of meeting at an earlier time.

Between that memory of meeting and the impossibility of meeting, a form emerged that then segued into what we call the “episodōs” at the Yokohama Triennial. The Yokohama Triennial had to deal with the fact that, because there were physical constraints, some of its processes had to move into other time signatures. So, we created what we call episodōs. These episodōs happened online and sometimes artists would produce episodes. For example, there was one artist called Masaru Iwai, whose practice is connected to cleaning. We had invited him before the pandemic began and now his cleaning practice suddenly took on a new residence online. He produced a social network on Instagram where he would invite other people to put on masks and clean. So there was a spillage between the curatorial energies and how they moved outside the constraints of the curatorial framework and produced new, unexpected gatherings, combinations and possibilities. This is something that I think we should take from this time. The period of COVID-19 has given us a lot of heartache and sadness and melancholia, but it has also made us all inventive and imaginative in how to rethink the questions of gathering, solidarity and conversation. Now, sooner or later, the pandemic will go, but this relationship be-

tween offline, online, this relationship between distance and proximity, the creation of a much larger horizon of expectations around an artwork may remain. This modest availability of means can create a new conversation about how the contemporary art world thinks about space and time. Similarly, our practice is not just about the one event, it extends to recordings, online media, a kind of constant building of its own archival possibility into a way in which the time signature of the Biennale or curation extends in a different way. Many years ago, we had written a text called “Earthworms Dancing”[11], an argument for a slow-motion biennial. I think we are now beginning to realise that the temporal stretch is something that we should all welcome and live with because of the extraordinary characteristics of the time that we’re living in right now.

CURARE participant: I want to go back to what you said earlier about your goal of bringing people together, of getting to a place of mutual curiosity and mutual exploration. You said that as curators you establish a diversity of sources in order to get to this place. But, this does not guarantee that you will achieve equality and mutual explora-

tion, because there’s always individual interests and opinions. How do you establish this environment of mutual exploration and interests, besides just using a diversity of sources?

Jeebesh: Two colleagues of ours who have worked with us in our studio made an intriguing point. Their idea was that we are perennial lines; we may be online or offline, but we are still lines. But then, we are also live dots[12]. Their question is, when we are live dots, what are we doing with each other? An important thing about sources is that they destabilise the time horizons by which individuals produce their individualities. In the present, if you look at the climate change debate, all the discussions are about time horizons. What is the time horizon by which we try to make sense of our lives? Sources are immeasurable; our invitation to each other is to try and be in that immeasurable space that is between one another, to work in this shifting time horizon, to say that all time is nested in other time horizons, which are unknowable, playful, knowable, troubled, and so on. This multiplicity of temporal placements of and intersections with one another is what we think we are inviting people to. We hope that this invitation is mutually en-

chanting. Art has this pressure of being an enchanted place in an alienated and disenchant-ed world. Whatever part of art history and art theory you read, it is always written with this premise — art has to produce the re-enchant-ment of the world as if the world is becoming banal and routinised and completely predict-able and art produces the sight of surprise, amazement, astonishment, unpredictability. But leaving that aside, what we are trying to say is that the question of time is deeply nest-ed in art and the conversation about art today. It is not an Euro-American time of art history that we are talking about; we are talking about a different timescale to work with.

Through sources, and the way we are work-ing, we are trying to build a weave of time ho-rizons while keeping the immeasurability and curiosity of the turning world. Time horizons will always be shifting around us – the time of economy, the time of crisis, the time of col-lapse, the boom, the doom, personal time, Proustian time. We are living in a plenitude of unknown times.

Our sources are very intensively subjective. We try to open the riddle of this world, and we can draw from biology, we can draw from ge-

ology; a source can be from anywhere. We are now working on a show in the Vienna Acad-emy of Art, which will open in October 2021. We are working with their collection, and the question is to unpack that collection in a way that hasn't been done before. We are inter-ested in what kind of times are nested in this collection and forgotten. We have named the exhibition: **Hungry for Time** ^[13]. What are the substitutes of time that the project of domi-nation produces? The violence of linear time has been unaccountable, people's lives have been humiliated and subjugated in the idea of linear time. It's not so much a choreography out of a time, it's about registering that ac-counts and images of time can actually have immense consequences for living life.



Raqs Media Collective was established in 1992 by Jeebesh Bagchi, Monica Narula and Shuddhabrata Sengupta. Their work is located at the intersections of contemporary art, historical enquiry, philosophical speculation, research and theory, often taking the form of installations, online and offline media objects, performances and encounters. Raqs follow their self-declared imperative of 'kinetic contemplation' to produce work that demands the viewer to look anew at what they take for granted. Myths and histories of diverse provenances, a deep ambivalence towards modernity and a quiet but consistent critique of the operations of power and property inform their diverse oeuvre. Recent exhibitions include "The Laughter of Tears", Kunstverein Braunschweig, Braunschweig, Germany (2012); "Still More World", Mathaf Museum, Doha, Qatar (2019); "Twilight Language", Manchester Art Gallery (2017–2018); "Everything Else is Ordinary", K21 Museum for 21st Century Art, Düsseldorf (2018); "If It's Possible, It's Possible", MUAC, Mexico City (2015), and "Untimely Calendar", National Gallery of Modern Art, Delhi (2014–2015). Exhibitions curated by Raqs include: 7th Yokohama Triennale (2020); "In the Open or in Stealth", MACBA, Barcelona, (2018–2019); "Why Not Ask Again", Shanghai Biennale (2016–2017); "INSERT2014", New Delhi (2014); and "The Rest of Now & Scenarios", Manifesta 7, Bolzano (2008).

^[1] <https://sarai.net/>.

^[2] Raqs Media Collective, Additions, Subtractions: On Collectives and Collectivity (2010), https://works.raqsmediacollective.net/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/Additios-Subtractions_On-Collectives-and-Collectivities-2010-category.pdf.

^[3] <https://sarai.net/category/publications/sarai-reader/>.

^[4] <https://sarai.net/sarai-reader-09-projections/>.

^[5] Sarai Reader 09: The Exhibition (2012–2013). Curated by Raqs Media Collective. A collaboration between Devi Art Foundation, Gurgaon, and Sarai-Centre for Study of Developing Societies, Delhi.

^[6] The exhibition INSERT2014 took place in 2014 in New Delhi. Artistic direction: Raqs Media Collective. Organised by Goethe-Institut/Max Mueller Bhavan, New Delhi and Pro Helvetia, Swiss Arts Council, New Delhi. Exhibition sites: Mati Ghar, Indira Gandhi Na-

tional Centre for the Arts, New Delhi and Gallery, School of Arts & Aesthetics, JNU, New Delhi. Exhibition's publication: https://works.raqsmediacollective.net/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/INSERT2014Publication_Web.pdf.

^[7] Why Not Ask Again? Arguments, Counter-arguments and Stories, 11th Shanghai Biennale (November 2016–March 2017).

^[8] Liu Cixin, The Three-Body Problem, Head of Zeus (2008).

^[9] In the Open or in Stealth: The Unruly Presence of an Intimate Future (2018–2019). Curated by Raqs Media Collective. MACBA - Museu d'Art Contemporani de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain.

^[10] Afterglow, Yokohama Triennale 2020. Artistic Direction: Raqs Media Collective. <https://www.yokohamatriennale.jp/english/2020/>.

^[11] Raqs Media Collective, Earthworms Dancing: Notes for a Biennial in Slow Motion (2009),

<https://www.e-flux.com/journal/07/61387/earthworms-dancing-notes-for-a-biennial-in-slow-motion/>.

^[12] FMI – Time, a process, commentary by Aarushi Surana and Kaushal Sapre (2020) <https://works.raqsmediacollective.net/index.php/2020/11/05/five-million-incidents/>.

^[13] Hungry for Time. An invitation to epistemic disobedience with Raqs Media Collective in the art collection of the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna (2021–2022).

Imprint
CURARE — Curatorial Studies
Course Est. 2020

The CURARE Reader is published as part of
the CAMPI Curating and Management in Public
Institutions program of the District Office for
Mitte in Berlin, Office for Further Education
and Culture, The Department of Art,
Culture and History
www.kultur-mitte.de

Published by:
Ute Müller-Tischler,
Department Manager of the District
of Mitte, Berlin | Director of CAMPI
and Co-Founder of CURARE
Solvej Helweg Ovesen, Director of Studies
(CURARE Course Management & Concept)
| Co-founder of CURARE

Research assistance:
Ioli Tzanetaki (2020-2021)

Content Editors:
Solvej Helweg Ovesen
Ioli Tzanetaki

Graphic Recording:
Anne Lehmann

Translations:
Saskia Köbschall

Transcription:
Ioli Tzanetaki (English)
Saskia Köbschall (German)
Copy editing & proofreading:

Carrie Hampel
Saskia Köbschall
Lea Pischke

Contributors:
Ute Müller-Tischler
Solvej Helweg Ovesen
Bonaventure Soh Bejeng Ndikung
Raqs Media Collective: Jeebesh Bagchi
and Shuddhabrata Sengupta
ruangrupa: Ade Darmawan,
Iswanto Hartono
Krist Gruijthuijsen
Övül Ö. Durmuşoğlu
& Joanna Warsza
Agustín Pérez Rubio
Christina Landbrecht

Design: FUK
www.formundkonzept.de

CURARE participants 2020-21:
Felix Fugh
Lara Huesmann
Isabel Jäger
Katja Kynast
Annika Maus
Malte Pieper
Lusin Reinsch
Maja Smoszna
Hauke Ziessler



CURARE participants 2020/21

Felix Fugh, Lara Huesmann, Isabel Jäger, Katja Kynast, Annika Maus,
Malte Pieper, Lusin Reinsch, Maja Smoszna, Hauke Zießler