

# C

# of the Willing

A 24 hour event with 16Beaver

Saturday 29 October 2005

Sunday 30 October 2005

Saturday 29 October 2005	Sunday 30 October 2005
01:45	<i>Chill out and Drinks</i>
02:00	...
03:15	<i>Chimerical Walk</i>
04:00	...
05:00	...
06:30	<i>Breakfast at Sunrise</i>
07:00	...
08:45	<i>Games for the Willing and the Unwilling</i>
09:00	with Cesare Pietrojusti
10:00	...
11:00	<i>City of the Willing—Epilogue</i> (Radio Talk)
12:00	<i>City of the Willing—Prologue</i>
13:45	<i>Counter-Cartography Walk</i> with C.CRED
14:00	...
15:00	...
16:30	<i>Cultural Confrontation Cooking</i> at IOR
17:00	...
18:00	...
19:00	...
20:30	<i>On Collective Practice &amp; Collaboration</i>
21:00	Dialogue between 16Beaver Group & Boyle Family
22:00	<i>Casual Conversation</i>
23:15	<i>Capturing Certain Conditions</i>
24:00	(Screening of Open Submissions)

How do you spend your day? Where? With whom?  
 Are we willing to attempt to change the very  
 structure and function of language: its words,  
 definitions, relationships, and connotations? Can  
 this be done by individuals or does it require a  
 collective effort by definition?

Please note daylight saving at 02:00 on Sunday 30 October!

"It is impossible to get rid of the world without also getting rid of the language that both conceals and protects it, without stripping bare that language's truth. Just as power is ceaseless falsification and 'social truth', so language is its constant safeguard and the Dictionary its all-purpose reference. All revolutionary praxis has sensed the need for a new semantic field and for the assertion of a new truth; from the encyclopédistes to the 'critique of the wooden language' of Stalin (by Polish intellectuals in 1956), this necessity has

not ceased to be felt. Power resides in language, which is the refuge of its police violence. All dialogue with power is violence, whether suffered or instigated. When power husbands the use of its weapons, language is entrusted the task of protecting the oppressive order. Even more, the conjunction of the two is the most natural expression of all power."

Mustapha Khayati,  
*Captive Words—Preface to a Situationist Dictionary*

# *C of the Willing*

Noon Saturday October 29 to  
Noon Sunday October 30  
2005

A 24 hour event with 16Beaver, in which we will move through London, explore words beginning with the letter C as well as various notions of willingness. We are proposing an alternative to the Calendar Day, by beginning and ending in daylight. We'd like to stretch the very understanding and location of standard time and the Meridian. Post-PM. Post-AM.

We do not expect everyone to join us for the full length of this event, so come to the section that you like, decide if you'll stick around, and feel free to drop in and out.

For specific times and locations and additional materials see below or go to:  
<http://www.16beavergroup.org/london>  
<http://www.cca.rca.ac.uk/16beaver>

For 24 hour up to date information call: RCA hotline 07962 574 141

The idea of subverting the conventional beginning and ending of a day relates directly to an ongoing concern at 16Beaver for the culture and politics of the everyday. Whether it is through the theory and practice of various social structures, eccentric lifestyles, or experimental aesthetics, this concern has brought us all together over the years, the months, the days, and the hours. This is our first 24 hour event and the location and history of London gives our gesture a particular relevance. People around the world adjust their watches and habits according to the Meridian. London, as a past and present center of imperial power, is the primordial exporter of standardized time. If all roads lead to Rome, then all schedules point to London.

Playing with words is another regular habit of ours. We like to open things up and redefine things that have been made rigid. What we do is largely defined by how we speak and think, so a playfulness with language comes as no surprise. We will drift through language with the same curiosity, irreverence, and contentiousness we will take with us to the city.

"The claim, as is now the case, that globalism illustrates the victory of free enterprise over totalitarian collectivism is to understand nothing of the current loss of time intervals, the endless feedback, the telescoping of industrial or post-industrial activities.

...

How are we to conceive the change wrought by the computerization if we remain tied to an ideological approach, when the urgent need is in fact for a new geostrategic approach to discover the scale of the phenomenon that is upon us? And we need to do this to come back to the Earth—not in the sense of the old earth which sustains and nourishes us, but of the unique celestial body we occupy. To return to the world, to its dimensions and to the coming loss of those dimensions in the acceleration not now of history (which, with the loss of local time, has just lost its concrete foundations), but of reality itself, with the new-found importance of world time, a time whose instantaneity definitively cancels the reality of distances—the reality of those geographical intervals which only yesterday still organized the politics of nations and their alliances, the importance of which had been shown by the Cold War in the age of (East/West) bloc politics."

Paul Virilio, *The Information Bomb*

## Monique Beudert Fund



GASWORKS



# Saturday 12:00 to 13:30

## *City of the Willing* (Coffee and Cookies)

Curating Contemporary Art Department  
Royal College of Art, Stevens Building,  
Jay Mews, London SW7 2EU  
Tube: South Kensington or  
Knightsbridge + Bus: 9, 10, 52

This discussion is meant to be a casual one in a 'many to many' format. During this time, 16Beaver will give a brief and a casual introduction to what they have planned for the day: a time to meet and better know one another. It will be a good chance to develop a few questions in relation to the City and the Willing. What are the willing capable of doing in a city like London? Who are the Willing in the first place? What are the unwilling doing? How are they changing the cityscape of London and other cities? With whose force and what force will we take this city?

### C—Capital

In his book on *Nietzsche & Philosophy*, Gilles Deleuze writes: "The *victorious* concept 'force', by means of which our physicists have created God and the world, still needs to be *completed*: an *inner* will must be *ascribed* to it, which I ascribe as 'will to power'. The will to power is thus ascribed to force, but in a very special way: it is both a compliment of force and a something internal to it." (p. 49)

We can think of each of us as a force affecting the city in a certain way, in whichever way we choose to. We are also forces affecting each other. There will always be an affect of an external force that we like to invite, to take part and change the flow of things.

If you are there, please think of yourself as this force, together we constitute another force of forces, i.e. based on the sum of our forces, that do not cancel each other, and do not eliminate our differences. We would like to be the active forces of the city for that day (and soon also everyday). One problem of the city, often time, is that forces are constantly being channeled, the channel of work, of school, of family, of holiday, of schedules, of punctual time, of weekend vs weekday time, of formal vs informal time. Even within the paradigm of the flexible personality\* in the dominant centers of our global cities, the channeling is even more at work, invisible, hidden in the folds of processes, practices, 'casual days', easy going to work but with stiff upper lips, personal time, hobby time, during working hours! Yet, one still never gets anything else thought or done other than what C. requires.

\* See Brian Holmes, 'The Flexible Personality'

How are you? What is your name?  
What brought you here?  
What will keep you with us?  
And where will we be going?

### C—Conversation

Q: But how does all this talk of force relate to what I might do?

A: Deleuze would say that for Spinoza there is a continuous variation—and this is what it means to exist—of the force of existing or of the power of acting.

"Hello Pierre, hello Paul" When I see Pierre who displeases me, an idea, the idea of Pierre, is given to me; when I see Paul who pleases me, the idea of Paul is given to me. Each one of these ideas in relation to me has a certain degree of reality or perfection. I would say that the idea of Paul, in relation to me, has more intrinsic perfection than the idea of Pierre since the idea of Paul contents me and the idea of Pierre upsets me. When the idea of Paul succeeds the idea of Pierre, it is agreeable to say that my force of existing or my power of acting is increased or improved; when, on the contrary, the situation is reversed, when after having seen someone who made me joyful I then see someone who makes me sad, I say that my power of acting is inhibited or obstructed. At this level we don't even know anymore if we are still working within terminological conventions or if we are already moving into something much more concrete. But we do know that more of Paul and less of Pierre might increase my power of acting or increase my force of existing.

In other words, seek the conversations you seek.

# Saturday 13:45 to 16:00

## *Counter-Cartography Walk* with C.CRED

Meeting point in front of the Albert Memorial, Hyde Park, London SW7  
Tube: South Kensington or  
Knightsbridge + Bus: 9, 10, 52

The route of our walk will be determined by all participants, including our friends from C.CRED (see below), CCA, 16Beaver Group, and everyone else interested in taking part.

The criteria for suggesting these locations is that these places retain or recall counter-narratives of the city: forgotten, misplaced, displaced, possible sites of pleasure, resistance, forgetting or sites for proposed scenes for unrealized films and more. These histories / stories are probably not the ones marked on a conventional or even an unconventional map or guide of the city.

C.CRED is a London based but very nomadic artist collective and members-run platform for the development of collaborative structures, projects, interventions and other initiatives linking art and aesthetic practice to wider socio-political contexts. Although maintained by a small group of people, it operates only through participation and through the wider, continuously changing collective structure that remains the foundation of the different projects and interventions the collective organizes.

<http://www.ccred.org/>

Walking is one of the oldest forms of thinking... Individually and together. The academy itself began, in the times of those overrated towel-wearing-slave-owning Greeks, as a group of walking people. Interested as we are in forms of self-education, we'd like to focus here on the notion of confusion. The overlapping of our various maps and motives in connection to the city of London and the idea of the city itself, will certainly create a somewhat chaotic scenario. And that is OK. In fact, this is exactly what we are looking for... A confusion that may give rise to collective discovery as we walk through the city. The focus on sites that have a tendency to disappear, or be made to disappear will give us an additional understanding of walking as an act belonging to memory, a kind of

time travel to the fictional Rome that Freud presents in the beginning of *Civilization and its Discontents*, "a promenade of "tactile apprehension" as Walter Benjamin would have it.

### C—Cartography

We are not seeing an 'end to history', but an end to geography.

Cartography in an a-geographical world?! What is the role of cartography when we are confronted with the imperium of time? What sites do you associate with counter-narratives? What places that no longer exist do you keep in your memory? Do you associate particular sites in London with cultural and political amnesia? What do you think of, usually, when you walk through London? Any particular connections between a specific site and a specific set of thoughts or emotions?

**Cartography:** (early 19th Century), from Fr. cartographie, from Gk. Khartes layer of papyrus and graphein to write, to draw.

8:15 PM  
Where can you go in 12 minutes?  
I can smoke two cigarettes  
while I go there  
The first one I would smoke  
while I tie my shoelace  
My bag breaks and everything falls to the floor. It occurs to me the world is a grin that flickers on a hanged man's dead face  
The shoelace is twelve minutes long.  
It has a beginning, a middle, and an end.  
**Khlebnikov**  
What takes place every day is not what happens every day. Sometimes what doesn't take place is the most important thing that happens.  
Kleb den Kopf  
i think Lefebvre  
Usually on a walk one thinks of nothing  
Cleft, cleft, cleft, barks the middle, while the end

asks the middle to find  
a good place in the city.  
It is now around two o'clock. What is there to think about?  
It is necessary to get lost to get to a new place.  
Ambiguity is a category of everyday life, and perhaps an essential category. One could think of the fact of it being another time in another city.  
8:20 PM  
Outside it is raining  
But the familiar is not necessarily the known. ...'was ist bekannt ist nicht erkannt'. Familiarity, what is familiar, conceals human beings and makes them difficult to know by giving them  
a mask we can recognize...  
dada, surrealism  
a mask that is merely the lack of something. And yet familiarity is by no means an illusion. It is real and part of reality  
lettrists, situationists, yippies, yuppies,  
deambulation and dérive Do we want to lead  
imaginary lives across time zones?  
fluxus, street buffoons, strangers  
stragglers, well wishers, drifters, tourists

The capitalist individual sees the other member of society—be they bourgeois or not—as outside of himself, and in opposition to himself.  
animals, paraders  
His consciousness only reflects the fact that competition separates one individual from another in such a way as to constitute a society which is beyond the grasp of any individual consciousness  
Poets. Beasts, memory machines and devastated lovers unconsciously willing and consciously unwilling all walking together,  
*what the f. are you doin'?*  
angry and ready to meet the zapatistas they are nowhere on the long road to freedom and...  
so we think prisons  
what animals can we find in the city?  
Hospitals, factories, zoos  
what areas are they enclosed in?  
*end section!*  
*yes*  
*next?*  
*yes*

# Saturday 16:30 to 19:30

## *Cultural Confrontation Cooking*

### + Talk / Archive with IOR

IOR, 109 Corbyn Street, London N4 3BX  
Rail: Crouch Hill / Tube: Finsbury Park / Bus: 210

“In history as in nature, the rotten is the laboratory of life.” **Karl Marx**

The Institution of Rot (IOR) was founded by artist Richard Crow and writer Nick Couldry in 1992 as part of London’s Secret Spaces. Situated in a Victorian House in North London, Crow’s working and living space, the IOR has been (from 1992–1996) an active artist-run space dedicated to performance, audio works and site-specific installations. Included in the “Life/Live” anthology edited by Laurence Bosse and Hans-Ulrich Obrist (1996), IOR significantly contributed to the extraordinary dynamism of London’s artist-run spaces phenomenon of the 90s. Rooted in a do-it-yourself production and a collaborative process, IOR’s specific concerns (and obsessions) were the privacy of the human body and its public transformations (ingestion, expulsion, cleansing, confession, rituals and taboos).

The IOR was also, from 1985–1994, the recording studio of the group Diastolic Murmurs (Adam Bohman and Richard Crow). At present IOR is a ‘living archive’ of recordings, objects, texts and images. It also remains “open” as a point of contact for international collaborations and occasional (unofficial) artists’ residencies created in partnership with curator Lucia Farinati.

Recent projects include: *Found Wanting* in collaboration with the collective e-Xplo (2004); a live broadcast in collaboration with Sound Art Museum—Radio Arte Mobile, Rome (Feb. 2005); The IOR Archive presents *The Adam Bohman Talking Tapes Vol 1-2* (ongoing), Resonance fm (2005).

For the dinner event the IOR archive will be activated with some original recordings, films, slides, texts and objects.

Before arriving to the site of the meal we will all stop in at a market and look for ingredients that might introduce Cultural Confrontation. Cooking. Coordination is a possibility. Each participant please bring at least two ingredients.

“We like their food but we do not like them!”

“We like them but we do not like their food!”

“We like them only if we like their food!”

#### C—Commodities

In *Capital*, Karl Marx writes: “Commodities cannot themselves go to the market and perform exchanges in their own right. We must, therefore, have recourse to their guardians, who are the possessors of commodities. Commodities are things, and therefore lack the power to resist man. If they are unwilling, he can use force; in other words, he can take possession of them.” (p. 178)

Is there a place in London, a local farmers market or the like, in which one can trace back the process of production of the food we will be consuming? Is there a way to find out whether the commodities we will be buying were brought to the market with force? Is there a way to know that the workers involved in production were not underpaid? Is there a way to know what exactly we are eating? With or without pesticides, with or without hormones?

Do you have a particular philosophy related to food consumption and/or agricultural practices? Why is English cooking so bland and simple when this region has at times colonized half the planet, gaining access to the most diverse ingredients and culinary traditions? Is there a food that makes you angry?

The guests would not leave. The meal would not end. The welcome was turned into an entreaty to remain,  
live long, to forget the other days,  
the meals, the deals at the local  
*fast food* hole.  
The heart’s core grows harder from day to day.  
The heart wears a body;  
the body—a shirt.  
Even that’s not enough!  
Someone—the idiot!—  
Everyone got nervous when he took  
of his shirt.  
manufactured stiff

cuffs and clamped starch on the chest  
Aging, people suddenly have second thoughts.  
*End section when? You say when.*  
*I’m done.*  
Women rub in powder and rouge.  
Men do cartwheels according to Muller’s system.  
But it’s too late.  
The skin proliferates in wrinkles.  
Each new fold enshrining paths to  
an alternate path.  
He sure knew how to make mashed potatoes.  
Love flowers and flowers and then withers and  
shrinks.  
*I am also done.*

*end of poem* Mayakowsky  
I am done with this meal.  
He would serve them in a helmet.  
8:40 PM  
*start new section?*  
Who will bring the sausages?  
yes  
yes?  
yes  
yes  
she asks? what sausage?  
sure!!!!!!  
*ok*

# Saturday 20:30 to 22:00

## *On Collective Practice & Collaboration*

### A dialogue between 16Beaver Group & Boyle Family

176 Prince of Wales Road, London NW5 3PT  
Tube: Chalk Farm / Rail: Kentish Town West / Bus: 46, 168, 31, 134

A presentation about the Boyle Family and 16Beaver Group modes of operation, and some guidelines or parameters that they think are relevant for building collaborative modules. It is also meant to be a discussion about collaboration, common work and common concerns.

For more information on the Boyle Family, go to:  
<http://www.boylefamily.co.uk/>

What does collaboration mean to you? How does collaboration relate to politics? Is something collaborative inherently more political? Have you all abandoned aesthetics? Are you a political front?

Have you ever wanted to kick anyone out?  
Have you ever wanted to quit 16Beaver?

8:45 PM We have hit a wall. Not just mental but completely psychotic. He wants to talk about his experiences. She wants to talk about something that would radically change our everyday. He wants to talk about something specific. He wants to take turns. He wants to insist. She wants to even the playing field.

Stalin is too rude and this defect, although quite tolerable in our midst and in dealing among us Communists, becomes intolerable in a Secretary-General. I've only wanted more Renes more / Ayreens more Johns more Jesals more Yates / more Paiges more Peters more Susans more Steves more ...Overall, the guests have no possible way to know, who was right and who should have given up.  
That is why I suggest the comrades think about a way of removing Stalin from that post and appointing another man in his stead who in all other respects differs from Comrade Stalin

in having only one advantage, namely, that of being more tolerant, more loyal, more polite, and more considerate to the comrades, less capricious, etc. This circumstance may appear to be a negligible detail. But I think that from the standpoint of safeguards against a split, and from the standpoint of what I wrote above about the relationship between Stalin and Trotsky, it is not a detail, or it is a detail which can assume decisive importance.

**Lenin, 24 December 1922**

They only kept going because they did not like the jefes, the bosses, the governors, the presidents, the...  
But, no doubt, to be concrete at last—for there is no concrete response other than the proof that each one must give of what he really is—I must speak instead of my failure.  
As for the past, I have always attributed, very casually, to most of the comrades or ex-comrades of 16Beaver at least as much capability and honesty as I perceive in myself, thus deluding myself about them and me at the time. It's a recipe against boredom

and apathy.

It's a good excuse to talk about things you don't know for sure will happen. For now, it is sufficient for me to declare my insolvency for having made progress a movement that I always held to be the condition of my radicality. It would be like disarming naivete itself to want again to save a group in order to save myself, when I haven't known how to make it be anything I wanted it to be. I prefer therefore to take up again the stakes that my adherence to 16Beaver had deferred: to lose myself absolutely, or to remake absolutely my own coherence and to remake it with the greatest number of people. But before leaving to the revolution the concern of recognizing its own people, from now on I'm sticking to what the demands that I've formulated about autonomous groups impose on me: I will not renew contact with comrades who would wish it, or whom I would wish to see, except in the effective realization of a revolutionary tumult that my taste for radical pleasure can appreciate.

**Vaneigem, 14 November 2016**

# Saturday 22:00 to 22:30

## Casual Conversation

Where: 176 Prince of Wales Road, London NW5 3PT  
Tube: Chalk Farm / Rail: Kentish Town West / Bus: 46, 168, 31, 134

We will remain at 176 Prince of Wales Road, maybe have some juice, tea or coffee, and follow up the event with some opportunity for casual conversations between people at the event.

Some things require blanks in the script.

What should we do?  
Where are these ideas taking us?

**Habermas: conversation, power and distortion**

Stupid!  
Normal is predictable?  
9:00 PM **Goffman, E.** (1959) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, (London: Penguin. 251 pages). Views social encounters as a dramatic performance in which people use various props, and act in 'teams'.  
*I formally ask you two to not attack each other in front of innocent publics ow ow you are right this is casual*  
You cause great shame to the name 16Beaver.  
conversation shame to the name  
**Zeldin, T.** (1998) *Conversation: How Talk Can Change Your Life*, (London: Harvill Press). A short and somewhat quirky book that, nevertheless, manages to convey some of the trials and excitement of engaging in conversation, whether for pleasure, self-education or work. It is the text of a series of six talks broadcast by BBC Radio Four.  
Packaged  
**Google** was one solution for the 20th century  
**Wardhaugh, R.** (1985) *How Conversation Works*, (Oxford: Blackwell. 230 pages). Still the best introduction to conversational process that I have come across. Chapters examine the social basis of talk; prepackaged verbosity locating an agenda; co-operation and playing the game; beyond and behind words; context; getting started and keeping going; topics, turns and terminations; and requesting, informing, advising, agreeing, apologizing, promising.  
**Google** is the sickness of the 21st century  
?  
Is it formal?  
now let's try pr is out

we are in ok.  
how are you?  
**Malone, M. J.** (1997) *Worlds of Talk. The presentation of self in everyday conversation*, Cambridge: Polity. 182 + xiv pages. As the title suggests this book picks up on Erving Goffman's insights (*formally*) about the interaction order to our self-presentations in talk—the process of 'crafting our behaviour' so that it makes sense to others.  
Malone uses conversation analysis to discover how selves are 'created and transformed in everyday talk.  
I'm delighted to be asked that question  
There are chapters on the interactional order and the self; the foundations of interactionism; the construction of conversations; gender and talk; doing things with friends; and disagreements. you are most welcome.  
I have been quite well. How are you?  
**Habermas, J.** (1984) *The Theory of Communicative Action* Volume 1, Cambridge: Polity Press. 463 + xxxix pages. Includes an important discussion of 'ideal speech situations' and communicative action.  
I am alright. Thank you.  
**Gadamer, H-G.** (1979) *Truth and Method*, London: Sheed and Ward. 552 + xvi pages. Brilliant discussion of conversation, understanding, hermeneutics and praxis. New edition now available.  
how is your brother?  
your mother?  
*we can also flip casual maybe better casual p a really good conversation as if we do not know each other now we know how we are doing or we do know each other even better*  
9:05 PM What is your mother doing now? well my mother is better now, you know she had this small accident and her shoulder was hurt and I was worried

but she is much better, i spoke to her today  
I didn't know. Sorry to hear that  
You love your mother very much, right?  
very much yes how did you know?  
And so in a way it works more like, you wouldn't go from micro encounters where you are using Goffman to say the **Wallerstein** level in one swoop, but you think about political movements or the organizations which crystallize out of them, there's a very important way in which those are sort of blown up micro-situations.  
You always speak of her very kindly and it looks like you've learned many things from her.  
In fact, what's really striking about a revolutionary situation is that it's an event which is really changing a macro structure, but during the moment when it's happening it feels like a micro-situation. It feels like, say, everybody in St. Petersburg in 1917 is all focused on the same thing. And people all over Russia are following things on the telegraph and so it actually does bear out.  
I'd love to meet her, actually.  
The service could not send the message: A message or picture is too large to be transmitted.  
So if you think about it that way you might say the more stable versions of macro situations are the ones where the micro encounters that make them up are not really linked together or they are linked together in a pretty much taken-for-granted or routinized way.  
Do you talk to her about 16Beaver?  
It is true in fact. would be nice, maybe one day if she is here, or we go together to Palestine  
What brings them into a much sharper focus allows the dynamism that happens in micro-situations to spread pretty widely.

**Saturday 23:15 to 01:30**  
*Capturing Certain Conditions*  
**A Late Night Screening of Open Submissions**

Rio Cinema, 107 Kingsland High Street, London E8 2PB  
Rail: Dalston Kingsland Station / Bus: 67, (N)76, (N)149, (N)243

Participants are asked to bring in a cued selection from TV, news, a video or a film of their own or by others (Length: 1:00 to 5:00 minutes).

What is of relevance at this point in time?

Which films are able to capture those moments?

How / where are political struggles present in films / videos / TV / internet?

How / where are social conditions in films / videos / TV / internet?

What is our current predicament? What is certain or uncertain about it?

Can video or film capture anything outside the condition of capturing?

16Beaver has for some time been interested in constructing or looking for alternative formats of social exchange. This particular exchange will take place through the selection of videos that will be screened. Individuals are asked to bring in a cued selection from a video / film / DVD of their own, from television, from films, from friends, which captures a very specific condition. We should note that we are not interested in great works of art or even artists works. Instead we are interested in encouraging a dialogue to take place about the present moment, our current condition. The selections can be seen as questions, responses, provocations, or suggested lines of inquiry. They are also meant to speak toward the ability or inability of the selected medium (television, film, video, internet stream) to capture anything at all. Our only demand is that the selections be between 1:00 to 5:00 minutes in length. DVD-Pal, VHS, Mini DV, DV Cam.

While the choice of “capturing certain conditions” might seem quite vague for an open call, we think these words contain an incredibly simple, almost brutal specificity. The fact that the certainty of a fact might be debatable does not make it less certain for those who think it is certain. Then there is the possibility of capturing without necessarily communicating... enclosed, self-contained, internalized perception. During this screening, however, we would like to send the censors for a walk, be they disguised in arguments for decency, aesthetic quality, political relevance, or anything other than capturing the certainty of this condition.

If you can get your hands on a captured piece of a certain condition and you would like to share it, this is the moment to do it. The format of the open screening is one that allows for visual media to recover its character as manipulated, handheld, shareable matter. In the US only cult movies manage to take the audience and to become an active public who transforms the very space and function of the theater itself. The even rows of chairs and the focused gaze of the crowd are easily seen as belonging to a totalitarian social structure, yet the most “progressive” radicals sit quietly in the theater until the show ends. This screening wishes to bring back the spirit of irreverence with which teenagers, surrealists, and even

the often romanticized situationists go to the movies.

#### **C—Capture**

“For the first time in the history of the arts, in the history of culture, man found the means to take an impression of time. And simultaneously the possibility of reproducing that time on screen as often as he wanted, to repeat it and go back to it. He acquired a matrix for actual time. Once seen and recorded, time could now be preserved in metal boxes over a long period (theoretically for ever).”

Tarkovsky, *Sculpting in Time*, 1986

“10. ‘...the faith that many social scientists have in film as providing them with an “objective recording instrument” is touching and almost sentimental’.

18. “I know” often means: I have the proper grounds for my statement. So if the other person is acquainted with the language-game, he would admit that I know. The other, if he is acquainted with the language-game, must be able to imagine how one may know something of the kind.

61. ...A meaning of a word is a kind of employment of it. For it is what we learn when the word is incorporated into our language.



62. That is why there exists a correspondence between the concepts 'rule' and 'meaning'.

64. Compare the meaning of a word with the 'function' of an official. And 'different meanings' with 'different functions'.

65. When language-games change, then there is a change in concepts, and with the concepts the meanings of words change.

66. I make assertions about reality, assertions which have different degrees of assurance. How does the degree of assurance come out? What consequences has it? We may be dealing, for example, with the certainty of memory, or again of perception. I may be sure of something, but still know what test might convince me of error. I am e.g. quite sure of the date of a battle, but if I should find a different date in a recognized work of history, I should alter my opinion, and this would not mean I lost all faith in judging.

67. Could we imagine a man who keeps on making mistakes where we regard a mistake as ruled out, and in fact never encounter one? E.g. he says he lives in such and such a place, is so and so old, comes from such and such a city, and he speaks with the same certainty (giving all the tokens of it) as I do, but he is wrong. But what is his relation to this error? What am I to suppose?

83. The truth of certain empirical propositions belongs to our frame of reference.

166. The difficulty is to realize the groundlessness of our believing."  
Ludwig Wittgenstein, *On Certainty*

What scenes or images have you seen [recently or not so recently] that you cannot forget? What films or videos are you familiar with which challenge established narratives? What film or video changed your way of seeing something? What is certain to you? Do you know of any troops that invade movie theaters to perform dialogues with the big screen?

The Capture of London, AD 296.  
*Constantius Chlorus*.  
Description: A classical coin depicting the capture of London in AD296 by Constantius Chlorus. On the obverse there is a bust of Chlorus in armour

and mantle. The legend reads 'FL VAL CONSTANTIVS NOBII CAES'. On the reverse, London is shown kneeling to receive the general who is mounted on horseback. He is wearing a helmet, armour and cloak and is holding a

spear in his right hand. A fortress is visible on the right and a galley below. On this side of the coin the legend reads 'REDDITOR LVICIS AETERNAE'.  
Inscription: 'LON. P.T.R.'

## Sunday 01:45 to 03:00 *Chill out and Drinks*

Where: Location to be announced (Kingsland High Street),  
please call 07962 574 141 for full details  
Rail: Dalston Kingsland Station / Bus: 67, (N)76, (N)149, (N)243

In the bar, we will call all meaning to surrender, altogether different, might as well do it now: a Carafe that is a blind glass, glazed glitter, a substance in a cushion, dirt and not copper, a piece of coffee, nothing elegant, Mildred's umbrella, a box, a seltzer

bottle, red roses, water raining, colored hats, cold climate, a feather, a brown, a little called Pauline, a sound, a table, in between, the dog, a leave.

"A SELTZER BOTTLE.  
Any neglect of many particles to a cracking, any neglect of this makes around it what is lead in color and certainly discolor in silver. The use of this is manifold. Supposing a certain time selected is assured, suppose it is even necessary, suppose no other extract is permitted and no more handling is needed, suppose the rest of the message is mixed with a very long slender needle and even if it could be any black border, supposing all this altogether made a dress and suppose it was actual, suppose the mean way to state it was occasional, if you suppose this in August and even

more melodiously, if you suppose this even in the necessary incident of there certainly being no middle in summer and winter, suppose this and an elegant settlement a very elegant settlement is more than of consequence, it is not final and sufficient and substituted. This which was so kindly a present was constant.

WATER RAINING.  
Water astonishing and difficult altogether makes a meadow and a stroke.

COLD CLIMATE.  
A season in yellow sold extra strings makes lying places.

IN BETWEEN.  
In between a place and candy is a narrow footpath that shows more mounting than anything, so much really that a calling meaning a bolster measured a whole thing with that. A virgin a whole virgin is judged made and so between curves and outlines and real seasons and more out glasses and a perfectly unprecedented arrangement between old ladies and mild colds there is no satin wood shining."  
Gertrude Stein, *Tender Buttons*  
pp. 8,12,14

# Sunday 03:15 to 06:15

## *Chimerical Walk*

### A Night Walk Through Dark Spots of London

Where: Meeting point outside Rio Cinema  
107 Kingsland High Street (corner of John Campbell Road), London E8 2PB  
Rail: Dalston Kingsland Station / Bus: 67, (N)76, (N)149, (N)243

Distribution of 'no shift lag drugs'

<http://www.shiftlag.com>

**Chimera / Also chimaera.**

1. Gk Mythol. A fire-breathing monster, with a lion's head, a goat's body, and a serpent's tail.
2. A grotesque monster represented in painting etc.
3. a) A bogey horrible phantasm.  
b) A wild or fanciful conception.  
c) A thing of hybrid character.

**Chimeric, -ical** of the nature of the chimera; imaginary, fanciful, visionary; prone to entertain chimeras.

The route of this walk will be planned in considering and choosing areas and places that are most feared, neglected, exoticized, eroticized and invisible to the public areas that people advise you to avoid or not go there by night. The spirit of the walking gang will build the solidarity and daring mostly inaccessible to the individual. Please come with suggestions and ideas.

We will attempt to create a short-lived gang of the willing or the unwilling. Our night walk might help us face situations where class, gender, solitude, and many other aspects of the city are exposed.

#### **C—Communicate**

"A few weeks ago, I made a short trip to Italy. The first evening, in the Milan station, it was cold, dark, dirty. A train was leaving; on each car hung a yellow placard bearing the words *Milano Lecce*. I began dreaming: to take that train, to travel all night and wake up in the warmth, the light, the peace of a faraway town." This is probably the last text Roland Barthes wrote, entitled 'One Always Fails in Speaking of What One Loves'.

Roland Barthes, *the Rustle of Language* p. 296

He furthermore writes "In the love of a foreign country there is a kind of a reverse racism: one is delighted by Difference, one is tired of the Same, one exalts the Other..."

It is difficult to love England, but we do love London like we love all cities. And we declare that London is not England and New York is not America and Paris is not France and Karachi is not Pakistan and Berlin is not Germany and and and despite all national claims. We only have language to express this love, and therefore we are doomed to fail.

We will try to express our love through this walk. Our reverse racism in this city. How can it show itself? The sensation of that moment, how can we communicate it?

At some point there is also the call to the end of the night. The last call. The nightcap. The last kiss. The last breath. The last toast, the last drink, the long day's journey into the night. Night as the final curtain, night as the conclusive finish, the conclusion. The last song of the night. Our last night together. And yet, within this ending there is also a restlessness, the ambiguous, the unfinished book, the unfinished story or the night interrupted by sleep. As in I fell asleep last night. And we can even speak of the night, which never ends, the night of Luis Buñuel's *Exterminating Angel*. The socially, culturally determined, constructed night set against the night that binds us, bids us to stay on, to not surrender, to venture forth together, always easier together toward a new day.

Which are the most dangerous parts of London?  
What do you fear / like most about the night in London or any other city? / Where are the night workers of London?

"The arrival of night is announced by cries or other acoustic signals, signs that the inhabitants are to close off the city from the outside and, within it, 'to close their shutters and retire into their houses'. The voices of the night watchmen are evidence of the constant presence of authorities: 'Through the whole night, in all cities of the world, the night-watchmen reassure the inhabitants with their punctual cries'. Here the functions of reassurance and control can hardly be separated, because without a doubt the security measures met a widespread need. Retreat into one's own home,

so far as it is available, provides the necessary protection from the dangers of the night, which are 'locked out', banished to the street—and so ascribed to it. At night, one's habitation is invulnerable, as a rule not even accessible to the police. Those who leave the protection of home not only place themselves in danger, but also render themselves suspect. The ideal of power is the separation between the good citizen lying in his bed and the 'wicked schemer who sneaks around in the dark.'"

Joachim Schlör, *Nights in the Big City* pp. 35-36

One cannot separate notions like fear and security from a history of the night. How can this history inform our critiques of the current discourses of heightened surveillance and security of our cities? What can we discover about the city at night, that we may miss by day? What, if anything, is unique about London at night? If the night is the domain of ghosts and spectres, then which spectres will we be seeking out?

**Sunday 06:30 to 08:30**

*Breakfast at Sunrise*

Where: Gasworks, 155 Vauxhall Street, London SE11

Tube: Oval or Vauxhall / Bus: 38, 185

**Sunday 08:45 to 10:00**

*Games for the Willing and the Unwilling*

**With Cesare Pietroiusti**

Where: Gasworks, 155 Vauxhall Street, London SE11

Tube: Oval or Vauxhall / Bus: 38, 185

What we do at 16Beaver can be seen as an experimental form of theater of everyday life. It is not by chance that many of us who meet there/here find a great source of inspiration in games and game theories. Games have premises, scenarios, frameworks, instructions, rules and often when these are the most simple, the most complex social relations develop. The formality of games can be used for social control and/or liberation. Their informality can take to forms of sharing that are impossible within capitalist routines. Last, but not least, games often provide what we find to be a great thing: a good sense of humor. We should not forget that we are playful beings.

Artist Cesare Pietroiusti is no stranger to games and what he calls “non-functional thoughts”. He will join us for this session to play together.

C—Call

“65. Here we come up against the great question that lies behind all these considerations. For someone might object against me: “You take the easy way out! You talk about all sorts of language-games, but have nowhere said what the essence of a language-game, and hence of language, is: what is common to all these activities, and what makes them into language or parts of language. So you let yourself off the very part of the investigation that once gave you yourself most headache, the part about the general form of propositions and of language”.

And this is true. Instead of producing something common to all that we call language, I am saying that these phenomena have no one thing in common which makes us use the same word for all, but that they are related to one another in many different ways. And it is because of this relationship, or these relationships, that we call them all “language”. I will try to explain this.

66. Consider for example the proceedings that we call “games”. I mean board-games, card-games, ball-games, Olympic games, and so on. What is common to them all? Don’t say: “There must be something common, or

they would not be called ‘games’ “but look and see whether there is anything common to all. For if you look at them you will not see something that is common to all, but similarities, relationships, and a whole series of them at that. To repeat: don’t think, but look!

Look for example at board-games, with their multifarious relationships. Now pass to card-games; here you find many correspondences with the first group, but many common features drop out, and others appear.

When we pass next to ball-games, much that is common is retained, but much is lost. Are they all ‘amusing’? Compare chess with noughts and crosses. Or is there always winning and losing, or competition between players? Think of patience. In ball games there is winning and losing; but when a child throws his ball at the wall and catches it again, this feature has disappeared. Look at the parts played by skill and luck; and at the difference between skill in chess and skill in tennis.

Think now of games like ring-a-ring-a-roses; here is the element of amusement, but how many other characteristic features have disappeared! Sometimes similarities of detail.

And we can go through the many, many other groups of games in the same way; can see how similarities crop up and disappear.

And the result of this examination is: we see a complicated network of similarities overlapping and crisscrossing: sometimes overall similarities.

67. I can think of no better expression to characterize these similarities than “family resemblances”; for the various resemblances between members of a family: build, features, colour of eyes, gait, temperament, etc. overlap and crisscross in the same way. And I shall say: ‘games’ form a family.”  
**Ludwig Wittgenstein**, *Philosophical Investigations*

“It’s a game, as you’ll see. I am a prisoner of the Iraqi government, but that government was appointed by the Americans.”  
**Saddam Hussein**

“...it is believed that, in order to liberate listening it suffices to begin speaking oneself—whereas a free listening is essentially a listening which circulates, which permutates, which disaggregates, by its mobility, the fixed networks of the role of speech: it is not possible to imagine a free society, if we agree in advance to preserve within it the old modes of listening: those of the believer, the disciple, and the patient.”  
**Roland Barthes**. *Listening*, 1976

“History, which threatens this twilight world, is also the force which could subject space to lived time. Proletarian revolution is the critique of human geography through which individuals and communities have to create places and events suitable for the appropriation, no longer just of their labor, but of their total history. In this game’s changing space, and in the freely chosen variations in the game’s rules, the autonomy of place can be rediscovered without the reintroduction of an exclusive attachment to the land, thus bringing back the reality of the voyage and of life understood as a voyage which contains its entire meaning within itself.”  
**Guy Debord**, ‘The Organization of Territory’ in *The Society of the Spectacle*

“The rules of the game have changed... If people want to come here, they come here and play by our rules and our way of life. If they don’t then they will have to go, because they’re threatening our people and that’s not right either.”

**Tony Blair**

Can games restructure social relations or are they simply a temporary relief from them? How is it that the metaphor of game has pervaded every facet of life and yet we may find ourselves as alienated and isolated as ever?

## Addendum to C. of the Willing

### 0. Coalition of the Willing

1. Cosmopolitanism of the Willing
2. Context of the Willing
3. Community of the Willing

### C—Coalition of the Willing /Coalition of the Wealthy/Coalition of War-Criminals/CoW

The first American President known to have publicly mentioned acting with a “Coalition of the Willing” in place of a UN Mandate was Bill Clinton.

#### Coalition of the Willing? Make that war criminals

The pre-emptive strike on Iraq constituted a crime against humanity, wrote 43 experts on international law and human rights.

The initiation of a war against Iraq by the self-styled “Coalition of the Willing” was a fundamental violation of international law. International law recognizes two bases for the use of force.

The first, enshrined in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, allows force to be used in self-defence. The attack must be actual or imminent.

The second basis is when the UN Security Council authorizes the use of force as a collective response to the use or threat of force. However, the Security Council is bound by the terms of the UN Charter and can authorize the use of force only if there is evidence that there is an actual threat to the peace (in this case, by Iraq) and that this threat cannot be averted by any means short of force (such as negotiation and weapons inspections).

#### Coalition of the Wealthy

Although the Coalition of the Willing only contained about a quarter of the world's countries, it contains a disproportionately large fraction of the world's economically powerful countries. For instance, the CoW contained: 15 of the 30 OECD nations; 15 of the 27 EU nations (including the two acceding nations); 5 of the top 10 nations by GDP; 4 of the G8 nations; Nations with 61% of the global GDP.

#### Current members

1. USA 130,000 troops.
2. United Kingdom 8,761—Had 45,000 troops in and around Iraq at the time of invasion
3. South Korea 3,300
4. Italy 3,030—Began phased withdrawal of troops in March 2005
5. Poland 1,500—Began to withdraw troops in October 2004
6. Ukraine 950—Announced to withdraw troops by October 2005
7. Georgia 889
8. Romania 860
9. Australia 850—Had 2,000 troops in and around Iraq at the time of invasion
10. Japan 550—Limited to non-combat zones only
11. Denmark 540
12. Bulgaria 450—Began phased withdrawal of troops in March 2005
13. El Salvador 380
14. Mongolia 180
15. Azerbaijan 118
16. Latvia 136
17. Albania 120
18. Lithuania 118
19. Slovakia 105
20. Czech Republic 80
21. Bosnia and Herzegovina 36
22. Estonia 35
23. Macedonia 33
24. Kazakhstan 27
25. Norway 10—Sent about 150 troops to Iraq and later withdrew all but ten officers. The new Red/Red-Green Coalition-Government promises that it will withdraw the remaining ten officers soon.

### Members with no military involvement

Several countries chose not to, or could not, sustain a military involvement, but nonetheless pledged their solidarity with the Coalition.

1. Angola 0
2. Colombia 0
3. Eritrea 0
4. Ethiopia 0
5. Kuwait 0
6. Micronesia 0
7. Rwanda 0
8. Solomon Islands 0
9. Uganda 0
10. Uzbekistan 0

### Members which have withdrawn

1. Iceland 0  
Mainly specialists and such
2. Nicaragua 0  
Withdrew 115 troops in February 2004
3. Dominican Republic 0  
Withdrew 302 troops in May 2004
4. Honduras 0  
Withdrew 370 troops in June 2004
5. Spain 0  
Withdrew 1400 troops in June 2004
6. Philippines 0  
Withdrew 51 troops in July 2004
7. Thailand 0  
Withdrew 443 troops in August 2004
8. Hungary 0  
Withdrew 300 troops NATO training force in December 2004
9. Tonga 100  
Withdrew 40 troops in December 2004
10. Moldova 0  
Withdrew 12 troops in February 2005
11. Portugal 0  
Withdrew 128 policemen in February 2005
12. Netherlands 4  
Withdrew 1350 troops in March 2005, later reduced troop level by nearly 800
13. Singapore 0  
Withdraw its single Amphibious transport dock deployed in the Persian Gulf in March 2005

### Democracy On Its Way!

**Britain:** 86% say give weapons inspectors more time, 34% think that US and Britain have made a convincing case for invasion.

**Spain:** 80% opposed to war, 91% against attack without UN resolution

**Italy:** 72% opposed to war

**Portugal:** 65% say there is no reason to attack now

**Hungary:** 82% opposed to invasion under any circumstances

**Czech Republic:** 67% opposed to invasion under any circumstances

**Poland:** 63% against sending Polish troops, 52% support US “politically”

**Denmark:** 79% oppose war without UN mandate

**Australia:** 56 per cent only backed UN-sanctioned action, 12% support unilateral action. 76% oppose participation in a US-led war on Iraq. Australian Senate voted 33-31 to censure Howard for committing 2,000 soldiers to US action

“With the aim of protecting and reasserting its own sovereign territory, the *Coalition of the Willing* set about making explicit what had been largely implicit in the ordering of things: it will take responsibility only for imposing the force of law and order; in a denial of community, it will not accept responsibility for the effects of that ordering; and those who dissent or retaliate will be held responsible for the disorder and the terror that this implies. That this response could only perpetuate the conditions that give rise to terror is revealed by examining more closely the pre-history, not so much of September 11 per se, but the notion of responsibility that has been evoked in attempts to heal the wound it exposed.”  
**Rosalyn Diprose, *Responsibility in a Place and Time of Terror***

“Recourse to revenge rather than mercy suggests that our ideas of freedom, autonomous responsibility, and sovereignty remain ideals and therefore insecure. Moreover these ideals are necessarily insecure because, insofar as they rely on shoring up a future pre-emptively, they support the transgression of the uniqueness and extra-territoriality of others. Nietzsche admits to the suffering inflicted on others in maintaining the self as the measure of meaning and value in the “social contracts” for which these self-responsible subjects are destined (Nietzsche GM II 5 & 8; 1967, 64 & 70). In a society of individuals responsible only for themselves, justice becomes a struggle, an exercise in measurement, the establishing of equivalences across different centres of freedom. Disagreement over law and challenges to the force of law that guides the establishing of equivalences are thus viewed and lived as the breaking of the contract, as ingratitude, as a wounding of the sovereign self. And, for this, debts must be extracted from the dissident other, pain must be inflicted, dissent censored.”

**Rosalyn Diprose, *Responsibility in a Place and Time of Terror***

### C—Cosmopolitanism

“We have doubtless chosen the term ‘city of refuge’ because for quite specific historical reasons, it commands our respect, and also out of respect for those who cultivate an ‘ethic of hospitality.’ To ‘cultivate an ethic of hospitality’—is such an expression not tautologous? Despite all the tensions or contradictions which distinguish it, and despite all the perversions which befall it, one cannot speak of cultivating an ethic of hospitality. Hospitality is culture itself and not simply one ethic amongst others. Insofar as it has to do with the ethos, that is, the residence, one's home, the familiar place of dwelling, inasmuch as it is a manner of being there, the manner in which we relate to ourselves and to others, to others as our own or as foreigners, ethics is hospitality; ethics is so thoroughly coextensive with the experience of hospitality. But for this very reason, and because being at home with oneself (l'être-soi chez soi—l'ipséité même—the other within oneself) supposes a certain reception or inclusion of the other which one seeks to appropriate control, and master according to different modalities of violence, there is a history of hospitality, an always possible perversion of the law of hospitality (which can appear unconditional), and of the laws which come to limit and condition it in its inscription as a law. It is from within this history that I would like to select, in a very tentative and preliminary way, some reference points which are of great significance to us here.

First, what we have been calling the city of refuge, it seems to me, bridges several traditions or several moments in Western European, or Para-European traditions. We shall recognize the Hebraic tradition, on the one hand, those cities which would welcome and protect those innocents who sought refuge from what the texts of that time call ‘bloody vengeance.’ This urban right to immunity and to hospitality was rigorously and juridically developed and the text in which it first emerged was, without doubt, the Book of Numbers.

God ordered Moses to institute cities which would be, according to the very letter of the Bible itself, ‘cities of refuge’ or ‘asylum’, and to begin with there would be ‘six cities of refuge’, in particular for the resident alien, or temporary settler.’ Two beautiful texts in French have been devoted to this Hebraic tradition of the ‘city of

refuge’, and I would like to recall here that, from one generation to the other, both authors of these essays are philosophers associated with Strasbourg, with this generous border city, this eminently European city, the capital city of Europe, and the first of our refuge cities. I am speaking here of the meditations by Emmanuel Levinas in the ‘Cities of Refuge’ and by Daniel Payor in ‘Refuge Cities’.

In the medieval tradition, on the other hand, one can identify a certain sovereignty of the city: the city itself could determine the laws of hospitality, the articles of predetermined law, both plural and restrictive, with which they meant to condition the Great Law of Hospitality—an unconditional Law, both singular and universal, which ordered that the borders be open to each and every one, to every other, to all who might come, without question or without their even having to identify who they are or whence they came. (It would be necessary to study what was called *sanctuary*, which was provided by the churches so as to secure immunity or survival for refugees, and by virtue of which they risked becoming enclaves, and also *auctoritas*, which allowed kings or lords to shield their guests (*hotes*) from all those in pursuit; or what occurred between the warring Italian cities when one became a place of refuge for the exiled, the refugee, and those banished from another city; and we who are reminded of writers in this context can call to mind a certain story about Dante, banished from Florence and then welcomed, it would seem, at Ravenna.) Finally, at this juncture, we could identify the cosmopolitan (*cosmopolitique*) tradition common to a certain Greek stoicism and a Pauline Christianity, of which the inheritors were the figures of the Enlightenment, and to which Kant will doubtless have given the most rigorous philosophical formulation in his famous *Definitive Article in View of Perpetual Peace*: ‘The law of cosmopolitanism must be restricted to the conditions of universal hospitality’. This is not the place to analyse this remarkable article, or its immense historical context, which has been excised from this text without trace. It was Cicero who was to bequeath a certain Stoic cosmopolitanism. Pauline Christianity revived, radicalized and literally ‘politicised’ the primary injunctions of all the Abrahamic religions, since, for example, the ‘Opening of the Gates of Israel—which had, however, specified the restrictive conditions of hospitality so as to ensure the ‘safety’ or ‘security’ of the ‘strong city’ (26, 2). Saint Paul gives to these appeals, or to these dictates, their modern names. These are also theological-political names, since they explicitly designate citizenship or world co-citizenship: ‘no longer foreigners nor metic in a foreign land, but fellow-citizens with God's people, members of God's household’ (Ephesians II. 19-20). In this sentence ‘foreigners’ (*xenoi*) is also translated by guests (*hospites*); and ‘metic’—but see also ‘immigrants’, for ‘*perioikoi*’—designates as much the neighbour, from a point of view which is important to us here, as the foreigner without political rights in another city or country.”  
**Jacques Derrida, ‘On Cosmopolitanism’ in *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness***

Can we imagine the will of a city in sharp contrast to the will of the state? As Derrida notes, the notion of cosmopolitanism has its roots in the Hebraic and medieval traditions of the ‘city of refuge’. If states like Britain, Spain, or Denmark will continue to wage preemptive war, against international law, against the wishes of their own citizens, can the city act as an alternate assemblage, to provide

an alternative force for advocacy, tolerance, critique, and refuge? What, if anything, is worth salvaging in this discussion of cosmopolitanism within the context of a city like London?

#### C—Context

“Slovene politicians desperately tried to steer a middle course between US pressure and the unpopularity of the war with the majority of the Slovene population. First, Slovenia signed the infamous Vilnius declaration for which it was praised by Rumsfeld and others as part of the “new Europe” of the “Coalition of the Willing” in the war against Iraq. However, after the foreign minister signed the document, there ensued a true comedy of denials: the minister claimed that, before signing the document, he consulted the president of the republic and other dignitaries, who promptly denied that they knew anything about it; then, all concerned claimed that the document in no way supported the unilateral US attack on Iraq, but called for the key role of the United Nations. The specification was that Slovenia supported the disarmament of Iraq, but not the war on Iraq. However, a couple of days later, there was a bad surprise from the United States: Slovenia was not only explicitly named among the countries participating in the “coalition of the willing”, but was even designated as the recipient of financial aid from the United States to its war partners. What ensued was pure comedy: Slovenia proudly declared that it did not participate in the war against Iraq and demanded to be stricken from the list. After a couple of days, a new embarrassing document was received: The United States officially thanked Slovenia for its support and help. Slovenia again protested that it did not qualify for any thanks and refused to recognize itself as the proper addressee of the letter,

in a kind of mocking version of “please, I do not really deserve your thanks!”, as if sending its thanks was the worst thing the United States could do to us. Usually, states protest when they are unjustly criticized; Slovenia protests when it receives signs of gratitude. In short, Slovenia behaved as if it was not the proper recipient of the letters of praise that went on and on—and what we all knew was that, in this case also, the letter DID arrive at its proper destination. The ambiguity of Eastern Europeans therefore merely mirrors the inconsistencies of Western Europe itself. Late in his life, Freud asked the famous question “Was will das Weib?” (“What does Woman want?”), admitting his perplexity when faced with the enigma of feminine sexuality. And a similar perplexity arises today, when post-Communist countries are entering the European Union:

*Which Europe will they be entering?*  
Slavoj Žižek, *What Does Europe Want?*

Žižek continues by asking “To put it bluntly, do we want to live in a world in which the only choice is between the American civilization and the emerging Chinese authoritarian-capitalist one?” In invoking the city as an assemblage that can stand in opposition to the State, there is also the possibility of reaching to the assemblages, formalized “communities” outside the state. Although the EU has seemed destined to be a mere economic bloc in the service of larger industrialists, it has also had the potential to be more than that. The Europe that Blair has invoked is in stark contrast to a Europe that could possibly stand in opposition to the models of subjectivity and political representation presented by America and China. If, by this invitation, we can respond to what ties the US to England today, it is in fact that they are the two central bodies in this “coalition of the

wealthy, the coerced, or the willing.” And if there is anything to ask here, it is how this bond between these English speaking nations may be presenting an obstacle to the development of Europe as a potential oppositional force. And before we can ask “What can Europe do?” We could ask not only “Which Europe?” but also “Europe for what, for whom?”

#### C—Community

“These communities, local, national, global, are formed, not by association between autonomous, free individuals who respect the same sovereign power and freedom they find, by analogy, in others. Rather, community arises from the way that, as finite or mortal beings our finitude and hence our uniqueness can only mean something of value to others. It is as bodies that we are mortal, finite, vulnerable, and make unique sense as an expression of belonging to social worlds in a way that no one has access to and, with this, as the basis of moral value. But the body’s unique sense only appears and makes sense, not as a sign of sovereignty, but by exposure, through death and through birth, to the finitude (and hence uniqueness) of other bodies in community (Nancy 1991 p. 28; 1993 p. 204). At the same time, community, and the circulation of meaning that sustains it, only arises and makes sense through the sharing and preservation of this uniqueness. A community, however large and however disordered, cannot be maintained when suffering inflicted by these elusive forces of Western imperialism strip the bodies of others of the opportunity for community. Under such conditions, community, meaning, and Being will implode. In the extreme, those guardians of a disorder that is maintained by so much collateral damage may be called into account and reminded of their community and, therefore, of the effects of their imperialism, by violence in return. Then there may be no future toward which impassioned freedom extends, and no home to want to come home to. Terror: the disabling of the future and an attendant implosion of meaning and Being, not from a single event that we might call 9 / 11, but without a locatable origin and possibly without end.”

Rosalyn Diprose, *Responsibility in a Place and Time of Terror*

“The novelty of the coming politics is that it will no longer be a struggle for the conquest or control of the State, but a struggle between the State and the non-State (humanity), an insurmountable disjunction between whatever singularity and the State organization. This has nothing to do with the social in opposition to the State that has often found expression in the protest movements of recent years. Whatever singularities cannot form a *societas* because they do not possess any identity to vindicate nor any bond of belonging for which to seek recognition. In the final instance that State can recognize any claim for identity—even that of a State identity within the State (the recent history of relations between the State and terrorism is an eloquent confirmation of this fact). What the state cannot tolerate in any way, however, is that the singularities form a community without affirming an identity, that humans co-belong without any representable condition of belonging (even in the form of a simple presupposition).”

Giorgio Agamben, *The Coming Community*

We ran away from our community, we ran away from our responsibility, we ran from what kept us hungry, we ran from the fight, we ran from our dreams, we ran to our homes, but our homes were gone, our ground was groundless,

our fears were our dreams, our security our terror. Who could hope in this time, could find the leisure to think in this time, in this time of lost time, reigning time, it’s raining time. Time to go. Time to move. Time to call on new forms of collectivity. Communities of the future, held together, outside even cities, regions or ballooned balloons, full of hot air. The community to come, the community we would struggle for would have to confront not just Agamben’s whatever, but however. However will we get there? This place which only this day, this time can open us to?

Royal / Beaver Correspondence

From: rca@16beavergroup.org
Subject: RCA -- Discussion -- 03.08.05
Formal or Temporal or
Temporary Paralysis
Date: 3 August 2005 19:09:58 BST
To: rca@16beavergroup.org

- Contents:
1- Writing
2. Playful Ambition

2. Playful Ambition
Something that stuck out after our discussions together was the quality of play. One element of that play would emerge from the dialogue between us by attempting to make the process a central part of the work.

Though, play is not the theme we will be exploring per se, it is quite possibly a mode in which we may work.

The main point to be made is to consider play as a part of our process together. And in this particular case, play could open us up to re-examine our roles, to take liberty in thinking or attempting to think, what in fact is possible in this context of an exhibition? What is it we attempt to do when we organize a group of artists who don't necessarily produce art?

One way of looking at 16Beaver would be to think of it as an experimental space, where everyday life, cultural practice and interests, intellectual pursuits, political will and thought, social interaction, friendship, and various other facets of life are allowed to mingle and inform one another.

What is the most we could do together, given the fixed conditions, given the theme of exchange, given the 13 of you, given the institutional demands, given the questions we are interested in, given the 350 possibilities we have manifested thus far in the various activities 16beaver has organized over the last 6 years, and given our openness to the outside? We may begin by playing.

16 BEAVER GROUP

From: Emma Ridgway
Subject: Re: RCA -- Practical -- 22.08.05 -- Proposal: The C of the Willing
Date: 31 August 2005 15:01:46 BST
To: Royal Beaver

Hello All,
Thank you for 'The C of the Willing' proposal of a 24 hour marathon of events. Ahhh, jetlag, platforms, screening and marathons; a potentially surreal mix of willing and disruption. It sounds an exciting and ambitious project, both in energy on the day/night/day and resources.

- Content of this mail
1. Very simple Question
2. 12+12 = 24hr
3. Other events to be aware of around London

Very simple Question
I have a simple question (but this is not necessarily my one and only): What does the 'C' stand for? Collaboration, Community, Camaraderie, Control,

City, Curation, Concept, Context, Cybersex (Paul Virilio's point, not an Emma confession), Confession, Competency, Contestation, Chain, Capital, Conversation, Coalition, Consciousness... I presume that it stands for something, perhaps I missed you explaining it earlier.

12+12 = 24 hr
We were thinking that the 24hour marathon could run from Saturday midday 12pm - Sunday midday 12pm. How does this sound to you?

On Sunday, I spent four hours at the B&B curated discussion event for 'London in six easy steps', which worked well. I thought I should try and build up my event / talk / screening stamina, like runners do for marathons.

All the best,
Emma

From: Ayreen Anastas
Subject: Re: RCA -- Practical -- 22.08.05 -- Proposal: The C of the Willing
Sent: Thu 9/1/2005 5:00 AM
To: Emma Ridgway

dear all, it has been a great online marathon...she cannot run so fast...she has to start somewhere...I will start here...

- 1. Very Simple Answer
2. RE: 12+12 = 24
3. other things

1. Very Simple Answer
> What does the 'C' stand for?

- 1.1 the C is open -- unlike the O!
1.2 the C is the Sea that is Separating us.
1.4 many of your choices are valid Emma, and it will depend on the Context.
1.5 the C was never the Coalition.

2. RE: 12+12 = 24
sounds good. the three of us will talk and we will get back to you about this...since a conflict of schedule might arise if we shift it earlier.

3. other events in london sound great, we can integrate some on our way, when we define the schedule.

more soon,
Ayreen

From: Emma Ridgway
Subject: RCA -- Practical -- 04.09.05 -- Expansion (& regards from the C)
Date: 4 September 2005 22:47:11 BST
To: Royal Beaver

Hi all, email, to my mind, is not the most concise and accurate form of communication as it can be more misleading than it appears to be. It does not necessarily force brevity and clarity (as suggested in Peter's mail 22.08.05) - as I amply demonstrated in my last mail. Reading Ayreen's response, I realise that I should have been more explicit about the reasons for the second and third part of my mail 31.08.05.

- Contents:
> Expansion of point 2 : '12 + 12 = 24 hours'
-> Expansion of point 3 : 'Events around London'
Expansion of point 2: 12+12 = 24 hr

We like the idea of the marathon as a schedule of events that will disrupt the expected timings of things. However, we do not want to only be 'internally' disrupted i.e. something that involves

just our two groups.

>Publics
We are concerned that the project addresses the public in different ways: the chain of events creates the opportunity to include different publics at different events. In the proposal there are events that can be more intimate (such as the meal) and more open (such as the walk or screening). Our group has been discussing the issue of creating and addressing publics throughout our course (looking at Habermas and Warner). Examining the individual responses to your questions (currently being compiled) it can be seen as one of the concerns of various members of our group - we will send more on this soon.

>Schedule shuffle
With this in mind, we feel there are certain events in your proposal that will attract a wider public and therefore call for more emphasis. We consider these events to be the screening, the night walk and discussions. These will inevitably get more of our budget and take more energy to produce. For example, the screening at the Rio cinema will realistically be the most expensive part of the programme and we would like it to be well attended. As we chose a public cinema, not an art or university venue, we feel it is important to choose an unusual but realistic time. Although 'morning movies' sounds appealing, we think that a Sunday morning show goes too against London's drinking habits (i.e. possible attendance); therefore midnight movies could be more attractive but still a rare thing in London. This seems a more substantial way to fill the central hours of the marathon and could replace the party, which may be beyond our modest budget.

>12 until 12
We suggested the marathon runs from 12 until 12 for a few reasons. Firstly, we thought that the momentum of the whole event would be better sustained if we finished earlier on Sunday. This conclusion came from discussions of our personal experiences of staying awake, for various events, through the night. Secondly, from your proposal, it could be abrupt to start at 6pm with the discussion. Starting earlier on Saturday could be a good way to build up to the events of the evening and night (discussion, screening, walk) and for our two groups to familiarise ourselves with each other. (Also, as openings are usually at 6pm, it may be more interesting to open at 12!) If the event happened early afternoon (Saturday) to early afternoon (Sunday) it could be anytime, such as 2 to 2, but for us 12 to 12 sounded right (as it marks out midday, midnight, midday).

I hope this is clearer - expanded - and more precise.

Regards from the C (Copenhagen),
Emma & Silvia

From: rca@16beavergroup.org
Subject: RCA -- Practical / Discussion -- 08.09.05 -- A-Z + Budget +
Date: 8 September 2005 23:51:48 BST
To: rca@16beavergroup.org

RCA -- Practical / Discussion -- 08.09.05 -- A-Z + Budget +

- Contents:
1. Notes on Conversation (A - Z)
2- Budget
3- Flights
4- Scheduling

1. Notes on Conversation (A - Z)

It was good to talk to Victoria and we hope the task to communicate the basic ideas discussed with the entire group will not be too difficult. This note is to help clarify the main points.

a. you and i and we need to give this whole thing time, thought, ideas.

b. we could think about how our desires could be fulfilled within this context, how can one best intervene given this context, generating research, finding interesting materials, introducing interesting questions, possibilities for walk, locations in the city, c words, a list of c words, c word of the day, interviews with artists i like in london whose name starts with the letter c, process, creativity, unknown headings, hmm, sleeplessness, the history of sleep deprivation.

c. we would like to think more about the ideas informing this work, 'c of the willing'.

d. 24 hour event is the event, if the entire event needs to be seen as a performance to give it orientation in artistic terms, then so be it, but it is an event underway, on its way. each of its element is important but it is not the object of the work by itself.

e. if we felt the pressure of representing (definitively) 16beaver in one event or even publication each time we did something on our own or with collaborators, we would never do anything, this event needs to be seen within a wider context of 350 events, not 1. 350 + 1. 351

f. having said that, we have never tried this before, so it should also be something new, should add a new move, a new twist, a joint we never discovered we had.

g. the latter requires play, and our ability together to be creative with ideas

h. in regards to organizational concerns: we created the 24 hours framework, specifically to make things clearer and easier. within this frame, we were hoping to allow some space, some play, for things to take place. this is an important part of our way of working at 16Beaver. the timeframe, giving the time. some of the elements will be predefined more in advance, and others more closer to the events and some directly will happen and surprise us during.

i. we will try our best to give you the known parameters, because it will help. but if it is not possible, it might be a good idea to work in a more flexible way according to what is given and what is known.

j. for example the space we need for the talk, would be a space that can accommodate 30-100 or so people, that hopefully has a projector that can be connected to a dvd player and a computer, because we are thinking of organizing an event similar to the ones we usually organize at our space in NY on monday nights. it will be a kind of introduction to 16Beaver, either literally or through a how, how does 16Beaver work, it will last approx. 2-3 hours depending on the rest of schedule and the capacity of the space.

k. We would like to orient each of the events around one or several c words.

l. all the obstacles we (who we?) face (what obstacles?), the demands for fixing things long in advance, of getting approvals through bureaucratic channels, getting funding via grants that require a proposal for a project to be concrete before a project has had time to breathe and actually become, etc... all of these are the walls that are constructed often within artistic contexts, in society at large even. 16Beaver is in part a response to that, a response against that. we believe that if you have a choice to publish or print something that is not yet there, not well developed, better not publish it at all.

m. If you want to be ambitious know what you are ambitious about, if you want to be modest, know what you are modest about.

n. we are modest about what we think will be achieved in our 24 hour event. it will be one day. hopefully interesting and stimulating. but if someone walks away from that event and says, "boy, now i know what these guys are doing, good thing i read the brochure also, because it is all clear, let's go home and get takeout" it would be news to us. we hope we do not fully know what we are doing, because we hope that it changes and grows with time. next month, we may yet be something even more interesting than today. (not clear, especially this oh boy thing!)

o. we are ambitious about the idea of a publication together. but it needs to grow in the same way we explained our modes of operation. not to run ahead of ourselves with the formalities before we have a substantial content that we think suitable in this context. so better not to do something than doing something hastily because of some pressure of production. (of course, again we would like to do it!)

p. and, ambitious publication does not rule out a simple web component, nor a small handout, nor a map. the only thing that needs to be understood pertains to resources. all modest things should be done on DIY level financially. it is possibly the ambitious things that require some finances, and even those, with some resourcefulness, other doors open.

q. ambitious publication does not rule out a web component, nor a small handout, nor a map. the only thing ... doors open. (difficult for me to reformulate! because the following is maybe enough)

r. reformulation re: publication - let it emerge through our conversations and even through the events. it needs to happen after. along those lines, if something needs to be published in advance, it can be a website, which is a very useful way to communicate with a large public on practical matters and to offer some introduction. And if we want to give a handout, this should also be done on a small and modest budget. And if the interest for something ambitious is not there on the part of people in the RCA, this is also ok, because it will need commitment to follow through.

s. another clear note: if a grant application needs to be written, let's put it together based on what we know. all will be fine.

a. we do not think so much about success or failure. b. if we think failure, we are not afraid of failure, because this will not all end today. it may, but based on past results, it probably will not. (instead of "failure" replace with rechanneling of plans or change of plans, because we are flexible to adapt to given parameters, success and failure may not be the best terms as noted in the text itself)

t. every failure presents us with new paths to follow. One could argue that it is more difficult to fail (than to ...?). maybe we should attempt failure more often. (i would not drop this whole passage)

u. coconuts, camps, castles, cathedral, carpooling, catastrophe, collisions, collaborations, commitments, cases of beer we can drink together in the party that should not be too expensive.

v. car, this is a different kind of car, how will we drive?

w. if (we will never leave each other alone, without a leash at least)

x. there is an interesting story from the past. For mass moca, the institution demanded a set title for our event months in advance, they had to publish it for the catalogue, they had to make a postcard, we thought about it, we did our best, we gave them a title, three events, at the end, what resulted in the process was quite different, the event was great, but it was something which

emerged from the 7 or 8 events we had organized at our own space in new york, so 200 + people attended, many people were involved, the event exceeded theirs and probably our own expectations, and fortunately they were flexible enough and had enough trust in our work to let us go ahead and change our path. What we can confirm in this context is that we will stay within this 24 hour frame, and if we fix elements such as a location, we will work with that, and if we say a small guide in advance, we can work with that, but let's let the things that really need content the breathing space they need, and let's actually engage on that front at least with equal vigor and energy as the fronts that are organizational.

y. one might say that we do not produce anything we leave things behind as we move, maybe we should think about all the things we have left behind or will leave behind. Consequences rather than appearances. What is it to produce an event? Is an event a production? A product is mostly understood as a closed finished entity we mostly open doors and leave them that way. (this is an unfinished thought, but just leave it that way)

z. z should be left open. (this is too predictable, let's add a note about all the possibilities that we have left unexplored thus far, this would already begin to present us with a relation to advanced determinisms and reverse causalities)

16 BEAVER GROUP



## CCA—On City

'There was once a sad city, the saddest of cities, a city so ruinously sad that it had forgotten its name.'

Salman Rushdie, *Haroun and the Sea of Stories*

*C of the Willing* is the promise of an act of empowerment: for 24 hours, a group of people will be given the opportunity (or—as it's often the case that nothing is given but everything is, by an act of the willing or due to a play of circumstances, produced—will create for themselves that opportunity) to re-name the city, according to a set of prescribed rules—which are themselves the result of a willing for arbitrariness, understandable from a group that takes its name from the name (and number) of a street—but also according to their mood, their previous knowledge or simply to meteorological factors, which remain, in all cases, the unknown factor, to be taken into account and not to be predicted.

The act of re-naming will be performed in English, and therefore the city will be given back its original name: the (C)ity. New itineraries will be discovered, which are meant to change the common cartography of the city, to challenge the spirit of adventure, to test the spirit of resistance and to stimulate the spirit of adaptability. It will be remembered that this is the city where the art of conversation reaches one of its extreme peaks, and hence there will be an attempt to de-construct this tradition and to talk about more than conversation. There will be moments of cooking, as one of the most convivial of collaborative acts, and crossing—of streets, canals, bridges, gaps, prejudices, boundaries. There will also be a great need for courage—to confront not only fears of the dark, the promiscuity of certain locations or the fatigue, but also one's own lack of emotional availability and interest in sharing or exchanging with potentially too many others. The (C)ity will thus be revealed as the territory that allows for an infinite number of encounters, but also the cold and deserted space where one has to find inside one's self that particular willingness to cohabitate and to contribute to a dialogue.

Probably there will be no conclusion; the chain of events and surprises will be cut by the pragmatic and implacable 11.59 am, after which the (C)ity will become London again, the curators and the non- or never-to-be- or not-even-tempted-to-become- curators may all seek refuge in the privacy of their beds and the 24 hours marathon may, at least for a second, look like a dream, like a fantasy in a remote corner of someone's brain. However, the city will be there to remember its 24 less ordinary hours, when it was interrupted from its coordinated or chaotic routines, and it was given (back) what, once in a while, every city aspires to: its capital, complete name, and all the contents and discontents within it.

## CCA—On Chronology

Time is geometrically conceived in space through the movements of the clock hand. 60 seconds (60'') equals one minute (1'), 60 minutes (60') equals one degree (1°) and 90 degrees (90°) equals one right angle. In one hour, the minute hand of a clock turns through 360 degrees. Similarly, in one revolution, a wheel turns 360 degrees. These are the building blocks of Euclidian geometry, and the basis of Western society's conceptual framework. Based on these conceptions, there are certain geometrical axioms, or statements that we accept in order to 'proceed'. 16Beaver, in part because of the fluidity and multiplicity of its constitution, is a capricious collective that is defined in both time and space. In developing our project with 16Beaver, we played within, outside, and around the axioms that define our understanding of the world around us, in order to develop a project that analyzed these conceptual frameworks.

*A point has no magnitude:* Our year group on the Royal College of Art MA Curating Contemporary Art is comprised of thirteen students from ten different countries. Our geographical disparateness is but one of many things that makes us different from one and another. A point on a map has no magnitude, but a person does.

*The whole is greater than its parts, but equal to the sum of its parts:* In joining the curating programme, each one of us agrees to invest two years in a situation that defines us as a group. When we approach a project, we approach it as individuals, and as a group. In working with 16Beaver we skewed the dynamics of the conventional artist-curator working relationship. They are a group that mirrors us. The project had more curators than artists. How would this affect the outcome of the endeavor? The whole is equal to the sum of its parts, but do the parts necessarily constitute a whole?

*A line has length and direction, but no breadth:* In our conversations with 16Beaver we didn't want to travel in a linear direction, and the nature of the project didn't allow it. We are many, and so are 16Beaver. I began something, she finished it, he edited, and then we all agreed we didn't need it. Our conversations had breadth, but no length and no predetermined direction.

*The shortest distance between two points is a straight line:* In developing the project, we exchanged emails from all around the world in frenzy and in complacency. At dusk for one and dawn for another, words traveled through the cybernetic sphere. They crossed each other and missed each other, but sometimes met one another, and that's when things began to happen. We hoped the project would grow organically, in different forms at different times.

## RCA—Royal Curiosity of Art

Q: 16Beaver is nominally defined by a place, 16Beaver Street in New York, a point of intersection of the interests of its members, a platform for discussion and a time shared together. You describe yourself as ‘memberless’. Since 16Beaver operates as an open and non-hierarchical network, whose interests are defined by a changing set of individual participants, how do you retain an identity as 16Beaver? How would you describe these interests at the present time? What makes your activities 16Beaver events?

• Silvia Sgualdini

Q: What do you (as a collective) believe in? How would you describe 16Beaver’s agenda, beyond simply as a platform for facilitating dialogue, and how has it evolved or changed in the past six years?

• Victoria Brooks

Q: In the ever-widening field of artistic activity, the blurring or expanding of boundaries has allowed artists to enter into areas of debate or practice where they would not previously have been admitted—politics, ecological issues and social regeneration to name but a few. In a recent article Julian Stallabrass noted: ‘the pure opposition of art to both the instrumental life of work and to mass culture has been clouded by increasing pressure on art to surrender its free play of ideas and objects in favour of becoming useful... states turn to art as a social balm to foster calm and cultural solidarity’ (‘Partying’, Art Monthly, May 2005). As an organisation with a socially engaged agenda, to what extent do you feel that artists are being progressively co-opted to provide an aesthetic mask for delicate social concerns, or to act as a filter between the audience and the decision-makers?

• Andrew Bonacina

Q: How much do you align 16Beaver’s social practice (meals / walks) with relational aesthetics?

• Victoria Brooks

Q: How do 16Beaver succeed in countering Brian Holmes’s honest and damning opening statement in Liar’s Poker: ‘When people talk about politics in an artistic frame, they’re lying’?

• Andrew Bonacina

Q: I am interested in hearing you discuss whether (or when) collaborative practices still contain a statement of criticality. One could say that artist groups are heroised as much as individual artists today. Yet collaboration, for instance in some art colleges in the UK, still provokes discussion when the time comes for evaluation of work. In 16Beaver, as I see it, the members are profiled through their individual work, yet the ‘collective’ insists on its presence. At the same time we can’t be sure whether the Beaver group we meet in October will be the same group a year later. Your statement ‘we are open to all input, but we do not want to be part of the mix, we want to construct the mix’ makes me really curious about how your decision-making process works.

• Cecilie Gravesen

Q: When evaluating the idea of the collective as a basis for activity, at which point in time do you think 16Beaver could render itself unnecessary or obsolete?

• Tobi Maier

Q: Do you see yourself as more or less an ‘institution’ even a non-formal and loose one?

• Raluca Voinea

Q: Where do you see the border between art and activism? I wonder whether your operation within art contexts can be read as an answer both to the question of your ‘institutionalisation’ and to the ‘artness’ of what you do (this is for me an open question and not a rhetorical one).

• Raluca Voinea

Q: I would like to hear how 16Beaver feels about groups such as the Artist Placement Group, and other activist groups such as Group Material, in relation to questions of art versus non-art practices, collaborative structures, and activist efforts.

• Charlotte Bonham-Carter

Q: Consider how communities coexist in a city such as London, a place comprising a cluster of realities that act as a magnetic field people are drawn or forced into. These communities sometimes share the same spaces, overlapping, ignoring, despising, intersecting, influencing each other every day. What is the value of a community? As individuals, how do we construct our own community and how do we trace our own trajectories in the city through habits, links, interests, projections, desires? How do we construct our own borders? As a collective whose interests are animated by a personal engagement with socio-political issues, do you see this project as having agency in the social reality of London?

• Silvia Sgualdini

Q: Do you see 16Beaver’s structure as transparent and one that could be adopted anywhere or is there anything locally specific about how you function as a group?

• Anne Low

*C of the Willing* has been conceived and organised by students on the MA Curating Contemporary Art at the Royal College of Art in London—Andrew Bonacina, Charlotte Bonham-Carter, Victoria Brooks, Jonathan Carroll, Elena Crippa, Cecilie Gravesen, Céline Kopp, Keiko Koshihara, Anne Low, Tobi Maier, Emma Ridgway, Silvia Sgualdini, Raluca Voinea—in collaboration with 16Beaver in New York. Developed from a proposal by Victoria Brooks.

Supported by a fund inaugurated in 2001 in memory of the curator Monique Beudert (1950–1999).

#### **Acknowledgements**

We should like to thank the following for their invaluable advice, support and assistance: åbåke; Boyle Family; C.CRED; James Goggin at Practise; Penny Govett; Nav Haq at Gasworks; The Institution of Rot; Catherine Lampert; Cesare Pietroiusti; Resonance fm; Charles Rubinstein at Rio Cinema; Anita Zabłudowicz; Claire Bishop, Alex Farquharson, Fiona Key and Teresa Gleadowe at the Royal College of Art.

#### **Patrons**

Brian Boylan, Sadie Coles HQ, Victoria Miro Gallery and Anita Zabłudowicz.

Royal College of Art  
Curating Contemporary Art  
Kensington Gore  
London SW7 2EU

tel. +44 (0)20 7590 4494  
[www.cca.rca.ac.uk/16beaver](http://www.cca.rca.ac.uk/16beaver)  
[cca@rca.ac.uk](mailto:cca@rca.ac.uk)

16 Beaver Group  
16 Beaver Street, 5th fl.  
New York, NY 10004

[www.16beavergroup.org/london](http://www.16beavergroup.org/london)  
[info@16beavergroup.org](mailto:info@16beavergroup.org)

published by Royal College of Art, 2005  
texts © 2005 Royal College of Art / 16Beaver Group and the authors  
edited by CCA / 16Beaver Group  
designed Collaboratively in London by Practise and åbåke  
printed by Aldgate Press  
set in New York

The MA Curating Contemporary Art is co-funded by the Royal College of Art and Arts Council England.