

Curatorial Collectives and Feminist Politics in 21st-century Europe: An Interview with Kuratorisk Aktion

Angela Dimitrakaki



Kuratorisk Aktion. Photo: Bjargey Ólafsdóttir.

Founded in 2005 by Danish-born curators Frederikke Hansen (b. 1969) and Tone Olaf Nielsen (b. 1967), Kuratorisk Aktion [Curatorial Action] define themselves as an all-female curatorial collective committed to an investigation of ‘colonialism’s catastrophic race and gender-thinking’ which ‘continues to structure the nationalized, racialized, classed, gendered, and sexed divides of globalized corporate capitalism’.¹ Conducted in mid-2010, this interview considers the theoretical, aesthetic and activist premises as well as histories that feed into Kuratorisk Aktion’s complex curatorial practice, seen to inform a broader innovative and critical project vis-à-vis the possibilities of feminism in the political landscapes of the 21st century.

Angela Dimitrakaki (AD): Frederikke and Tone, you were born in the late 1960s in Europe, like myself. If for a moment we imagine that profound socio-economic divisions within and across national contexts permit us nevertheless to speak in generational terms, our European youth was marked by two major shifts. First, in the late 1980s and early 1990s European space underwent a major transformation with the collapse of so-called communist regimes. One outcome of this was the consolidation of the paradigm we know as ‘globalisation’, meaning the full expansion of global capitalism (that we now see in crisis). The Western left appeared to have contracted for reasons too complex to touch upon here. Second, in the late 1980s European women’s movements and feminist politics seemed to be a thing of the past, ushering us into the spurious ideologies of a comfortable ‘post-feminism’. In short, our youth was defined by processes of de-politicisation and mass disillusionment. Did the above play a role in your constitution as political subjects? And how are these generational experiences connected with your decision to explicitly associate your professional lives with the political in the 21st century?

Kuratorisk Aktion (KA): Before we begin answering the intriguing questions you sent us, we would like thank you and Lara for inviting us to do this interview. We are honored to be included in this urgent historicisation of curating feminist and women’s

art. The interview offers us a welcome opportunity to specify the role played by feminist theories, (art) practices, and exhibition formats in our curatorial practice; more specifically, how we have found it necessary to supplement Western feminist politics with a global transnational feminism as well as with queer, postcolonial, anti-capitalist, and environmental justice theories and practices in order to take curatorial action against the injustices and inequalities produced and sustained by the divisions of global capitalism.

As for the two paradigmatic shifts you refer to, they both played a crucial role in our individual constitution as political subjects and, eventually, as politicised curators using curating as a form of activism. But not instantly – it took years before we were able to truly comprehend how patriarchy and capitalism, alongside the alleged deaths of feminism and communism, had once again naturalised themselves, this time on a global scale. This *belated* recognition possibly had to do with the ideological-political fabric of the Danish welfare state. During our upbringing, Denmark's self-image as a fully *realised*, transparent social democracy premised on equal rights had become so pervasive, so effective in all sectors of society (especially in the education system) that the country seemed almost beyond politics, even post-political. As a result, most of us became blind to the fact that gender equality was not realised, as claimed, and that the social democratic party was well underway to fully embracing a Giddensian 'third-way politics' in the name of globalisation, thereby betraying the interests of the Danish working and lower middle classes as well as the growing immigrant population. Worse still, many of us forgot that political processes are not irreversible and that political victories tend not to be universal.

Not yet acquainted (Frederikke studying art history and political science at Aarhus University and Tone pursuing an MA in art history at the University of Copenhagen), we individually however both began to detect cracks, fissures and contradictions in the mythology. Feeling somewhat maladjusted with regard to the normative gender and sexuality models in Denmark – the financial independence of the 'always already liberated Danish woman' resting upon her sexual and intellectual dependency – Frederikke embarked on a personal feminist-lesbian crusade within the emerging scene of alternative artist-run spaces, while Tone's flirting with the growing punk and squatter movements dovetailed with theoretical and curatorial investigations into relational aesthetics, late-modern subject formation and cultural diversity. In short, from our zones of invisibility, we began to see others: zones of racialised and classed invisibility. By 1997, both of us found the social and intellectual environment too limiting and left the country. Frederikke migrated to Berlin and later Zurich in an attempt to find an informed scene for her queer-feminist practice and politics. There, she worked as a curator organising projects applying gender and sexuality as categories of analysis in order to tease out the micro- and macro-political operations of the heteronormative order in such diverse areas as the 'family,' the anti-war movement and electronic pop music. Tone enrolled in a critical and curatorial studies program at UCLA in search of a forum where she could rethink questions of curatorial authority, framing, and display. Witnessing such paradigmatic events as the WTO protests in Seattle in 1999, 9/11 and the subsequent invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq and, more importantly, the longstanding activist art and community traditions in the US, she became interested in the activist potential of cross-disciplinary and intercultural curating and its ability to address sociopolitical urgencies and effect change.

It was our individual, radicalising experiences away from Denmark that eventually enabled us to join forces and form Kuratorisk Aktion. Although we were familiar with each other's work, our paths didn't cross until end of 2004 – in Denmark of all places,

which by then had broken with 75 years of social democratic majority by electing a neoliberal center-right government supported by the populist-nationalist Danish People's Party that immediately joined the US-led coalition in Afghanistan and Iraq. Unsurprisingly, we found that we were equally committed to seeking out new forms of agency, resistance, and envisioning in the arena of global capitalism, migration, and war, and that we abroad had acquired similar discourses, ambitions, and different yet complementary tools with which to 'take curatorial action.'

So, to answer the latter part of your question, given the complex ways in which neoliberal agents instrumentalise image and language, we both felt there was no alternative but to counter-mobilize and associate our professional lives with the political. As Arundhati Roy wrote shortly before 9/11 on the role of writers and artists in the order of unjust neoliberal globalisation: 'Isn't it true, or at least theoretically possible, that there are times in the life of a people or a nation when the political climate demands that we – even the most sophisticated of us – overtly take sides?'²

AD: Would you say that Denmark has a strong tradition of feminist activism in the arts? In her catalogue essay for *Wack! Art and the Feminist Revolution*, Jenni Sorkin discusses, for instance, the group Kanonklubben [Canon Club] based at the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts in the late 1960s and its 'all-women splinter group' that formed in 1970 and took 'a radical approach, confronting the poor social and economic conditions of women'.³ To what extent was your feminist consciousness, as part of your political subjectivity, nurtured by your immediate cultural context?

KA: There were indeed powerful moments of feminist activism in the Danish art scene – and Kanonklubben definitely made up one, as did a number of participatory and constructionist practices in the mid-90s (Maria Karlsson, Simone Aaberg Kern, Susan Hinum, and others come to mind). But like other such moments around Europe, they soon became invisible and remained unregistered until the late '90s and early 2000s when our generation, with a collective like Kvinder på Værtshus [Women down the Pub] and the teamwork of Katrine R. Dirckinck-Holmfeld and Honey Biba Beckerlee, pursued a first historicisation of feminist and women's art in Denmark. The first with the publication of the anthology *View – Feminist Strategies in Danish Visual Art* in 2004, the latter with the joint exhibition and publication project *Jubilæum 96 – At forhandle kønnet* [Jubilee 96 – Negotiating Gender] also from 2004, which during the official 250 years anniversary of the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts 'celebrated' the belated acceptance of female art students some hundred and fifty years later. Again, political processes are not irreversible: despite the efforts of these contemporary feminists (and many more) to reconnect with this long but interrupted legacy, the prevailing 'post-politics feminism' has hindered attempts to carry forth this struggle.

This immediate cultural context definitely nurtured our feminist consciousness. However, feminist consciousness in Denmark has historically tended to operate with stable categories of gender and sexuality that extend to Scandinavian, white, middle class, straight (and occasionally lesbian) women only. So, in Berlin and Zurich Frederikke found aesthetic and activist zones that complicated these inherited categories and made room for transgender and transnational perspectives in her work. As for Tone, it was the encounter with colored women's community organizations in LA that enabled her to see the urgent need for a feminism capable of fostering solidarity and co-responsibility between women across divides of nation state, 'race,' class, sexuality, and privilege.

AD: The previous question hides a more pressing question for feminist activism in the age of global capital: is feminism as a political discourse mainly possible in liberal

societies? We know that in many parts of the world women suffer in circumstances that are unimaginable to 'privileged' western societies. Although no country has eliminated the gender gap and despite class divisions within a given culture, being a woman in Denmark is vastly better than (not merely 'different from') being a woman in Afghanistan. It is indeed extraordinary that we still have to think of women's rights as human rights in terms of 'privileges' enjoyed by a relatively small number of women globally. Yet in the context of postmodernist identity politics in the 1980s and 1990s 'speaking for others' was often frowned upon. Somehow if as a white, middle-class, atheist woman you spoke about 'other' women, you were deemed patronising. Are these attitudes changing? Do you see your own political formation as exemplifying a new ethos of connectivity? Can we indeed distinguish between patronising forms of pseudo-universalising feminism and a feminism that is all-inclusive and globally thinking?

KA: We're not sure we're able to answer the first part of your question, to be quite frank. That would entail a long discussion on what so-called liberal and non-liberal societies are. But there are women struggling and organising against the adverse effects of global capitalism all over the world – Afghan women's resistance to the Taliban regime prior to the US led invasion and their incisive criticism of the belated support from Western feminists after the invasion is but one example. Rather than *representing* these struggles, thereby becoming a patronising mouthpiece for 'women who have less than us,' we try, through our projects, to *directly connect* their local and regional struggles with ours and link us all to the larger project of decolonisation in the age of global capitalism.

We are tremendously indebted to transnational feminist thinkers and activists like M. Jacqui Alexander, Chandra Talpade Mohanty and Vandana Shiva. All have in different ways stressed the importance of crossing the nationalised, racialised, classed, gendered, and sexed divides that separate women (and men) in interlocking positions of inferiority and superiority, so that we can begin to see how corporate capitalist structures operate on us all – though to *very different* effects – and, in Mohanty's words, begin to detect 'relations of mutuality, co-responsibility, and common interests.'⁴ Only then is the road paved for joining forces and practicing deep solidarity across contexts and privileges in the mutual work to transform capitalism and its various relations of rule. 'If', as Mohanty continues, 'we pay attention to and think from the space of some of the most disenfranchised communities of women in the world, we are most likely to envision a just and democratic society capable of treating all its citizens fairly. Conversely, if we begin our analysis from, and limit it to, the space of privileged communities, our visions of justice are more likely to be exclusionary because privilege nurtures blindness to those without the same privileges. Beginning from the lives and interests of marginalized communities of women, [we are] able to access and make the workings of power visible – to read up the ladder of privilege.'⁵

The work of Kuratorisk Aktion constitutes an attempt to translate a transnational feminist project of decolonisation into a curatorial ethos. For a collective of white, Scandinavian, middle class women, who 'every morning wake up on the right side of capitalism,' the synchronic reading up the ladder of privilege, however, must be accompanied by a diachronic analysis of the ladder's European roots, if we are to steer clear of the discursive homogenisation and colonisation of women (in both the so-called poor South and wealthy North) that has characterized much Western feminist discourse. As Paul Gilroy reminds us: 'In drawing the new map of Europe [...], we must be prepared to make detours into the imperial and colonial zones where the catastrophic power of race-thinking was first institutionalized and its distinctive anthropologies put to the test [...]. The empires were not simply out there

– distant terminal points for trading activity where race consciousness could grow – in the torrid zones of the world at the other end of the colonial chain. Imperial mentalities were brought back home long before the immigrants arrived and altered economic, social and cultural relations in the core of Europe's colonial systems.⁶

Since we formed Kuratorisk Aktion in the spring of 2005, this has resulted in an ongoing curatorial investigation into the complex relations between historical colonialism, capitalist globalisation, and neocolonial forms of exploitation on the one hand and postcolonial forms of conviviality on the other. In a broad body of projects, ranging from cross-disciplinary exhibitions to film programmes, publications, and public discussions – and most often all the above combined – we have strived to show how colonial dynamics continue to inform the way in which global capitalism creates boundaries between, and within, bodies and mentalities in order to sustain itself. With the declared aim of taking curatorial action against the injustices and inequalities produced by these boundaries – and in the long run contribute to the hard work of transforming them in a process of deep solidarity – we have developed a methodology we call 'curating *across* capitalist divides.' Proceeding from transnational feminist, queer, postcolonial, anti-capitalist and environmental justice theories, art practices and exhibition formats, this methodology enables us to bring together bodies and mentalities normally held apart and create a multi-vocal, cross-disciplinary project format where diverse, sometimes conflicting, knowledges and experiences can be articulated, exchanged and engaged with in ways that by-pass established 'North South White Colored Male Female Straight Queer Normal Abnormal Corporate Corporeal Individual State Subject Object' demarcations. The result, in Alexander's words, is a situation, where by crossing whichever boundaries we have inherited, '...we can begin to see the relationship amongst things, not in order to see that they are all equal because there is inequality, but at least to see that there is relationship between and amongst them.'⁷ Our work is a synthesis of aesthetic and discursive analysis, critique and activism, intended to shed light on the relationships between things, subjects and processes with an aim to subvert the power relations that divide them.

AD: Following on from the previous questions, in what ways do you think that your practice as a collective differs from forms of collectivity associated with second-wave feminism – the generation, that is, of our mothers? Or are there perhaps crucial overlaps between then and now that we need to consider so that we don't 're-invent the wheel'?

KA: We have parted ways with *certain* feminist collectivity models of the past in that we don't mobilise any stable categories of sex and gender or see feminism limited to one's own borough/country/hemisphere. Yet, our conception of the exhibition as a platform where new types of knowledge can be generated in a multi-vocal, cross-disciplinary and collectivist manner that again will generate new publics and alternative subject positions is very inspired by the 'project exhibition' developed in the mid-80s, which has its direct roots in the feminist art movements of the '70s and '80s, as artist and curator Marion von Osten has shown.⁸ Also, second-wave feminism provided us with intersectionality theory, an understanding of how forms of oppression based on gender and sexuality do not act independently from one another, but intersect with each other and with other forms of oppression based on 'race,' ethnicity, class, nationality, disability, etc. to create a complex system of multifaceted oppression. This intersectionalist approach – first heralded by Euro-American coloured and lesbian feminists of the second wave and now applied on a global scale through the 'deep solidarity' concept of transnational feminism – has in our work translated into an examination of exactly where the 'race'-and-gender thinking of historical colonialism intersects with current capitalist globalization to

transform into neocolonial forms of inequality, exploitation and oppression, and exactly where historical and present resistances to this neocolonialism can be found. Not just in the so-called poor South, but 'at home' in the so-called wealthy North.

AD: You are probably familiar with the fact that many collectives, independent curators and cultural workers in general exist in a situation of precarity: insecure, temporary and 'flexible' employment, voluntary work and so on. Women are no strangers to precarity, which now affects all sexes. Does this situation affect your own collective and if so, do you feel that a feminist consciousness can play a special role in combating this kind of exploitation?

KA: Curating across capitalist divides in a transnational feminist collectivist manner isn't exactly popular in the mainstream art world, so Kuratorisk Aktion most definitely exists in a situation of precarity. Originally, when we decided to merge our individual practices and adopt an independent, collective identity, we did so in order to manifest a strong presence of common ethico-political curatorial concerns on a local and international art scene, which at that time wasn't especially receptive to queer-feminist, anti-racist and anti-capitalist concerns (and definitely not in combination), and to support one another in circumventing the situation of precarity that neoliberalism imposes on the so-called creative class. And although transnational feminism has played a crucial role in building, practicing and upholding our collective curatorial ethos, it has done little to better our material situation.

Right from the start, we have been completely self-organised (with occasional temporary project employment within various art institutions) and carry the full thematic-conceptual, financial and practical responsibilities when realising our fairly large-scaled, long-term projects. Occasionally, we also receive invitations to curate projects for art festivals, journals and the like. These projects are usually smaller, yet just as significant as they give us the opportunity to revisit conclusions of previous projects, formulate new theses and put them to the test.

So far, we have been able to finance our projects through public and private funding without compromising our politics, which has been a privilege! But since the Nordic region still doesn't have funding programs for curatorial research and labour, we have been unable to secure salaries for ourselves. Like so many other cultural producers, we thus support our families by doing odd jobs after Kuratorisk Aktion 'office hours,' but are painstakingly aware that being in our early forties, we may not 'have the muscle' to keep up Kuratorisk Aktion for another ten years while attending to 2-3 'day jobs' on the side.

So, encouraged by growing institutional interest in the practice of Kuratorisk Aktion, we recently applied for a number of directorships – wishing to translate our curatorial practice and politics into a radical institutional format – but never made it to the final selection (and probably never will, apparently being too female or too collective-like, too political or too institutionally inexperienced). This series of failed attempts at becoming 'mistresses of the house' has led us to currently plot to pursue research grants outside the art world that would allow us to uphold our independent curatorial knowledge production. Moreover, we intend to engage this 'women's condition' of double and triple shifts across the globe more directly in our forthcoming project *Just Ecology? Transforming Sustainable Development with Transnational Feminism*. If we are to find a balance between economic growth, social progress and environmental protection, we need to pay attention to and implement transnational feminist from-the-bottom-up collectivism in all strata of life.

In both cases, our objective is to further develop what Sarat Maharaj has identified as the 'successes' of our independent curatorial methodology: 'As marginal voices of North and South start talking directly to one another – cutting across the divide – mapping the world according to what they [the participating practitioners from around the globe] saw as common to their experiences, they bypass established N/S demarcations. We see 'colonised consciousness' from quite disparate zones reach out to build new commonalities. Starting off as mobilizers even orchestrators of the project, you [Kuratorisk Aktion] find yourselves looking for new ways of defining your roles in the emerging scenario.'⁹

AD: Your practice rests, in my view, on a politics of alliance: in your mission statement, from which I have quoted in the Interview Introduction, you flag up not just questions of gender and queer politics, but also postcolonial critique and, crucially, the horizon of corporate capitalism. Left politics and the anti-capitalist movement inform your thinking and work. By working on 'Nordic colonialism' you seem to have brought the war home, as it were. Your principles as a collective appear to be co-extensive with a current 'mutation' of identity politics (the political consciousness of a bygone postmodernism that led nonetheless to a fragmented micro-politics) into a more integrated oppositional platform of engagement. In responding to the intricate power mechanisms of globalisation, do you think that current forms of collectivism *from the bottom up* make possible a further expansion of the political after its first post-1968 re-negotiation?

KA: If we understand your question correctly, we do believe that the forms of self-initiated and self-organised collaborative responses we see to the multiple global urgencies of today have contributed to a further expansion of the political, adding to the macro-political not only micro-politics but what we could call a 'politics of the common.' With Hardt and Negri's 2009 book *Commonwealth*, in which they seek to define the human-made common inside the multitude as a way for the multitude to organize itself against global capitalism, we see but one of the latest attempts to come up with a notion of the common that (unlike the concept of the universal) is able to cut across the differences (theorised by, for instance, various feminisms, identity politics and postcolonial studies) in such a way that inequalities, not differences, are ironed out. The intricate power mechanisms of supranational affiliations (like the G8, WTO, NATO, IMF) and multinational corporations call for common action and thus a redefinition of the common good because they operate on a global scale. A new notion of the common is also essential in order to respond to the global crises of climate, food, poverty, health, finance, resources and security currently facing the planet. Not only are these crises global but also interconnected and interdependent, as stressed by many NGOs – and so, even if you are not directly hit by one (or more) of the crises, you are still implicated.

The Zapatista National Liberation Army, the anti-globalisation/alter-globalisation movement, the World Social Forums, and various NGOs mobilising during the COP15 UN Climate Change Conference are all examples of from-the-bottom-up collectivism, whose strategising in response to these global urgencies have unfolded across national, ethnic and class divisions with respect to a politics of the common. The Bolivarian revolution in Venezuela that has generated the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America – an alternative social, political and economical alliance between socialist and social democratic countries of Latin America and the Caribbean – also offers great promise (and some concern) as a form of from-the-bottom-up collectivist movement against global capitalism and for a South American politics of the common good. And in Denmark, we have recently seen a number of similar unexpected resistance alliances emerge. In the mid-00s, the radical left autonomous movement, activist artists, intellectuals and so-called maladjusted

immigrant youth formed a joint revolt against the normalization campaigns of neoliberal-conservative-Danish People's Party governance, which (promptly instrumentalising the 'culture of fear' produced by the War on Terror) continues to criminalize the radical left, the intelligentsia and the Muslim members of the immigrant population in the name of state security. And since the end of 2008, various NGOs, activist artists, intellectuals and asylum seekers have co-initiated what immediately became a rapidly growing popular movement against Denmark's incessant tightening of its asylum, refugee and immigration policies.

Presently, the major shock effect of the financial crisis in particular (as Venezuela's president Hugo Chavez was prompt to announce during COP15: 'If the climate was a bank, they would already have saved it')¹⁰ has opened the door to new zones of resistance and action towards a politics of the common. While some anti-capitalists were fast to see the crisis as the fulfillment of Marx's promise of capitalism's collapse (finally!), others have stressed the potential of the crisis to make the opaque operations of global capital more visible to Western populations, perhaps helping to undo some of the blindness and some of the zones of invisibility that privilege, according to Mohanty, produces. For instance, during a public hearing we organised in Copenhagen in 2008 titled *Whatever happened to the alter-globalization movement? Learning from the recent past, planning for the future*, artist and educator Jakob Jakobsen suggested that the approaching bankruptcy of still more members of the Western middle classes might just make possible a new solidarity with the global proletariat.¹¹ In any event, the financial crisis has allowed us, in the words of social theorist Axel Honneth, to spot the structure of late capitalism more clearly and view its internal structural tensions, not so much as 'contradictory' in the hope that they will lead to capitalism's end, but as 'paradoxical': in one generation capitalism can generate moments of cultural liberation, which in the next generation are transformed into new, more advanced forms of disciplining and exploitation.¹² Perhaps this paradoxical connection between liberation and oppression could form the basis for future anti-capitalist analysis and intervention.



Images from the public hearing *Whatever happened to the alter-globalization movement? Learning from the recent past, planning for the future*, Den Frie Centre of Contemporary Art, Copenhagen, September 27, 2008. Photo: Kuratorisk Aktion.

To bring this back to the work of Kuratorisk Aktion, our practice of including theorists, critics, researchers and activists in addition to visual artists from all over the world in our projects is immensely inspired by (and arguably contributing to) this kind of collectivist transnational, cross-over organising. Just as our desire to turn curating into a medium for the envisioning of a just, sustainable future through alternative knowledge production and action should be seen as an attempt to expand the political, from the bottom up, towards processes of defining the global common good.

To that end, we have developed a conception of the exhibition format as a transnational, multi-vocal and cross-disciplinary platform where repressed pasts and naturalised orders can be addressed, contested and unlearned through: 1) Interrogations into the dynamics of historical colonialism and its structural reproduction in capitalist globalisation, 2) Examinations of processes of decolonisation and the postcolonial condition as trauma, hybridisation and conviviality, and 3) Think tanks for imagining and generating new forms of resistance, healing and transformation towards just sustainability.

So, as curators we are indeed engaged in a 'politics of alliance' that combines various struggles, practices and theories in order to stress that the war has to be fought on *both* sides of the (neo)colonial divide. And the long series of projects we have done on Nordic colonialism has indeed been an attempt to bring 'the war home,' as you suggest. The comprehensive *Rethinking Nordic Colonialism: A Postcolonial Exhibition Project in Five Acts* from 2006 was the first project in the series and Kuratorisk Aktion's very first project, during which we developed our methodology of curating *across* capitalist divides. Setting forth to revisit the complex colonial history of the Nordic region, the project took its starting point in three questions: 1) Why has the colonial history of the Nordic region – unlike the history of, for instance, British, French, Portuguese, and Spanish colonialism – to a large extent been forgotten, repressed, romanticized or made to look exceptionally *soft*, by the Scandinavian countries that gave rise to it as well as by the international community, and what interests drove Nordic colonialism? 2) What effect has Nordic colonialism had on the societies that became its objects and on the societies that generated it, and can we still find traces of the colonial dynamic in the relations between the Nordic member countries today and in the nationalist, racist, fundamentalist, and heterosexist sways that the Nordic region is currently experiencing?, and 3) As a result of colonialism's historical chains of cultural clashes, what mixed identities, languages, and cultures have emerged in the postcolonial condition that the region now finds itself in, and how do they challenge normative conceptions of 'cultural purity' and 'ethnic superiority' so prevalent in Europe at present?



Installation view from Act 1 of *Rethinking Nordic Colonialism: A Postcolonial Exhibition Project in Five Acts*, Reykjavik, Iceland, 2006: Inuk Silis Høegh & Asmund Havsteen-Mikkelsen's "Melting Barricades" (2004-2006). Photo: Bjargey Ólafsdóttir.

Following Gilroy's call quoted above, *Rethinking Nordic Colonialism* deliberately went back to the colonial zones of the Nordic region and unfolded in five consecutive acts in former Scandinavian colonies during 2006. Act 1 took place in Reykjavik, Iceland, from March 24 – April 16 and presented a group exhibition in the Living Art Museum and a workshop in The Reykjavik Academy. The second act unfolded in Nuuk, Greenland, from April 21 – May 14 and presented a different group exhibition in the Greenland National Museum & Archives as well as a public hearing in The Teachers' Training School of Greenland. The Faroe Islands' capital Tórshavn hosted Act 3 from May 12 – June 4 and featured yet a new group exhibition in The Faroe Islands Art Museum and a spoken word/performance/music event in The Nordic House. The fourth act took place in Rovaniemi in Finnish Sápmi from June 16 – July 9 and presented another group exhibition in the Finnish Railways Locomotive Engine Shed and a conference in The Arctic Centre. Each act brought together a carefully curated group of artists, theorists, politicians and activists with different (post)colonial backgrounds from all over the world, who were invited to reflect on a specific (post)colonial problematic in relation to the specific location of the act. In total, *Rethinking Nordic Colonialism* presented 56 practitioners from (post)colonial nations and home-ruling territories in the North and the South, who exchanged experiences and strategies on the (post)colonial condition during its course. The fifth act became the culmination of the project and consisted of the publication of a DVD and a website, which documented and contextualised the many activities, insights, knowledges and conclusions generated during the first four acts. On November 25, this DVD and website were launched to the public during a series of simultaneous closing events in the Scandinavian capitals, whereby the local discussions on Nordic colonialism that had taken place in the former colonised territories finally reached the current populations of the former Scandinavian colonial powers.¹³



Høgni Hoydal (FO), Moshekwa Langa (ZA), Aura Seikkula (FI), and M. Jaqui Alexander (TT) in discussion during the public hearing "Debating Independence: Autonomy or Voluntary Colonialism?", which took part in the Teachers' Training School of Greenland, Nuuk, Greenland, from April 22-23, 2006 as part of the second act of *Rethinking Nordic Colonialism*. Photo: Knud Josefsen.

Because of its methodology and structure, *Rethinking Nordic Colonialism* enabled a series of cross-exchanges and engagements that complicated a number of assumptions and stereotypes. Firstly, by bringing (post)colonial subjects of the North in direct contact with postcolonial subjects of the South, the project asserted that the wealthy North is not solely populated by free, privileged 'haves' but also subaltern and marginalised 'have-nots' (still-colonised peoples, indigenous peoples, (paperless) immigrants, refugees, poor working class women, etc.). Secondly, by facilitating a direct exchange between practitioners from sovereign nations already

decolonised and practitioners from home-ruling countries in the Nordic region still to become independent, the project created a situation where (post)colonial subjects could learn from one another and where practitioners and audiences belonging to the once-colonising nations were given the opportunity to 'stay quiet' for once and listen to these voices. This in turn troubled the hegemonic Eurocentric assumption that all legitimate scientific and material knowledge stems just from the First World and that knowledge traditions from the Third and Fourth Worlds are of no or lesser value. Lastly, by presenting (post)colonial practitioners of diverse ethnicity, class, gender and sexuality, the project accounted for the widely unacknowledged fact that the (post)colonial condition is not a uniform experience but depends on the gender, class, ethnicity, 'race' or sexuality positions of those who live through it.

In retrospect, *Rethinking Nordic Colonialism* represented a very first attempt at writing a comprehensive history of the region's colonial past and had four specific outcomes. The project made it clear that the history of Nordic colonialism continues to be extensively repressed, romanticized or made to look exceptionally *soft* because its oppressive elements are incompatible with Scandinavia's (self-)image as the cradle of social democracy and the modern welfare state. This uncovering in turn allowed Nordic participants and audiences on *both sides* of the colonial divide to self-identify as postcolonial (in many instances, for the very first time) and to thus associate themselves with the bigger history of Western imperialism. Thirdly, the project revealed an urgent need for new processes of geopolitical and mental decolonisation since not all the region's member countries and indigenous peoples are yet sovereign or fully self-determining (Greenland, The Faroe Islands, The Aaland Islands and Sápmi to be exact) and because the repression of Nordic colonialism seems to have blocked for a mental digestion of its colossal impacts on both sides of the colonial divide. As a result, the region's populations are still haunted by colonial patterns of thinking and acting. Lastly, the project's engagement with Nordic (post)colonialism revealed a horrific story of oppression and exploitation, but also histories of agency, resistance and hybrid forms of identity and social organization, which may prompt an unthinking of hegemonic binarisms, normative values and fixed categories, if we dare engaging them.

AD: We can observe the resurgence of all-women collectives (artistic, curatorial, mixed) in Europe – for example, there is the curatorial collective WHW in Eastern Europe, Oda Projesi as an artists' collective in Turkey and so on. Do you think that the proliferation of collectives can potentially redefine cultural and political life in Europe?

KA: Given our own failure to become 'mistresses' of an art institution, we're tempted to say no. In order for (all-female) collectives to redefine European cultural and political life they need to be given the possibility to run institutions, biennials as well as educational and research programs to a much larger extent and in the radical manner characteristic of their from-the-bottom-up collectivism – not just in terms of programming but in terms of employment policies, financial management and public relations. Having said that, there are signs that things are slowly changing. WHW's appointment as curators of the 11th Istanbul Biennial and three curatorial collectives making up the artistic team of Manifesta 8 testify to a new institutional interest in the approaches and potentials of collective curating.

As for the potential of collectives to redefine cultural and political life outside of the institutional and parliamentary framework, it's already happening as we touched upon in our previous answer. But there is an urgent need to theorise and historicise the specificity of (all-women) collectives further, as this anthology courageously sets forth to do. On that note, we think it crucial to underline that the proliferation of

collectives in terms of mere numbers does not necessarily equal the proliferation of collectivist thinking, organising and production. There are numerous pseudo-collectives organised in a gender-biased, top-to-bottom manner or according to consensus-based decision making processes, where differences are easily bracketed off. So, to avoid the unconscious reproduction of normative values and dynamics, it remains essential to engage the very concepts and definitions of collectivism further.

AD: In what way can we see curatorial collectivism as a form of activism? Is this an activism exhausted within the art world or do you think that there is scope for revisiting the avant-garde demand for art as life through curatorial work? That said, would you agree that collective work and networking are no longer just demands emanating from a radical consciousness but are also imposed on us from capitalist structures as such? As an academic based in Britain, I am constantly pressured from above to 'collaborate' and 'network' and do things for 'the public'. It is a demand of funding bodies that suits our information and knowledge economies and one feels the urge to resist, to simply 'refuse' to play the game. Doesn't global capital will us to network and co-operate? For example, all sorts of radicals in the arts (including feminists) now foster the biennial culture and we know very well what economic and ideological interests biennials serve. How can one guard against being co-opted by the very system one is meant to undermine?

KA: As will hopefully have become clear (or perhaps repetitious) by now, we do indeed see our collective curatorial practice as a form of activism. We aim for the transnational, multi-vocal and cross-disciplinary knowledge production fostered in our projects to generate radical critique and critical action at a micro-political and politics-of-the-common level that in the long run could have macro-political effects. In that sense, you could say that our curatorial practice is driven by a desire for exhibitions to contribute to social change that indeed brings curating into the avant-garde equation. We would like to believe that we belong to the growing number of curators who have worked hard to break curating's ideological isolation from everyday life by stressing the political dimension of exhibitions because of the way they directly contribute to the construction of identity, values and history – be they normative or alternative.

But you're absolutely right that there are clear signs of global capital willing us to network and co-operate, intensifying the risk of activist collective curating being co-opted by the very system it sets forth to challenge. So Kuratorisk Aktion is very conscious of how we position ourselves within and beyond the art world and how to keep our curatorial politics intact, both when we self-initiate projects and are reliant upon institutional partners to host them and when we get invited to guest-curate projects for institutions. The set of curatorial politics we bring with us is to never compromise the thematic of the exhibition project or the contributions of the participants. In our view, our thematics dictate specific politics and ethics at all levels of the project. For instance, when problematising Nordic colonialism we found it crucial to fundraise within the (former) colonising powers and not extract the funds from the still-colonised territories and their fragile economies. In the process of deciding on which politics and practices to adopt, and to detect possible blind spots produced by our privileges, we work and dialogue closely with institutional and independent partners and consultants, who are touched in other ways than us by the circumstances of the thematics we engage. Thus offering a very programmatic and consistent curatorial 'package,' we can possibly provoke the unveiling of inconsistencies – of not practicing on the levels of distributing financial, social and cultural capital as one preaches on the aesthetic level – inasmuch as we force the institution to pause for a second and consider its readiness to change its institutional policies all the way to accommodate the thematics it has accepted to engage.

Still, in our incessant belief that we can detect and remedy our blind spots with the help of consultants and the methodology of curating across capitalist divides lies perhaps our ultimate and incurable blind spot per se. In the words of postcolonial critic Erik Gant, '...post-colonial thinking seems doomed to act, to re-enact a colonial spectacle, so that at last/once again, with open ears, we can listen to it all the way through. The most recent example I know of and have followed with curiosity is a project called Rethinking Nordic Colonialism.'¹⁴ In Kuratorisk Aktion's strong belief that change can come about if only one communicates and connects sufficiently with those at the bottom of the ladder, Gant diagnoses a methodological, theoretical, and eventually, political form of action that rejects one system only to establish new ones as a form of erudite repetitive compulsion, so characteristic of the Western tradition. He may have a point. Because we keep returning to the 'colonial crime scene' as if to somehow find a way to curatorially, i.e. systematically, deal with the sense of agonising and embarrassing pain, guilt and shame that being part of Danish society and the white 'race' produce in us. The latest case in point is our 2010 large-scale, travelling retrospective on the work of Greenlandic-Danish visual artist and thinker Pia Arke (1958-2007), *TUPILAKOSAURUS: Pia Arke's Issue with Art, Ethnicity, and Colonialism, 1981-2006*.¹⁵



Installation view from the part of *TUPILAKOSAURUS: Pia Arke's Issue with Art, Ethnicity, and Colonialism, 1981-2006*, installed in Den Frie Centre of Contemporary Art, Copenhagen, 2010. Photo: Anders Sune Berg.

Without being able to analyse the exhibition at a distance yet (somehow it is still too close), perhaps there lies a strategy for resisting co-option – or to overtake co-option on the inside – immanent in Arke's methodology of *mongrelisation*. As the fruit of an unholy alliance between an East Greenlandic seamstress and a Danish telegraphist, Arke approached colonialism in the only reliable way, 'namely by taking it personally,' as she herself phrased it. And as an artist she investigated her field as an aesthetic material, with the help of which one can both sow personal doubt and harvest generally valid answers. She searched in old archives, the museums of modernity and the photo albums of ordinary people. Like an archaeologist, she dug into the past in order to bring her findings and herself into dialogue with the tangible: the body, her roots, her neighbours, memory. In short, she pushed, pressured and jostled archives, relics and finds in order to get the big (official) and the little ('insignificant' because private) histories to fit. Arke was an *affected anthropologist*, one who on the basis of her mixed identity and her pictorial experience wrote history

from below in solidarity with the little histories. But she also wrote from the *sidelines* – from the position where the *mongrel*, the walking both-and or neither-nor, rummages around.

Out of this practice grew a deliberately messy, mongrel-like methodology that allowed for different and seemingly incongruous observations to coexist. Her entire production is a testimony to the impossibility of the faultless, pure and unmixed, making 'identity' and the relegation of the colonial condition to those who have been colonised only an impossibility – we're all in the mix, both colony and metropolis. What makes Arke interesting in terms of your question of co-option, then, is that her practice becomes un-definable and therefore un-classifiable, making her less manageable and thus un-disciplinable to the information and knowledge economies of global capitalism.



Installation view from the part of *TUPILAKOSAURUS: Pia Arke's Issue with Art, Ethnicity, and Colonialism, 1981-2006*, installed in the National Museum of Denmark, Copenhagen, 2010. Photo: Anders Sune Berg.

Installation view from the part of *TUPILAKOSAURUS: Pia Arke's Issue with Art, Ethnicity, and Colonialism, 1981-2006*, installed in Greenland's National Museum & Archives, Nuuk, Greenland, 2010. Photo: Leiff Josefsen.



AD: The opening sentence of your Mission Statement explains that you are 'committed to curating radical critique and critical action' rather than, say, art. I found this a striking statement in its urgency, pragmatism and activist optimism. Could you

expand on this as a tentative closure to your interview, which also concludes the volume as a whole?

KA: Kuratorisk Aktion's thinking is admittedly overtly programmatic, and you are right to diagnose that we don't focus our talking and writing much on the specificity of art and its potential vis-à-vis, say, social critique and action. As a result, we are often confronted with questions such as 'Where is art in all this?' and 'Isn't the world of art and art related activities becoming secondary or illustrational to an objective you have already worked out on the political level?', as Maharaj once asked.¹⁶ Our answer to such inquiries is that art forms the very premise of our practice. It is the very 'potential of art to conceive the world otherwise,' in BAK director Maria Hlavajova's words;¹⁷ its ability to generate – and we're paraphrasing Maharaj again – the unpredictable, the unwriteable, the unscripted; that site from which the unknowable is engaged, from where new subjectivities and new translations can be generated; in short, the place which allows for the very engagement with radical difference in its own terms¹⁸ – that has informed both our mission and mode of inquiry. This was certainly the case with our exhibition project *The Road to Mental Decolonization* for the 2008 Sámi Art Festival in which we sought to complicate notions of gender and indigeneity in the Nordic region by introducing a theory-based framing of the psychoanalytical politics of trauma and memory on the one hand and practices of artistic research and giving testimony as 'affected anthropology' on the other. So art is always embedded in our projects. It is even given a privileged position in the way we include it alongside other disciplines to conceivably enable these to learn from art's mode of engagement with the unwriteable. Finally, the realisation of our interventions is mainly facilitated through the art world: albeit an apparatus for the most sophisticated reproduction of conservative, normative values, the art institution still remains one of the few sites where this reproduction can be challenged head on. Although, then, we don't subscribe to the view that artistic practice is *necessarily* endowed with the gift of seeing things differently, in our accentuation of art's potential to become an active social and political player within the current world order, we do jump the fence of ideological isolation and land in the hybrid field where the artist is engaged as one among many agents invited to, concertedly, pose new (kinds of) questions and look for alternative answers or complications. To put it more simply: If asked to do a show on ecology, we wouldn't call it *Art and Ecology*; we would skip the 'art' as well as the 'and' and go straight to 'ecology.'

In fact, we were asked to do just that and perhaps it is appropriate to conclude the interview by looking ahead to the *Just Ecology?* project mentioned earlier. Scheduled to open in Copenhagen in 2013 – the host city of COP15 where world leaders in 2009 failed to reach the far-reaching global climate change package everybody was anticipating, thanks to the disastrous leadership of Danish PM Lars Løkke Rasmussen – *Just Ecology?* is a combined exhibition and think tank project, which confronts rooted understandings of 'ecology' and 'sustainable development' with transnational gender and feminist perspectives. The project will bring together 20 feminist and women from around the globe, whose practice and thinking within eco art, environmental justice work, indigenous knowledge exchange and transnational feminist theory and activism offer alternative understandings of ecology and new models for sustainability.



oh A Aoa PA .oAnu
u. ot ln o Pa t. .ot
h o . A B .ot
t n a t AkAoK .
W eW e
WW d eWÓ
. j PA. oA.
a A n. h r8,, 6 .
Aoa ns r A j oA
ot. a koA A j AÓ
oA j Ó8,, 6f oh A
k o.ol . At Au
uuPf oh A n tl
An. t nuf

The concepts of ecology and sustainable development are far from innocent and universal, but highly contested concepts that since their introductions have undergone several criticisms and counter-definitions. Popular conceptions of the terms often most see them as two sides of the same coin, connoting the former with the ‘natural environment’ and the latter with ‘natural resources’ use and preservation.’ But both terms have specific histories and uses. The term ecology was coined by German biologist Ernst Haeckel in 1866, who defined it as a science of the relationship of organisms to their environment. The relational perspective of ecology is a precursor to the concept of ‘sustainable development’ and its focus on the relation between economic growth, social progress and environmental protection. Emerging from the Western-centered environmental movement in the late ‘60s in an attempt to address the devastating effects of social and economic development on natural and human environments, the most often-quoted definition of sustainable development stems from the UN established Brundtland Commission, which in its famed 1987 *Our Common Future* report defines the concept as: ‘Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. It contains within it two key concepts: 1) the concept of ‘needs’, in particular the essential needs of the world’s poor, to which overriding priority should be given; and 2) the idea of limitations imposed by the state of technology and social organization on the environment’s ability to meet present and future needs.’¹⁹ The report was a result of a growing recognition that environmental problems are global in nature and that they have to be addressed through the establishment of sustainable development policies and strategies in all nations. More importantly, it paved the way for the recognition that the many crises facing the planet are *interlocking* and that sustainable development can only be achieved if the conflict between economic growth, social progress and environmental protection is simultaneously pursued and resolved.

Both concepts have since then come under severe criticism from different quarters in the North and South alike. In the ‘70s, ecofeminists begin to unravel how the

concepts of ecology and sustainable development fail to see the parallels between the exploitation of nature and the oppression of women and the Global South, thereby failing to transform the capitalist and patriarchal systems that produce this triple domination by their construction of differences into a system of hierarchical binaries, where higher-ranking subjects legitimately dominate lower-ranking objects.²⁰ In the early '90s, ecosophists voice a criticism towards ecology and its environmentalist movements for upholding a dualistic separation of human (cultural) and nonhuman (natural) systems, calling instead for an 'ecosophy' capable of linking environmental ecology to social ecology and to mental ecology more directly. Some indigenous peoples' organisations have criticised the concept of sustainable development for understanding 'development' simply in terms of 'economic growth,' arguing that it thereby ignores the role played by 'cultural diversity' and 'traditional knowledge systems' as means to achieve a more satisfactory intellectual, emotional, moral and spiritual existence.²¹ And among academics and NGOs, it is argued that sustainable development is yet another tool of global capitalism, which serves as a kind of First-World protectionism by impeding development and improvement in developing countries (through, for instance, unjust Co2 quota) with reference to environmental protection.²² On that note, some critics go as far as accusing the concept of sustainable development of being an oxymoron, claiming that environmental protection and social equity for the developing countries are impossible without the introduction of 'sustainable un-development or de-growth' in the developed countries.²³

Given that the global crises hit women around the globe the hardest, compelling them to find new strategies for protecting themselves and their communities, *Just Ecology?* creates a women-only platform where the notion of a just and sustainable future can be engaged from their intersecting perspectives and interests. Presenting women active within ecofeminist, indigenous and gender research, activism, community mobilisation and aesthetic production across the globe, the project aims at: 1) Exploring the interrelatedness of women's and the Global South's subordination and the degradation of nature, 2) Contextualising feminism, ecology and sustainability historically and globally, 3) Acknowledging the work that women are doing individually and collectively to preserve natural resources, change social structures, enhance life quality and imagine a more equitable future, and 4) Visualise theories and practices that can address the diverse and conflicting calls for development and growth on the one hand and de-growth and un-development on the other.

Just Ecology? endeavours to test the radical thesis that without a politics for a new world order that is based in traditional knowledges of women and indigenous peoples, there can be no real sustainability, let alone development. Needless to say, this will have to unfold in stringent adherence to Kuratorisk Aktion's principles of curating across capitalist divides, so as not to promote one singular understanding of sustainability but keep the concept open to adjustments and inclusions.

On that note, in our opinion transnational and cross-disciplinary curating and art making cannot replace politics, but both are able to facilitate new kinds of queries and unlearnings, to offer much-needed sites for remembering and healing, and to provide alternative models for linking us up as singularities in the common. Some of these sites and models could potentially help pave the way for just, sustainable change that will transform women's lives as well.

Angela Dimitrakaki is Lecturer in Contemporary Art at the University of Edinburgh and a member of the research network Transnational Perspectives on Women's Art, Feminism and Curating.

NOTES

¹ Quotations from KA website www.kuratorisk-aktion.org A new version of the website is currently being prepared to be made available in Fall 2011.

² Arundhati Roy, 'The Ladies Have Feelings, So... Shall We Leave It to the Experts?,' in Arundhati Roy, *The Algebra of Infinite Justice*, London: Flamingo, 2002, p. 176. Written February 2001.

³ Jenni Sorkin, 'The Feminist Nomad: The All-Women Group Show,' in *Wack! Art and the Feminist Revolution*, The Museum of Contemporary Art, Los Angeles and The MIT Press, Cambridge Mass and London 2007, p. 461.

⁴ Chandra Talpade Mohanty, *Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*, Durham & London: Duke University Press, 2003, p. 242.

⁵ Mohanty, *ibid.*, p. 231.

⁶ Paul Gilroy, 'From Assimilation to Conviviality or, There Are No Second or Third Generation Immigrants,' in *Minority Report: Challenging Intolerance in Contemporary Denmark Station 4: The Book*, eds, Trine Rytter Andersen, Kirsten Dufour, Tone O. Nielsen & Anja Raitzel, Aarhus: Aarhus Festival of Contemporary Art, 2004, p. 135.

⁷ M. Jacqui Alexander, 'Colonialism and its Contemporaries: Feminist Reflections on the State of War and the Meaning of Solidarity,' in Kuratorisk Aktion (ed.), *Rethinking Nordic Colonialism Documentation DVD*, Helsinki: NIFCA, Nordic Institute of Contemporary Art, 2006, p. 6. The essay can be downloaded from www.rethinking-nordic-colonialism.org/files/pdf/ACT2/ESSAYS/Alexander.pdf.

⁸ See Marion von Osten, 'Producing Publics – Making Worlds! On the Relationship between the Art Public and the Counterpublic,' in Barnaby Drabble & Dorothee Richter, eds, *Curating Critique* (ICE Reader 1), Frankfurt am Main: Institute for Curatorship and Education & Revolver, 2007, pp. 238-243.

⁹ Sarat Maharaj quoted in 'Curating Across the North-South Divide: Sarat Maharaj in Conversation with Kuratorisk Aktion,' in Malene Ratcliffe, Lotte Juul Petersen & Sanne Kofod Olsen, eds, *Udstillingsformer – kuratoriske metoder og praksisser*, Odense: Funen Art Academy, forthcoming fall 2011.

¹⁰ Quoted from

www.politico.com/blogs/glennthrush/1209/Chavez_If_the_climate_was_a_bank_the_US_would_already_have_saved_it.html December 16, 2009.

¹¹ The public hearing *Whatever happened to the alter-globalization movement? Learning from the recent past, planning for the future* took place on September 27, 2008 and accompanied the two exhibition sections *Jumps & Surprises* and *Wir sind alle Ungdomshuset*, which we guest curated for the group exhibition *asking we walk, voices of resistance* in Den Frie Centre of Contemporary Art in Copenhagen that same year in collaboration with curator Katarina Stenbeck.

¹² Martin Hartmann & Axel Honneth, 'Paradoxes of Capitalism,' in *Constellations*, vol. 13, issue 1, 2006.

¹³ By the end of 2007, Kuratorisk Aktion furthermore distributed an additional 3,000 copies of the DVD as educational class sets and lending copies to a large number of senior high schools, universities, art schools, libraries and educational resource centers in all the member countries of the Nordic region. The intention was to make the project's examinations and conclusions widely accessible to younger generations and to underline the importance of beginning to acknowledge this colonial history and its repercussions today.

¹⁴ Quoted from Erik Gant, 'On the enigmatic and diabolic in Denmark's Greenland policy,' unpublished essay available at www.danbbs.dk/~e_gant/enigmatic.pdf, p. 4.

¹⁵ The show opened in Copenhagen, where the greater part of her works were displayed in Den Frie Centre of Contemporary Art, while a smaller selection was curated into the permanent collections of Greenlandic and Inuit artefacts from January 8 – February 14, 2010. The exhibition then travelled to Greenland, where one part was exhibited in the cultural center Katuaq and the other in Greenland's National Museum & Archives, both Nuuk from March 5 – April 4. The show ended its tour in BildMuseet, Umeå, Sweden, from June 6 – September 5, 2010.

¹⁶ 'Kuratering på tværs af nord-syd-skillelinjen: Sarat Maharaj i samtale med Kuratorisk Aktion,' *op.cit.*

¹⁷ Maria Hlavajova, 'Introduction,' at <http://www.bak-utrecht.nl/?go=4>.

¹⁸ Sarat Maharaj, 'Avidya: 'Non-Knowledge' Production in the Scene of Visual-Arts Practice,' in Ute Meta Bauer, ed, *Education, Information, Entertainment*, Wien: Institut für Gegenwartskunst, Akademie der Bildenden Künste, Edition Selene 2000.

¹⁹ Quoted from *Our Common Future: Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development*, 1987, chapter 2. Published as Annex to General Assembly document A/42/427, Development and International Co-operation: Environment, August 2, 1987. Retrieved from www.un-documents.net/wced-ocf.htm.

²⁰ Maria Mies & Vandana Shiva, *Ecofeminism*, London & New Jersey: Zed Books, 2005 (first edition 1993).

²¹ *UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity*, Paris, November 21, 2001, article 3. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001271/127160m.pdf>, July 14, 2009.

²² Sylvie Brunel, *A qui profite le développement durable?*, France: Larousse, 2008, p. 42.

²³ Vincent Cheynet, 'Contre le développement durable,' Institut d'études économiques et sociales pour la décroissance soutenable, January 4, 2005. Retrieved from www.decroissance.org/index.php?chemin=textes/dev_en_question.htm.