

**TOWARDS FAIR
PRACTICES IN THE ARTS**

#01 Solidarity: how do we work together?

27 February 2016



Photo: DahliaKatz

**REPORT BY
SOTA · NICC · OKO · HOOGTIJD · ACOD CULTURE
KUNSTENLOKET · KUNSTENPUNT**

Introduction

Reports from the working tables

Towards a Fair Practice in the Arts is a collective trajectory, for and by the art sectors, striving for more solidarity, diversity, sustainability and ethically justifiable artistic practices. It is organized by SOTA, NICC, oKo, Hoogtijd, ACOD culture, Kunstenloket and Kunstenpunt.

The symposium ‘*Solidarity: how do we work together?*’ was the first public event organized by this collective, aiming at joining many and diverse voices from the art world in order to engage with questions such as the following:

How do we take care of the flex workers in our sector? How do we guarantee the remuneration and the accrual of social rights for all artists and art workers? How do organizations (small and large) face up to the growing demand for co-responsibility and solidarity with the more vulnerable players? How do we guarantee a fair distribution of resources and the access to (cultural) infrastructure? How can we on the long term assure a fair distribution of revenues in the sector? What kind of agreements would underlie this? How would they be implemented and fulfilled? And last but not least: what is fair when the available means are not sufficient?

This document contains the reports of the parallel working tables that were organized during the work conference. In multiple worktables - all representing (best) practices concerning solidarity in the arts sector - we collectively explored the possibilities for more solidarity in relation to time, space and resources. A variety of art disciplines were involved in the discussions, and attention was given to exchanges on different levels: between artists and organizations, between artists and between organizations. The reports ideally serve as starting point for further discussions and investigations into what fairness is and how we can reach it in order to actually move towards a fairer practice in the art world.

The reports were made in the language of the discussions at the table. Tables 4 and 6 were held in Dutch, the rest of the tables in English.

Next?

In September 2016, the results of a large-scale scientific survey about the socioeconomic situation of artists of all disciplines working in Flanders will be published. The survey focuses among others on income, multiple job holding (paid and non paid, artistic and non artistic activities) and career perspectives.

Following the publication, the platform on Fair Practices in the Arts will organize a large gathering and sector specific trajectories based on the results.

Overview

A. Report Table 1	03
Solidarity in the support of artistic research How do we create conditions of co-responsibility between organizations and artists during the development of their work?	
B. Report Table 2	07
Solidarity between institutions and artists (1) How do we realize a fair division of labor between the different actors in the realization and presentation of artistic work?	
C. Report Table 3	11
Solidarity between institutions and artists (2) How do we realize a fair division of labor between the different actors in the realization and presentation of artistic work?	
D. Report Table 4	17
Solidarity between small and large organizations How do we realize fair collaborations between small and large organizations?	
E. Report Table 5	21
Solidarity within collectives What fairness is possible when it comes to work experiments within collectivities?	
F. Report Table 6	24
Solidariteit tussen opdrachtgevers, kunstenaars en architecten Welke alternatieve samenwerkingen kan je nastreven om mogelijke risico's te counteren en gedeelde verantwoordelijkheden te installeren tussen opdrachtgevers, kunstenaars, architecten en andere bemiddelaars?	
G. Report Table 7	29
Solidarity between actors from different and diverse cultural frameworks How do we guarantee reciprocity concerning projects in which one works from diverse cultural, social and economical backgrounds?	

A. Report Table 1

Solidarity in the support of artistic research

How do we create conditions of co-responsibility between organizations and artists during the development of their work?

Actors: FLACC/Sarah Indeherberge

Moderator: Katrien Reist

Reporter: Robrecht Vanderbeeken

1. Introduction by Katrien Reist and the group (one by one)

2. General remarks on the fairness label:

- The idea of positive conditioning as a strategy is emphasised and welcomed in the meeting: name and fame instead of name and shame.
- We will have to work together. The policy of finding extra funding and philanthropy will not deliver. Examples abroad prove the money does not come in. If it comes in, it only goes to mayor organisations. What we need is a fair system of redistribution.
- Challenge: artists are in favour for fair trade but galleries are not (yet/always). How to deal with that?
- If we make a label, who will police the sector and lead the campaign? Who will audit the auditors? How can we generate a transparent system of 'self control'? A possible problem is that transparency implies that a wide audience has access to confidential information as well, which implies that galleries will be less eager to open-up their internal policies.
- Everybody in the group is aware of the fact that we need a trajectory in the long run. This event is part of an on-going discussion. Crucial, however, is to set goals.

3. Discussion on artistic research

- When we talk about artistic research we are not taking about the academic/artificial version.

This is about artists working on their projects, artists in residence. Extra attention is necessary for the support of the creation process (which is very hard to define).

- A big problem is the output-oriented attitude (galleries need material products and events to put in their reports and programs). But what about the time you need to explore and study? How to 'quantify' that?

4. Looking for cases on fairness

4.1 CASE 1 – FLACC (REPRESENTED BY SARAH INDEHERBERGE)

FLACC is a residency place, provides in a working budget, covers travel costs, food (15euro/day). Only a workspace, not accommodation provided. Disadvantage: not employed, no social rights.

This institution uses the following argument to explain the absence of a salary: 'if the government pays the artists, they are not free anymore. That's a danger'. The 'moral question': do artists want to produce in an institution working for a wage, not being free?

FLACC works with an open call. Twice a year was too much, now they have one application a year. Fix number of positions: 10 artists. But only 2 or 3 come from the open call. After a call they receive up to 200 candidates... They can't read all the dossiers.

In the discussion it becomes clear that fees and payment are necessary. A mentioned good example: Vincent Meessen paid everybody for taking part in a conference.

FLACC provides 5500 euro a year/artist. This is not a fixed budget. Some get more, some less. Depending on the project and deal with artist. Transparency?

FLACC asks a return of 75 percent of the production money. As a commission, in case of a sale of a work within three years after residence. This sometimes leads to a conflict with the gallery. (They take 50 per cent all in, no taking account of the production costs)

Question: how does FLACC choose the artists? They work with an "artistic commission" in collaboration with the artistic director. (Who takes the final decision). Extra: every collaboration is a long term collaboration: artists can come back with questions, possibly the infrastructure... but they have to pay 15 euro for use of studio.

FLACC is not a presentation place, it wants to be accredited as residence space. Problem: the visibility is minimal without any presentation formula. That's why they ask artists 'to take FLACC with them', in their communication.

Discussion: is this kind of 'branding' needed for a public institution? Answer: yes, because you have to make clear that the government is investing in many ways. If you do not make this visible, only the

sponsors and private partners get visibility. This leads to the wrong impression that they, and only they, are supporting. While society is paying the bills.

Does FLACC collaborate with other residencies? Yes, e.g. Jan van Eyck, Masereel centrum. It's important to learn from each other. What if required (technical) knowledge is absent? They look for experts and hire them.

4.2 CASE 2 – EXPERIENCE OF ELEANOR BAUER (A.O. ARTIST IN RESIDENCE IN KAAITHEATER)

Residencies and research is not the same thing. Residency is about supporting. Research is about creating knowledge. Fairness in research has to do with providing an alternative for the capitalist disposition that as an artist you are always working for a goal. Collaboration is about a promise: you have to deliver. But why not support proto-production, development of methods, knowledge... More attention is needed for 'the soil' versus 'the growing process of making vegetables' (i.e. works of art).

So the question is: can we introduce a new category "fundamental research" or something like that? This comes close to the idea of commons: providing in infrastructure and space just to be there, to do whatever you need to do.

If we use or define currencies, what will be accounted for? Intellectual input? Use of space? Sharing of ideas? Time? Work? Money? We have a lot of currencies, the problem is the conversion. How to value them, who profits from the value surplus... Class issue: who can still be an artist today if you don't have backup from home? If you are from the working class, it's not evident to work together with very wealthy people in private galleries (other conditions apply, they have another perspective on needs).

Another issue: what do I have to perform in return for using space? What does an institution like Kaai want? That I call myself an artist in residence? Problematic about that is that other partners start thinking 'she's covered'. But that's not the case: I can use space, but I don't have budget or a salary. I work with other dancers, I need to pay them. The currency for institutions is visibility, artists is giving them.

Does an artist want to be 'free'? Being without an institution already much more problematic. Having space without money is a handicap, but it's not easy to discuss this because you do not want to bite the hand that feeds you. You want to be cooperative as a kind of gratitude. So the challenge (as part of fairness-process) is: how can you be critical to this institution? A requirement for the label can be: there should be no residency without money, payment and freedom.

Kaai: you are an artist in residence, but they don't tell you what the budget is they have put aside for you. You have to 'sell' your plans. They want to be 'part of the process', which can be helpful but it can turn into a kind of gate-keeping as well. Getting support is measured by the exchange rate: visibility for the institution in return.

Reference of PAFF: it's structure of self-supporting. There is just infrastructure, you are free. The only

currency is time and space. If there is no money, they should not ask for 'output', projects... for their program.

*Proposal: **transparency about budget, from the beginning.***

Pay for the basics first...(i.e. salary). See to it you take up people as 'working', account for them in terms of working days which is necessary for the administration concerning unemployment. If the budget is conditional, create transparency about the procedure (apply with a proposal, who will decide on this, what is the possible budget?)

*Proposal: **make a distinction between high visibility, medium and low.*** (Low is for instance: watching films, which can be essential for the creation process) This makes it possible for the artists to divide their research-time in 'A,B,C' related to different collaborations. Flacc would be in the middle. Here, making products is a by-product. Research comes first. But the institution wants to be mentioned as a partner in some way. Visibility is a big currency... (artists have to name residency-place)

*Proposal: **wage should come first.***

We need to define and redefine value. You start with immaterial things, after a time you make material things. But it will not be easy to get institutions to go along with this idea. They want return on investment. So, we have to try to find the cracks in the system: how do we strive for the institutions to agree on what value is? Maybe we can give them extra credit if they really want to invest for fundamental research? (Again: the strategy of positive conditioning). Don't express your specialness as artists-who-are-different-from-working-people. Emphasize you are part of the working people, you need a working wage. Not being paid does not make you free.

*Proposal: **more time for dialogue.*** Now it is more and more practical oriented. People are busy, lack the time to just discuss work and ideas. The soil needs rest now and then. You cannot plan and plough all the time.

*Proposal: redefining what is **value** (next conference?) How to value the values?*

B. Report Table 2

Solidarity between institutions and artists (1)

How do we realize a fair division of labor between the different actors in the realization and presentation of artistic work?

Actors: Campo/Carl Gydé, Sarah Vanhee (artist), Netwerk Aalst/Annie Van Hoorick and Sarah & Charles (artists)

Moderator: Bojana Cvejic

Reporter: Joris Janssens

1. The Quest

This group deals with solidarity between institutions and artists. We talked about the fair division of labour for creation, coproductions, presentations — about roles and commitments.

2. Two Cases

2.1 COLLABORATION NETWORK AALST / SARAH & CHARLES

About the collaboration

In this first case, the collaboration is project-based. After a group exhibition where Sarah and Charles were part of, NEST, a partner in Holland looked for coproduction partners for a project. Netwerk Aalst was willing to invest in the project (20%). For this, a new short film had to be made. The Dutch partner did not have enough budget to produce it. Netwerk (20%), BUDA and Vooruit (10%) invested financially. Pianofabriek invested in kind via residency space. There was a grant from VAF (70%).

Eventually, the exhibition had several ‘chapters’: film, sculpture, prints,... These works were presented in the Netherlands and in Netwerk, but in a different constellation. This has to do with the different spaces but also with financial logics. The Dutch partner had a smaller and more insecure budget.

The sustainability of collaboration

Before the project — First there was a group exhibition and then a solo exhibition with the same partner. This happens a lot, but it is certainly not standard. After the project — Charles thought Netwerk could do more effort in supporting the artists with the further distribution of the film. The institutions are in a better position to do so.

The importance of clear communication (also via contracts)

Netwerk always wanted to be very clear about the artistic part of the budget towards the artists (fee and production budget discussed separately). There were no surprises for the artists. Clear communication on the budget is an important issue. And a clear contract.

The remuneration of the artists' work and the production budget

It is Netwerk's policy to keep both fee & production budget separately. It's up to the artists to invest their fee in the production budget, which S&C did. In the communication of the Dutch partner, the fee was the production budget. More generally, it's quite rare to pay fees to artists. For Netwerk, it's valorisation of the work of artists. But it's difficult, because 'making a work' can last several years.

How to deal with financial risks

For the Dutch partner, this was clearly more difficult. An issue arose: the Dutch partner was promised subsidy they did not get. So suddenly there was a lot of pressure on the budget. But how does an institution operate when the money is not there? How do you deal with this risk? Netwerk made an agreement with the Dutch partner that they were executive producer, because they were more flexible with cash flow than the Dutch partner. Eventually other partners stepped in (BesteBuren).

The basic fundament: the importance of trust and respect.

Evaluation of the collaboration: material production and presentation. Charles is very satisfied with conditions for material production and presentation. The team had the right expertise, very trustful, transparent and flexible. Trust and respect is the fundament.

Evaluation of the collaboration: communication, promotion and documentation.

As far as communication is concerned, there is an issue. As an institute that started from a certain tradition with a focus on archiving, it apparently has another pace because it is not on social media and the website is rather old-fashioned. Also, S&C had to make their folder themselves to have it on time, but the advantage was that they could do this.

Archiving and documentation of the project needed to be upgraded, as far as the visual documentation is concerned. Most people communicate on an international level via social media and internet.

So the quality of the documentation should be matching the standard needed for this. The documentation is becoming more important, because more and more people will only access the work like this.

About the texts: there are different aims: communication/promotion and critical reflection. Both are important and maybe they should not be mixed, but the distinction can become very blurry.

The evaluation of the project: quantitative versus qualitative.

Netwerk counts the number of visitors, because they have to. But this does not interfere with artistic choices or the evaluation of the projects.

2.2 COLLABORATION CAMPO / SARAH VANHEE

The sustainability of the collaboration

The collaboration started after a discussion with the former director of CAMPO, Dirk Pauwels, who invested in a project. And then the discussion continued with current director Kristof Blom. Eventually, Sarah became part of the multi-annual application of CAMPO. So there is a long-term commitment, via oral agreement and a letter of intention. Throughout this collaboration, more complex projects happened. More generally, CAMPO works via a long term kind of collaboration with artists: 7 years on average. Apparently, this is very similar to the term of the relations with artists and their galleries.

Freedom and flexibility #1: CAMPO's 360°, flexible support model for the artists

CAMPO pulls all aspects of the performance projects: full fledged artistic support. CAMPO wants to be very generous with all their resources: not only financial support for projects, but also the different skills of the team, the infrastructure (different locations), their international networks to mobilise partners and further distribute the work... This pool is put into place differently according to shifting needs of artists. Some have a new work each year, others not. Some work with different other partners as a main producer. Some work in different countries. Some work with different disciplines. Some work in situ... The specificity of CAMPO is to be flexible to support artists in their different needs.

Through their way of working, CAMPO acts as a vehicle for solidarity between artists. This means that the profit of certain (internationally successful) projects can be invested in projects of other artists (which might be more difficult to sell). CAMPO has different kinds of revenues: public subsidies and coproduction budgets from the international market.

Communication: The 'branding'/labelling of the collaboration

The 'branding' of the collaboration is a sensible point, especially when there are different partnerships involved. When Sarah steps into the project under her own name, she is not branded as a 'CAMPO artist'. Still, there is an issue... Projects are touring as Sarah Vanhee/CAMPO projects. However, the role of the author and of the producer are very different, which isn't well-represented in this kind of formulation. For CAMPO of course the visibility is important...

CAMPO and Manyone: Sarah also has her own organisation (Manyone). It is an artist-run organisation, together with other artists, with a different logics than CAMPO. For Sarah, also having Manyone is important because of the fact that a lot of her projects are so different and process-based. They can be very experimental, very small or more spontaneous. In working with an institution like CAMPO, there are certain requirements e.g. as far as communication is concerned. The complementarity is important and works very well.

Financial commitments and risks

CAMPO's goal is to provide the right conditions to support the artists, also financially, so they need to be paid correctly. You cannot regard artists as a 'fixed cost'. This is not in tune with the need for artistic flexibility. But this becomes difficult when there is pressure on the overall budget. Choices need to be made, and it is more easy to cut variable costs than fixed costs. But Carl monitors the artistic budget closely to maintain this at the same level (=40% of the total budget is the aim), sometimes fixed costs for the organisation need to be cut. People in the staff of CAMPO recently had to leave after Flemish Government budget cuts. On the other hand, other kinds of revenue are being sought to raise the artistic budget. Bigger part of the budget is salaries and fees for the artists. The aim is to keep production budgets as low as possible. But it is not always easy to maintain this since budgets can shift during the project.

3. Towards a synthesis: a common ethos

In both cases we talked about the same points: the sustainability of the partnership, the flexibility of support models (financial, logistics, etc.), financial risks, the importance of clear communication, division of responsibilities.... So the discussion about and trajectory for the development fair practices can work further on these different operational points.

The more fundamental synthesis is that both cases illustrate an common ethos: the value of wanting to support the artists, being able to flexibly adapt to the specificity of their needs in terms of formats, visibility, continuity. We need to take care with flexibility. This word is abused a lot and actually put artists in a really vulnerable position. Here, we are talking about sustainability and protection, a long-term engagement where trust is really the fundament.

C. Report Table 3

Solidarity between institutions and artists (2)

How do we realize a fair division of labor between the different actors in the realization and presentation of artistic work?

Actors: BUDA/Agnes Quackels, Pianofabriek/Karliën Vanhoonacker and Einat Tuchman (artist)

Moderator: Ingrid Vranken

Reporter: Tom Viaene

1. Intro

This is a report of one of the two working tables focusing on the work relation between institutions and artists in the context of the production and presentation of artistic work. More particularly, it deals with the cases of BUDA Kunstencentrum (Kortrijk) and Pianofabriek Kunstenwerkplaats (Brussels), each working together with the artist Einat Tuchman for different projects.

Each institution has its own approach when it comes to this question. First, Agnes Quackels, artistic director of BUDA will give insight into BUDA's collaboration- approach with the artists. Next, Karliën Vanhoonacker, artistic coordinator of Pianofabriek, will accordingly do the same. After this, Einat Tuchman, who has worked with both of these institutions on different occasions, will stimulate a debate according to the problems she encountered while collaborating with the mentioned institutions in the context of a project.

Ingrid Vranken, who moderated the discussion, also in the capacity of being a member of SPIN, stressed two points before launching the debate. First, apart from outlining these general insights, attention can go to difficulties in the collaborations, but we try to trace good practices in order to learn from them. In the end, we should come to proposals that would improve on these. Vranken added in this regard the importance of the question of 'commitment', by which partners-in-collaboration commit themselves to partake when it comes to risks. Second, we should describe the cases by mapping a field of currencies, e.g. not only talking about money, because more things are being exchanged (currencies: financial, immaterial, material, visibility, community, decision making).

2. How does BUDA work?

There is no real fixed template. That's how Quackels starts off her account. There are so many wages for so many artists coming to work here, she continues. BUDA tries to support projects financially, according to an evaluation of the needs of the diverse projects. Depending on the already existing subsidies for the projects, BUDA determines how it could contribute to the project in a relevant way.

There are small amounts for small projects, and bigger amounts for bigger projects. BUDA strives to support some artists in a more structural way and next years wants to investigate how to develop this more profoundly. It wants to do better what it already has been doing for a while: to also support mid-career artists, who are working on a project, and who often lack support to accomplish this. A certain sustainability and a long term support is BUDA's most important goal.

BUDA has different commitments with different people and companies. Though co- production is not its main mission, there is a structural co-production agreement between BUDA and SPIN and Action Scénique, and from next year on with Manyone, SPIN and Lotte Van den Berg. Together with SPIN it also researched and stimulated alternative involvements of audiences and cultural professionals. Anyway, whenever we deal with long-term commitments, then there should be money. That's at least how we try to approach this, Quackels stresses. The artists are free to do with the money what they want. Just to say that there is no clear demarcation for what it should be used.

The artists BUDA decides to work with and to support on a long term are mainly mid-career artists and artist-run companies. First of all, it is focused on creating a soundboard for them. Investing in deeper relationships is important. For BUDA these partnerships are like 'family'. Though creating 'families' around a production space, has the danger of creating zones of exclusivity, community-creation is important to BUDA. The involvement of people on a long-term basis creates continuity, also for BUDA as an arts center. When artists return at our venue more than once, it is also because we think they are not seen enough at other places, so clarifies Quackels.

3. How does PIANOFABRIEK work?

Karlien Vanhoonacker immediately goes to the heart of the matter: When 'co- production money' is not sufficient enough and subsidies can't crystalize into wages, what do we do? When it comes to Pianofabriek, she asks herself: what can we do better?

It is true that, she notes, not enough shared responsibility is taken up. You need to force your house to take up that responsibility. Even force your partners more. For her, this forms a constant struggle. What is a good balance between 'saying no' (e.g. setting limits) and taking into account what x and y are good at? Everybody has to deal with limited financial conditions these days. You can constantly sense this kind of offensive mode concerning fees, visibility etc. The major question is: can we in the future find a way to create 'fees'?

Pianofabriek is confronted with the same internal discussion as BUDA. There is not enough money which causes a constant 're-balancing' of projects. What you see in 'critical situations' is that executed cuts are done on the level of artistic budgets. Most houses won't cut in their own wages. This is weird if you take into account that the sector is there in the first place to support the artists. If you ask me: whenever we choose to involve artists, and ask them to do something, we have to make them part as employees.

4. Einat Tuchman in collaboration with BUDA and PIANOFABRIEK

4.1 DISCUSSION

Einat threw back some questions to both organizations, with and for whom she has worked in different contexts. She was first interested in knowing how these centers make sure they stay open to the diverse Belgian art scene. And how they handle challenging the problem of exclusivity that is part of any cultural programming. There is also the related risk of creating an inner-crowd audience around a small selection of artists. Agnes Quackels agrees that for part of the work BUDA does, this could be seen as a risk. But she states that professionals are not better as an audience than others. Next Festival is a festival with a large and broad audience for which the presentation of more 'spectacular' work for the large stage is more suitable. It implies a lot of risk taking that is characteristic of BUDA. Something I loved even before I started to work for this center.

Einat now goes on to tackle something she has experienced on many occasions herself. She notes a lot of misinformation on both sides of the co-production. Many people are involved in one production. And much attention needs to go to the interactions, the relationships, the communication. The fact that different institutions support one project, causes a lot of difficulties that she finds hard to counter. It appears her way of communication is lacking with how to cope with that. It all appears too 'spontaneous' (e.g. 'un-planned'). And often, there's a repetition of the same kind of info all over again. She is especially confronted with this, when she is asked to write a text by all the different partners. You are booked at different places, but not everybody is involved in the same way. This creates a lot of problems. She feels that in that case she becomes a producer of different institutions. What we lack here, she states, is a moment we all come together to decide on a common strategy.

Both Quackels and Vanhoonacker agree that this is a problem, but ask themselves if this is really avoidable. The basic question is who is responsible for the communication and who finds itself in the more fragile position. In the end, the artist, for sure, needs to deal with the reality of each place, center. Quackels and Vanhoonacker want to know from Tuchman on what level exactly the responsibilities should be shared better. And whether she has a specific example.

Tuchman talks about her different 'hospitality-projects' in Sint-Joost-ten-node and Kortrijk. In her artistic city-research, by which she immerses herself in communities and neighborhoods, exchanges with the other(s) is in the forefront. She stresses again how difficult it is, when working with several co-producers at the same time (Beursschouwburg and Pianofabriek in her case), to know who's going to do what, who is

supposed to be the central go-between and who is in charge of what. A project like that, that changes a lot (work-in-progress) can be a fragmented thing to keep on track. Is it necessarily the artists who needs to be the final central hub for coordinating it all or can the partners take up more organizational tasks?

Vanhoonacker admits it is a tricky thing. You have to communicate differently with the different parties. It demands a certain flexibility and creativity of the institution. Quackels points to the specificity of Tuchman's approach. It basically lifts the institution out of its comfort zone. It is the essence of your project, she notes, to work on these boundaries. Tuchman, according to her, proposes with her work another model of collaboration. What you are demanding, she states, is quite difficult, because people basically want to work as they are used to. Vranken intercepts: maybe Institutions are not adapting fast enough to this new style of working, this kind of art practice? The daily rhythm of the institutions stays the same, and then there are these sparks that presents a challenge to the 'normal' ways of working. Unusual projects, so reacts Quackels, have to be taken care of in different ways. A project like Tuchman's is not about a finished product which she will in the end present. It demands another way of working together.

Tuchman is skeptical. As she has experienced with the neighborhood-project, Tok Toc knock, of which KVS was co-producer, things are much more complicated. In the evaluation of this project, Jan Goossens (at the time, director of KVS), decided not to support these projects anymore because they take too much time and organization. Note-taker, Viaene, intercepts: What is the relation here between the problem of communication and the problem of time? What are the consequences for the institution when an artist immerses herself – for a long time – into a neighborhood? What kind of obstructions does it deal with? Is it an option to decide otherwise, to maybe do less and better?

Tuchman persists in solving the communication problem. It's great that your project can be done at many places, she states. But it's a totally different approach when you find yourself in this network of different localities that function more or less in the same way. How can we make this communication a bit more functional? She sees a lot of time waste, inbetween centers and cities. How can we ameliorate this? Quackels understands the need for this but underlines the fact that there is no way to have a general approach for all the parties involved. Vanhoonacker proposes that the artist asks to assemble everybody around the same table... This is exactly the problem, so confirms Tuchman. It is impossible to gather everybody for such a thing. The availability simply is not there.

Vranken clarifies the biggest challenge here. It constitutes the basic issue of this round table. The fact that responsibility for the project is centralized, and not enough shared, makes the position of the artist somewhat fragile. The artist is unavoidably the node of information. But here we should ask ourselves: Shouldn't the artist ask herself if that is really what she desires in that situation? And how is it possible for the venues to take on more responsibility for the production?

Quackels refers again to what Vanhoonacker already pointed at in her introductory account: There is a fundamental imbalance between full time paid people and the artists in the context of these projects. It implies a blindness towards the work situation of the artists. Tuchman fully agrees. And stresses how much more helpful it could be if the (task) roles within a production would be more clear. The difficult

matter with this is, Quackels reacts, that it is hard to determine what is a fair division of time (e.g. investment wise) for each and everyone involved in a project.

A representative of the Dutch Platform BK present at the table gives an insight of the background discussion in the Netherlands when it comes to matters as these. She sees possibilities in basic income measures. When everybody would have such a basic income at the beginning of the project, it would change a lot. There would be no differences between employees of the institution and artists anymore. You would have a totally shared context. And if you wanted to do more, you could of course do that. Instead of waiting for this basic income to be realized, Vranken proposes, we could strive for an experimental project in this sense. This project would enable us to calculate the amount of time spent on the project, and how you pay everyone the same amount.

Quackels thinks this to be a good idea but adds that there is no need for more money anyhow, the money just is strangely divided and distributed. Everybody seems to agree. Common thoughts on this point. The most important thing is to not desert everybody to a precarious system. Artists have labor rights too. We should have more insight in how it came about that we started paying for structures, but not for artists. A switch is necessary here. Everybody should be on the payroll. It still seems to be difficult for many to conceptualize... True things are changing. Within the new 'Kunstendecreet' there is now this specific check-up: you need to convince the government that you are really paying the artists.

That's a good thing, Vanhoonacker intervenes, but what still worries her, is that most institutions cannot tell how much of the budgets goes to the wages for the artists. The government should demand more transparency in this regard. It should ask the institution to clarify its investments and how much specifically goes to the wages. Because nobody really knows where the total budget goes to. One could claim that most of the budget of artistic organizations could be called 'artistic budget' as it all serves the central artistic goals of the organizations, but the share that flows straight to the artists by means of income and (co)production budget should be more transparent. The administration of the funding governments should find ways to control this.

The representative of Platform BK notes that in the Netherlands it is the case that in architecture one third has to be fee. Maybe artists should be forced to pay themselves, Quackels adds. This is part of the problem. The relation between the artists and institutions should be revised. The problem is that the artist is not conscious of her power. Indeed, Vanhoonacker steps in, they should learn to say 'no' in specific occasions.

Tuchman of course agrees but specifies a danger in this: the danger of not getting booked anymore. All parties at the table now discuss the 'weak' negotiation position of the individual artist. A new discourse should be developed here. It is already important, for now, for the artist to stress how much she is doing for less money than the others involved (employees of the organizations). Whether the basic income is a fair measure still needs to be seen, but what we can be sure of is the one thing that turned 'invisible' in this whole process: the 'employment' of the artists.

4.2 PROPOSALS

Pragmatic proposals, step-by-step proposals, proposals that set an example, and that enable us to have a better view on the real situation on the floor.

1. Commitment to the artist on a long term basis
Openness to feedback, from both sides, artists as a soundboard for the organization, that's why the commitment is also so important, the feedback is crucial for the practice of your institute.
2. Difficulty to adapt to production needs of certain projects, a possible reaction to that is to do less, a side-effect of this is the almost unavoidable danger of exclusion to that.
3. Within institutions there is a certain blindness to the work situation of the artist (financial, employment) > experimental project to see if a standard of equal payment for all the involved in a certain project - the artist and the employees of the institution - is possible.
4. The need of transparency about the budget > in specific, about the share of the artistic budget that is really meant for the artist > to make visible the 'real work situation' again.
5. Creating awareness concerning the artist' power/ability to say 'no' when the promises of payment are too vague or not part of the project (the moment the artist doesn't accept the situation anymore, this enables to undermine the structural inequality).
6. The notion of the 'artist statute' as a status of unemployment works often against the understanding that research and inbetween time is actually 'work'. The working time that becomes invisible by this status of unemployment. What's the role of the artist in the society? That role is invisible because of that and a real dialogue about this is needed. A broader dialogue is needed about the artistic practice as work (most of the practice time is covered up by that status of unemployment).

D. Report Table 4

Solidarity between small and large organizations

How do we realize fair collaborations between small and large organizations?

Actors: detheatermaker/Elsemieke Scholte, deSingel/Karliën Meganck, Lokaal01/Frederik Vergaert, Middelheimmuseum/Sara Weyns

Moderator: Delphine Hesters

Reporter: Nikol Wellens

Participants:

Delphine Hesters (Kunstenpunt), Helga Baert (Hiros), Karliën Meganck (deSingel), Elsemieke Scholte (detheatermaker), Lieve Franssen (ShantiShanti ea), Laurette Muylaert (ACODcultuur), Sara Weyn (Middelheimmuseum), Frederik Vergaert (Lokaal 01), Nikol Wellens (Kunstenpunt)

1. Inleiding: over solidariteit tussen kleine en grote organisaties.

Uitgangspunten van waaruit te vertrekken in het debat:

Geen enkele praktijk is 100% fair, de inzet is om er constant aan te werken. Laten we veronderstellen dat we in de kunsten fair willen zijn en willen handelen, maar we niet altijd weten hoe dat te doen, of dat de condities niet altijd meewerken. Iedereen is deel van het probleem, iedereen kan deel zijn van de oplossing.

Twee cases:

- detheatermaker & deSingel
- Middelheimmuseum & Lokaal 01

De eerste samenwerking gebruiken we als centrale case, de tweede om bijkomend te reflecteren.

2. Case 1 – detheatermaker & deSingel

Elsemieke & Karlien lichten hun samenwerking toe.

detheatermaker is een ‘eenmanszaak’, in 2008 opgericht door grote en middelgrote organisaties (deSingel, Troubleyn, Monty, Aisthesis UA, a.pass opleiding) met de bedoeling om een werkplaats voor theater te starten. Subsidie kunstendecreet voor vergoeding van de coördinator en kunstenaars; de partners dragen de overhead. Elsemieke werd de coördinator. Streven was steeds om een faire betaling van makers te realiseren, ook met nieuwe partners. Op jaarbasis 13 nieuwe projecten en 8 die in het vorige jaar gestart zijn: zowel individuen als kleine en grote producties. Investering tussen partners en makers voor de lange termijn. 2 sporen: belangstelling zowel voor kunstenaars en organisaties, 2 artistieke gesprekken, soms kruisen en samenkomen. deSingel is een grote instelling, evolutie van vnl. presentatie naar ook ontwikkeling en productie. Nu alle 5 de functies (van kunstencentrum naar kunstencampus).

De samenwerking is gestart met deSingel als oprichter van detheatermaker en de partner die de zakelijke ondersteuning van detheatermaker verzorgde (boekhouding, logistiek, auto...). Dit is geëvolueerd naar een ongoing artistiek gesprek voor de lange termijn.

Reflecties over de grond van en voorwaarden voor de goeie samenwerking tussen deSingel en detheatermaker:

- Gemeenschappelijke grond van de samenwerking = artistiek gesprek, niet een concreet project dat gerealiseerd moet worden. Kritisch gesprek is leidend in een organisch proces over een lange termijn. Een investering in elkaar en in de relatie as such.
- De gelijkwaardigheid van de partners ligt in dat gesprek – hoe ongelijk ook in termen van middelen.
- Een gemeenschappelijke visie/wens over wat je voor de kunstenaars én het publiek wil. Een gemeenschappelijke zoektocht naar de mogelijkheden voor parcours van kunstenaars en positioneringen van instituten in een tijd en omgeving waarin lineaire carrière modellen en institutionele hiërarchie doorbroken worden. Hoe dit mee vorm te geven en daardoor te navigeren, en in die processen kunstenaars en publiek de nodige veiligheid schenken?
- Een engagement voor elkaars doel, niet enkel voor het eigen doel of eigen noden in de samenwerking. detheatermaker werkt in de eerste plaats met kunstenaars, maar engageert zich voor het publieksgericht werk van deSingel. deSingel werkt in de eerste plaats met het publiek, maar wenst dat publiek te verbinden met het niet-altijd-evidente-werk van de kunstenaars.
- Groot respect en vertrouwen voor de kunstenaar, ook vanuit het grote huis. detheatermaker geeft kader aan kunstenaars, zorgt voor de ‘veiligheid’ van de kunstenaar in de confrontatie met de processen in zo’n groot huis. Maar ook wel: de expertise van detheatermaker bestaat er ook in om goed te kunnen inschatten welke kunstenaar klaar is en de juiste motivaties heeft om een traject binnen deSingel te lopen.
- Voor het publiek van deSingel zijn projecten en interventies die kunstenaars onder de vleugels van detheatermaker ontwikkelen best experimenteel. deSingel zorgt voor een duidelijke communicatie naar het publiek over de samenwerking met en eigenheid van het werk van detheatermaker en de artiesten. Zo worden de verwachtingen van het publiek bijgesteld, kunnen ze het experimentele gehalte

van het programma beter plaatsen en zo ontstaat een soort speelveld waarin andere regels kunnen gelden dan degene die gewoonlijk in voege zijn.

- Grote zorg voor publiek en kunstenaars in de ontmoeting tussen kleine speler en heel groot huis. Wat wel niet altijd evident is, is om de hele ploeg van het huis mee te krijgen in nieuwe verhalen. Veranderingen vragen ook op dat niveau veel aandacht.
- Nodig om voortdurend af te stellen en wederzijds aan te passen aan de verschillende tijdslijnen en logica's waarin de organisaties werken.
- Autonomie: deSingel ondersteunt wel het zakelijk beheer van detheatermaker, maar detheatermaker zou ook blijven bestaan zonder deSingel. Moest dat niet meer het geval zijn, zou de samenwerking zoals die nu bestaat kapseizen.

3. Case 2 – Middelheimmuseum & Lokaal 01

Sara en Frederik lichten hun samenwerking toe.

In 2006 was er een sectoroverleg in Antwerpen met een vraag naar een platform voor startende kunstenaars en curatoren. Middelheimmuseum is toen als instrument aangeduid. Sara heeft een programma ontwikkeld (in Hessenhuis, vanaf 2011 in Middelheimmuseum). In 2014 herstart vanuit de vraag aan Lokaal 01 voor samenwerking. Aan deze vraag lag ook een grote nood aan artistiek gesprek ten grondslag.

Lokaal01 is momenteel een eenmansorganisatie. Oorspronkelijk was het een kunstenaarsinitiatief met tot 2013 ruimtes in Breda en in Antwerpen. Daarna alleen nog in Antwerpen. Naast de ruimte is er weinig geld om kunstenaars te betalen ('eregeld' van 500 euro). Doorgaans zijn kunstenaars bij Lokaal01 voor een werkperiode van 6 weken met aan het einde een presentatie.

2 modellen in de samenwerking tussen Middelheim en Lokaal01:

- Hangar in Middelheim ter beschikking stellen als residentieplek voor kunstenaars. Dit leidde gauw tot de vraag naar presentatie. De verwachtingen van de kunstenaars klopten niet altijd, vroegen veel coaching die niet steeds kon gegeven worden.
- Summerschool 2015: samenwerking tussen meerdere kunstenaars, presentatie was geen voorwaarde. Dit model gaf meerwaarde: intenser door de concentratie in de tijd, opener qua proces. Thema was de zelforganisatie van kunstenaars, en was een samenwerking met Pascal Gielen, Extra City, Academie voor Schone Kunsten (Nico Dockx). De selectie van de deelnemers verliep op basis van motivatie. Succesfactoren in deze samenwerking: een langer voortraject om mogelijkheden duidelijker uit te spreken. Er is een groot verschil tussen tijdslijnen in een stedelijke organisatie dan bij Lokaal 01. Die Summerschool is een extra project naast de residentiewerking van Lokaal 01.

4. Cruciale factoren in een faire samenwerking, op basis van de besproken cases:

- Engagement voor de noden van beide partners, niet alleen over de eigen noden.
- Wederzijdse aanpassing: elkaar leren kennen en zich (wederzijds) aanpassen aan de diverse

processen, tijdskaders, (al dan niet) flexibiliteit, identiteiten, doelstellingen, financiële en menselijke mogelijkheden.

- Goede open communicatie. Blijven spreken, durven spreken, durven schuren.
- Goeie afspraken maken. Durven spreken over geld en de verwachtingen t.a.v. elkaar.
- Vertrouwen
 - in elkaar
 - binnen de organisaties
 - zelfvertrouwen, eigenwaarde van de partners
- Autonomie! Een gelijkwaardige samenwerking kan maar ontstaan als de partners t.a.v. elkaar voldoende autonomie hebben en als ze voldoende bestaansmiddelen hebben.
- Tijd! Een goeie samenwerking vraagt onvermijdelijk veel tijd en heeft nood aan het regelmatig bijstellen van het pad – organische groei.

5. Specifieke uitdagingen indien de partners erg verschillen in grootte

- Elkaar leren kennen vraagt veel meer als de verschillen in manier van werken zo groot zijn
- Zich aanpassen aan elkaar vraagt veel – veel te overbruggen
- Gevaar voor instrumentalisering is groter
 - kleine partner denkt mogelijk gauw grote middelen te kunnen binnenhalen
 - grote partner denkt mogelijk gauw de kleine te kunnen inschakelen in eigen verhaal

E. Report Table 5

Solidarity within collectives

What fairness is possible when it comes to work experiments within collectivities?

Actors: POP (Potential Office Project)/Koen Berghmans and Vincent P. Alexis, Jubilee/Katleen Vermeir and Ronny Heiremans

Moderator: Kobe Matthys

Reporter: Josine De Roover

1. Introduction

After the presentation of the different participants and the two study cases (POP & Jubilee), we can detect a number of common grounds and similarities in the approach of artist's initiatives and collectives to the challenges of fair practices in the arts. **Why and how to work together differently?**

2. Why

Artists and creative makers often join forces because they are confronted with a number of **similar problems or shared interests** for which they search and/or find creative solutions.

- Problems of precariousness
- Too big of a job to do alone
- Too much administration or expenses to carry alone
- Unable to find 'clients' alone

3. How

Therefore they create new **kinds of structures**, for which for example the name of POP, "Potential Office or Office of Potentials", is very revelatory.

Within these more recent - **open or semi-open** - structures, we can detect a number of recurrent features.

- The organizations or structures around the artistic practice or creative makers are often **project based & project inspired**, limited in time or in number of participants – inspired by creating the possibility to execute projects. Not an existing structure, but the project raises the structure around it.
- Their, often newly created, working methods are mostly **open source**; they use existing open source tools/methods or, if needed, create **new sets of tools** which they are willing to **share**, not only with their members, but also with other people. This is in strong contradiction with the capitalistic ‘winning selling proposition’ or private market, in which innovative structures and tools are protected and owned by a restricted number of people. Within these structures, **exchange** is not merely money-based, but also **service or time-based**. (e.g. What about network as a currency? “I know people that can help you...”) By doing so they often introduce forms of **alternative currency**.
- Not only the costs (administration...) are **shared**, but also the **credits** of the work or the projects are **shared**. (e.g. Jubilee as executive producer), **the knowledge and the visibility**.
- These new strategies are often **content-based** and **the structures often operate as an INTERFACE** to share information and knowledge; this can be specific projects, help to realize them or translated to a broader framework of working relations and relations with stakeholders
 - with the own ‘members’ and (art) community
 - with policy makers
 - with potential ‘clients’

4. What I do, I give it to the organization (and by enlargement to the community)

4.1 EXAMPLES – CASE STUDY POP

- Because of the precarious situation of architects, who choose not to work in bigger or traditional systems and do not have a standard practice, a number of individual architects decided to create a new structure.
- Around 30 individual architects and creative makers and designers are involved in POP. They all have their own individual structure or work.
- POP is an online highly open structure and network offers structure to projects, but has no company status.
- Gatherings are being held in bars for regular meetings or in different places for workshops, communication is based on emails & a wiki platform

4.2 EXAMPLES – CASE STUDY JUBILEE

- is a platform of similar art practices, not a collective, where a certain number of artists with a rather high cost artistic production, join forces to realize projects.
- Members pay 7,5% of their income sources to pay for the sustainability of the structure.
- JUBILEE operates as executive producer and invests in visibility and shared knowledge, researches alternative currencies...

The **threats** which prevent success for these new forms of working together and sustainable commitment

of members, reside particularly in these moments when the new 'shared' methods are confronted to the existing financial and legal system (that is money-based and does not offer (yet) the legal basis for new approaches in working together)

- The actual financial system is dominant, and used by the stakeholders surrounding the new structures; commissioners of the projects are mainly money-based
- Problem of equivalence of alternative currencies: *how to translate my money in your time?*
- The legal system is not adjusted to new forms of exchange, which threatens the legal security of the participants. *How to make an organization that does not exist?*
- Small organizations/alternative models of working together can operate with very fair art and exchange practices, but if you translate them in financial terms, they can be considered as not fair.
- Exhaustion: How to prevent people taking part in these experimentations from exhaustion? How to establish a kind of stability that could reinforce engagement?
- 'Return of the repressed': How to get back to individualistic reflexes? How to 'ego-fuck' for a while? How to respect/manage the collective & the individual interests?

5. How to meet and how to beat law?

F. Report Table 6

Solidariteit tussen opdrachtgevers, kunstenaars en architecten

Welke alternatieve samenwerkingen kan je nastreven om mogelijke risico's te counteren en gedeelde verantwoordelijkheden te installeren tussen opdrachtgevers, kunstenaars, architecten en andere bemiddelaars?

Actoren: *BC (Brussels Cooperation)/Ken De Cooman*

Moderator: *Stefan Siffer (VAi)*

Verslaggever: *Katrien Kiekens (Kunstenpunt)*

Participants:

Stefan SIFFER (VAI), Ken DE COOMAN (BC Architecten en Studies); Laura MUYLDERMANS (Architect) & Katrien KIEKENS

1. Cases - Case BC

- BVBA & VZW
- VZW-structuur: breder richting kunstenprojecten
- Start: projecten in Afrika waar bouwproces zeer anders georganiseerd is met minder structuur, geen duidelijke verantwoordelijkheden (goed afgelopen)
- Overgebracht naar België: eerste illegaal bouwwerk via workshop, bijzondere technieken overgebracht, onbetaalde aannemers, niet aangegeven arbeid, geen duidelijke verantwoordelijkheden (goed afgelopen)
- 'Problematisch' project (CASE ROND EERSTE VERSTORING):
 - Samenwerking met Ief Spincemaille, stadskunstenaar Leuven '15 – '16, stad Leuven, architecten,

geologen (onderzoek naar eerste onverstoorde laag van Leuven, waar geen archeologie gevonden werd: **eerste verstoring** (=artistiek concept))

- Budget van 1.500,- wel veel productiebudget bij 30CC
- Zoektocht naar granulaten die toegevoegd konden worden aan onverstoorde laag, labowerk
- Start workshop na fundering: opbouw aarden toren, spontaan aanmelden helpers, vrijblijvend werk met 40-tal mensen, onduidelijke verantwoordelijkheden, goede atmosfeer
- Tijdens ontkisting: scheuren toren leidt tot verhoogde druk op samenwerking, zekere geheimhouding errond
- Artistiek project dat verder gaat dan eigen werk artiest, geen gedefinieerde verantwoordelijkheden (weinig budget), wanneer er iets fout gaat komen er gestes van goodwill (bv. afstaan ereloon, ook al was dat klein), geen typische zoektocht naar wie in gebreke moet worden gesteld.

(Van de website van 30CC:)

Om de twee jaar stelt de stad Leuven een nieuwe culturele ambassadeur aan. Iedere vertegenwoordiger kiest zijn eigen opvolger. Stadssopraan Noémie Schellens gaf de sleutel van de stad door aan stadskunstenaar Ief Spincemaille. Ief is Leuenaar, jong, geniet (inter-)nationale bekendheid en zit vol plannen ... Spincemaille is de man achter onder meer 'There is the sun', een project dat in 2013 onderdak vond in De Leuvense Klimaatweek. Deze installatie leverde zonlicht op bestelling in de appartementen die uitkijken op de noordkant van het Leuvense Sint- Maartensdal.

Met het project 'Eerste Verstoring' zoekt en graaft stadskunstenaar Ief Spincemaille naar de eerste sporen van bewoning in Leuven. Sinds haar ontstaan is de stad Leuven bijna twee meter hoger geworden door bouw- en andere restanten die vorige bewoners er achterlieten. Als je door al deze historische lagen heen graaft, kom je uiteindelijk bij de lagergelegen grond waarop de eerste bewoners hebben gestaan. Archeologen noemen dit 'onverstoorde grond' of 'moedergrond': grond die vrij is van menselijke tussenkomst.

In Leuven graaft Ief 14 ton van deze 'oudste' grond op om er een 6 meter hoge 'Hemeltoren' mee te bouwen: een aarden schouw om mee naar de hemel te kijken. De toren zal gemaakt worden door verschillende lagen onverstoorde aarde aangestampt op elkaar te leggen. De put en de toren zullen gegraven/gebouwd worden op het Hertogeneiland, een eiland tussen de Minderbroedersstraat en de Lei, waar ooit het eerste grote bouwwerk van Leuven werd gebouwd. De navel van de stad ...

Na voltooiing van de toren laat Ief de natuur terug op haar beloop. Regenwater zal de aangestampte grond binnendringen. De toren zal langzaam in elkaar zakken, als een zandkasteel dat overspoeld wordt door water. Op het einde van dit proces zal deze aarden 'ruïne' terug in de put worden gestort.

2. Discussie

Interessante punten:

- Afwijken traditionele 'driehoek' opdrachtgever, architect, aannemer waarbij elk zijn/haar afgebakende

verantwoordelijkheden heeft

- Transponeren van een bepaalde manier van werken naar een nieuwe omgeving
- Depersonaliseren mandaten

Verschil architectuur/kunsten:

- Vaak grotere budgetten in architectuur, vandaar overreglementering
- Maar overreglementering werkt remmend
- Verlangen naar vrijplaats: hoe werkt dit voor architect? Wat is de rol van het bureau?

Reactie Laura:

- Architect is een beschermd beroep, 'je bent altijd architect', statuut reikt ook tot buiten professioneel werk.
- Statuut en positie van opdrachtgever (bv. een publieke overheid of een projectontwikkelaar), architect en kunstenaar zijn zeer verschillend. Waar een architect geld mee verdient mag niet in concurrentie gaan met kunstprojecten, wat eigenlijk niks met statuut heeft te maken. Grens is niet makkelijk te bepalen.

Voor BC is die vrijplaats een verlangen, voor architect zijn de grenzen niet te negeren.

Interessant om oplossingen te zoeken die niet meteen in de regels te zoeken zijn. **In plaats van project- en op basis van uitsplitsing verantwoordelijkheden (angst), meer projecten op basis van vertrouwen.**

Reactie Laura:

- Verzekeringsmaatschappij weet niet om te gaan met kunstprojecten
- Vertrouwen met grote projectontwikkelaar is moeilijk, gezien zijn agenda: als architect kan je niet anders dan meegaan in het verhaal van opgesplitste verantwoordelijkheden

Schaal van grote projectontwikkeling is problematisch om de juridische grenzen te laten vervagen zoals in een vrijplaats.

Geen verplichting om voor kunstwerken met architect samen te werken, maar van zodra een samenwerking met architect komt, is er de problematiek van de verhoogde individuele verantwoordelijkheid van de architect (bijzonder statuut waardoor burgerlijke aansprakelijkheid complexer wordt).

Ook in vrijplaats blijven verantwoordelijkheden. Vraag: hoe ga je die herverdelen (bv. in CASE LEUVEN)? Kan bijvoorbeeld via voorwaardelijke collectieve verantwoordelijkheid zoals in case. Uitgesproken voorwaarde was solidariteit tussen architect, kunstenaar, opdrachtgever, stad Leuven, producent, geologen, structurele ingenieurs.

Solidariteit = gespreid risico.

Hoe kan dit geïnstitutionaliseerd worden? Belang van afspreken onderhandelingspositie; interessant voor architectenpraktijk?

Reactie Laura:

- In geval van grote fouten (instorten gebouw) ben je niet genoeg met collectief, dan is er een derde partij nodig (verzekeraar)

'Prisoners'dilemma: indien instorting, dan gebeurt het zo en werd er niet op zoek gegaan naar individuele 'schuld' of concrete ingebrekestelling. Instorting kan deel zijn van kunstpraktijk. Solidariteitsprincipe is een maatschappijkwestie: akkoord gaan dat dingen kunnen falen (ref. Afrika). Belangrijker om solidariteit te behouden. In Afrika geen keuze, in België wel.

Interessant instrument om out-of-the-box te denken. Wat verstaan we onder experimenteerruimte? Vrijblijvend zonder meer met als enige criterium schaal? Of kennisopbouwend? Structuuropbouwend? (Meer ontwikkellabo)

Interactie maatschappij en beleid om er een ontwikkellabo van te maken en over te brengen naar andere, grotere projecten. **Zoektocht naar structuren om vrijplaats mogelijk te maken.** Klanten (bv. gemeente Edegem) zijn geïnteresseerd. Draagvlak is er, maar regels niet. Regels? Dan toch?

Reactie Laura:

- Waarom moet dit steeds in statuut van architect? Dit werkt remmend. Geen 'substatuut' mogelijk?

Grootschalige CASE BOKRIJK in de stellingen: via workshopstructuur, onder aannemingsbedrijf, voor publieke opdrachtgever (lijkt een succes te worden)

Wie loopt weg met de eer en wie met de winst? **Quid auteursschap? Quid winstverdeling?** Is daar over nagedacht?

Verschilt van project tot project. Tot hier geen discussie binnen de verschillende bouwgemeenschappen. Mogelijk om gevoelige zaken zoals winstverdeling op natuurlijke manier in te richten. Bv. workshop materiaal (gratis deelname met handenarbeid als 'currency', loon voor organisatoren) of via uitvoeringsbudget

Ook 'kennisopbouw' kan verloning zijn.

BC op zoek naar fundamentele doorbraak. Collectieve aanpak kunnen verderzetten ook in grotere projecten.

Wie heeft intellectuele eigendom?

3. Definitie 'Fairness', componenten, hoe & mogelijke issues

- Praktijk die spontaan ontstaat, niet vertrekkende vanuit structuur
- Solidariteitsstructuur groeit, is vergelijkbaar met coöperatie, maar zonder juridische elementen
- Collectief risico
- Mogelijk problemen/aandachtspunten:
 - Er is geen structuur as such (Wat in geval van serieus probleem, wanneer draagkracht onvoldoende is?)
 - Er is duidelijke behoefte aan een nieuwe structuur om vrijplaats mogelijk te maken, maar bestaande architectuurwetgeving laat dit niet toe (wel: in kunstpraktijk)
- Vrijplaats mag niet vrijblijvend worden
- HOE? Zoektocht naar vrijplaats via laboratoriumruimte in de praktijk, noodzakelijk om tot innovatie te komen, Regeling in den minne en herdefinitie van 'individuele bijdrage', in vraagstelling statuut architect, maar ook statuut opdrachtgever/klant

Grote potentieel van vrijplaatsprojecten: overzetten naar grotere projecten. Ambitie om het model implementeren op verschillende schaal en projecten, waardoor minder afhankelijkheid van financiering door andere projecten.

Past in actuele debat over het beschermd statuut van de architect - top-down is er ook druk.

G. Report Table 7

Solidarity between actors from different and diverse cultural frameworks

How do we guarantee reciprocity concerning projects in which one works from diverse cultural, social and economical backgrounds?

*Actors: Lumumbashi Biennale – with Els Opsomer (artist/SIC),
Toma Muteba Luntumbue (artist, curator),
KVS and partners in Congo and Palestine – with Hildegard De Vuyst (KVS)*

Moderator: Dirk de Wit

Reporter: Sandra Couman and Dirk De Wit

*Participants:
Louis Munos, Stijn van Dorpe, Sandra Coumans, Hildegard De Vuyst, Toma Muteba, Els Opsomer, Dirk De Wit*

1. Cases

- Sound Image Culture (SIC) Brussels
- Lubumbashi biennale
- KVS

2. Discussion

2.1 POSITION AS AN ARTIST OR CURATOR/INSTITUTION

Working between different cultural and financial frameworks provokes questions concerning ambitions

and the position of an artist, a curator or an institution: ambition to meet and exchange with other artists, the ambition to meet and exchange with audiences, the ambition to become famous and build a career.

- One has to adapt ambitions when going to different places. It all depends on the local context.
- What do you want from it as an artist exactly?
- One can choose for exchange rather than representation: there will be no direct return, working conditions might be difficult and unpredictable. It needs an investment in time and effort in building a ground for communication and dialogue.
- Exchange doesn't exclude representation: artists, curators and institutions seek balance between sometimes conflicting ambitions and reflections: exchange, representation, return, fame.
- Is it about working in different boxes like 'west' and 'south', or is it about working in between borders which one finds here and in other countries and continents? Is it possible to overcome these boxes, borders and barriers by finding new ways of working?
- Questioning the (global) system of valorization in visual arts: the role of gatekeepers and the role of the market often work against the development of sustainable and long term relations.
- A small organization, a biennale or a person (curator or artist) can play the role of an institution in terms of creating sustainable and open networks, relations with the local and link with international networks.

CASES – INSIGHTS TO SHARE

Showing an artist film in Senegal can be difficult (material, technique, screening conditions), but there can be a huge and attentive audience willing to reflect and discuss.

Curating a biennale as a long-term investment in exchange between artists from different countries and the local cultural scene, and not as a direct investment.

SIC is about exchange and dialogue, the result is important but not the final goal.

KVS believes in cultural production to create meaning and exchange, which leads them to diverse communities and cultural frameworks both in Brussels and in other continents.

Els Opsomer doesn't believe in difference as separations and oppositions, but considers all human beings as a whole in which one detects many differences.

2.2 DIFFERENT (PRACTICAL AND FINANCIAL) WORKING CONDITIONS

How to work in and with small organizations, with little or no public funding, uncertain budgets and means? How to work in countries with hardly an artistic policy (the minister of culture has a yahoo or gmail address)?

- Being transparent in working conditions and financial conditions.

- Go there and then sort things out. Find solutions every single day.
- Do things with the people from there and adapt to local conditions and means. Work with local resources (people, space, material,...) instead of sending a list of requirements.
- It needs engaged people & willingness to do it: engaged people who are ready to invest in learning with and from each other (reciprocity).
- You need to explore & try to see the potential that a place offers, while always keeping in mind if it will be useful for the artists themselves.
- Work with valid partners and be aware of their history, goals and ways of working.
- Working with local conditions and realities means also working and negotiating with political, social, ethical realities and esthetical questions.
- Work towards a true exchange: be confident that the project is worthwhile. Keep asking yourself why you do something. Look for balances.
- Overcome barriers between individuals and institutions: the wish to do something comes from the employees themselves; from the people that work for a specific organization or institution.
- Communicate with everybody involved.
- Practical problems, such as visa, limits the possibilities for exchange.

Inequality is inherent to any kind of project

- be conscious of it
- share power and resources
- transparency about everything, especially with regard to money
- be aware of ways of thinking / assumptions that the other has of you
- production and management team should be equal in terms composition / constantly include the people you work with on every level

The setting up of a project itself is already where one should be conscious of how to approach a topic and how to implement best practice.

- Key: set up an exchange / kind of training for everyone involved.
- Role of the curator (or organiser) in making these guiding principles work: find different responses or even different questions with regard to current societal and political questions

CASES - INSIGHTS TO SHARE

Lubumbashi Biennial

- incertitude tout le temps
 - se débrouiller a tous les niveaux
 - pas de moyens: logistique, financière, petite équipe, etc
 - les fondations locales RDC Utilisation des ressources qui sont là Construire des partenariats
- ◇ Faire travailler les gens ensemble
 - ◇ Utilisation des ressources qui sont là, construire des partenariats, faire travailler les gens ensemble
 - ◇ is a way of working which is interesting everywhere

The Lubumbashi Biennial had no means to promote itself in the city, but worked with engaged people who were speaking about the biennale.

Invisibilité peut devenir une force / see where the force of something lies.

KVS: Palestine

different circumstances:

There is hardly public cultural policy and on the other hand there is money from different foundations: how to engage with the money that is obviously there? How to mitigate between the local situation and sensitivities on the one hand and the `home front` that has little knowledge and maybe understanding of the local situation?

- truly understand the socio-political circumstances and the ways how to maneuver with them / get to know the dynamics
- one needs to deal with political and ethical questions which are linked with these donors or sponsors.
- The importance to actively work with local contexts: the local context there when you work there and the local context here when one invites artists to create here or to show their work which was made elsewhere.

Els Opsomer was invited to screen her film in the biennial of Lubumbashi and she wanted to engage with other artists from Lubumbashi and invited artists in a workshop. The workshop was cancelled because the team was too small to organize it. Els Opsomer went in advance to help organizing the screening.

Hotel Charleroi

Stijn van Dorpe participated in the project `Hotel Charleroi` which was organized by artists in the city with very small budget. Stijn sees many parallels with the Lubumbashi biennale: local artists and participants in Charleroi knew who to contact and where to go.

2.3 CONTEMPORARY THEATRE, DANCE, VISUAL ART, MUSIC ARE NOT ALWAYS VERY COMMON, DIFFERENT NOTION OF ART, DIFFERENT HISTORIES OF ART.

In many countries on other continents (Africa, Asia) one can see western artistic tradition only via images and audiovisual media. Masters from other continents are hardly part of our public collections, and if they are part of our collection means they have got through the gatekeepers (curators, museum directors, art market).

Foreign artists: bring new experiences (the work, the experience, the audience) for the biennial.

2.4 SUSTAINABILITY: LONG-TERM INITIATIVES AND LONG-TERM RELATIONS

How long do initiatives survive when working conditions are difficult? Will all artists and cultural workers who set up self-organized initiatives for the development, production and distribution of art

remain? How to ensure long-term relations between self-organized initiatives when they are unsecure? When they move, what is left concerning structures/infrastructure and who takes over? Do they keep relations and networks when they leave?

- Make sure there is some sort of report/record of what was done.
- Be clear that it is not only about you but also about them.
- Will work if an organizational structure is built and a project/idea becomes less dependent on individuals.
- There exists sustainable models, but they might be different from the ones one is used to (see the potential): support individual artists, producers or presentation platforms which build networks around them and take a leadership role in them to make networks work. When artists go, they keep being part of the networks and the people who stay take over (this means a shared network and no networks in the hand of some elitist people)
- Il faut partir des valeurs locales et ne pas oublier la dynamique réelle. Il faut connaître l'agenda politique.

CASES – INSIGHTS TO SHARE

Dancers of Africa and Palestine move to Europe or US, but they keep their networks.

Toma Muteba: Moving to Europe means burying your career and work because it is often framed and contextualized in not always the best way.

Some European institutions invested in local persons to build networks in different continents, but they became power institutions and lost contact with local dynamics.

3. Resume

- In first place it is about exchange and dialogue and that takes time
- Don't focus on the differences but see yourself as a part of the whole
- Keep asking yourself why you want to do it
- Be open and flexible for the potential and possibilities that a place and people offer
- Be careful not to export to fixed ideas about supposedly correct ways of working or institutional frameworks
- In terms of sustainability, where do you try to establish it: in terms of the organizational structure or in terms of individuals
- Try to share power and resources as much as possible, be as transparent as possible
- There will always be inequality, but be conscious of it and transparent about it
- Despite all good intentions, get to know the socio-political reality and take it into account