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WELCOME

DAVID: Oh, it's gone quiet. Hello. Great, can you hear me? Yes. Good morning. A very warm welcome from me. I'm Professor David MBA, Deputy Vice Chancellor Research Knowledge Exchange & Enterprise, responsible for research, knowledge, exchange, enterprise at the university. Great to see so many people here. There is a huge interest in the event. I'm grateful for your time and that you are able to join us so a very big warm welcome from University of the Arts London.

Before I start, to say that we are not expecting a fire alarm. And if you do hear the alarm, follow the exits out of the building. For your information we are recording today's activity. Great.

I can rattle on? Great. Good! Research matters at University of the Arts London in ALL its forms. Our research and knowledge exchange are at the core of our approach to changing the world for the better. It is the way we expand the borders of knowledge and creative practice. How we enhance the way we teach our students, how we identify and address some of the world's biggest problems, from climate change to social justice. Our research contributions to the world are foundational to both our global shared futures and the very concept of a university of our kind. We already have been awarded for successes in research. In 2021, the university scored highly on the research excellence framework for arts and design. As we celebrate and build on this, we believe there is still more we can do.

At this Conference, we have come together with colleagues across the sector, and in our expanded field of shared interests, to explore not only the theoretical exploration of art but also the vital concept of practice as research. We passionately believe that learning by making, by immersing one's self in the art of creation, holds immense value in shaping the understanding of research processes and the impact of art and design on society.

Through practice and research we merge theory and the practice, intertwining architecture and activity, recognising that the process of creating art is a profound form of enquiry, a way of been rating knowledge that is not fully captured in context, race, outputs [sic]. Throughout the conference, we will witness the fruits of practice, artists and scholars to present projects, showcasing how practice has opened new avenues of exploration. To witness the transformational power of the arts in action as practitioners push the boundaries of chosen medium and challenge the conventional norms, inspire new perspectives ... foster empathy ... and unite us in our shared human experience.

But this conference is not just about passive observation. It is an invitation to immerse yourselves in debates around practice research and to participate actively in conversations, so please do. The emphasis on practice as research is a testament to our commitment to fostering a vibrant, dynamic and academic community.

As I said from the start, research matters in the University of the Arts London in all of its forms, on behalf of our university and the organising committee, I extend my gratitude to all of the participants, artists, scholars, who have travelled from far, and sponsors who contributed to making the conference today a reality. We are honoured to have you with us today. Once again, you are all very welcome, thank you. [Applause]

INTRODUCTION

ORIANA: Thank you, David.

CAPTIONER: It is very difficult to hear this presenter.

ORIANA: [inaudible] ... if there was not a technical glitch somewhere, where would we be? I was saying hello, welcome. I'm Oriana Baddeley, a professor at the university. For my sins in the past, I was responsible for helping develop research and practice research and its documentation here at the university in relation to the different funding schemes that the government had developed.

By training, I am an art historian. It is one of those weird things in art schools that you kind of get pushed into helping other people work, if you come from art history and you are working in an art school. I started working in this art school a very, very long time ago. I started when I was finishing my PhD. I kind of never looked back. I never felt that I wanted to leave the context to practice to work within a more traditional university structure.

I feel that I spent a lot of the '90s and the '00s, let alone post that, in the last decade, talking to artists and to designers, hearing from them. It was an incredible privilege, hearing from them what they had been trying to do and what they had succeeded in doing and realising there was a wealth of work going on which often does not reach wider audiences, other than an e‑photograph really moment in terms of public display.

One of the things we were doing, particularly at the university and across the sector, and it was very much a part of work that ... we had two people from previous research excellence frameworks, Anne Boddington and before that, Ruth Brown who chaired art and design within the assessment of this research in the UK and there was a move in the last two decades to recognise the importance of work that is produced beyond the traditions of the scholarly article and beyond the traditions of text.

When I moved to one side from being a Dean of Research at the university, one of my first discussions with my new boss, David, who has just spoken to you, was how could I contribute? How can I continue to work with the university? And at the moment, I'm Chair of something called Practice Research Advisory Group UK, attempting to help the sector to think of new ways to articulate, to document and to debate the type of knowledge produced through practice.

David was really supportive of how we should take that and run with that and he would be really interested in us working further in that field and start a series of moments like this but also may be linked activities, lectures, symposia, conference, over the next five years.

That seemed like a great idea but we would have gotten anywhere without the help of the organising committee of the conference. I wanted to thank you, to Dilys at the end but I felt that I had to thank from the beginning, the small group responsible for pulling together these sessions. I have thanked David but really instrumental, Nell Lyhne, who is studying for a PhD here at the university, and without whom, we would not have had anything like the excitement that we have got today. She kept telling us we would be boring so we have done our best to be not boring! I hope, Nell, that it is something that you will have enjoyed being a part of the Lyhne Organising Committee. Pratap Rughani, who is not only doing a presentation but part of the organising committee to help us to provide a sounding board for the ideas that we are trying to debate today. But most of all, my thank you is to Lynn Finn, the research administrator responsible for the event and I think that maybe she did not need any of us, as it would have happened and you are brilliant. Thank you so much!

Before going on to the first session of the day, there is ... I would like to draw attention to the programme. You can all link into Wi‑Fi here. It's called CSM Shows 2023, and the password is CSM@2023. We have a very rich and a full programme. It is structured around three panels and a plenary discussion in the later afternoon. Each of the panels is a self‑standing unit, within which ideas about research and practice are debated and looked at from positions. So I hope you find it as exciting as we did when we were putting this together. Obviously, we will be speaking with the chairs and we shall talk to them later on.

But I think that I should hand over to our first panel, panel 1, entitled What would the Earth have us do? A pretty big question. I hope that we can get some answers to that from our panel which will be, I think, you will be introducing the panel but if I can introduce Sian Sutherland to us, if you would like to come up here. And then we can start with panel one. We are running a little late but we know that and we will catch up with the time. I know we are on panic if things are running late. So we have nice little signs to tell people to go quicker and we will try to keep to time! How are you, Sian.

PANEL 1

SIÂN: I'm good. I have a mobile mic, thank you, Oriana. Thank you, David for a warm welcome. It is a perfect high for me to be at Central St Martins and here on this bobby dazzler of a day. It is hard sometimes to go into a space with no windows. I'm **Sián** Sutherland, an entrepreneur, a mum of two grown‑up boys.

Seven years ago, I created an organisation with my co‑founder, called A Classic Planet. I love these kinds of events. I love the melting pot of all of the insights and the perspectives that we get by the different panellists. And the panel that we have together with Nicolas Rochat, and Dilys Williams, it is particularly interesting to me because one, is another seriously entrepreneur, Nicolas Rochat is disrupting the garment industry, proving that the impossible is possible.

And then of course, Dilys, is a professor, who is really challenging the creative industry to step up to the different level of responsibility. Because never has it been more important for us to have the skill set of the creatives than there is now.

So, our topic today is a small question, as you say, what a tiny question, what would Earth have us do? So, I want to set the scene first. We are thinking a little of our place, Planet Earth in the wider universe. I don't know if you have seen some of the incredible pictures that are coming down from the James Webb Telescope that give us a completely different perspective, to imagine us to dream bigger. We are seeing things that we have NEVER been able to see before. The scale of the world and beyond that, the universe that we live in, we have never seen these things before. It makes us think that perhaps our boundaries are too small, perhaps we also need to think bigger. We have been aware for decades, now, of the specialness of the planet that we are living in, this beautiful green marble, and the image that is hanging from spice, it is a completely unique thing. The wonderful globe that we call "home" but, and I wanted to set the scene a little as to why the event we are at today is important, that beautiful home is on fire, we have caused this, it is shocking to me when you look at only last year, we witnessed seven extreme weather events. This year, El Nino is coming back in the autumn, and we are forecast to have even more extreme weather events, so I will not dwell too much on a beautiful Friday, and to be the Debbie Downer of the sessions but things are happening so much faster than we ever imagined, so we need to speed up!

We always talk about the future as being something that is a bit unpredictable, risky, who knows what will happen but what we know for sure now, is that our future has never been more predictable. More climate devastation, this is the trajectory that we are on, talking of resilience, rather than prevention, fewer ecological resources, the impact of temperature has a phenomenal impact on even the way at that we grow food. Last year, 25 less crops in Italy alone. Everyone has seen the huge temperatures in Spain, the impact on olive oil, what which think of as luxuries are absolute commodities and we hope to have less fossil fuel dependency going forward. I want to set the context that we as a plastic planet and plastic free, are laser sharp focused as to plastic being the lens as to how to create change. I live in a world where often I hear "we will fix the plastic crisis later on. It is about the carbon, the greenhouse gas, that is what we must focus on now." But plastic has given us an incredible opportunity, this are no plastic deniers, it is something that we feel guilty about each day. It is the gateway to the climate crisis, connected, and in many ways, a visible, canary in the coal mine to wake us up. Thinking of carbon and greenhouse gas, and plastic, and it is so light, it is incorrectly but it is heavy on greenhouse gas emissions. If it were a country, it would be the fifth biggest emitting country on the planet. Even if it was not about the pollution, about the devastation, the fact that every lungful of air we breathe in contains plastic, even without any of those things, plastic broke the system. The invention of plastic changed our entire culture of take, make, repair, refill, reuse, to take, to make, to chuck it in a bin for a mythical recycling fairy to do something with, that now we know nothing is happening with it. So it created this opportunity for us to change the system and to ramp up to the giddy levels of hyper consumption.

We've had plastic for so long, it's really easy for us to think it is a material in itself. Plastic is a mixture of chemicals, many of them are toxic. One of the things we've been working on recently is the creation of the Plastic Health Council, bringing the science, the proof of the impact of the plastic chemicals to all the major governmental and United Nations events. It is not like copper and aluminium or cobalt, it is simply a mix of chemicals, 13,000 chemicals are used to make plastic, 50% of them have never been tested for the impact on human health.

And much as we talk now about circularity and I'm sure many of the courses here focus on circularity, plastic will never fit into any kind of circular model. You don't recycle plastic, you down cycle plastic. I know a lot of you will have seen this little illustration before which I put up simply to show ‑‑ Can anybody tell me what is the wrong with the circular economy in this visual that everybody uses and everybody refers to?

FLOOR: It's all got plastic?

SIÂN: What is wrong with the final one? There is still a bin. There's still a bin. That is not circularity. The reason for that and anyone here who works in the wider world of materiality, the reason for that is we take materials from nature, we take resources from nature and then we chemically modify them, even something as natural as leather, skin, designed by nature to go back to become the nutrient for the next stage of growth. What do we do it? We tan it, use chromium, dyes and toxic chemicals so it cannot go back as a nutrient. Imagine if we rethought the materials, instead of chemically modified them, so they could never go back to nature as a nutrient, but instead we didn't chemically modify them and we take from nature and we borrow them, we simply borrow them but we keep their nutrient status so, that when they eventually return to nature, everything always does, they go back as a nutrient for the next stage of growth? It's doable.

We work in the world of materials at PlasticFree and it is exciting to me to see the amount of innovation happening in this space particularly in the space of nutrient‑based materials.

The other thing we have to be careful of, of course, is we have to take less. Earth Overshoot Day, in the US it is actually 12th March. This year on 12th March, the US have taken the amount of material they were entitled to but nature could replace. So, Earth Overshoot Day is something we need to be aware of. We are literally taking the resources from our children's future when making stuff with them, we're selling it as stuff and calling it GDP. This fundamentally has to change. It is not about swapping one material for a slightly less bad material. It's less in the first place. Because one of the provocations I want to give you is this, I had a call the other day from a journalist saying the Government is thinking of having seven bins in your kitchen, what do you think, there's a cost‑of‑living crisis, what is your opinion? My opinion to be honest is why is there one bin? Why is there any bin? Why have we normalised waste? We're the only species on planet that makes waste. That's the fundamental question we need to answer.

We like to think of the plastic crisis in a slightly different way, as perhaps a gift. That little tap on shoulder. The whole of humanity, we are all impacted by plastic, to say hey, you've gone down a toxic cul‑de‑sac and you need to get out of fast. For us we consider it as a fossil fuel awakening to not only get us to think differently about materials but also the systems of how we live. Carbon, I don't know, I can't see it, I can't feel, I can't touch, plastic, I feel guilty about it every single day.

But technology has really failed us here. I was on a plane the other day, don't judge me, it struck me nothing's changed. Like, the plane experience is the same as it was 50 years ago. The car experience, yes, we might have EVs now but other than that, fundamentally it's the same. So, it struck me that technology has failed us. It is so much about this little thing I hold in my hand, how it can sell me more stuff and that's where technology has focused. What we need technology for now is to really get us to think in a much bigger, more exciting way. We haven't even bothered to replace plastic as a material. We haven't bothered to invent new materials. Imagine the materials of the future that we're now going to invent in a post‑plastic world.

We believe passionately that creatives are the answer for this which is why it's so exciting to be here with you all. But I think creators will need new tools. They are not trained for this new world, this post‑plastic world, where we had different systems, where we have different systems and think about circularity in a different way. For the past two years we have designed and built a new design tool for the creative industry built by creatives for creatives to help them think in a completely different way, to help them feel like the smartest person in the room, to push back against their inevitable creative brief that just says "use a recycled polymer, use a bioplastic, it will be enough and give us a green tick". I will show you a tiny 60‑second film which shows you what this looks like.

[FILM]

SIÂN: You'll not be surprised that as an entrepreneur I believe equally passionately that business is the tool of change. We can't wait for governments. They're never going to regulate us in time. They will do what industry wants. Industry needs to step up and they'll be the tool of change. But I have never, if I look back through the big social changes in history, have they ever been instigated, catalysed by an economist or a banker, no. It has always been creatives. It has always been the maverick thinkers, architects and engineers, who have pulled humanity from one system to a better system and that's what we need right now.

Always it's been this way. We believe the design has the power to change everything because everything is designed, even if it is a bad design. It's had an element of a creative process at the beginning. Everything we wear, the cities we live in, everything in our world is designed so this is their moment and we need to stop thinking that the future, it is inevitable, it's just going to happen. I read these articles about artificial intelligence and oh, it's so terrifying. You think we have no control over this, what is wrong with us? The future doesn't happen, it is created by us and we need to think about it differently but we need do it fast. There's too much think tanking, too much McKinsey huge reports on the deaths of CEOs. There are not nearly enough action tanks of we need to go faster. Everybody in this room, everybody watching this, you are the ones with the power. There is this wrecking ball of change that is happening right now. The future is not some distant thing in 2030. It is happening right now today at breakneck speed. You all need to be part of it. We need your skills like never before because hope is not a theory, it is not for me even a noun, it's something you do every single day, something you create every single day. One thing as an entrepreneur because you learn very quickly how to fail is that you have to have hope. You have to have optimism.

So, I'm going to leave you now with this final question as I hand over to Nicolas Rochat, because the real question for me is not about what's the most sustainable thing, what's the new material, what's the slight, you know, twist on the dial of the status quo. The real question for me is this. How are we going to live because we are going to have to live in a very, very different way in the very near future? So, it gives me great pleasure to now introduce my friend and colleague and an amazing entrepreneur, who is disrupting the garment industry, Nicolas Rochat, from Mover. [Applause]

NICOLAS: Thank you, Siân. Thank you, Siân. What should I say after that? Thank you for inviting me here. It's an honour to be in the Mecca of design and fashion. We are Mover, plastic‑free sportswear. We are a small Swiss, independent company. Swiss people like to be small and independent!

I'd like to speak today about the relation between sports and nature with regards to our background in technical sporting garments and our passion for the outdoors.

The planet first, these small animals are copepods. They are five giga tonnes of this less than one‑millimetre size plant and living in our world's oceans. Every night they migrate from 200 metres below the sea surface to the sea surface to eat on foetal plankton. By doing that, they move more water than the moon and the tides. It is the biggest mass migration on the world. But not just that, they eat 30 times the carbon that humanity can produce by burning fossil fuels. The same humanity has wiped out 50% of these animals, the marine planktons in the last 70 years. There are very direct impacts to what we do.

How did they wipe them out? Through chemicals and through plastic pollution. So, ocean plastic pollution, the plastics we see floating on the oceans, whiling in the gyres or watched up on the beaches, these plastics only account for 8% of the total plastic pollution, ocean pollution. These are the ones killing the birds, the turtles and the whales. It is just 8%. All the rest, 92%, is the soup of micro plastics. Out of that soup, a big third comes from our textiles, synthetic textiles. This is what we can address because the impact we can have by changing our clothing habits is significant. It is a third of the actual ocean problem.

For no real reason, almost all sportswear is made of plastics since the last 50 years. When we say for no real reason, it is that we, as a sports people, we don't really understand why we never questioned that before. It would be very interesting to see these guys run today on the same play track and starting without starting blocks and see which one would win today. Is this progress?

And then, of course, the industry answer and the regulators answer to ‑‑ well, the industry answers to the plastic problem is to rely on profitable science and to work on plant‑based plastic, on algae‑based plastic, whatever bio polymers or PLA, recycled plastics, all of these materials that will never degrade as long as they are in contact with oxygen. We still have oxygen in the ocean and on our outdoors.

It's a very cynical answer from the industry. This is a label of a pair of shoes I bought last year to go in the mountains. It's written here that it's the upper fabric is made of 50% or more of recycled content, while the sole has at least one material in the mid‑sole, out‑sole contains a minimum of 3% bio base, of 5% recycled content. Wow! That's stunning! This is New Balance, yes. It's really amazing!

To ask the question, shall we transform a toxic linear economy, we know it's toxic, into a toxic circular economy. This is your bin. It's a nonsense when you think of why would we put something that we have taken out of the nature, which is toxic, back into the environment?

We should ask the fish what this one thinks about recycled plastic. This fish has eaten 9% of recycled plastic. Nine per cent is in green here. The number of recycled plastic today worldwide. In 40 years from now this will double to 17% or 18%. Meanwhile, the plastic production will triple, exceeding 1.2 billion tonnes of plastic per year. This is the result of our recycling plastic policy. It is to allow the industry to continue the business.

We are sounding the alarm. We are a very small company but we decided to go completely plastic free three years ago and we launched this project in October 2021. We decided to use no PLA, no bio plastic, no compostable plastic, no Spandex, nothing, none at all. We just had to re‑think and reinvent everything to create new garments but nothing that much new near because, basically, it is a cotton sweater and a wool shorts. What is very interesting is to understand how far we can go in the process and what we can make out of it and how we feel wearing this, instead of what we have been wearing in last 50 years.

So, we worked on the trims, on the accessories, on the tails. Our threads are cotton. We struggled with the zippers, not with the zippers because the tees and the slider are made of metal, but it is about the tape and band that it is attached to, it is a mixed polyester or cotton. The small cord stoppers. And, of course, buttons are easy. We had to reimagine a lot of small things.

This is a little extract of the latest collection. What is beautiful is to work with our suppliers on the actual structures of the fabrics because what is available can be enhanced and can be improved and that's what is very interesting in the process we are in today.

Amazingly, as a result it all gets much more comfortable. There's a reason for that and that was our starting point. It was a search for breathability. We used to do technical ski clothing with Gore‑Tex and polyamide, our frustration was the breathability, the thermal exchange of the system and that's how we came, not through a sustainable angle, but through a functional angle to this new approach and new concept.

So, we are a very small team in Lausanne, dedicated fashion by outdoors and very attentive to details. We are ready to move now to the next level. Our project is ready to go. We sell online. We have a logistic base in Spain and we produce mostly in Portugal. Obviously, we rethought also the packaging, the tools to ship the flow with our suppliers and manufacturers. We were lucky enough to be able to re‑think everything from scratch and now we are at the point that we have to communicate, to reach out, to gain traction and to move faster and to sell, to sell less garments possibly to more people. Thank you very much for listening. [Applause]

SIÂN: Thanks, Nicolas. I love that phrase "feel plastic free". You're right. When you wear a natural material, it does feel completely different, that breathability. It's a great expression.

I'm passing the mic on to Dilys Williams to talk to you about this new level of responsibility for designers.

DILYS: Thank you very much, Siân. Thank you. Lovely to see you today. Thank you for the two great presentations. Just a few words there, within those few words lies a really profound re‑purposing of what it means to be a designer, because within those few words, it tells us that the Earth is our sole beneficiary, our benefactor, a participant and our own source of life, in the words of Ruskin, "Life is the only source of wealth." What have we just heard just now about plastic is really incredibly important but is that enough? What actually does it mean to be a designer in the context of our times?

It requires a really deep shift in our collective habits of mind. Our sources of knowledge, our frames of reference and our sense of ourselves in relation to the wider world of which we are a part, our intuition, our ingenuity, our resources of human intelligence are actually all part of the Earth too.

So, are we hoping for the impossible had David Craver's work is a great inspiration to me. I have amazing work through my own work as a designer, through to working with student and designers in small businesses, through to people who work in massive global industry businesses, with researchers, with tutors, and there is amazing evidence that we can think differently. There is evidence that fashion, actually, is an activity that takes place at personal intimate levels through to the pervasive global level which means that it can help us to think about how we make things. It can help us to think about our social relationships and notions of value, and importantly, fashion creates a zeitgeist and a sense of actually what is important to us in a very visible form. That zeitgeist can have a really profound impact not just on what we make, but why we make it, how we make it, with whom we make it, and how we think about each other and identify ourselves in the world.

So, we've heard a little bit from Siân already that this making of the world in the way we've done is based on a model of extractivism and exploitation has created an extreme act of self‑harm. We are not just talking about the Earth's systems; we need to talk about Earth systems justice and a safe place and a global commons for all people now and into the future. It means more than just changing the parts of what we're doing.

And again, has already been said, making society has involved already exceding at least seven of globally quantified safe and just boundaries out of nine from the work of Ricksam (?), we have had a clear idea of these boundaries for a very long time, before thinking back to silent spring in the '50s. The World Economic Forum is not well known for its ecological thinking but in this simple diagram from the World Economic Forum Global Risk Report, you can see the interdependences of life systems and justice, the way that we live every element of society and how we see ourselves in the world is intertwined with climate change, biodiversity loss and social injustice.

Just one particular stat, $44 trillion worth of society is exposed through biodiversity loss and if we are thinking about the intersectional impacts of all of this, which are basically written across the bottom of there, the situation is stark.

But the good news is, our ways of living, our perceptions of prosperity that is actually at the heart of the problem. We can change that. Artists and designers make sense of things. We are here to create conditions for changing not just what is but how reality is looked at and how we interpret things. We can tear down borders of current understandings. We can explore with each other through making what it means to live well together. This is an image from ‑‑ I came into academia from working as a designer, I was head of women’s wear at Katharine Hamnett for a long time. It is where I started to realise actually how differently we could behave through acts of fashion. Fashion must, as Nicolas was saying, reduce its emissions by between 50% to 60%, and that's just emissions, if we are to keep within Earth system boundaries. 50% to 60% reduction in the quantity is arresting. It's an amazing figure. We also need to be really careful, there's a lot we need to be careful about, but averages are misleading. It's the richest 20% of people who have 20 times the emissions of the poorest 20%. So, that tells us who need to do what and how.

So, I've worked with a lot of other people thinking about what it means to be a designer and have practised in fashion and to make sense of things. The more we do this work, the more we realise just how difficult it is. The more we realise that thinking otherwise to this dominant system is something that is a very inconvenient truth for a lot of people who are in the current system. Because regeneration, reparation and other elements of Earth systems justice involves much more than improving efficiencies. It means much more than innovations in a current system. It means intergenerational justice, intragenerational justice between government, countries and species. How can we, as designers, take this on? In the words of Gregory Bateson, we have epistemological errors, errors in our ways of knowing, our habits of mind in many if not all parts of the world. We're torn between our current thinking that is based on a logic of volume and an ecological thinking that actually goes to the heart of what is important.

I also draw on Guattari's work around three ecologies, this is where I think that fashion is incredibly important because if we're thinking about the crisis of personal, societal and biosphere level and we think of ourselves on a personal, societal and biosphere level, because we're all working and operating and living at all of these levels simultaneously, then fashion is an important way to be able to recognise and act on the situation.

I'm going to talk a little bit about some of the examples of how I've been working with others over the last few years and where I've got to, there's never a static point, but I've been looking at this point of what it looks to be a designer, creating boundary objects and creating a collection, there is all sorts of things you can do around being a designer in that context, but it's not enough in itself. There's a lot of work around thinking about designers as co‑enquirers, how we work with others and how we can co‑learn with each other from each other as a set of people with a shared intention.

What I think I've been particularly interested in is this idea of the creator of learning objects, where the designer creates or creates the conditions where others can do the creating or sets out ways in which to be able to invite people, designer is host. I will just give you a couple of examples. When you're a designer, as a boundary object designer, you have a collection and things you're asked to make but you can make lots of changes within those things. When you're thinking about a co‑enquirer, it's about how you use participatory practice and how you use principles of transformation design to co‑enquire with each other about the opportunities and barriers in bringing together ideas from the concept through to ... here's an example of a skep that I used called shared talent which I did in a lot of different ways in which we reconvened using a transformative planning methodology and reconvene people across the system that don't normally get to see, meet each other or to understand the interdependencies, the cause and effect between their decisions. It is one of the outcomes from one of the first projects.

The outcomes from the first project. Designer host, an example of a project I have run in a number of different places, where you look at the decisions in context and think of the concerns that people may have and invite people in to talk about the concerns, either through making or through representing themselves, through photograph, et cetera. It is something that we did in Chris Street, in an area of London where there is lots of biodiversity loss. In the horde we took in irons, sewing machines, where we started to make things to represent the concerns of different people in relation to their lives and across different age ranges as well.

So, in 2008, I used the concepts to set up Centre for Sustainable Fashion, to set out a set of ways in which we could approach thinking about what it means to be a designer. Over time, through learning with and from and as, designing, what it means to contextualise our work, we created a kind of methodology, that when I get as far as being able to do good tech, I could make this into a 3D model. So the methodology is based on the idea that there are ways of being able to see the world in social, culture, economic, and economical lenses and the ways in which you can create prosperity in the four lenses and ways of understanding the world using different philosophies and belief system, to understand ourselves as part of the other and the Bunto, the idea of I am, as you are, there are lots of ways in which to develop the model to be ways of seeing, knowing, doing, to take us beyond the canon of fashion in its conventional form.

How do we know if we are making a difference through our work? We looked at transformation design, we take a simple way of thinking about ideas of working within a context, designing within a context, which is what the boundary object maker does, or awareness raising does, which is really important but not enough in itself. Then there is the ideation level where we are thinking about the boundaries, the borders of the contexts in which we are in, creating services and systems in which we can change the ways in which we interact with products.

But the deep shift is something that we need to be able to find ourselves in, so that we understand ourselves differently. But the deep shift is really, really difficult and very uncomfortable.

It's very difficult and uncomfortable as there is so much holding on to the old systems with good reason. All of our lives are tied up in a consumerist, capital model based on volume. For us to be able to move beyond that, it is scary for a lot of people who invested a lot of time, money and their sense of selves in this, so, I have found it has been useful for me to draw upon Akauma's work and to look at the rebellion, the rebel, to think about simultaneously to amplify, expand and enhance, those things that we know are progressive, to be able to work together, to look at ways in which we can communicate and in the words of don Ella Harroway, to tell the stories of meaning through which we present ourselves but unless we negate and phase out the stuff we can no longer stand and no longer sit around to be complicit in, then we cannot create a difference.

In 15 years of my work here at the university, I'm excited and proud of all that I have been involved in, with lots of other people. However, in the grand scheme of things, we see that it has not dented this model of volume.

As even all of the new ways in which we think of fashion as re‑sale, et cetera, it has not reduced the volume in which people are consuming, in fact, it is exacerbating. People do things for all good intentions but unless we fundamentally shift our ways of seeing, knowing, being, we are not going to be able to create the deep change that we need. So sitting and holding that space, that intention, lightly, it is a really difficult but a very important place for designers to be as we do negotiate, we do use making to be able to make sense of things and as a university it is an incredible role for us now, as we are becoming committed to being a social purpose university, to sit in the tension, to hold the attention to understand we cannot take a dualistic approach. With the people that take different risk, levels to me, I work with designers, students, who are rethinking their practice, through to people who have massive design companies and the risks are different, the intentions making the same, the risks of losing a job, who can afford to be critical in a business that has given us a particular demand, a particular target? So, we have to think about working with intention across all of the scales and to think about how we can hold it lightly but with complete conviction.

Because, unless we do that, we will not be true to ourselves as designers, so, just to finish off, and I hope that I have never minute. Transforming fashion means we must look at the always of living in the Anthropocene, to repurpose the fashion activities across multiple scales, regions, to transform the why, the how, the what and with whom within our practice. It is under way but we have not reached the tipping point and it takes all of us to be able to come into this in different ways and the multiplicity of answers that we can create.

The fourth fold prosperity model I spoke to involves producing less clothing, shifting to regenerative agriculture, re‑localising supply chains reparation for the opportunity lost for those in the system that we created through that model and will no longer necessarily have jobs in that. I spoke to people in big businesses who recognise their responsibility. Businesses have a responsibility as we make the transition, governments have a responsibility and we as individuals have a responsibility to think about what reparation means, it is huge, it is difficult but we have to do it.

So, biosphere rebellion involves amplification of fashion as a cultural expression, it is why I became a designer, what I love about fashion. We all need a livelihood in it but in the Earth system justice terms it is the modification of design and designing through the stimulation and the volume model. Earth's system justice involves drawing on a broader canon of knowledge, the unwritten, the tacit, the indigenous, the situated, the eco feminist, towards injustice that is towards race, class, gender and they are all intertwined within our interbeing and repurposing education, that is why I am also excited about and I can speak all day about. Through this, designing can be seen as individual and collective acts as professionals, as citizens but all‑around questioning, disrupting, reassembling the methods of design of our clothing and our production and consumption but more importantly, the understanding of the ecology within which they sit. Thank you. [Applause]

>>: I know we are running behind. Thank you very much, Dilys, I want to watch that entire presentation again. It was so inspiring so deep. So much in there. I love the three ecologies, all of those things. So, a quick Q&A, if anyone has a burning question. It is only coffee out there. It will not go cold but I would love to have the opportunity for you to ask questions of the amazing panellists. I will kick off with a question for Nicolas. As, as we all know, we live in a world of green wash, particularly, I think, brands and, I think that the fashion industry is guilty of green wash. I look at things like Patagonia, Nike, and the sustainability claims that they are making, even Patagonia that we put on a pedestal, it is amazing, and nature is our stakeholder, having made billions, let's say. So, what are your thoughts on that? Is it something that you strive against?

NICOLAS: First, you mentioned the targets 2026 in the chart. I think it is a realistic target. In Davos at the world forum last year, H&M were on stage to announce that they have 8% in recycled materials in the collection to reach 20% by 2030. Come on! They were on the stage and they were applauded for that. So there is a real green washing industry, a problem with industry. It is good for business, it is not business for good, for sure. We have this, you know, Adidas party for the ocean for shoes, where they recycle the fish nets from the oceans to produce the shoe. Together with the foundation, they did 15 million pairs of shoes. If they get 1%, that is maybe 20 million revenues for the foundation. Does the money go back to the ocean? For sure, the shoes go back to the ocean!

And Patagonia, sorry, as it is my hero, I was grown up with them, driving to Chamonix to get the first fleece jacket. I love the brand and everything that they did. Today, the CEO pretends he does not know what the marketing team is doing when he is addressed about the recycled policy resin in the garments, so this is a lie.

So, I am sorry but I am very activated against recycled plastic, as you can see, I really believe it is a big danger. I take it as a fraud. I take it as a fraud and it should be fined and it should come down. And in other industries, it would not be allowed. It could be considered as an ecocide. I'm angry!

>> It's what we need. Dilys, I loved the whole thing about co‑solving, as an entrepreneur, I am conscious that sometimes the towards of business and creativity are separate and never have they needed to be together more. I know perhaps within UAL there is more cohesion, are you hopeful that the two communities can collaborate together. Certainly, economic models need a massive reinvention, donor economics, and Kate Raworth, who I am a fan of but how to get the creative industry to disrupt the business more?

DILYS: It is a great point and the recognition of risk. People working in a context where they are used to, they have built an economic model that must be torn down but we must work out how to tear it down. At the moment it is grasped on to tighter than ever. We see it in politics and in business. We need to be careful not to have a finger pointing approach.

It is where the creatives are good to go in. The act of making, actually, it is a great way of people getting beyond the job roles and in the shared talent model that I showed up there, is an example of immersive practice to bring people in from lots of different fields of life from economists to buyers in business, from CEOs together with embroiderers, et cetera and the act of making, the conversations, the creation, it breaks to stand the silos, the transformative planning model that I used is a way of convening people in deep immersion which is helpful and people must be willing to let go, even for a few hours, days to be able to immerse in situated practice, which is another example of where you start to understand things beyond the surface. I think that we have to try to find ways as designers, where we are well‑positioned to find ways in which to convene situations where people can use a practice to get to the heart of things and the heart of the things that they are fearful about, and the concerns that they have, as people hold on to things as they are not sure what will happen otherwise. We must learn to get go. It is not easy as a designer. And step into the unknown as the current stems have failed us. A stat yesterday said that we have enough clothing on the planet already to clothe six future generations, which makes you think. Does anyone have a question for us. Yes! Great! Lots of questions.

You have until 11.50. We have loads of time. Why did I think I was rushing?! Great. We have loads of time and the coffee is not even brewed.

FLOOR: My question is for you, Dilys. I left education when I was a teacher for 46 years in schools and higher education last year. My focus was very much on environmental education. I think that education is really, really important. But my question is, I joined UAL as a student on an MA in fine art. My question is, how is UAL ‑‑ and it is not just for you but anyone who works in UAL ‑‑ how are you educating your students and your tutors? As my experience on the MA in Fine Art, is that we have many machines for making things, stuff, from plastic ... materials like resin, I used very frequently. Other kinds of materials, which I think are not sustainable, like for example, acrylic paint ... which then goes down the sink, I use on a daily basis. There aren't, presumably in the world, that many fine artists, compared with fashionistas but nevertheless I think it is important to look in the university about what we encourage, the materials that we encourage our students to make and the second aspect of this is the idea of alternatives.

You have talked about the social justice and climate change justice, we cannot turn to the natural world, or the natural materials, and think that we are to find a solution here, because any use of leather or silk or wool, involves cruelty and you have talked about interspecies justice and you talked about intersectionality, and we have to look at all of the materials that we use, we cannot say we will not use plastic, we will turn to use natural material.

So, the question, firstly, it is about how are you educating the students and the tutors about the actual materials that are used and encouraged to be used on your courses? So, sorry, that is a long question.

DILYS: Great. Thank you. I can only speak from my role at the Centre of Fashion and my role as the Chair of the Social Purpose Group. And it is complex. And I will be happy to catch up afterwards but there are four ways across the university where we consider how to transform the system of what, why, how, whom we educate and to what end. The four elements are to look at curriculum change, staff development, student experience and looking at the interpoints, the touch points of students along the journey and we have identified particularly, actually, the need to also support the staff as they are very busy and don't necessarily have the time to be able to develop their own practice and to evolve that as well in relation to environmental and social justice, so that is one area. A second area is in operation and materials, as you say, it is huge. We do sit on the balance. To hold attention between being able to change the processes and the practices and also to prepare people for when they go into industry, what industries are currently doing and what industry needs to change, even the elements, it does not necessarily know it needs to change or is not ready to change, so we sit in that tension, things cannot change overnight. But there is a commitment, a climate action plan, sorry, the other two areas are mobilising the areas, and looking at the communities, to look at the practice, to demonstrate, to share at how practices can change and the fourth is looking at research, knowledge change and the future around what it means to be a social purpose university, so there is work going on, we make a report on it each year but there is a long way to go and the specifics of the materials within the courses, it is really important that the courses themselves make a decision, there is not a blanket, let's stop this, start this, as you say, there is a cause and effect of the decisions that we make, so important to talk about it, to talk about it openly and the things that we have not been able to do yet, why, how to move quicker, the most important thing to focus on, that is why I am interested in the rebel analogy, is what do we dial down? How can we dial down things? And simultaneously, and do what we can do really well, so dialling down what we can do less of and more of is something that we have to take part in.

NICOLAS: The rebel is brilliant. It is a mindset. It is about creating the right environment for the mindset to happen. It takes time. It takes time to enter into this but when you get there, **Sián** and myself, who are allergic to plastic, it is not something that we have to think about it, we just don't want it. So, it will take time and these sessions are useful to that.

SIÂN: I wanted to add one more thing, you bring up Kate, it is interesting how plastic is so invisible, we are aware of the textile, 70% of clothing globally is made of plastic, we are aware of it but it is the fact as soon as you paint anything, a building, a wind turbine, anything, you have made it a plastic structure, the second biggest user of plastic is the built environment. But what is exciting when referring to animal cruelty, and raping nature of more and, animal, the injustice of that as we address, and as we transition from the fossil fuel materials, the exciting things is seeing the new materials coming up. When I talk about the nature's original circle of newt represent, growth, nutrient, growth, that there are a new generation of materials that are happening quickly. We need the students, the academics to embrace the new world of material, which are nutrient, not just plastic free but toxin free, our world is laced, infected with chemicals, we make a new chemical every 10 minutes with no idea that impact when they rereleased into the environment that it is having. So, the new materials, not using animal by‑products based on natural, rubber, gum, and fibres, and the materials and the composites that we are seeing, there is a company that Nicolas and I work with, Natural Fibre Welding, phenomenal, reinventing the system of taking and making. Everything is locally sourced, it is extraordinary combinations, the founder, who won Inventor of the Year, his plant level alternative is the only plastic‑free plant level alternative. Every BMW car material is using that material. You could eat it, that is how toxic free it is. It is collaborated on a trainer, which came out. We mentioned Adidas, the excretive director of Adidas had to leave as he could no longer be part of the bullshit, as it is nothing but a scam. He has collaborated with Less Collective, and they have created a product to you can grind up and put back into the planet as a nutrient. Those material, and that is one company, there are many others using algae, plant proteins, so good, that we could eat them and if not, we should question why. So there is hope. And we must stop thinking that transition is too soft peddle and keep using plastic or recycle plastic as it makes us feel less bad but to accelerate towards a very different world. David Attenborough said, we have all of the answers, what we have now is a communication problem. So that is why the creative industry is so important as we need to communicate sustainability and the aspirational of the reinvention of a new aesthetic as to what is but they and to do that quickly. And sustainability is not about less, it is not about something that is green and hairy, it is about beauty, abundance. So we have to reframe the shift that is not about negative, that is massively about positive. So that then we can rush towards it.

FLOOR: [Question inaudible]

CAPTIONER: Please use a microphone.

SIÂN: There is a panel after lunch that I encourage you to join. It is Nell as panel with Jennie Stephens and when she talks about climate, and where we need to get to, she frames everything around climate justice. So everything that you have said, I absolutely concur with. The Global South, making for the rich north to consume and what do we do? We send our rubbish, our waste back in return! We take all of the resources from the Global South, the inequality, it is ... there are not enough words to cover the inequality of what has happened and what continues to happen each day, the UK exports 60% of plastic waste largely to developing countries, expecting them to deal with it ... but there is an opportunity for us through the lens of climate justice to address so much of the concerns that you raise there. I don't know if you want to add anything.

NICOLAS: I see it as almost the opposite, to me, it is common sense to go back to natural fibres, to forget what we have tried for the last 50 years, to reconnect with what the planet and the Earth is giving us. So, I love the research, the technology, the new materials as much as I love natural fibre, I feel good touching them. The entire world has been wearing natural fibres for millenaries, which worked fine, so for me, yes, we created a huge distance and a huge gap between two worlds but to me, the solutions are to reconnect also and both together. So I see it more as something prospective and positive.

FLOOR: Hello. Thank you. I am here from a part of Patagonia, from Chile ... I have one question, I think that, I think that the Patagonia, the beauty, the impact, I have seen the [inaudible] in the north, where the fashion waste is displayed, in the middle of the small desert that we have in Chile, mountains and hills, full of Armani, Benetton, and we don't foe what to do with it? So, my question is, what is the role of researchers? And the designers? And to know the trend? I've been working with refugee camps in a huge project for Southwark, £3 billion towards net zero to 2030 and 2050. To my surprise one of the biggest surprises, it is the lack of reality ... that the authorities and the designers have. I have been working not so long ago in Spain, in Bilbo, with the homeless, and one of them, a Dutch person said, "You know what is the problem guys, you, researchers, should be homeless ... for a week or two and then you will have a full knowledge of what it means and how to address." So, back to the question: How do you see the role of researcher and designers and know the trend in order to tackle let's say net zero 30, 50 and so on, apparently there is a dichotomy in what we practice, produce, influence, it seems for the West but what about the minorities? The refugee camps. What about the Aboriginal communities? So where can we breach that in a more holistic, real connection, so, what is the role and knowing the trend?

DILYS: I couldn't hear all of what you said. It is a really tricky thing for us to work as designers in UK in a very privileged context and as you say, in a very comfortable context. Even if you try to consider what it means to be in a very vulnerable position, we're not necessarily ourselves there. We do quite a bit of work around what it means to be a participant, this idea of co‑inquiry, one of the researchers in the Centre for Sustainable Fashion spends time in refugee camps looking at how it changes the role of the designer and those three kinds of heuristic models of the different ways in which we can think about ourselves, it's not a fixed kind of here are the three ways in which you can be a designer, but it's helped me as somebody who came from industry who was somebody who was expected to create collections and work in a very conventional way, to think about how can I use the capabilities that I've developed both through my education and through my practice in very different ways to be able to situate learning and exploration in ways that can help people to connect together and understand each other's context. You know, how can I sit here and take about how can I design for most vulnerable person in the world, how can I design for more than human life? I can only do that by listening, thinking, seeing, being able to spend time and learn from and with. You have to be very careful because I'm very privileged. If we talk about the people working in refugee camps, it's very, very tense to think about what we're actually providing versus what we're getting from learning from these communities. So, it's really tricky. I mean, we've got a various different ‑‑ we have the Design for Social Responsibility Lab, that has been taking place around the world and UAL is one of the hubs for that, which is looking at ways in which people from lots of different communities and lots of different places can be co‑enquirers, that idea of research, rather than researching somebody, we are co‑enquirers and learning from each other but how do we create the conditions where it's fair for all of the people involved, where the risks and with the Shared Talent Project, I'm very careful, in fact, I suspend it, because I realised that I was in such a position of privilege compared with other people. You think you can understand the risks that they are undertaking by spending time with you but, actually, you can't necessarily do that even a project, the three‑year project. I think we have to be really acting with care and consider what we are best placed to do as creatives that can work together with others and to break down this idea of different kinds of disciplines as well. We are working on it. It's a work in progress. And as I said, I think the more that I work in this area, the more difficult it becomes, the more uncomfortable, the more I understand, yeah, just how difficult it is to be able to do this work. I'm not sure that is really an answer but I think a greater awareness of just how difficult it is. It isn't just a simple thing of kind of creating better products or products that are using Fair Trade, et cetera, it's a much deeper sense of changing ourselves and that's something that I think we have all learned within the centre that I work in. It is that it has to start with a fundamental change in ourselves and how we reconsider our roles in the context of our times. It is a massive shift. In the last 15 years, I don't think design and certainly design education was really kind of finding that difficult space and really working in it but I think that is starting to happen.

SIÂN: I will add a couple of things. You raised the very good point of the fashion that is being dumped in the pristine Atacama desert. We work with the Ghanaian African Youth Organisation, so I'm very painfully aware of the 15 million pieces of clothing that the UK sent to one town in Ghana alone in the name of philanthropy. Fifteen million, stuff that we don't want any more so we pop it in the charity bin or charity shop and this is where it ends up. 30% of it is burnt immediately, so the toxicity of burning fossil fuels.

The only way I can see this is going to change is through laws, so one things that we're very involved in is the UN Global Plastics Treaty and also which is a legally binding agreement that all 190 member states including the big fossil fuel producing companies like Saudi and Russia and Iran, that have agreed that we need to have a global legally binding treaty that will stop some of the things that we're talking about today, we hope, we have to have hope. It will be in place by the end of next year which is record time for any kind of global treaty. It will address the full life cycle of plastics. When we talk about what happens to things once they have been made, who has responsibility for them, to its second, third, or fourth or fifth or forever life? This extended responsibility you hear a lot about in industry now this is what we need. People talk about packaging and when I used to have a skincare brand, massive plastic sinner by the way, I knew I had to have product liability because if anything happened to somebody who used that product or the end result of that product, we were liable for. Why is there not the same level of liability around packaging? It's all the same thing. We're making the same thing and sending it off with no regard for what happens to it next. So, that whole thing of if you as a manufacturer had to be responsible for the second, third, fourth, and forever life of whatever it is you are pumping out, then you would think again, I believe, on using something as toxic and indestructible as plastic and you would use materials that can safely go back to nature. I have a little hope that some of these new regulations that are coming in particularly through governments and through things like the global treaty but we are all powerful here, we all need be squeaky wheels within our worlds of work, how we vote, all of these things, because it should not be down to the 1% of the world to decide how we're going change the world because it will never happen. You know, the rich, the über educated and ubiquitous privileged won't change the systems of the world because the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. It needs to come from Global South, an outrage and an optimism from the people.

FLOOR: Hi. Is this on? Can you hear me okay? Cool. So, I working in an innovation team for an apparel brand. I went in to try to make a change, it gets very muddy very fast. I think it's amazing that you make performance apparel, one of ours is a big hiking brand. I would like to hear about how you made that transformation about using Gore‑Tex and lots of coatings. The big argument is that it needs to perform. We could hike naked, we'd be grand.

I think that host for change is really interesting. I've been hosting a lot of workshops internally but I think that, like, how would you recommend clarifying and enacting transformation with people who might have been in a company for 30 years and you're coming in and you're like hey, let's to this and they're like fuck off. Yeah, that would be great, some advice!

NICOLAS: Actually, our journey has been very interesting in that sense, that we were, Mover was a technically ski clothing brand, formerly Swedish, which I took over almost 20 years ago. I became specialised in technical ski clothing. I'm a fanatic skier and I thought it was fun. Quite quickly, what we realised is that we were all doing the same garment. We were all building the same jacket and the same trousers for the same function. There was no real reason to be our brand on the market which was already saturated. Our starting point was to actually differentiate ourselves from the others. And then, of course, there was a natural feeling for natural fibres, for wool, for merino wool as a first or second layer. We were not first on the market. Icebreaker was already existing that. We started using that and replacing polyester and the polyamide, that unlike was using as first layers. Then we came to insulation which was polyester, thermalite and this wadding and insulation, and fleece. They were giving too much heat, this morning, I woke up sweating because I'm not used to sleeping in polyester no more. I hate this feeling to wake up and I think all around the world, including in the Third World, they deserve to sleep in linen, cotton and wool which would make all of our lives better. We developed in 2009 the first wool insulation. I contacted wool mark and they came back to me six months after saying it was not existing, there was no wool insulation and non‑woven fleece was not made of wool was not on the market. We developed that with a German manufacturer. It was called Swiss Wool, now it's called LANA Line. Now it's spread around the UK suppliers and Italian suppliers of non‑woven wool insulation. It's beautiful because it gives you a different thermal regulation. It gives you a different comfort. That's what we were looking for, this change.

Then we were frustrated by the last shield which was the Gore‑Tex membrane we realised because we had ski garments with wool lining, wool garments, and first layers of merino and still this plastic coating on the outside. It is breathable in the lab but it doesn't breathe in the mountains. When you woke up in a corridor you have to take your Gore‑Tex jacket off, or else you come up at the peak and you are sweating. So, we were not satisfied in terms of function.

We looked for an alternative in the market which was actually existing here in UK since the 1930s. It's the cotton fabric developed for Burberry for the British Army first, for the Navy and then for made the trench coats from Burberry's success. We tried to use that for ski wear. It worked, like hell, because we were breathing through system so the thermal regulation was way better and enhanced compared to the synthetic alternatives we have been developing before. Suddenly which realised we had something in our hand that actually had a better functional performance than what the industry was providing. And that's how when ‑‑ to end the story and the loop, a sailor friend came to me in Lausanne in 2015, who was with a foundation Race for Water, and he brought samples around the world, and there was a disaster in terms of plastic micro particles. It was where we realised, we had already developed a solution to go plastic free. So, it was really a process that comes from the performance and the function for our sport to a solution which is completely natural fabric based. Try it in the mountain, it really works.

FLOOR: I will do.

DILYS: I think being able to go through a methodology is something that I have developed around participatory practice, which if you can do something where you can suspend people's disbelief and take them somewhere in nature preferably, or somewhere that is an environment where you can kind of convene people in a way that people can start to talk together, obviously, through making is a really good way to do that but not everybody is comfortable of doing something like that, I have used the transformative scenario planning methodology which is used in conflict resolution, which is basically kind of convening people, finding out what it is as their concerns and it is the U‑shape that you get to the bottom of the intractability of the situation and then you start to think about, you know, imagine differently and rather than taking a problem‑solving approach. I tend to think that designers get called problem solvers but, actually, we're possibility creators because we don't start from the problem, we start from imagining actually how envisioning how the world could look if we could think about what we all particularly want. If you do that in a group, and then you collectively decide what it is that you actually would like to be doing and the place you'd like to be and then you work backward and you think, okay, how do we work backwards to be able to do that, rather than working forwards where you kind of find yourself in a really tight spot. And then your kind of, yeah understand what you can do on a time scale, what you need to do now what you commit to and then yeah, reconvene at different places and times. I mean, it can be real fun and you can be amazed at the differences it can make. We've done that in really massive global businesses and sometimes you do also need someone from almost outside to come in because they can ask the sort of stupid questions as well. Yeah, that thing of immersion, convening people, really working out a visioning of where you want to be. We also use scenario planning where we actually show based on data that we've gathered different scenarios of what the world could look like in the future based on extrapolation and scenarios planning is something that is used in all sorts of industries where you go to the extreme of where it could look like, what would I do in those worlds and you can work backwards. There are a few different ways. They're all quite fun.

FLOOR: I might find you after! [Laughter]

SIÂN: We're wrapping. Thank you, guys. I love what you just said about possibility creators, not problem solvers. That's exactly what we need right now. We work with business a lot. I love saying to businesspeople, "Imagine if you had a white piece of paper and you didn't have the baggage of your brand, heritage and the stakeholders and everything that you drag into work every single day that would restricting your thinking. You had a white piece of paper, what would a 21st century look like today in whatever market you are in?" It is an extraordinarily freeing thing to give to people within the world of business, what, I don't have to think about it, I couldn't fail, that would be an amazing experience for me. So, we need that level of imagination, don't we, of possibility creators, not problem solvers, it is a great phrase that I'm going to leave everybody with. Thank you all for your wonderful questions. Thank you to my great panel. [Applause]

ORIANA: Thank you, that was so fascinating. I hope you don't mind that we grab you when you're having your coffee. It's 11.15 now. If you could be back here at 11.40 am. There is croissants and coffee, do help yourselves.

[Break]

PANEL 2

ORIANA: Welcome to the second panel of our symposium. The panel is entitled Dialogue, Presence and The Gift.

The title came very much from discussions between the three speakers and myself a couple of weeks ago because they don't relate just to one person's talk but they seem to encompass some of the issues that were going to be discussed. One of the things that we started to think about was the way in which it becomes impossible to work out that if a dialogue, one of our headings, if a dialogue is only carried out between those that agree, can there ever be any true change? We touched on some of those points this morning. I love the idea of hope, that Siân brought up. How do we make that dialogue between ‑‑ we got that from some of the questions, like who is the dialogue with? Who is it, who is speaking? If the dialogues only carried out between those that agree, can there ever be change? Should it be a challenging engagement with those outside a shared set of beliefs.

What we wanted to do in this last session of the morning and through a series of really fascinating case studies, we want to explore some of the ways in which very particular historical context and institutions have been used to test the boundaries of what is shared understanding and what methods can be used to create constructive dialogue.

Our speakers in this panel are Samson Kambalu, Professor Samson Kambalu from the University of Oxford, and more recently known to you probably as the artist responsible for Antelope and the gift in terms of the fourth plinth in Trafalgar Square; and Pratap Rughani who is a professor here at UAL, who is going to talk to us about who you can speak to but he's going to show it and it is very much to do with this being a forum where we can talk about ideas in process. He is going to talk about work that is not yet finished. He's going to talk about work that tries to embrace the impossibilities of certain forms of dialogue in relation to historical moment and the present. And then, we're finishing by no means finishing, we're moving on to Professor Mark Sealy, who is a professor here at UAL, but probably better known to many of you as the Director of Autograph, the very renowned gallery and cultural centre in Rivington Place. We'll have lots of time, I'm sure, to talk as a panel and to answer questions from the audience.

By the way, Samson is up there on the Zoom call because he's at Art Basel and Switzerland seems totally overcome by fog at the moment. Poor Nicolas, loss who was here this morning, only got here by the skin of his teeth at three in the morning but Samson missed it. Samson, can I hand over to you?

SAMSON: Yes. You can see me?

ORIANA: Yes.

SAMSON: Okay. Yes, so I'm speaking from France. I was at Art Basel with all of the collectors there. I've been driving up and down Switzerland and I couldn't make it. I have to network and make the most of it!

We're trying to find home for these antelope after Trafalgar Square and that means a lot of meetings with potential collectors, funders, donors, so it is part of it. Anyway, I couldn't get away.

Okay, so I will start here with this. I'm going to talk about cinema and practice and the less of the problematic gifts. The gift is where I'm coming from, I'm combing from Malawi and here it is otherwise known as under development, but I think it's simplistic, I did my PhD on the problematic of the gift and how it affects society. I studied my own traditions in Malawi, and the philosophy, that my coming out of it, I decided that perhaps southern Africa is a hard tough nut to crack because of this philosophy that has been developed.

Yes, yes, so the gift is basically, I think it will come up as I speak, you get to know. But Africa society, southern Africa didn't have the gift. The gift they had for African thinking. It is polar opposites. It is what is happening at Trafalgar Square. Nelson represents the capital and the economy. The other one represents the economy. It captures the skyline, while Nelson is trying to reach the heavens. It is a good confrontation. It is exactly what is happening in South Africa and southern Africa for me, so I was glad to be invited and to make this work for Trafalgar Square so that I could share my thinking that's inspire by the colonies of where I'm coming from. For me, it is a big revelation, I went to a Western school in Malawi. I still couldn't understand African art through my Western education, where art was centred around art as a presentation. It's only when I moved into economics, somehow when I was working on my PhD, I thought that maybe I should try looking elsewhere and I stumbled on the problem of the gifts. For me when I looked at philosophers of the gift that's when things started falling into place. Finally, I agreed that okay this is leading somewhere. All of my Western education in art couldn't really explain to me what I had experienced growing up there but when I move to economics, I thought of as a gift. It came out of nowhere. I was reading in the bath one afternoon and I moved on to that. Anyway. Can you play the first slide please? The one example of a mask and how you see the masks when I was growing up. Three years ago, back in Africa filming for the BBC and these sculptures are still there.

Masks are still there, are you able to play the video?

[Video]

SAMSON: You can stop it now. It is an example of what is happening. It is happening now. The British untangling these things, masking and like other traditions in Africa, it is like a science. It is not really Metaphysics, for me, the West put on masks, I can attribute ... they say that things like racism in the West is putting on these masks [sic]. My theory is that there is ... the West denies its animal side. This side of human. Masks is how the mind constitutes itself. You cannot have a mind without this other. In Africa, we just acknowledge we live with this other.

And every now and then it comes up. So, this happens. And for instance, need this. It is difficult to see how within can stop it. It is part of human nature. You cannot actually exist without these structures. In art, you create biomes ... can we play the other. Sorry, I will be quick. I will show you a vision of the train. This is by the Neo Brothers. [sic]

[Video]

SAMSON: okay, you can stop it. For me, I mean, this is for me, the music in this film, it is esoteric, it is seen as strange but the same in Africa, when the music that is used for masking, it is as strange to me as it is to you. The artist is supposed to create this other worldly. And there is constant enchantment and the mask is that it makes sure it is supposed to be that way. It is other‑worldly. My weight exists between the figure ... and with the arrival of trains in South Africa and in Zimbabwe, in working in the mines, it was 19th century ... the African village, fitting to the minds of Zimbabwe in South Africa, to work in the goldmines there.

So, the African maskers, they, there is this foreboding image. I remember working on the train, and they say this Berlin, the mask is a reminder of the Holocaust [sic]. And the train is a forbidding image as it recalls the times when hundreds were packed in the trains, leaving behind the villagers. So my work exists between the traditional structures and the untraditional as you cannot really call masks, masks are always a present. The last man on Earth will be a mask. And it exists ... in the cinema, if we can play ... between the traditional masks and the Neo Brothers ... [sic] this is like many artists in Africa. African photograph is big. When the photographers introduce in Africa, many see this as performance around it is animate. [sic] photography for repetition. There are great photographers in Africa. And this captures the for instance since the beginning of time. If we can play this video.

[Video]

... would you say that my work is a work is a form of masking. Indeed, moving to Europe, the mask took away my sense of alienation. I walk around with a camera. This is in London.

I don't lie, I asked stranger to film me ... this was in London.

The next one. The films are photographical. I got that from Charlie Chaplin. I watched a lot of films.

This is one a made in California in the footsteps of one of my favourite areas of film makers.

If we play this ... I was in the forest.

And this is what I did, inspired by that part of the world. You can see the influence of my time there.

So, when I speak a bit about time in my work.

The timing, you can see that my work, you can hear the African music, it can be heard also in popular music [sic] and there is no beginning or end ... I like that you can study my films and maybe take an image and complete the film in your head. And there are many times ... times of work ... and in the time of for instance ... when I was born, as a projectionist, I would take films and edit and mix to deliver to the African audience [sic] in Africa there is a structure that people suspect you have a hidden agenda! The whole point, when you are delivering, from moment‑to‑moment, like Shakespeare. Shakespeare did not wait for the play; he wrote words to deliver a message but every word was a little moment.

And this is the kind of thing that I want to do in my work. Every moment has to count. And ... what is encapsulated in the gift. The structured times, to put it roughly.

This is how my films are shown in galleries, even sometimes using text.

And the text you can see on the walls. This is in Whitechapel, me talking about films as a child in Africa.

Next.

I make my films all over the place.

Transport Museum ... yes, this one I made ... I share these films on Facebook. I was discovered on Facebook! So I tell my students, it is worth it! All of the curators are looking on Instagram, I used to make these films and posted them on Facebook for my sisters and stuff. And a gallery in Africa saw them, so we did a show in South Africa. And then they were seen and I was invited over and that's what happened! But you can't make films if you don't know the language, if you have not trained as a painter, a sculptor, and Okri must have been smart [sic]. I got invited to Venice. Ignoring other artists in the gallery but I think there was an eye. When it was asked ... where is this guy ...

ORIANA: Samson, I don't mean to interrupt but I think maybe you need to speed up a little. We are over time.

SAMSON: By how many minutes? okay. I think we are finished. Next slide. I will finish.

So, you can see the capture here, if is a simple use of language of film.

Here we have the big and the small, end of story.

What I mean about the capture, the bigger man represents the empire. It seems obvious in Trafalgar Square, the big mask and the small mask, the man on the horse.

The slave says I know how to do everything here, why I be serving you? It is a long story.

The figures are together in the film. The animate is masking.

And this photograph, this is a principal mask. It is Ewu, disguised as an antelope. Next, we have this one ... sorry, if you have questions, you can ask me later. But basically, this is ... this represent where we are all coming from. And in Malawi, the society is presented by women [sic]. Africa will say, don't put the whole woman on the pedestal, just put the womb [sic] so, I will stop there. [Laughter] [Applause]

ORIANA: Thank you so much. I am sure we will have time to come back to the fascinating issues that were raised. We can move on to Pratap.

PRATAP: Thank you. Thank you very much. Good morning, everybody. For this session of searching and researching, I want to invite you into the creative lab of a cutting room of a work in progress. A multiscreen installation, working title: Changes of the Heart.

In order to shine a light on some creative tensions in image and ideas formation that shape and flow through the process of making, my thanks here to Professor David Chung from the University of Michigan. We have a relationship as shaped by.

ORIANA: And thank you to my researcher, who together, we are co‑developing a project that we are about to have a window into. For 30 years in my own documentary practice, I sought to develop what I think of as "intercultural documentary" an approach that insists on making visible the beautiful pluralism of Britain's truer, deeper reflection of its and our histories. That shift was essential for my generation at a time when a single monoculture dominated television, public art spaces, space institutions and spaces of public life, space where the Windrush generations were invisible. It is a privilege to share the panel with the significant voices in the making of pluralism in contemporary culture. The theme to investigate now is to hold that exploration of difference in a period, hopefully not an age but a period of disinformation and separation.

Most storytelling across arts and media has a very big challenge today. Now, far too much of our mixed media landscape is characterised by what Peter Coleman described as "toxic polarisation" whilst liberal democrats largely ignore, they are less practiced in inflecting on and counteracting on a speech untethered from the connected vision of the tender and the delicate relationships of care that grow a collective culture. Key production processes and algorithms feed this polarising trend, magnifying the attitudes that lean towards conflict. The profits of online vitriol are great and underpinned by income generational model that rewards the lucrative and undertaxed trade in the heat and the friction of polarisation, capitalising disaffection and driving people to extremist content.

In much social media, the division is amplified. Today there are fewer bridges between ideas and opinions, a trend that hollows out the quality or sometimes even the prospect of dialogue in the public sphere to threaten to denature the connective tissue to form the habitus of UK multiculture. In making a case for more relational storytelling it is important to protect the work of robust and rigorous reporting and significance in exposing crime corruption and holding officials to account, the argument not about the social objectivity or the black and the white of the state but rather to respond to the reflex of polarisation of so much media culture by researching relational ways of storytelling that create a restorative narrative. Reflections on documentary making led me to argue for a new focus on the centrality of ethics in practice, especially when recorded lived experience. Without a clear ethical frame and internal compass media risks damaging the situations it reports to describe, leaving more polarised trails for the audiences to choose between. The way practitioners rehearse the exploitative patterns bugs uncomfortable and necessary ethical questions for many creative practitioners and funders. In the last 3‑4 years, here are some of the things that the university and I have been producing with UAL to ask the questions of the nature of the dial log, the conditions of dialogue and here is an example of an attempt to towards restorative narrative and reflections on the ethics for the practitioners and the institutions as to how to go about storytelling and one resource that the university invested in, this website which explores some of the underpinning dynamics about how we work with another. So, I mention that in case anyone wants to follow‑up, that is available or we can give you further links and copies of the material. So, I'm about to make an argument for an experiment in bringing together film and media practices, to rethink the art and the information architecture for more relational storytelling. Safely designed to be biased enough to nurture connective tissues, including deep listening and searching for shades of grey. In finding the stories that model this, I benefit from the nuanced research Andal's of the writer and founder of the Forgiveness Project and the educational work that the charity does, the picking of the shifting current currents of emotion, shift, pain, involving and understanding of the victims and the perpetrators to give confidence to try to learn to be with the two men you are about to meet, to attend to a more visual exploration of the connection and what it may mean.

So, what I'm about to show includes test footage as Oriana signalled from the beginnings of the work in the process of coming, much more to be shot in the year, these are glimpses of emerging ideas, the sound is raw, the image is place holders and the footage is upgraded and what you will see is on three separate screens or projections rather than images on the same screen you may see here so please approach that with that in mind. When I work with some of our wonderful students to be very careful who you let into the cutting room, so we are among friends. If we can run the first ten seconds.

So, an essential story in Chambers of the Heart.

if we can back up to the beginning again.

Essential Story in the coming work, working title, Changes of the Heart.

It is from Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

What happened here ... what happened here, in the Milwaukee suburb, are you dropping the spots? Thanks. I will carry on. What happened here in the Milwaukee suburb of Oak Creek in August 2012 is an event so shocking the ricochet is felt in the heavy lineage of race‑based mass murderers led by white supremacy in the United States. I heard about a man living here, son of a Sikh temple President, one of six people murder in a Milwaukee Gurdwara or Sikh temple shooting. The response made it clear that the experience of the shooting would not risk retraumatising. He wanted to share what happened: I thought I was experiencing post‑traumatic stress, he said but actually, I am now experiencing post‑traumatic growth. I value each day more than someone who has not gone through this. For me, when I heard that, I thought, what on Earth could his journey have been to get to that realisation.

[video]

... and those were the first two people shot, outside. And the final resting place. Over by the vehicle over there, that black vehicle. Then, after the two people were shot, there were two children who ran inside and started to warn everybody. As they ran inside, people started to find their own hiding spots. So, the first shots ... the first shot that was ever fired inside the temple here was fired at that frame.

PRATAP: But what if the white supremacist side of the story? In my early work I would not make room for extremist opinion or the bigot and hatred that causes so much hurt, loss and sometimes death. Later on, in many places with people facing conflict and the after math, however, I listened closely to engage sharp arguments on different sides of an event, idea or conflict, in South Africa, Rwanda, and in many places to put a counterargument on each side for the search of understanding of a diverse audience. There were curious highlights in the process. For example, being schooled in the logic of grand apartheid by three generations of the Whatt family in their home in the white‑only homeland. But I felt that the presence was essential in a film about the future of the new South Africa. But I remained wary of giving space to known perpetrators, unless in cross‑examination where scrutiny was to emphasise their wrong‑doing. For example, filming Gideon Nivoort, a South African security policeman who applied for amnesty to the Truth and the Reconciliation Commission for his role in the murder of the Black conscious leader, Steve Beko, who admitted to hitting Beko with a cut off rubber hose during police interrogation in Port Elizabeth. After that, Beko suffered a slow and a terrible death. I filmed his testimony, I did not and could not connect with his human story. I then interviewed Steve Beko's older son and after he listened to the evidence, I gave Beko more screen time to shape the story. In this I was guided by a friend, a challenge to face profound pro tension to face the other. To the body becoming a totalised vision. To insist that the gaze of the other is primary, leaving us the duty of creating and realising our relatedness. Here in Milwaukee, the other did not appear in the form of a critic or social justice campaigner or atrocity survivor but a former white supremacist, a founding member of what was claimed to be the largest skin head organisation in the world, the organisation responsible for the Milwaukee temple shootings.

[Video]

This statue here ... is my last remaining racist tattoo. It means "racial holy war".

PRATAP: I read about his violent history. Horrified by the pleasure he took in so very, very many gratuitous and grievous violent attacks on very many people of colour, gay people, Jewish people, over the years. Alongside my revulsion I didn't know how far to push in exploring the histories of what he has done. By naming more of this, would an audience be too repelled to take in his story or even to listen to him again at all? Or may some celebrate his racist path? Also, do the audiences have a right to know, and if so, how literal to be? Having found out as much as possible when faced with the real person, somehow letting the meeting and the experience run through my body, an inner awareness is an important awareness of shaping the way of being in the act of looking, listening and filming. As we know, the body keeps a score, the methodologies of non‑violent communication and mindful awareness have much to say in finding a response that integrates the head and heart, anchored in sematic awareness. On a good day, the camera and my hands find the frame that responds and know what to do or know how to guide others filming. This is always a heuristic experience, with the discoveries and reconfiguration emerging from the skin of the film, the makers and the subjects. Leading me in was Pardeep, with his experience, his knowledge, and his "moving with relentless optimism", the temple shooter killed and shot himself after the murders. Pardeep later came to feel and to know he was performing a false self, appearing strong for others but collapsing inside. He needed to understand why the shooter did when he did and thought that Arno Mikaelis may be the key, so he reached out to Arno after the shooting. Arno for his part after renouncing extremism, knew he bore responsibilities for the murders, having co‑founded the organisation that recruited disaffected white kids like the shooter. Here is an exchange about their first meeting.

[video]

>> I remember that first question you asked me, what happened to my eye? It caught me by surprise. I was kind of ... what did happen to my eye. When I started to go into the story of what happened to my eye, I feel you grimacing and feeling my pain. I knew at that point, that our relationship started from a genuine place of empathy.

And understanding.

Care, and consideration.

And as we sat down, and we started to share about our fathers, our daughters, our struggles and our challenges, and our hopes ... at that point, you answered exactly what I needed you to answer at that point. Because there are so many people, the first time when you went to the different audiences and everybody put their hand down of, well, what is responsible for white supremacy in this country, what to do about it? Is it about GPs? Legislation? This thing, that thing? As people put hands down there is a sort of disillusion. And not it, when you raised your hand to say, "Listen, you will not have to walk on this journey alone, I'm going to walk with you." For you to step up. And I knew at that moment that I gained more than I could describe in words.

I think that is what the gift of this was.

>> Thanks, man.

>> You can stop squeezing my hand.

PRATAP: You can leave running, that's fine.

[FILM]

>> As soon as I heard news of it, before it was real, it was white nationalist dude to committed this attack. I had this gut feeling that is what it was about. This gut feeling that I had something to do with this before that was established by media. And not just shame, like humiliated at my past behaviour and so I think definitely if we're thinking about that day‑to‑day work ‑‑ and this seems like counterintuitive too, my whole thing was that I could never forget the people that I've hurt, I can never forget the harm I've done. I need to be accountable for it every single day, always. And then later on, and especially what you've taught me over the past decade is, like, I can't be hating myself about it either, so it's this constant, like, balancing act of acknowledging that harm and being dedicated to trying to reconcile it without, like, hating myself for doing those things. It's always ... the people I have hardest time finding compassion for are white nationalists! Like, I would ... when ISIS was at its peak and the so‑called Islamic State was committing some of the most atrocious acts that the world has seen in a broad scale for a long time, it's so easy to hate the people who did that, but it was easier for me to be, like, well, I don't know what the like to grow up in the Middle East with nothing or to do grow up in an oppression regime, I have never walked in those shoes and it wasn't like giving those guys a path but I had got to point where it was relatively easy for me to be compassionate towards ISIS, or towards some kid from inner city who does a drive‑by shooting or any time that stuff like that happens, I'd be always be like, yeah, I never shot anybody but for most part this driving around and being an asshole, it is hard to beat me as a kid, I set a really high bar for that? when the shooting happened and I would think about it, my first response is this bitter hatred for me and I think that hate was driven by my shame because I was so ashamed that I was part of that and I was so ashamed of the harm that I had done that is still reverberating to this day. What I've learned since then, a lot from you, is if I'm hating myself and if I'm having this grudge against myself, it's going to just absolutely neuter my potency to do something about those things. If I would have been overcome by my self‑hatred the day we met that would be type of thing, okay, I think I can do this.

PRATAP: What became clear to me was that my role was to step back from interviewing and allow Arno and Pardeep find the conversation between friendship. The texture of friendship would lead the shot choices that followed. What emerged in this truth as both victim and perpetrator each held an invisible key to the other's journey from survival to new life and here's the last clip. It's very short.

[FILM]

>> And I think when I got to the temple and just saw all of the faces, you know, they were just in a place of incredible pain and I knew there was something that we all had to do. I just didn't know what.

>> Right.

>> And so, some of the desperation really was what do we do, how do we uplift this community.

PRATAP: In the last scene, the three separate ‑‑ sorry ‑‑ in this last scene, the three separate but juxtaposed screens enable to take a conversation and explore it as a dynamic happening where shots and audio are not synchronous across scene but offer a way to reimagine and recreate a happening.

I think of these forces as a kind of ‑‑ these forces between victim and perpetrator as a kind of rhythm of the heart producing systolic and diastolic pressure, attracting to the light of finding a way through loss and revulsion at the hatreds and violence that had brought us to this place. I'm working with other practitioners to develop an educational resource aimed at supporting storytellers to develop listen and responses skills that can help configure a space where are where the most challenging stories can be held but be held in a which that dreams and invites connection.

The show related to this is due to open in Detroit in Ann Arbor and hopefully Arno will find a new home. Educational work will hold research debates using examples from Chambers of the Heart as a way of thinking about dialogue.

To conclude, at a time when storytelling sees a drift toward yet more pointed and polarised antipathies of difference, this is a necessary time for audiences to explore our own heart chambers. Like being curious, to understand curious to understand a perpetrator. I found this work by turns that this work by turns threatens to topple my reflex certainties and dare to enter a place of not knowing and of imaginative identification where the process of filming finds its own haptic visuality, its inner logic of response its location and place. Like new neural pathways, exposure to restorative stories can make it more possible to imagine better outcomes from those who walk a path of transforming unspeakable loss. If the medium can become the message, what if the process of creating that in is dedicated to restoring relationships through light of understanding difference committed to an avowedly restorative approach to storytelling. What new visions might then flow from new narratives of the ethics of such a media practice? [Applause]

ORIANA: Thank you so much, Pratap. That was fascinating. Mark, can I ask you to come up?

MARK: I will. Oh, my God, my mic is already on. Thank you. I just wonder whether I can see properly here. Yes, I can. All I'm going to do today is offer a few provocations but, first of all, I'm going to say thanks very much for invitation to speak today. It's always a pleasure to be invited into the room and also an honour so thank you very much. I think we forget how difficult and how hard fought for some of these platforms are or have been over time.

This is a kind of text in process. I figured it would be a kind of way of sharing some ideas in the form of a gift. This is called Fixing up House, The Passion of Photography. We're in a time reckoning with history. We are at a moment where salvage is required, scavenging work is necessary, and digging up the things from the archive for scrutiny is essential.

Across the terrain of Western cultural institutions, there exists a sense of unease, a cultural turn, a dizzying political bewilderment concerning how to manage visual narratives of the colonial and the racist assumptions that have refused and defined. I'm quoting Ariella Azoulay, "The museum ... [speaking too quickly] ... knowledge exchange has itself become an object of scrutiny cited as hostile place, that creates instruments of violence."

For me, this then is the dawning of the house of other. A new kind of cultural space that is open and welcoming in this house, the uneasy narratives, histories are revealed and opened up for scrutiny. The house of other is not built solely on European foundations. In this space, notions of conquest and ownership are banished instead. In the house of other, difference is exalted and indigenous cultural knowledge formations are given proper space to express themselves and realise their end.

Here, these knowledge systems are respected fully and equally valued alongside diverse ways of knowing in our world. In this house the stranger is welcome and otherness in all of its forms is celebrated through cultural dreams of reparation and generosity. That talks to what Pratap has been working to. This house champions justice. The return of cultural objects in their places of origin, it welcomes formal and legal apologies for historical wrongs. Museums and archives today are in the throes of profound change as they grapple with the fraught legacies of colonialism, imperialism and slavery, all of which played fundamental roles in building the cultural institutions of the Western world.

In the house of other recognition and reckoning are given real value. Monuments are rethought and unsung heroes are clothed with new dignity. In the house of other, indigenous knowledge formations are treated as sacred and revered. They are to be deployed as acts of liberation and empowerment, for those who have been disconnected, racialised and locked out of history. Here, hostile images are given new life and oxygen allowed to breathe the fresh air of liberation once again. Sasha Huber, an artist I have been working with, with her current work that redresses the violence of [inaudible] commissioned in 1850, the founder of the Museum of Comparative Zoology in Harvard, aims to restore dignity to the victims of a racist lens. What I hope most for especially in photography during this cultural turn is for its practitioners to demand not only social change but also importantly for their works to live as impetus for meaning of legislative change. Although the house of other is presently an imaginary house, its design and positionality are influenced by the works of its intellectual forebears. In it, the bravery qualities of Ingrid Pollard, Sheidal, Shinil Gupta and the many others who have worked to unfix the past, build spaces in which the diversity of this world's understanding and ways of being can surface and be seen.

In the genocidal broken time of photography, its early days when the world was laid bare ripped apart, expropriated by its imperial tools and dominated by Euro‑centric scopic racial, Western eyes reigned supreme, how the West saw rest tells us much about our current human condition than anything they encountered, read, mapped or archived, conserving the other from the times of extraction, from the time of extraction. I think we're living constantly in this time of extraction.

This is the horror show of photography's past, its messy science and its untidy history is now only now beginning to surface as a tense and uncomfortable burden. I like the idea of tense and uncomfortable burdens because it keeps us agitated and it keeps us thinking. Photography's soul is being interrogated, its language systems, its captions, its categories, its indexical nature, its canons provide evidence in abundance of who and what is missing from its history. Now, photography's missing chapters are being read out loud as archives and new photographic images from the Global South confront, confront photography's archives. The narrative now being amplified by other curatorial voices represents an exciting visual decoloniality in the making of photography's present history. The radicality in this gesture lies in the fact that photographers must stay in the making, thinking business which ties into some to do of the things we were discussing this morning. The making, thinking business. And the making of difference. The old guard of photography, what I call the stuck ones and the stuck ones live in most of our cultural industries all of the time. They stop progress and they keep us in the thick bog of progress, of lack of progress. Stuck ones are desperate to find ways to be associated with a decolonial process, they keep on trying to invent themselves as new people in a new world and they keep their colonialities alive in the present. They keep us back. Stuck ones in the old meanings and recurring archival nightmares that recall the violence of photography in imperial and colonising lineage.

So, we seem to be getting closer to the ground zero of photography, I like the idea of drill out some of these empirical, imperial knowledge systems, so I think we have to go backwards a lot further before we can go forwards. I think we live in an age of constant denial, an age where we imagine the progress is there to be had, where there's so many ghosts in the system that we all are constantly haunted and spooked by idea of change.

Ah, we may with the emergence of photographers see the beginning of what may become fully articulated archives that act as daring, counter narratives concerning the making of Black lives, nuanced, honest, complex, rounded bodies of work that have grown past and that have grown past the past and need to be celebrated in the present. Many dedicated scholars such as Stuart Hall, Deborah Willis, Belle Hooks, and Alannah Lockwood have opened new visual theoretical pathways through and into our understanding of the damage photography as an image making mechanism in hand of Western colonising powers has done to our collective, our collective sense of humanity. The act, they act ... scholars working against the grain of imperial epistemes do not only critique, they point towards and celebrate new formations of lenses culture and offer insights and lost hindsight, lost hindsight that photographers can do and perform within culture. This scholarly work feels forever pressing and critically essential today especially when we open dialogues concerning technologies, old and new. That was the point of this morning, technology's both old and new, museums revamped or left languishing and, of course, the legacies of pseudo-scientific colonising theories advanced by scholars. The legacies of whom are still being propagated through the noise of Western mass media, Western mad media channels that are both regulated and increasingly unregulated. We seem to be dangerously distant and disjointed, bodies floating in a deeply alienated inherited cultural space that is not of majority world making. We never made this world. It's been made for us, how we change it is what is being contested. It is this space that many of our contemporary photographers, especially through the lens of Autograph, and cultural theories, especially those who feel the presence of the Global South in their DNA, in their gravity, in their history, in their gravity, in their history, in their place of time, in their place in time, have been trying arrest realign and recreate so as to build a more inclusive world view. Seeking to create a global image bank that can function as a liberatory site, a global image bank as a liberatory site for all, Samuel Fossil's work sits within this tradition. He creates scenes in which emotional, the personal, and the political meet to narrate the past, address the present, and to propose a shared future. Undoing imperial violence means undoing times, space, and the body politic as given forms of experience as the transcendental condition of understanding, perception and judgement, that's our Ariella Azoulay again. How much time have I got?

ORIANA: Five minutes.

MARK: Images may isolate us. Since the first contact with Europeans, indigenous cultures have been left precarious, constantly at risk of being erased, obliterated or bulldozed into landfill, scorched or drowned as a result of aggressive colonising policies of extraction or contemporary forms of neo‑liberalism. The photographer Gideon Mendel, concerning his recent exhibition titled Fire and Flood, staged at the Photographers Gallery in London and shown in their recently opened Soho Photography Quarter, an initiative that turned the fabric of the street into a space of exhibition states that his photographs bear witness to the brutal reality that the poorest people on the planet almost always suffer the most from climate change. Among the arresting aspects of Mendel's approach here is how close Mendel's statement echoes Franz Ferdinand's radical book titled The Wretched of the Earth.

So, we have been having these conversations from a kind of Global South for a very long time and seems we're not hearing them still. The wretch of the Earth, a much-cited quotation from on this, "Imperialism leaves behind germs of rot ‑‑ There's your plastic ‑‑ which we most clinically detect and remove from our left‑hand, there's the new experiments, but we haven't ripped them from forms of our mind, from our mind's forms."

The correlation between Thenon, Azouray and Mendel in this present moment operates like a powerful time bending force that compresses distant historical concerns, on Thenon's work breathes through photographers such as Mendel and are pulled forward into our present released from the prison of history. I quite like the idea of a liberatory force that releases us from the prison of history because some of us have been framed for so long and contained within that history. Azoulay rightly casts aside the temporality of timelines, who needs time, it seems to me that when you have time or we have time, we can't change anything in time. Who needs time? Azoulay sees the museum as a time trap and Mendel is driven by a desire to represent that which is widely known but still ignored, recalling what WEB Debois writing in 1910 called The Crisis. Ha‑ha, the crisis, crisis, crisis. Pulling this enduring notion back into our consciousness, we are in crisis. Maybe then, the task of photography's future is to adapt a more fully pedagogic manifesto. It would be nice to have a new manifesto for change. It would be nice to have a new manifesto that we signed up to. It would be great to align ourselves behind one position, to make change possible in real incremental time, okay. One that works within what Gayatri Spivak says radical ways to learn from below. They've been talking about learning from below for a very long time and we're still trying to find ways of doing that. Maybe the university needs be a little bit more dynamic in that space. Thus, allowing us to discard the structures that create top‑down forms of power and eradicate all forms of apartheid. I could go on but I think I'll stop. Thanks very much. [Applause].

ORIANA: Shall we all go and sit? Samson, are you okay there?

SAMSON: Yes, I can hear you. Can you see me? I don't know.

ORIANA: I don't know.

SAMSON: I can hear you, yes. Oh, there you go.

ORIANA: Can I ask everyone when they want to ask a question to just wait until the microphone gets to you, because it helps with the recording process. Where do we start? That was so rich. All of you, it was so rich. There are so many ways that one could sort of dive into looking for relationships but I done want to be simplistic about that. I just thought, one of the things I felt with all of your presentations, it picked up on point that Siân made this morning about hope, about hope being, you know, an active process, because all of you are trying offer some way of actually moving forward. You are all wanting to be able to do something in a way that confronts the desperation we're all faced. The world is in a terrible place, ecologically in terms of social justice and in terms of the politics of the everyday. What we have in all of your approaches, it seems to me to be an attempt to find something that can actually be done, you know ... [Laughter]

I don't know, does anyone want to come back on that?

MARK: Are you waiting for me? I don't know, I think what can be done. I've been involved in building institutions in many ways, I think, even though it is very small and even the term "institution" is problematic because it starts to replicate all of the power structures you've been critical of. But I think one of the things I have enjoyed through a curatorial thing and, you know, the idea of being able to work with practitioners and artists and writers and different scholars of people in the making game is just how influential that can be in terms of the micro impacts that you can have on people's lives that hopefully add up to a greater sense of uni and exposure to different ways of being or different ways of understanding our present. That's the takeaway really from working as a curator. I've never been interested in anything other than actually photography in a sense has just been another tool or thinking through photography has ‑‑ I'm not a photographic historian. I'm interested in the work that the work is doing. I'm not someone who cell operates the idea of the luxury of making. The making process is where I differ from a lot of conversations. The luxury of just simply making for the pleasure of it is not how I've been formulated. I've always been formulated in a way that what tools can we have to fight the things that you feel, know, understand and want to change? Whether that's domestic violence or whether it's class issues. For me, it's about the work that the work is doing. I quiet enjoy the fact that people have luxury to be simply enter into the making place. But maybe a generations after myself of people who look like me might find it a place of ease and a place of rest. In many ways, we're looking to that degree of parity where [inaudible] is not upon you, where you can walk through the world and have a different sense of being without the threat of a kind of white racist nightmare around corner, which some of us, the DNA of that is always in the background. It's not necessarily Michigan where guns are. It's in everyday corners. So, that's the practicality of where the hope lives. Work is in a sense a conversation, an ongoing conversation which is why I just wanted to present images with artists who are just working through these multiple conversations.

ORIANA: It's very much a dialogue. It's not something you just do on your own, is it? It has to happen.

MARK: No.

ORIANA: It is a relationship.

MARK: With Autograph, it is a making organisation. Everything we do has a component of remaking within it. We try and make something. We work with the artist through the ideas that they're exercising out and it's not finished. I hate the idea of things being finished. This is it. It's not it.

ORIANA: Do you want to come in at all, Samson?

SAMSON: Yes. Yeah, I think the work I do ‑‑ can you hear me?

PRATAP: Yes.

SAMSON: Okay. When I came to Europe, the work I present, I need it. It is how I protect myself and how I make progress here and it was never just ... for me art was never just like a luxury. It is just difference between me surviving or not. Yeah, I have a lot of nuance, I speak English and I was raised in a Western world. I have nuance as an African. I understand and realise that over time. I'm in academy and in Africa and in Malawi, enthusiasm is seen as a good thing. I have to figure out. When I started in Western art, it was simply to maybe explain myself to people. It is work if a way and also being self‑conscious I am against this more structured environment in the West has helped me. For me, it is a necessity. Art is a necessity.

ORIANA: Is your idea of the gift, it strikes me it is also about empowering yourself.

SAMSON: Yes.

ORIANA: You in control of a gift. You don't have to wait for someone to tell you what you can do.

SAMSON: Yes, but you have to know how to ... for instance, I have learnt a lot. The gift of generosity, for me talking about, I will tell you why, I will tell you why, it always leads to exchange. Societies that build on the gift have to avoid this as far as possible, because exchange is pertinent. If I give you a gift at Christmas, you give me back and you end up with all of these tacky presents. This form of giving is present in material society with the womb and with generosity.

ORIANA: That makes sense. I can see that works. Sorry, Samson wants to come in on that.

SAMSON: For me as an African, a sense of place is important. If you want a more meaningful life, you have to introduce play. Like, for instance, for me I'm very open and generous. That gets me trouble often but it also takes me to other places that people will go. I have an open heart. For me, being conscious that my default in life is for a certain generosity as being important, because if aye wasn't, I would have demonised myself and lost my self‑esteem. A lot of things I presented are demonised to me.

ORIANA: That makes a lot of sense. You have done a segue to the open heart. Pratap, do you want to come in on that?

PRATAP: Something about the heart and the gift. The gift of our wound, it is an unwanted gift. What he and Arno have found is something which is born of great loss and unspeakable loss, this is something common to a number of people, Marina is in the room and she had an immediate conversation between a mum, Joan Scarfield and the young man who murdered her son, Jacob Dunne, typically this takes several years of ability to stay present, to loss to grief. when you're talking about hope and hope and despair, it makes me think a little bit of Rumi's poem the guesthouse, I think. Welcome each visitor.

This work, it is important to have hope. The life and work is a lot easier when we're in that phase. I think the work is much bigger than hope and despair. In a certain sense, the structural shift needs to be in a freeing tone, the way we individually feel on that particular day. In order to meet the scale of the injustices or the loss and the beauty to be born from that, with very special people, like some of the people we've been thinking about and listening to their responses. Something new and much finer is born from being true to that and that's an extraordinary gift to the culture. And that's a gift a bit more as a metaphor, it is not just literally me giving you a glass of water or other way around, that's fantastic when that happens, but this is something bigger to do with the nature of attending to in this suffering.

MARK: Already the capacity to receive. The gifter always suggests that someone is giving you, it is about how you acknowledge what you've been given. I think that lack of knowledge of what's been given, whether it's indigenous knowledge or whether it's other cultural assets that others have, the refusal of those gifts is part of that violence, if you like.

PRATAP: You make me think of the 1832 McCauley minute from the British Parliament which was new to its growing Empire in India. McCauley's 1832 minute described the whole of Indian culture as worth a single bookshelf in the great life of British European. What we have inherited in cultural imperialism is to saturated so the gift of now and the wonder of London and some other places is that we can dare to have these conversations around our competing histories and try to develop it. I think we're now at the most interesting time because we're not just juxtaposed with the different people in the room, we're in a place where we can start weaving a story that relates to what we want it to in each other's histories. It's not caricatured but the narratives we inherit typically are caricatured.

MARK: They really are and they're messy. I'm hoping if I stay in the gift game that the idea of being able to receive is taken on board. I think it's funny, isn't it, because there's always a sense of innovation and new and progress. Actually, maybe, I was wondering whether the pandemic maybe helped people stop a little bit, you know, and be present without necessarily feeling as though you are caught, this is why ... I mean I have kids and they are worried about how old I am. Don't worry about how old I am, it is what I'm thinking about rather than my age. If you stop thinking about time and you think about what you're thinking about, it is much more interesting and you are allowing yourself to be present. It is really interesting how we forget to be in our time and enjoy that and find pleasure in that.

ORIANA: Do you think accepting the gift is like allowing oneself to be present?

MARK: Absolutely.

ORIANA: That's how we kind of ... I was thinking while we were talking and I will come to the audience in a moment, that we have got a quote at the beginning of our session which was from a lovely group of researchers, James Bulley and Özden Sahin and they said, this was just a report on practice research for the Research Council. They said, "In practice research, forms of intuitive embodied tacit sits imaginative effective and sensory ways of knowing can be conveyed. It's sharing presents, an opportunity for the modernising and revitalising of such communication, uncovering novel dissemination routes in a digital era." It seems to me that's quite dry!

PRATAP: It's very good though.

ORIANA: It's kind of what we're saying, you can do things. You as a curator and as a film‑maker, Samson as an artist, can do things that you couldn't do with some other modes of communication. I think that's what we're trying to talk about today.

MARK: The idea of building a new house as well is really important to me in terms of thinking because the house of bondage which of course on its tour was talking about the apartheid racial. We are in it. So the institutional gambit I would argue including this house is how do we rebuild it. I'm not calling about it knocking it down but what kind of infrastructure do you need to walk into a place that feels built and new and I think that's really the challenge. I'm not talking about ... I'm not talking about, you know, new policies around diversity and inclusion, I'm not talking about mapping the colour of your staff, I'm talking about mapping the colour of how we think. I'm framed very much within a kind of 1960s/70s Black consciousness space. For me the mind is where it lives and that's where the exchange needs to happen and that's where the university and thinking stuff has to be engaged. When the mind changes the other things that we're trying to do and achieve, i.e., become a more tolerant and more humane and more complex and more involved with equality built into it, I hope that those things then begin to seep into the DNA of the building. That for me is really, really where the radical thinking needs to happen from what we wear to what we look at to what we say to how we travel, to where we kind of engage in a kind of global context.

ORIANA: You're right.

MARK: Without the matrix of those decolonial narratives that play at the same time, we become a kind of, you know, a performing set of radical liberal wet folk who want to talk and share over a pint of beer what change might like, we forget the capacity to act. It's not always easy.

ORIANA: That was very much this morning, it was about a capacity to act. I'm really fascinated by how such different subject. Can I just let the audience ... is that a question or a hand semi‑raised?

FLOOR: Thinking about what Mark has been just saying, our hope for curation is that the painting will come down. [Laughter] I'm referring to Sonia and what she did in Manchester. Now, it doesn't matter if the painting then goes back up, because it is now possible for it to come down. What I don't hope for is they add a plaque to Cecil Rhodes, it doesn't help.

MARK: I agree.

ORIANA: Anyone else want to come in? Over there.

FLOOR: Thank you very much for your conversations. Listening to everything you all said, three wise men ... [Laughter] ...

MARK: Thanks for that! I'm going home now!

FLOOR: There are two things I want to say. One is about enabling us people to have a space to think, to actually open up a space to think. There's that.

Pratap's films, I have seen them before, and I keep reflecting and I keep reflecting on them. There's something for me as a British‑born, of parents of the Caribbean, and this insatiable thing of it's all right for white people to just say sorry. You can see sorry and everything's all right. Yet ...

SAMSON: No.

FLOOR: If a person of colour in Clapham Junction of the age of 16 or 17 steals some chewing gum, they're put away for four years. So, when I talk about social justice, when we talk about social justice, there needs to be some sort of equilibrium here. It is fine to talk about people being sorry and getting together and, for want of a better word, kumbaya, there needs to be justice. When we talk about the use of cotton and the pollutants in our oceans, where does it come from? Who are the people doing it? What do they look like? What is their power? And when will true justice happen? That's the sort of thinking those conversations I want to look. There's something missing here. That's just me trying to be logical. I'm not sure if I am.

MARK: Very logical. [Applause]

SAMSON: Can I come in?

MARK: I think Sam wants to come in.

SAMSON: Yes, where are these people? For me actually for me it is about paradigms, actually. People think oh, I never go ... I can be arrested and stuff, but, actually, let's say a topic like racism, it's systemic, it's harder. I personally, what I find the hardest is to be who I am, you know, it's not enough to say, okay, we are taking these Black people, but also systems and that's what I'm fighting for, it's changing those paradigms. The universities are structured in a certain way that excludes a lot of people, people like me, actually. There are philosophies and knowledges that are created differently from the academic and those are also viable ways of creating knowledge you but if the universities are only tied to capital then, yeah, a lot of what I would call racism is going to continue because [inaudible], for instance in southern Africa don't follow the values of ... it just allowing people from the Africa into the room but it is also trying to accommodate their thinking and their ways of doing things, that's what it is about. For me, I judge a system through paradigms, it's not simple black and white. I'm interested in which paradigm are you using to speak to me.

PRATAP: I was going to add ...

SAMSON: I have to.

PRATAP: Carry on, Sam. I work in a creative industry. You can sometimes feel it, you can probably imagine it in a good liberatory moment, what does it really look like? I can see it as a case. I'm really interested in, a lot of my thinking is formulated in the idea of a kind of post‑World War II worlds, where there were new constitutions and declarations and the Cold War screwed up most of that and people are left with a kind of violent legacy of looking for what democracy and its flaws look like. I kind of think what justice looks like? What do we really want? I think this is what I meant by a manifesto. It's important to not just talk about it but to maybe align ourselves to it, even if it is not exactly what we personally want, but there must come a place where you say that collectively I will sign up to that part of the road to justice. I think what we imagine is that there's going to be a kind of, you know, a dawning, tomorrow will be a new moment but it's not going to be like that, it's going to be very incremental and it's going be a lot of hard work and it's going to be a lot of actually conceding your own personal desires to move towards some degree of collective thinking.

I think the reason why I'm interested in institutions like UAL or other universities or places of thinking or influence is that you are actually in a power dynamic which can amplify the concerns that the student body and its cohort of workers want so that's really an interesting sense of how you would put power to work. If I've been around this university for a couple of years, let's say, I'm thinking what's the work, the power work collectively around the changes that we've subscribed to and where and how do we feel its influence and how do we align to that space. If you have to forgive me, I'm an old leftist Marxist in that space. You have to line up behind points of change and move airway from those fractured siloed places, the whole divide and rule space and think through the incremental changes you want.

ORIANA: We need to wind up. You hadn't had a chance to come back.

PRATAP: I really pressure your response, Jennie. But also, I wanted to take really seriously what you say about divided spaces and the depth of the frustration of the lack of social justice. What I'd welcome is, this kind of conversation being possible there are certain things that don't get surfaced. What you are pointing your finger at, Jennie, is very, very significant and I don't think that gets heard. I don't think that the extraordinary stories, one of which we glimpsed a little bit in formation, I don't think this culture knows how to value those extraordinary journeys yet and that's partly because we have yet to create the conditions of contact in order to truly be with each other. I don't think you can go directly into that dialogue space, something I have learned from restorative narrative training, because you risk simply rehearsing the old power imbalances and the traumas that many people have experienced, until what Marie Louise Pratt describes in her book Trans Culturation, until we get the conditions of contract somewhere near something that might begin to look like equity we will not be able to attend to each other. I don't want to leave it in my own practice or leave simply in that way, I'm impressed, moved, and inspired by the extraordinary stories of people year on year who live with some of the things we have talked about and find a way through having that conversation.

ORIANA: I think we have to stop it there otherwise no‑one will get any lunch. Lunch has moved to further back in the central courtyard because there was some health and safety risk, they said! What time are we back at 2.15 pm.

[Lunch break]

AFTERNOON WELCOME

PANEL 3

ORIANA: Hi, everyone. Welcome back. The post session is always the hardest, I am sure. We are looking forward to a fascinating discussion to pick up on several of the themes we touched on in the earlier sessions.

But in probably an even more dramatic way, the afternoon session, We're All Animals is Chaired by Francine Stock. I will pass over to Francine to introduce the session. Thank you.

FRANCINE: Hello. Well, I'm delighted to be here, particularly as it is such a fascinating intersection of subjects and such a fascinating combination of speakers that we are going to hear. There is that great quote from Ghandhi, the greatness of a nation and its moral progress are divulged by the way its animals are treated. Well, you can substitute the words greatness and progress for survival and the definition of animal, clearly, as far as this afternoon is concerned is that animals, it is not humans and animals, it is humans as part of animals. In line with the ambitions of the day, the session is to seek to shift perspectives, to get a clearer view, maybe to map away through. That means that sometimes, abandoning traditional, often disastrous point of view that has taken to us where we are, from unfamiliar, to uncomfortable insights. The panel assembled put forward in the next hour‑and‑a‑half will put forward startling ideas and experiences but there is an underpinning of reasoning and science to all. An impressive mix of academic, academia and practice. Hearing from Jennie Stephens, Professor of Stability Science and Policy at North‑eastern University. I will not give lengthy biographies. And Nell Lyhne, and Robin Maynard, and Emily Doolittle, composer and lead in art making at the Anthropocene at the Royal Conservatoire of Scotland. The way it will work is this, everyone to speak for about ten minutes, if there is something that you would like clarified specifically about the presentation there will be a few minutes after they have spoken to do that. But we want to keep the momentum going so that the real discussion happens after all four presentations and can involve everyone. If you can hold back the big thoughts if possible but obviously, please feel free to question, I will be here to handle that, to questioner the speakers immediately after they speak. So, let us start, straight away with Professor Jennie Stephens, a climate justice scholar and act visit.

JENNIE: It is really great to be here, thank you all for engaging and thank you to Nell for inviting me and great to be here.

I want to connect and actually introduce and suggest a radical idea, that climate justice has the poem to overarch maybe not a manifesto but a guide for our collective work. Particularly the work in universities. I am in the middle of writing, finishing a book, that is going to reimagine what would our universities look like if climate justice was the goal? Needless to say, they would look very different than what we are doing right now. That is what I want to talk about.

I am based in Boston, I have been on sabbatical here in London and in Dublin, I have a science and engineering background. Today I am to talk about a paradigm. Paradigms are uncomfortable, to let go of things, we need to think about things differently. What I want to suggest, the provocation that the climate justice is the guiding principle is not because climate is the most important problem. We have so many problems. But climate change is a very particular symptom that is overarching of a deeper problem, which is based on our economic system, what we are valuing, how we value thing, and there are so many other crises, right? Not just climate, of injustice, of violence, of all kinds of ecological health, our own human health, so we are in a time of poly‑crises. It is violent. At times some of us are in quite pleasant spaces and may not feel the violence directly but we read about it and many have experienced the violence of it, and it's largely, and the reason we have been so ineffective is because of the concentration of wealth and power and the powerful interests that want to keep things the same. So, I want to focus on that point. I really want to encourage us all to bring a transformative lens. As we talked about this morning, small, incremental steps don't actually lead to a false sense of action, we need to transform things in a big way.

So, I embrace a feminist, a colonial and anti‑racist lens, which is really thinking of power dynamic, what are the system, the policies, the practices that are reinforcing problematic power dynamics to prevent us from doing what is good for people on the planet, and the planet, and how can we resist those, acknowledging that we are all part of, we are in the house, right? That we are trying to dismantle or to reimagine. So acknowledging it is not insisted and reinforce or on one side or the other, we are always both in the middle of it all. Many of the things we do reinforce what we want to change but we must be okay with that paradox.

So, I wanted to briefly complain what climate justice is and what it is not. It is getting leveraged in mainstream climate action, which it is not. Mainstream climate action focuses on Ground Zero and decarbonising things, that is important but not sufficient. If it is your goal, your approach is markets mechanisms, technological innovation and individual behaviour change. This is what I call climate isolation, thinking of the climate in a narrow way, that we have the technology to fix it and that narrow linear tech accurate call‑ups, many in the universities are perpetuating the view. It is not helpful. I suggest instead to focus on climate justice. Climate justice is about reducing human vulnerabilities, marginalisation, exploitation, oppression and by g equity and justice and if those are goals, then the approach is different. The approach is to invest in people, to communities, to understanding the existing structures, pack practices and relationships that maintain the justices and to have solidarity and collective action and particularly important to address and to bring in feminine scholarship here as feminists, gender injustice is among the most prevalent that we all experience and understand and when I say bring a feminist lens it is really paying attention to the problematic power dynamics.

So, in 2020 I wrote a book, Diversifying Power, why we need anti‑racist feminist leadership on climate energy. This was really a synthesis for me as to why we had been so ineffective, inefficient and inequality in the response to the climate crisis, largely as the same people with the same training coming up with the same ideas and none are transformative. So, I suggest that not only can we think about how to address the climate crisis and the polycrisis but to think about a shift in even thinking about universities. Universities, I suggest, are underleveraged resource in society. I think there is also a risk that by not being transformative enough in universities, we are reinforcing and perpetuating the problems.

I'm a Professor in Boston, with one of my students we wrote a piece published in the Boston Globe calling for the climate justice to be the mission of Higher Education. Boston is the city in the world with the highest density of universities than any other city. You would think if the universities are there to help society in the city and the community around them that Boston would be a mecca of social justice, it is not, it is a segregated desperate, health disparities, economic, racial, wealth/health gap in the country, in the world, which goes to show that our universities are not necessarily contributing in the ways that we think or the ways that they could. If you are interested in an academic paper that I wrote with students, that is discussing this system, you can take a look. What I wanted to encourage everyone to think about is universities as knowledge‑based institutions, that is often the way we are framed, right? But that there is a connection between knowledge, wealth, power, that universities have gotten manipulated into to be contributing to the concentration of wealth and power as well as gate keeping the knowledge as well! And in ways that are really not helpful for society.

So, when we think about teaching, I encourage us to think about learning but also unlearning. Letting go of the things we are being taught that don't serve us, and there is quite a bit. Thinking about research we need innovation, which is what the panel on plastics were talking about, how are we so reliant on plastics but if plastics and fossil fuels are the biggest challenges facing the universities, why are not their research centres focused solely on the challenges? We don't. The reason is because of the powerful interests that don't want us to, there is a resistance that there we need to focus on. In terms of wealth, it is important to pay attention to the money flows, and to the financialisaton of Higher Education, the commodifying and the commercialisation of education and the different ways that the universities can engage locally, engaging with different communities, and partner with the organisations that are trying to ex‑novate and to unlearn for transformative change.

So, one of the challenges, maybe it relates to the design mentality, it is thinking about unlearning is so much of what our educational systems focus on is individualistic, competitive, isolated kind of mindset. We need to move that away, we need to move away from that towards a collective collection of relation and knowledge, also spoken about in the panel this morning. **Sián** mentioned Kate Raworth and how economics is taught in universities, it is deceptive. It is simplistic, based on neoliberal markets‑based economics, not relating to what is happening in the world with the planetary boundaries, so unlearning economics is huge, and innovation and research, and fossil fusion phase out, along with connected to plastics and it has been really an intellectual no‑fly zone in the research community and in academia, we need to change that. There are now, the EU funded a project on fossil fuel phaseout and a few examples there.

So, another thing, we think of knowledge and universities in this paradigm of vary euro‑centric colonial legacy of universities, and Vandana Sheena suggestion ever suggested grandmother universities, acknowledging that we lose so much of local knowledge, losing the knowledge from ancestors, from elders, who are a part of our formal education systems, and that there is so much potential for us to reimagine the distribution of universities, even, how they are structured.

At Harvard University, they just recently, they had a donor [sic] of $50 billion and got an alumnus to donate $300 more million. And the President of Harvard said that generosity and loyalty are among the defining characteristics of the alumni, and I am part of that so I can talk to it from personal experience and critic, so what if universities taught a loyalty and generosity to others, to the land, to the Earth, to the non‑human species? With that connectivity, instead, it is so insular. It is telling you, you are part of a club, let's keep the club going and donate back to the club that you are a part of. From a very early stage in universities, we are encouraging this connection with the institutional loyalty that is, I think a little bit, it has potential to be harnessed in a different way.

So, I want to end here, to quote Vanessa de Oliveira's work, where she has said: We can't actually learn to swim until the water is at the hips. For many of us in this room, the water is not yet out our hips, so we cannot even imagine what is coming. So we go through our days, most of us, many of us, thinking, well, maybe it will not happen, maybe we will be okay, maybe there is a technological fix, maybe ... and we can't really learn to swim by watching others who are already there.

Because you have to experience it. So, they remark is about a humbleness and ... not a pest missile but a reality that we have to embrace in how we are thinking about the big challenges and how we think of the future. The future is now, we don't have time. We need to be acting in the ways that we want the future to be in the ways that we can, now. So, I will end here and say that the landscape is changing rapidly, if you change the same game on a landscape that has changed it will not be ... the game will not work. I think that many of the things we are doing in our universities and in our politics, trying to address the problems, are completely ineffective and insufficient, so we really need the transformative lens. Hopefully it sets us up well to hear other great perspectives on this. Thank you.

FRANCINE: Thank you so much, Jennie. Any immediate questions there. Yes?

FLOOR: [inaudible]

CAPTIONER: Please use the microphone.

FLOOR: ... if we don't have justice for other nature, and specifically if we don't have justice for other animals, and as I said earlier, we have to look at our practice, as artists, and we also have to look at the practice in universities in terms of how we feed people. I am really appreciative of the generosity in you giving us lunch but we just served up cows, sheep, and just served up other animals and we are here talking about dresses.

>> It was vegan. Lunch, it was vegan.

JENNIE: I think, I think that what your comment brings up is that we have lost connection, right? We have lost connection with so much in that many of us don't even think about the food systems, we don't think about the connection with the land from different agricultural practices. And I think that the opportunity is there for us to re‑define how we integrate that relational knowledge‑building and nurture it, with care and compassion in our university spaces and other spaces as well. So, thank you for that important point.

FRANCINE: Any other questions?

FLOOR: Thank you, that was really fascinating. My question is, given the issues that you highlighted within the university sector, how it is not working, what is the rational for arguing for reform within the university sector rather than proposing an alternative space where this type of change should happen?

JENNIE: Excellent question. I have been a part of a few conversations with regards to the future of the universities and guess where they are happening? In the universities. So it speaks to why we need to engage more outside of our campuses, different kinds of partnerships and also as you rightly point out to think more about the economic policy, to other policies, to educational policies, how the universities are funded, we are so constrained by the funding realities, that are very political and very, as I pointed out, increasingly reliant on donations from wealthy contributors and corporations that then dictate and have influence on what we are doing within the universities, so the case is very much to re‑imagine all of that. And part of that is engaging in policy and politics and distributing the potential of Higher Education in a different way.

FRANCINE: Thank you. One more. Then we will have to press on. The microphone is just coming.

FLOOR: Thank you for your presentation. I wondered if you were familiar with Esperanza Balding, because of her initiative to create communal services speaking about what you were talking about now, connecting Harvard to artist‑based work for Black creatives, creatives of colour and also communities that, as you said, with regards to Boston, a community that harbours citizens, do you have thoughts about that and that was last year, last winter when she finally resigned?

JENNIE: There are so many examples of amazing initiative attempts of individuals ... yes, metaphorical attempts, and then without the institutional support, and it really embracing, which gets to all kinds of green washing, as mentioned earlier and universities are all about branding, showcasing the cool things that they are doing without often times not changing that much what is really being done. So, I think this is why, and in some way, I'm in a university, I'm studying universities, so it is like a similar, insular thing but it represents something bigger in society, that is happening in all kinds of organisations and in all kinds of places. So, thank you for that.

FRANCINE: That is all that we have time for. Thank you very much indeed. [Applause]

So, our next speaker is the artist ... WK Lyhne, Nell, who practices in painting ceramics and film and also a PhD candidate here. Nell, thank you.

NELL: Thank you.

NELL: I have to say that I started my research during the time of COVID and Zoom, and all of my presentations were made online to a (sound drop) ... ... (reconnecting) ... which I was told to observe when you start do presentations to thank people for allowing you to be here. So, I would like to thank, UAL Research, Oriana, David, and I am very pleased and grateful to be here. I will start by putting you off ... I want to tell you that my research, Jennie was talking about power systems, my research concerns religious imagery, which is enough to put most people off as most people are not interested in religion. But bear with me by letting me explain it is a secular approach and that I am interested in the power of the images, of the power that religion holds, it is not more religious than that.

The film clip I will show you at the end is rough and imperfect. So it is a work in progress, I have not finished my PhD yet. It is a film that I have put together and will take the contributors and the collaborators with more expertise than me in the film expertise in music and film‑making to produce a finished result that I think that the projects deserves. The paintings that I show you are on display at the Zabludowicz Collection all together and the Zabludowicz Collection, if you don't know, it is a privately owned, public access museum in North London on the current John Moore's Painting Prize shortlist. I would like to point out that the research in my particular area has never been done before, to the best of my knowledge. Normally a when you do a PhD you make it more narrow to find something that has not been looked at but I can't and my supervisors have not been able to find anything at all about this, which is rather amazing! So, there is nothing that I can find to the best of my knowledge and furthermore, as you expect of anyone doing the research, the connections that I make are entirely new.

So, I want to offer you an opinion on one thing ... the animal in the image of the Lamb of God and the animal in the image of The Virgin Mary are ignored for a reason. That reason is connected with the devastation of the Earth, currently. Let me tell you how I came to believe this.

Firstly, the Lamb of God, up there ... it is everywhere and nowhere.

Florence, for example, where this is photographed, it is a city awash with the lamb. It is a centre of the renaissance wool trade evidence at every other street corner and building, put up as an embellishment but hardly noticed when you begin to notice you are not noticing it, it is on everywhere, pub signs, football shirts, everywhere and nowhere, and it hides in plain sight. I wondered why. It was funded by the chump and by guilds and merchants through the worth of wool using a connection with God as the powerful association and then more loaded with propaganda and political bias when given the national flag of whatever country it happened ending up in over the shoulder. That is very common. They call it is Pennant. Coming back to the earlier question about animals, the lamb is a sheep and sheep are everywhere but sheep are not just sheep, they are ewe, how often do you see a field of sheep and see a family group? Agriculture is just not like that. Now to the second image, The Virgin Mary. It is another promulgate by the Church. The wealth of the Church required her for many reasons to be exactly what her image shows us, not in my image but the classic image, animal, passive, docile, despite being Jesus' only parent according to the story, she is barely human. Never processed through the functions of sex, menstruation, aging or death and importantly and shockingly, she speaks four times in the Bible, only four times. So, the two images, the lamb and the woman who is Mary, are connected by more than just being two‑dimensional and unrealistic of the animals to which they refer. They also, crucially, share this ... the modern sheep is like Mary, remotely impregnated. The only subject of intimacy is with other chide, which she loses. In the case of the modern sheep, and they share another connection, they both occupy a place in Church music, the Agnus Dei, Lamb of God, is part of every cathedral, Catholic and Anglican and the Stabat Mater is a hymn for the Virgin Mary, where she weeps at the foot of the cross at the loss of her son and music, sound, version of the pieta.

Even if you are not religious, you will recognise the complex web of culture inherited power systems and species of exceptionalism of which we are a part, together with oi conical music and handed down through millennia and on pies our consciousness from birth to death.

I would also like to ask you to allow me to move you to something else unnoticed across the world ... something that happens specifically where sheep are farmed.

The following is from the poet, Ted Hughes, a Yorkshireman, the only other person I know who noticed this particular current, I'm sure others have but I have not come across others that wrote about it. He wrote, "Long ago, when searching for music on the radio, I came across the most appalling harrowing sound. Distorted by static, it sounded like one of the circles of Dante's Hell. The Swedish or Danish commentary did nothing to enlighten me, and years later, on a Welsh moor, I heard the sound again. Since then, I have heard it many times, and the last time I heard it I wrote it down".

What he is talking about is this: When ewes are sheered and returned to their lamb, the lambs do not recognise their mothers amongst the other shorn mothers. The mothers can't recognise their lambs because of the panic of the large group. They not only look different, they smell different. They need each other to survive, which is acute when on occasions in early sheering when the lambs are not yet on grass, so with the lamb, the farmer calls on the suck, so the atavistic connection between the mother and child is even more acute. Every parent in the audience who knows that feeling when they temporarily lose their child in public, suddenly, you go into a vocal shouting creature without pausing to think. This occurs for sheep, yearly, at least, on every farm, where sheep are kept for the 11,000 years, we have kept sheep. And Ted Hughes goes on to say, that the anguish for these goes on and on for about four to five hours depending on the size of the group, the reconciliation of finding one another and calming down. This is not an animal rights issue, suddenly the animals that I deal with on the farm that I work on, they are very well‑treated animals but it is important to notice this that otherwise docile, quiet animal, suddenly becomes a raging one and the connection here with Mary is like her at the foot of the cross, at the moment of her trauma, the very moment where she stops to become a mother at all, who is effaced as a mother and moves her to‑ing savagely vocal like ewes, the only time she is savagely vocal.

We are all animals. We are first animals, the pandemic showed us it is what connects us, actually, we ignore animal connections at our peril. Yet ignore them we do at ever greater speed. Women required to be mute, passive, invisible, means no education, menstruation taboo, human rights ignored. Consider this, 96% of the management of mammals on the planet today are us and the livestock we have domesticated. 96%. The sheep on the planet are currently almost 1.3 billion. They are required to be processed endlessly, even in the best circumstances to meet 21st century needs. Relentless mothering and relentless loss as well as the impact on the environment, the consumption, it now threatens directly our own future. My project will set, using the film with a common farm scene, using that animal sound, recorded three times from the Ted Hughes, to the first two, combined with a special piece of music, to form the anthem "Lament", I propose for it to sit in the canon, between the Agnus Dei, the piece of music sung in cathedrals up and down in the world every day, and the Stabat Mater, inserted between the two to give voice to the animal that is Mary and the mother that is a ewe to make the moment for both, explicit. I hope it can join the chorus of those around the world clamouring to be heard. So I will show you the film that I have thrown together. I am not a film‑maker but a painter. But I will show you the film that I am making here and to give background, there is Ted Hughes speaking at the beginning. And there is a small part of had is poem and at the end, the composer that I have been working with, a piece of his contemporary, Stabat Mater, our piece of music will be different but I have a bit of his Stabat Mater and we are working with astonishing counter tenor, Andres Schul, who some of you may know.

[Film]

NELL: Behind the hedge, the war of sheep is like a battlefield in the evening when the fighting is over and the cold begins and the due falls, and bowed women move with water. Mother, mother, mother, the lambs are crying. The mothers are crying. Nothing can resist that probe, that cry of the lamb for its mother or an ewe crying for its lamb. The lambs cannot find their mothers among the shorn strangers.

¶ Stabat Mater

NELL: I am not religious. I'm not an environmentalist. I'm not an animal rights campaigner. I'm not a scientist. I'm not even a vegetarian. I don't know the statistics like others on my panel will and earlier panels. I'm an artist. Art is an instrument of war.

Statistics are one thing but art can move people to care. Art makes the particular universal in the way that other things can't. It's what artists do and it's what our research does particularly well. As we've heard others say, sustainability isn't a choice; it's a fact. We're all in this together but we can make ourselves worthy of our times. We differ and those differences matter. This project seeks to ground the materially grounded differential. I passionately believe we need to find a position that doesn't vilify, the male, the European, the human, but instead to activate multiple ways of constructing transdisciplinary community, moving towards a rise onlyic relational, collaborative, on the logical subject, a place where different voices can be heard. Thank you.

>> Thank you, Nell. Any immediate questions now?

NELL: Oh, God.

FLOOR: Hi, that was amazing, thank you, Nell. I think there's a human recognition of the human face. Somebody decided that animals could have the same effect. It gave you an ethical imperative. It strikes me what you've done is to work against that and say the cry works exactly and you made the analogy as it would if you lost your child, so thank you.

FLOOR: Thanks, that was brilliant. I think what is unifying the conversation so far today for me is this idea of storytelling. It's let me think of Abatash Ghosh and what he was talking about with colonisation and removing the stories.

NELL: What was the name?

FLOOR: Abatash Ghosh. If you take the story away from the land, you have a right to exploit it. That's what the colonialists did and by doing that everything was distracted. I think you're playing around with these ideas, they're very, very powerful.

FRANCINE: Right. Thank you very much for now. So the next speaker is Robin Maynard, who more than 30 years has been studying the environment and the effect of humanity upon it.

ROBIN: Thank you, Francine. Follow that, if you dare! Follow that, I must. I was almost close to tears and she's what should happen when you hear those stories. We are all animals. Some of us as we have heard and seen, some of us and some genders and some sectors or some species are more equalled than others. I came in at the end of the session this morning and apologies for not being there right at the beginning. I could hear people talking and as both Jennie and Nell have just powerfully said, now the inequalities and the injustices, the domestic nation of the earth of other species, other peoples, other groups and other genders by our own species, which is like a power base, be those political, corporate or religious, sometimes they're working together, sometimes they're working individually but they always have a common goal, it's as that question there, shaping or controlling the narrative. So religious establishments in particular ‑‑ I rather love the Stabat Mater, I love the music, and I'm not religious but it does something for me. But what a mawkish sentimental image it is and what an odds with reality, there's Christ bleeding on the cross. The restrictions and the controls and the taboos that religious establishments and others impose upon their flocks. Yes, I kindly work for population matters, it's a charity and we are concerned with the impact of ongoing human population growth and overconsumption and there are many nuances and injustices and disparities and inequalities in that simple sentence. But girls and women's rights and choice are at the heart of everything we do and our work. This, my T‑shirt, was designed by a wonderful group we work with in Kenya, in an informal settlement, or slum called Kabira on the edge of Nairobi, it is the biggest informal settlement in Kenya and the biggest and informal settlement in Africa. We work with people who want to turn their lives around. They now have an environmental group and they're promoting women's rights and family planning. They designed us and put it up on the corrugated sheeting on the shacks in that centre. It is one of the proudest moments when I saw our logo doing good in that place.

But before returning to the really positive things, which was my brief, I promise you, don't talk about negative things, Robin, talk about the positives, talk about solutions. I think we have to talk about some of the negatives, because yes, girls' and women's rights and choice are absolutely at the heart of our work and they are solutions but they're not the reality for hundreds of millions of girls and women and boys and men globally. So, this first slide, I don't need to read out all of the facts, I've seen it up there, there are many, many things which should be sorted out which haven't been sorted out and we've been talking about it for decades and I heard some of the panel this morning saying, you know, this incremental change, this lack of progress this talking about the same problems but not actually changing the system or the dynamic.

Now, look at me, what a worthy man I am, I'm wearing my Sustainable Developmental Goal badge. I bet you have seen them on the lapels of politicians of all nations. I was at the UN recently and it was almost a badge of honour. I sort of put it on almost as a joke because we have not in a cat in hell's chance of achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. These are 17 generally good things that the United Nations want to see happen by 2030, that's just seven years’ time. By the UN's own admission, it is very unlikely any will be achieved in time.

Yes, we have a new initiative, a new summit of the future initiative to try and make take that progress forward, I rather forget we have missed the timeline that was set. Particularly on SDG5 which is gender inequality, on current progress, SDG5 won't be achieved until 2108, that's another 85 years, that's the UN's latest calculation. One third of all women in low to middle income countries give birth under the age of 19. I have an 18‑year‑old daughter. That's children giving birth to children. It is a lot younger in many cases. These are the statistics that burden my life and others with on a daily basis. 270 million women around the world have an unmet need or lack of choice over safe modern family planning. I'm sorry to say this but looking at those visceral images that Nell put up and I hope you won't take this as not a compliment but they're Baconian in their visceral in their fleshiness and bloodiness. 80% of girls in Egypt, where I taught, I taught as an English teacher, for a year and a half and I taught many of these girls, 80% of the girls there suffer FGM, that is they have part of their clitoris cut off. I'm really sorry to surface these inconvenient truths. They are grim facts and yes, the brief was to be positive, so I will come on to the solutions because the solutions, the positives are so simple, so off yourselves, so cheap, so effective and they rely on tried and tested and available technology, so it's really hard to understand why they're still out of reach to so many hundreds of millions of girls and women around the world. It's simple, it's 12 years of quality education for all girls and all boys. It's access to choice, of contraception so women have autonomy and agency over their own bodies and their fertility. Simple.

It wouldn't cost a lot of money, 264 billion, it sounds quite a lot of money, $264 billion would sort out those problems over the next 30 years. That's less than the combined personal fortunes of Elon Musk and Jeff Bezos, they could resolve that gender inequality, end those barbaric practices like FGM in a positive way, meet global unmet need for contraceptive choice for 2030, yet what do those ageing space cowboys do? They strap themselves into enormous metal phalluses and trust themselves into the lifeless empty void of space looking for new worlds. I have a word for them. It's not very polite, but I think they're pricks. So, we don't really need new shiny expensive high-tech toys for billionaires, we just need to deliver the tried, tested and known solutions to those most in need.

Perhaps it's better to hear this rather than from middle‑aged old white man like me that has worked for 38 years in the environment movement and clearly not succeeded in my brief but better to hear it from somebody with the greatest legitimacy, this is Malala, who was shot in the head for having the temerity of wanting to go to school. She knows that education and family planning bring multiple benefits for those individual girls and women, their families and their communities and their countries. But they also bring enormous benefits to the environment. They reduce the impact on people's local environment biodiversity and natural resources and they have a significant impact because of the unplanned pregnancies and the births that were not wanted and were not able to be supported, because of those avoided births, they've a significant impact on climate change. It is not an easy thing to say, nobody is saying instrumentalise women's bodies to fight climate change, but no‑one should ignore the benefits of giving people their basic fundamental rights and the further rights that brings to our Mother Earth.

In hard facts, this slide is based on a very interesting research project killed Project Drawdown, their only brief was to look at the top available solutions for climate change that could be deployed now the top 100, about 99 they looked at. These are the top five. Number three is family planning and education, that would cut, reduce carbon dioxide over the next 30 years by more than all onshore and offshore wind power combined. But despite those good and those benefits, individually and collectively and planetarily of deploying those available solutions, we're not doing it. There are 8 billion souls on this planet and counting. But there are more than half a dozen countries that have pro‑natalist policies where childbearing is promoted and access to family planning and abortion is restricted. This is largely due to unfounded fears of economic decline. What do you hear on the news every day it is always about growth, growth, growth. Growth has is what has got us into this bloody mess. Why are we carrying on? Why don't we have a different paradigm? It suits those people with the vested interests we have heard about. It is not often just fierce of economic decline but some pretty nasty nationalism, as you hear from Hungary. The declining population will not be solved by people who desperately need better lives from elsewhere, it will only be solved by new little Hungarians of the right colour, creed and race, that's the sort of nationalism we are seeing rising across Europe and also in the United States. Women's bodies are being instrumentalised to increase more consumers, more taxpayers, more pension payers, cheap labour, soldiers and souls to shore up the capitalist, military, religious order and their power. We refer to ‑‑ Nell used that absolutely accurate statistic ‑‑ in terms. Weight of mammals on the Earth, we call this, scientists call this era the Anthropocene because we're the dominant species. There are more chickens in Europe than there are wild birds. Nell, you know, beautifully brought this out through her art and that very, very moving film but there are very uncomfortable parallels between the restriction of women's rights, the sanitising and obscuring of their reality, their denial of choice and rights and that of other species. In terms of sheer numbers, sheep and cattle and pigs and chickens are incredibly successful. But that's because they are useful to us. They have been selected and bred, they've been altered and engineered for the traits we humans prize. In China, there are units, they call this concentrated animal feeding operations, 25 to 50‑storey pig units, where pigs are medicated, mutilated and slaughtered for our consumption. I would say there are plenty, not men tip, but there are humane, compassionate ethical farming and what I would call good husbandry systems but they're not the majority. For the other species not useful to us, they're in decline. There's been a 69% average decline in wild animal populations over the past 50 to 670 years, everyone we are driving the sixth mass restriction of life on Earth. We're going to be if we're not careful a very lonely ape on this planet with a tapestry of life, rent and reduced to its, you know, bare bones.

Now, I think I have bored you to death with points, but I'm going to put horrible statistics up. I feel like I was the sort of cheese, the vegan cheese in the sandwich between Jennie and Nell and I know I will be followed by an excellent presentation. Everyone knows that vegan cheese is no substitute for the real thing! We try through our formal art; we try as a campaigner. This is our statue Big Foot. He is based on a human male. He's looking down in perplexity, in a slight perplexity at his oversized foot which has squashed biodiversity. Some people might think it is offensive because he's actually made up a matrix of little baby blankets welded together. I have never, when we have taken him out into a public space found anybody offended by him.

Indeed, not this young girl here, but at another event a young girl lay down beside him and the globe and spent half an hour talking to all of the animals and talking to the Earth, Mother Earth, it was just so beautiful and insensitive.

Our other prop is this fellow who I sometimes think is a baby Boris Johnson or Donald Trump. Take your pick of bloated narcissistic egotistical, et cetera, fill in your words. And what he's trying to, he is sort of like, what is my problem. His problem is particularly for us in the Global North, our footprint is disproportionate. You know, if we were the true size as human beings on Earth compared to all of our fellows, in the UK we would be ten King Kongs. In the US, would be 50‑tonnes, stomping across the countryside, gobbling everything we can, nicking everybody else's resources, bringing them in and living pretty good lives off the fat of the land. The real challenge ‑‑ and I haven't heard it and yet, nobody wants to give up their good life. There was a recent survey of the general public what was needed if we were going to achieve climate change, we need to have an income no greater than that of the average Ghanaian, at the very best. But that's, like, you know, I don't know $24,000 or something. The majority of people in this country will not give up their lifestyles or their qualities of life. We have to communicate a new form of wellness if we are going to enable people to empathise with everybody not just their immediate family, not just their immediate country but this one wonderful world we live in.

My final world before I go. The one huge benefit of space travel was showing us our one blue green planet hanging there in that void of space, like a beautiful blue green pearl. We finally got this understanding of this one vulnerable living planet in the known universe. Thank you. [Applause]

FRANCINE: Thank you, Robin. Any questions immediately nor Robin?

FLOOR: Without meaning to be too logistical, I'm wondering how funding is made accessible to the people who need it. You've spoke about if Jeff Bezos and whoever actually chose to put their money in the right place and things could be done, but how does one go about that? Isn't that part of the problem?

ROBIN: Yes, well, there's lots of ways. We have small programmes where we work with grass‑roots projects. We never jump in. We always work with grass‑roots partner organisations wherever they are. By the way we have partner organisations in the English Midlands where there's a high incidence of teenage pregnancy because industry was gutted and nothing's put back in its place so you have social disruption.

But governments, the UN are trying to promote those programmes. A bad example is our own Government, we cut our overseas aid under the last administration and, actually, we have a reasonably, we do have a well‑informed minister of state in Andrew Mitchell who understand the issues and actually cares about them but he has not managed to get overseas aid increased to 0.7% of Gross National Product, let alone 1%. If we want to see a more equitable world this is a really difficult issue, but, you know, you see these interesting policies around migration, we haven't seen anything in terms of migration because of what's coming in terms of climate change, which is going to affect, as Jennie said earlier, and others have said, the poorest most vulnerable societies in the world. Where are they going to go? So, we should be pouring money into those countries to enable them to be more climate resilient, to be able to prepare themselves for what's coming and to be able to develop an appropriate method. What we're dealing with closing ourselves back. I fear we're going to see right‑wing governments all over Europe because of what's to come. We should be pouring money in is what I'm saying and we're not. I'm sorry, I'm not Jeff Bezos to give my fortune away.

FRANCINE: Thank you. We're going to press on. Thank you. Our next speaker is Dr Emily Doolittle, who is a composer. You have worked in both North America and the United Kingdom as well.

EMILY: I explore the relationship between human music and animal songs. Today, I will play three of my pieces which explore different overlaps of human music and animal song. The first of these points I want to look at is the use of patterns. I'm looking at animals, they tend to balance the use of repetitions or patterns with variety or surprise. A certain amount of predictability is essential for the listener to know which piece, individual or species they are listening to. But if something is too repetitive the listener will get bored and stop listening.

Here's the song of one of my favourite North American birds, the hermit thrush which uses patterns at many levels. Here's the song in its entirety.

So, as you can hear, the song alternates between a short song and a slightly longer silence but that's not the only level of patterning there is. The songs typically alternate between songs with a higher starting pitch and a loafer starting pitch, you can see it on this spectrogram here where the higher markings are higher frequencies. They also tend to go in an approximate sequential order. It's not exact, but each hermit thrush sings 6 to 12 of these distinctive songs, they may share a few songs with a neighbouring bird but no two birds sing exactly the same sequence of songs. Individuals are thus identifiable within the species. They follow a particular pattern, they all start about a long note that's called an introductory whistle and then it's followed by two or occasionally three phrasing of shorter pitches, slides, trills, and noisy sounds and so on. The songs are quite fast so they're hard for us to process. Birds process sound much faster than I do. I will play a recording of this song full speed and then slow it down so you can hear more and more of the detail.

That's all the same song. When the birds are hearing that, they are hearing that detail that we can only hear if we slow it down. If you listen to a lot of their songs, there's a similar style between the songs and some of them also sound surprisingly like human music. There are some that sound like little bugle songs, for example. The reason for that is that 70% of their songs are based on the relationships between pitches that you finds in the overturned series, I won't go into a long musical explanation there, but the overtone series is sort of a series of sounds that you hear from you divide a vibrating string or column of air at different lengths, you hear the sound octave in and a fifth up, two octaves up and so on, and lots of different human music incorporate the overtone series in various ways and so do hermit thrush songs. I will share some more with you because I love the hermit thrush songs. I had three but that was taking up too much time.

So, I've been studying retro song since 207 through a variety of ways, in interdisciplinary collaboration with scientists and looking at a cultural history of how people write about animal song and hermit thrush specific, people through all kinds of cultural and historical baggage, when they think that they are describing what they are hearing but they are strike their own prejudices and assumptions about what a bird would sing, what music it would sound like and so on, I would say it is the animal sound I know best. The next piece, it is not a transcription but the song I spent the most time with, this piece is about 3.5 minutes.

Hermit thrush song does not tend to vary but they do take liberty with how many times they repeat something, with sometimes phrases that may be included or left out, so I gave the flautist that same degree of freedom in the performance of the piece.

Can you turn this up a little bit?

[FILM]

I'm going to stop there as I'm going overtime. The next thing to discuss is context. Animal songs like music occur in context. For example, a human lullaby and human sports song or National Anthem sound different, like the song that the birds sing to young in the nest and to the territorial call that will sound different. Gannets are large seabirds that nest in sea cliff colonies with tens of thousands of birds called gantries, most of which are in the UK. The guttural clapping sounds to gantry are overwhelming to the human listener but gannets themselves recognise the calls, and the calls are distinguishable in amongst the ocean, the elements and other bird species. Here is an example.

[FILM]

I love that sound; I know it is not to everyone's taste.

So the next piece I wanted to play for you is based on the sounds of a gantry, it was written in collaboration with the poet Dawn Wood, so when I play the piece, she is reading her poetry at the same time and I also wrote for Jo Nicholson, everything you hear in the piece is Jo Nicholson playing clarinet and another musician, Ellie Cherry, who recorded and looped it, it may sound like an electrical piece but it is all clarinet sounds. And in the last piece I showed you I wanted to specify pitches and rhythms with traditional Western music notation but in this case, I had an idea of textures and the overlaps of different calls but didn't want to specify how the clarinettist would play it, in fact you can play it on almost any instrument. I wanted to do something visual and let them interpret that visual in the way that they wanted. What amazed semi‑that the performance sounded exactly the way imagined or hoped it would, even though this is what the clarinettist had for her score. I will play 5 minutes of the piece but it is longer than that but you can hear it elsewhere.

Gannet's rock. Fate whisper to the warrior, you cannot withstand the storm. The warrior whispers back "I am the storm".

Maybe at birth, I was a boat, setting sail on the sea of the waves that happened to me.

Or maybe I was the wave itself, connected with all the water there is.

And I could aim for that rock over there and see what the weather brings my way.

There used to be shamans who worked with the wind.

They would carefully gather it all into knots and you could pay them for a string and you would undo the knots at sea to brace yourself, to get your breath on your crest of a wave of the shocking nerves that you will withstand ... you are the wave.

You tell yourself that there is no calm in the unexpectedness of rain. Though the randomness of where and when a drop might fall has been described in an equation, here and there.

Since nothing ever comes from nowhere, there is no sound without a source.

The circling seabirds contain their prove, the way that knot can store the wiped. The puffins, the cormorants, the herons, the gulls, all fulfilling the energy, investing it and release and then…

Gem‑lit eyes make up the rock.

Clapping pre‑historic beats of gannets, scared by a modicum of space, before they plunge through you, the wave.

So, I will move on to the last point of overlap to discussion. Communication. I don't mean communication in the sense of transmitting information, we usually use language for that, animals use various vocal, chemical physical means but communication in the sense of sharing an emotional state, acknowledging self and others and saying who we are and what group we are a part of.

This is common across species for example in group wolf holes, each fits the hole into the group in a way that co‑insides, it is raw within the group [sic] but it enables communication with other species. I will end with a short recording of a practice that I developed with my dog, Idris Donut, during lockdown, we developed a practice of holing and playing oboe together. He was holing, I was playing oboe. I have a 90‑second clip, you will notice it is another form of notation, a process piece, I have heard of another version where it says that you can substitute another instrument, and another dog as well! But this is how we developed our practice. I will end with a short video clip of me and oboist friend, Kirsten Cooke, playing with my Idris Donut, and I wanted to mention that there is a crate there but the door is always open, he is always free to come and go. I notice when I play the oboe, sometimes he comes and holes with me, and sometimes not, that is fine, it is a voluntary activity for both of us!

[laughter]

This is about 1.30 seconds, and he has an amazing sense of exchange. He listening, comes in, goes through the pitches, comes in after we do, stops after we stop. And I know it is fun and silly but I also found it surprisingly moving.

[FILM]

[Laughter]

Good dog! Thank you.

[Applause]

FRANCINE: That is wonderful. I will invite us all up for the group wolf hole in a moment. Before we do, any questions for Emily? Oh, masses!

FLOOR: I just wanted to say, thank you, that was such an eye‑opener to me, in fact this entire panel, each one of the four speakers, it has been a very, very emotional panel. I'm sure everyone in the room feels this, incredible to witness. Emily, listening to birds you have given me a whole new dimension when I am out in the country this weekend, and definitely to dogs but have you ever been deep under the ocean?

EMILY: No, I have not. I am interested in others making those recordings but I'm claustrophobic enough to go under the ocean, it will be of an interest to me.

FLOOR: Have you worked with whales?

EMILY: Not personally, I have a doctoral student graduating soon, Alex South looking at humpback whale song from a musical and biological perspective, so co‑supervising two biologists at St Andrew's University.

FLOOR: We have been thinking a lot at my company of the sensory experience of being outdoors and having your kit not interact negatively with you and with the environment around you but I wonder about the communication that you have with birds, can we positively interact to incorporate it into our experience?

EMILY: Yes ... I will speak as myself, not as a biologist, which I am not, personally, I think that some animals are curious about us and interested in interacting with us.

I think it can be easy to misinterpret things for example if we go outside and play music, maybe a bird will start singing and it is a little too easy for us to think that the bird likes that, unless you know more about that bird and realise it is singing its alarm song or telling us to go away but I think that animals can be curious about us for example grey seals will hole when we sing, I feel okay about singing on a beach to see if the see whale will respond, sometimes to come closer, I don't think it is ethical to pursue them or put them in an area where they cannot get away. I personally think it is a genuine interaction. There can be ethical issues based on animal song, and I don't have a definitive answer but something that makes me think, maybe if we are careful, if it is okay, is that there are lots of animals that imitate human sounds. So, looking for some kind of mutuality even though I only recognise my own part of it. Prance France I am going to invite all of the panellists to come and sit down. If you would like to come and have a seat. Thank you so much.

So, I suppose what it will be good to do is to find out, including you as well, if you feel items that you may have feel were raised by the presentations which are all different in approaches but there are themes running through those. Perhaps it is good to identify some of those. Who would like to contribute first of all?

okay! So ...

FLOOR: I was interested, it cropped up with several of the talks, really, how much the context needs to be known in order to experience any of the underpinning meanings of the work if that is the ... do you know, do you need o to know what a thrush sounds like to understand your song? Do we need to have heard the ewe and the lamb to understand some of your paintings? Do we need to experience the kind of oppression you have talk ... what does it mean if you are not an audience who is already aware of some of the issues spoken of. I am going back to my session, is it only understandable to people who already understand something of what you are doing?

>> I think it is helpful ... yes, that is true but at the same time, I think what some of us were trying to get at is an emotional connection, which I guess that you can do on a visceral level.

FRANCINE: I would hope that in some cases, some people may like my music, some may not, that is okay but for those who find it interesting, I hope that they are interested in the abstract but through that, perhaps they are curious about where it comes from, perhaps they learn more about the hermit thrush or they learn more about whippets or, I don't know! So, I would be perfectly happy if somebody heard it with no idea what it was about and what interested in it in itself but it can be a way into more knowledge. I think there is a very small community of people out there obsessed with hermit thrushes! And it is nice ... [Laughter]

... when I get to present my research to people who know what I am talking about but it is not my only audience.

>> Something that I wanted to say to you, Robin, to discuss with you, you were talking about injections of funding that can change this and so on. What I find if my research, why I brought up the power systems around religion is that it is not always about the money. You can have all the agency going but you will not be allowed to access that group of people, FGM goes on behind closed doors. I don't know how you begin to unpick those things.

ROBIN: I certainly don't think it is own about the money.

I also think you must be careful that, you know the danger is, that the experts know something and they have been somewhere and they are the only ones that can speak about it, yes, of course you need to be the messages of the Earth I thought that the great invention ever, as you have, Emily, to a degree, if we could really hear what animals are saying we would be incredibly humbled when the day comes. I got into the environment as I was young enough to see the Greenpeace rubber dinghies going out in front of the whales. I had never seen a whale, I had seen a killer whale in the distance off Scotland but never seen any of the great whales but I can emphasis, and we can be hard on Homo sapiens, to say, look at us ... but we can empathise and put ourselves in positions and to be aware of what is going on in other parts of the world. So, I think that is a capacity for empathy is there. Maybe that goes back, I only caught the end of that restorative justice piece, which is hard on the particular individual, the white supremacist guy and the apartheid guy but the capacity for empathy, it is probably our most powerful tool to change things. That is a personal view.

>> I wanted to jump in to connect back to the idea that it is about money.

JENNIE: How much suffering and loneliness and unhealthiness, and negative things that are in the spaces where there is a lot of financial resources, as well. So, I think there is, and this financialisaton of everything ... and the assumption and actually, I was going to gently challenge you, when you said you know people don't want to give up, right? So much environmentalism is framed as a sacrifice. We have to sacrifice, where it is the other way around. We are actually un‑disconnected, unhealthy, lonely, mental health crises ... and you know, we are not doing well, right? In the places where we think we are doing well and that other places are not doing well and they should be more like us. Where it is actually potentially the other way around. Even ... so, I think that we again part of the reframing is thinking about wellbeing which includes this relational connectivity that we are all talking about in different ways.

But again, so many of our systems and structures and disconnect, and reinforcing of this disconnection, it is a part of what this ... I really, why I really appreciated being a part of this discussion and presentation.

FRANCINE: Taking us from the intractable problem that we have, moving at the great speed and we need a solution. If it can be in some way presented as an improvement for everybody's ... it is not going to happen, it is not a marketing trick to do in 6 months. I am interested in how the art is the work of the fore, and [inaudible] how do you bring the two things closer together. Can you see the practical ways in which it can come together.

EMILY: I never tire from the example you feel suicidal on a rubbish day, can scream and say, yes, that is how I feel. And at that basic level, it is one of the things that make you feel connected in that way. I have a question for Nicolas, is that okay? If there is a mic around. I have a question, I, in research my talk discovered that nearly 1.3 billion sheep in the world, that there were nearly 1.3 billion sheep in the world. I didn't know it was the case, I didn't know that they were the oldest farmed animal, from southern Syria, 11,000 years, almost from the time we became hunter gatherers, I have done a sheep shearing session with my lovely door at the time farmer recently. I asked how the wool collection went. That he sold it and bagged it up and lots of the pictures and the paintings were done with the body didaction with the shearers, I asked how the sales went. He told me what he got for the whole lot and I think that they sheared 450. I thought, really? What is that per fleece? He said 17 pence per fleece! He went on to explain how he loses money as it is, you can imagine to get at that point, so my question to you as you happen to be somebody that works with wool a lot, I don't expect you to be an expert but what happens to the 1.3 billion sheep if they are not used for wool? Are they eaten?

NICHOLAS: Now I feel bad because of the crying of the sheep. And I have seen sheep being sheared. And they felt pretty happy about that, it was a relief as it is summer, so a different circumstance. Now, the wool price, it is the same in Switzerland, 50 cents per kilogram. We are not buying wool as such in this business. It was actually burnt in Switzerland, the wool from the farmers as there was no value for it. Now, there is this German gentleman, who is buying this at 50 cents to do with the wool that is developed with him as we can use the wool that is of a bad quality, as such for clothing as these are not merino sheep, which is a specific species. And you don't find merino sheep, it is originally from Spain but the Merinos are in New Zealand, Australia, southern Africa and southern America, but mostly Australia, that is where the wool has value, as the yarn is thinner, going down to 50 microns a day, and we have another, it is what we can wear on the skin, so it has different properties.

EMILY: So, the 1.3 billion is largely for eating, rather than anything else?

NICHOLAS: Yes, most of the sheep is Merino.

EMILY: I say that most of the sheep on the planet we eat.

NICHOLAS: Yes, as it has little or no value.

>> And it is incredible, wool, there were a group of academics at MIT, mite meaning that most of the main products in civilised society, that we should use less of them. I mean my mobile phone is now the size of a biscuit, it was the size of a brick but they found that everything has gone up in use as people wanted more stuff as, partly like Apple encourage you to upgrade every year, so it is built into the marketing plan. The products that went down in use, were asbestos, radioactive ICO type, some pesticides and wool, and that is a natural, it is, I think it is called the [inaudible] paradox, a Victorian engineer who could not understand why we were using more coal, when there was cheaper fuel. So big systems to change. I am with you being optimistic, to not keep putting out negative notions, because I think that the article will change and the notion of moving from GDP to wellbeing, and this wonderful thing called the happiness index and some of the happiest people in the world, are on economic standard measurements, are the poorest, so Costa Rica is one of the happiest places in the world, where the average capita GDP is $20. Ours on the other hand is not so happy and we are taking X, Y, Z. So Costa Rica is a great example of a country that turned around its deforestation, so positive examples that one should hold on to try to lift up. Absolutely. Absolutely.

FLOOR: More on education rather than military.

FRANCINE: We're pretty much out of time, but if there are any more questions that anyone would like to bring in at this point, about this crucial leverage between art ...? No. Everybody is eager for tea! Any further thoughts from the panel? No. Well, all I can do is thank you for your questions. Thank you, all of you, for your amazing presentations. Really so varied and so committed and lively and wonderful. It's been a terrific session. [Applause]

[Break]

PANEL 4

1630 ND.

PRATAP: A warm welcome back everybody. What an amazing rich day and now we have a real treat for you in our final session called Feeling Our Way based on Professor Sonia Boyce's Venice Biennale Golden Lion award‑winning piece, Feeling Our Way. That's going to be the focus of the session. I just want to do a little bit of bio, say something about structure and then we'll be over to Sonia. Many of us will know and love Sonia as a colleague over a considerable period of time but I know we have some new guests to UAL who are very welcome, so I will read her full bio.

Sonia Boyce OBE RBA has been Professor of Black Art at University of the Arts London since 2013. She led a three‑year research project into Black artists and modernism, which led to a BBC documentary, "Whoever heard of a Black artist? Britain's hidden art history". In 2022, Sonia represented the UK at the 59th Venice Biennale for Feeling Our Way, for which she was awarded the Golden Lion! [Cheering]

I'm so glad you did that! I was really lucky to be standing with ... I mean it was like a cast of some of the most significant artists in ... waiting for the speech to open at the pavilion, I've not had that experience before, where in the communities of artists around Sonia there was such a strong sense that a collective story was being witnessed and understood. I just think the response to her work speaks so deeply of the way that you conduct yourself and the meaning of the quality you art. Sorry, I didn't want to embarrass you, I will go back to the official bio!

We are so very pleased that Sonia is with us at the University of the Arts London. I will carry on with the credits. Sonia received an OBE and was elected as a Royal Academician. Recent exhibitions include Feeling Our Way at the British Pavilion, Venice, Italy, touring to the Turner Contemporary and the leads art gallery. I will refer you to the programme for the more extensive list of the many places that it's gone. Her work is held in the collections of Tate London, Victoria and Albert Museum, the Arts Council collection, Government art collection, British Council collection and so on. She's then going to, after her presentation, we will then hear from Tanita Tikaram, we'll then do that in a discussion. Tanita, many of ups will know from bursting on to top of the pops sets in the 1988 with ancient art and twist in my sobriety, which has probably followed you all of the way around the planet, Tanita of she's a very original and respected songwriter, musician, artist, touring artist. She's not going to make a personal presentation but she's going to spontaneously respond to what happens in the discussion. That was important and I think it comes from a different philosophy. Lots of us prepare these conversations and kind of thread through and find the way we're going to do it and hopefully that gives you a certain flow and there's another school and I have come across this in a different film‑making process, where people say they don't want to do any of that and they just want to be there and what emerges and that's the significance. I'm so glad you have taken that approach because that's so key, it's an important aspect of the way that son's developed her own methodology. Thank you so much. Professor Sonia Boyce. [Applause]

SONIA: Thank you. Thanks for the invitation, Pratap, Oriana, Lynn, I know you have worked massively behind the scenes to get all of this day prepared and had lots of conversations with lots of people.

I was just explaining under my breath to Tanita that one makes a work that then in this kind of context, one has to explain what one's been doing. So, this is an attempt, you could say, to explain what I've been doing. Sound is porous. It has the capacity to connect us collectively and singularly. This is better articulated by writer and sound artist Brandon La Bell and he states, "Sound is intrinsically and ignorably relational. It emanates, propagates, communication, vibrates and agitates, it leaves the body and enters others. It binds and unhinges harmonises and traumatises. It sends the bodies moving, the mind dreaming, the air oscillating. It seemingly alludes definition while having profound effect. Sound art as a practice harnessing, describes, analyses, performs, and interrogates the conditional sound and the processes by which it operates. For it teaches is that space is more than its apparent materiality. That knowledge is festive, alive as a chorus of crises and to preview and receive sound is to be involved in connections that make privacy intensely public and public experience distinctly personal."

How can such an ephemeral medium like speech, talking, song, the voice become material for an artwork? As an artist that works with the performative responses of others using the power of language in its many forms to effect change, I'm rarely the figure on due in the artworks. Instead, role when the action unfolds is quite often hidden. I work with a team to bring team together in a specific place and at a specific time, a film crew with the sound recordist and stills photographer is present. They are there to record what takes place. Once everyone is assembled, I don't direct what happens. I ask others to engage without a script or rehearsal. This is as true of the crew as much of the performative contributors. I ask others to respond spontaneously in their own way with the skills available to them. The simplest example of this is a conversation. We all know what a conversation consists of and we are usually happy to go with the flow in that dialogic process. Being in the moment while potentially liberating is also terrifying when one knows it's going to be documented.

What if? Do I know how to? Am I supposed to respond? In addition, often the people I bring together have never met before. The anxiety of whether someone is meeting a potential friend or foe sits under surface of these encounters. To do all of these feelings are, of course, quite legitimate, I'm asking all the contributors to go into an unknown situation which can potentially have an impact on their reputations given the very public nature of these outcomes. Almost as soon as I was invited to make a new work by the British Council for the 59th Venice bee annal we were all put into the various chaos and lockdowns of COVID‑19. The art did prove a challenge. I stied to return to a project I had been working on in an iterative fashion for over 20 years, the devotional project which I will talk about a bit more later. The main thing about devotional it relies on collective, historical knowledge about Black women in the British music industry. Having created an archive of memorabilia of various performers I wanted a new commission to feature the voices of singers who might be prepared to go on a sonic journey of discovery with each other.

I drew up a list and got in contact with their agents, booked Abbey Road Studios, the iconic home of music and we all gathered for one day. Erin Wallen is a classically trained composer for voice. She was the last person to sign up to the project after Sophia, a vocalist, was unable to join the session due to COVID travel restrictions. Of the selected singers, Sophia is the only performer to have experienced an improvisational singing, something I had asked the performers whether they would be prepared to do. At a Zoom session prior to the day, she went some way to trying to alleviate the concerns of the other performers. Erin after a ten‑minute phone call with me said she wanted to guide the singers through a series of warm‑up exercises and would see where it would go from there.

I came across Jacqui Dankworth watching a programme about her mother, Cleo Lane and her father Johnny Dankworth in which she appeared and sang. Cleo and Johnny were the king and queen of the 1950s jazz scene in the UK. Jacqui has a phenomenal vocal range yet like the other singers was apprehensive about what would be enquired. Popia is the youngest singers, emerging from R'n'B and soul. Most people I have met who have experienced in a way mentioned Tanita Tikaram, who was involved in the project. Tanita and Natasha, I'm really pleased you are able to join us today. I had to admit I was a bit starstruck that you had agreed to go on this journey.

And, of course, I remain astonished at how much Tanita and all of the performers embraced the fullness of being in the moment. So, I want to show you first encounter between the performers. This is the first 20 minutes when they first met which formed the central part of Feeling Our Way. One of the questions that had been levied at me over the years, prior to this particular project, is, "If the performances are not directed or authored by me, with whom does the creative or artistic act lie?" I like to think of the creative impulse as something that is passed around like relay.

[FILM]

>>: I want to imagine your huge bell, that's the image I want to have of you when you sing but for you to start your voice low as you can and to glide up as high as you can.

Imagine yourself as a bell, try it one at a time and then all together.

>> Beautiful, now we're going to do it all together but as deep as we can to start with and, actually, as high, so don't worry about making a nice sound at the top, as high physically as you can go. It will be slower. So, let's start. Altogether, slow, drawn out but go high.

Try again but very strong this time. Really strong. Don't try and think about making a nice note. And hold the note at the top and strong and crescendo, get loud if you can.

I want us to try something. Imagine you're a lion, a growl, a sound that is not, it is like from here. So, imagine you're lions!

>> We are lions!

>> You are lions, I know. But a sound that you wouldn't normally make singing. Imagine, you're trapped in a corner but you're this massive ... argh. That's a good growl.

Now, the next thing, you can say this or sing it but you've got to say, "One, one, one, one, one, one, one." It is seven times. It is up to you if you are running out of joy or running because you're scared, in danger. That's all I want you to think about. Run, quickly seven times and then you can have a gap. You can say it, you can sing it.

>> That was fantastic. I will give you three words and these can sung in very definite rhythms. The words are, "I am queen." Those are your three words. Really think "queen".

[Applause]

SONIA: Underscore the emotional impact of the voice, by this I mean giving space for truthfulness of the voice and the power of testimony, I also want to mention a project I was conducting in tandem with the Venice project.

To underscore the emotional impact of the voice, to give truth and to the power of testimony, also to work in tandem with the Venice project. Yes, I Hear you was part of the Serpentine and programme including artists, Helen Cannock, Rory, Kilnen and Iona Cigar. My work looked at TikTok violence and social care. I conducted interviews with survivors and a perpetrator and facilitated workshops with professionals in social care. Most of the encounters took place over video Conference and calls as in the middle of lockdown.

A main consideration during the work was to operate the process of collecting testimony, to think being who was in a secure and a confident enough position to allow the experiences to be public.

Some of the people that I worked with were inevitably fragile from their experiences. These are the kind of issues that ethics within the field of research asks us to think about.

Again, I made a film, this was a small crew, a stills photographer and the four participants who wore body cameras in order to capture movements.

I'm going to show you now an excerpt from one of the four films by Jasmine Butterfly. No rehearsal all participants were asked to say something of the understanding of TikTok violence, here I give a warning as jasmine's testimony is deeply affecting.

JASMINE: She was basically in a domestic, abusive, violent relationship from the age of 18. She's 27 now. She has been my longest friend from 8 years old. She entered a relationship with her children's father at the age of 14. When she was 15, the relationship was just so toxic. We were just teenagers, you know when you are a teenager, you don't really know much about like relationships and how to be treated and stuff like that. She got pregnant at 15.

Had her first son, which is my God child. And the relationship, the relationship she was in was so toxic abusive. Like we was only teenagers, I remember he would lock her in the house for gays and abuse and beat her. Even as a friend he would just ... just not want us to be friends either, so it was affected, he was obviously affecting all of her relationships. There was one point I was probably about 19, 20. She was with him for a good couple of years. I was like okay, I feel he is going to kill my friend. I'm going to have a charity, I would name the charity after my friend, in remembrance of her as it was getting so bad. I remember when I went to her house, she had like this burn on her back. He had boiled the kettle and literally poured kettle water down her whole back ... I was like, something has got to give, you know but throughout the whole time she was with him, I had to be the supportive friend and empower her. So, yeah, see was in it for many years, thankful now, by God's grace she is not in that relationship. She has moved on, had another child and she is just getting herself back. We have such a strong sisterhood, we have both been through crazy relationships, as young, teenage mums.

But, yeah, I'm proud of us, how we have grown. And elevated and now have certain standards and boundaries in our lives to know that we are not going to get back into those kinds of relationships and have that exposure for our children. So, yeah!

One of the things I am asked regarding the performative works is which is the element of the process that I consider the artwork, the performance or the after math as the exhibit. There is a long‑standing discussion within the field of performance art about experiencing the performative moment first hand as if the documentation exists only as a secondary and poor relationship to that moment, cast aside as a relic. However, what happens if you were not there. My response to the question has been to extend the possibility of the moment and to use it as a springboard for further exploration.

It needs to be mentioned that when the performances are taking place, I try not to look through the camera. I want to experience them afresh, through the eyes of others, to come to the material, to figure out how I might play.

Considering the document, is the next stage in my methodology, here I mean, here, what I mean by that is understanding the process of engagement with others. Experience is what unfolds and encounters and then reflecting on the people and the material that is generated. Part of that consideration takes into account the site where the works are shown and what I believe I can develop in that space. Playing with print, including the creation of repeat patterns or wallpaper, the collage of sounds. Simply playing with material, seeing where it takes me.

The ten films in Feeling Her Way are colour‑tinted, here I make a reference to the artist aid ran Piper, central to the arts since the 1970s. Thinking of a work of her's, Coloured People, from 1991, taking the idea of colouring images of people as a culmination of the process of racialisation, with the relationship of colour applied, colour senior and people. I mentioned earlier, the Devotional company project, gathering the names of female performers given to me by the members of the public, it includes memorabilia, CDs, posters, cassettes and testimonies, I have played with what is a collection of memorabilia, wondering how to display the old memorabilia. The Venice Project afforded the opportunity to take the leap with some of my dormant impulses of geometric and abstract shapes. Gold, glitter and reflective surfaces, gave a certain joy and seemed appropriate.

I want to finish the presentation with a solo performance from Feeling Her Way, that of Tanita Tikaram. During the day at Abbey Road studios and after the morning session, each performer was invited to give a performance to the camera of whatever they wished from their weaponry. Noticing there was a piano in the studio, Tanita decided to pose some songs. The session, it seemed she was drawn into the creative process of Tanita in her own studio.

I spend my nights just raining down.

Oh, Lord, Lord, I still like keeping you around.

I feel the world is changing

I feel the world is changing way too fast.

I think the best of us is the better but I couldn't ask for more than what I asked.

and if you want for best and if you want to ask of me, what would that be, what would that be.

Lonely people, they don't say what they mean.

Lonely people, they don't say what they mean.

Lonely people, they don't say what they hide.

They hide.

They hide.

So strong ...

I feel my baby wants to change again.

I feel like baby wants to change again.

Face me, tell me everything's gonna be so much like we meant it to be.

Face me, tell me everything's gonna be ...

I got lots of joyful days.

I got lots of joyful days.

I got lots ...

Who's calling.

Who's calling out my name.

Who's calling.

Who's calling out my name.

For every brave soul, there's a sinner.

For every smart heart, there's their own time.

If you know, know, I've been losing this time.

Feel so sad.

I feel so sad.

About your love, it's losing you.

Feel so cruel.

So, cruel she doesn't choose you.

Such a drop from where you're standing.

I feel so cruel.

I feel so cruel.

To be like you.

You must be hurting.

To feel her gaze, is not on you, it must be scary.

And all the while I know the feeling.

All the while I know the play.

Ask me why, I'm still smiling.

Ask me how, I want to live.

Ask me how, I'm still laughing.

I got so much more to give.

Ask me why, we're still loving.

Ask me who, would take you from me.

After all, you're still giving me all I need to feel whole.

To feel the sun.

Upon my face.

To feel the rain, between my fingers.

And holding you, cannot be changed

And holding you, still feels the same.

And holding you, still feels the same.

I can't go from where you been.

Can't get no better, from what I seen.

There ain't no way for another song.

I feel my best shot, is already done.

I'm already done, I'm already done.

I'm already done, I'm already done. [Applause]

SONIA: Thank you.

PRATAP: Thank you so much.

SONIA:

Tanita, I feel it will be good to say just a little more about you.

And if there is anything that you wanted to say in response. To have a little exchange and then if there are any thoughts, questions, comments, I would love to hear as many of those as possible. So you are in the studio with your tenth album?

TANITA: Yes.

PRATAP: In your notes you are having a resurgence, so it is a rich, productive time for you. Do you want to say anything about what the collaboration has been like from your side?

TANITA: Yeah! Thank you. I was really shocked to be asked, invited to collaborate with Sonia and for me it is a different collaboration, responsibility, as all of the creative access is on Sonia, I'm invited to the party and you are the person who is kind of really having the great weight of creativity on your shoulders, I just feel like a kind of song and dance man! And really, something happens when you work with Sonia, is that she invites you to play ... and that was the main theme I took about feeling my way, when she invited us to take part in this project for the Biennale. So, for me the only responsibility I felt was giving her material to use.

So that is really the pressure that I felt. It was not like he to come up with a great song are doing something amazing. Or that I feel I am being judged, I just wanted you to have stuff that you could use. That is really my feeling about the process. And obviously, meeting Sonia, she is such a kind, generous and a warm woman, it is true!

PRATAP: It is true.

TANITA: It changed my idea as to how what people do in the art world. I thought I would walk into an ego‑type situation. I have to say, the day at Abbey Road it was the least ego‑driven day.

PRATAP: So, I get the fantastic feeling tone of it. Sonia, you describe yourself sometimes as a director who does not direct, and Tanita, you are wanting to give the gift, thinking of the piano playing today. So how does it work between you? You are looking for direction, Sonia is a director who does not direct. You are finding your voice and feeling your way, so take us through that change?

TANITA: Shall I talk about the day? I think that the thing that you have to realise is just to be in Abbey Road for any performer or musician, like being at the Biennale, it is such a great honour and you feel the ghosts in that wonderful room.

When I arrived, it was a funny kind of period. It was lockdown. So people were all in masks, and so, there is just that excitement of actually doing something creative during a period of really being very quiet.

There was just a real feeling of calm. I know that your daughters say you are a very stressful person but when walking into the atmosphere of calm and no stress and ... I was kind of like, well, you know, talking to Poppy and to Jackie, what are we doing? Is she going to tell us what we are going to do? And there was a feeling of, no, no ... and hey! And she was in this cloud. Really happy! And she had all of the really fundamentally important things about any creative project, which is just a great team around her. I don't think that you can underestimate how important that is. As it creates the whole tone of the experience for everybody taking part. So that gives you and obviously, Erin and facilitating that, again, it gives you the security to play. It was a very special day. It taught me a lot about working in a way that is not ego‑driven. That is really also the other thing that I learned, as well as just being really organised.

It is funny as it is about spontaneity and playing but it feels organised.

You have just the best people.

SONIA: There is a lot of work that goes on behind, in the setting up of these situations in terms of finding the right place, where something can happen, and then, I mean one of the thankful things about during that time of lockdown was that the television industry had worked out really quickly how to sort out safe distancing, how to comply with ways of taking care of everybody so that nobody, you know, keeping distance so that everybody was a 2 metre distance from one another, getting cars, to make sure, to getting the checklists done to make sure everybody knows where they must be at what time.

PRATAP: As ever with COVID there was an interruption and one performer needed to be in a different location.

SONIA: Yes, Sofia.

PRATAP: And the director that does not direct but yet having the organisational feeling but knowing what you want at some level but daring not to know in the moment. Can you speak to that a little bit.

SONIA: One of the things that brought me to the point of saying I'm a non‑director, I had done a project in 2007, working with a really great choir and a great vocalist, and it was the first time we had raised money, we raised money funding to do the project. It was done at Oxford.

I had to do; I suppose cartoon strips of what would happen during the day. I had never, ever done that before.

PRATAP: A story board?

SONIA: Yes, I had to story board the day. I didn't know how to do a story board; I didn't enjoy doing a story board. But I was betting a lot of comments, particularly from some of the people that I was collaborating with, that I was not doing it right in terms of being a director. So, I found this really interesting. I thought, oh, okay, so, I'm not good at being a director, so why don't I not be a director? Then seeing what happens. So that has been my response, really.

My response to the idea that creative process and those involved in the creative process, that there is one voice and what happens if there is not an authoritative voice, what happens if people are just given a space and we work it out in the space? So that has been my driving principle, really. I also genuinely believe as adults we don't get enough play time. That we are desperate for playtime. And that it is, I think in some ways, that it is attached to the question of ego and the way we may have formed our own sense of our identity, that when you let go, when play happens, that it makes one's sense of oneself a bit shaky, if you step back from it. When you are in it, you are just in it. Prat through that day and the solo you recorded was through the end of the day.

SONIA: In the three different sessions.

PRATAP: And the lyrics you found yourself singing from about play and the push and pull of that?

TANITA: I was just making stuff up, as I really thought that is what you wanted.

Yes, it is quite strange watching it, this concentrated, for me. I guess when it is in, when I have seen it in Venice, in Margate, I have lots of other stuff going on. So, I was quite emotional, really.

Sorry ...

SONIA: No, that is perfect.

PRATAP: I will keep my eye on questions and comments as it will be good to feed it in as we talk. I will shift gear; I don't think you were here to listen to Professor Mark Sealy among others but a significant thing he was drawing out is the post‑war story of race in this country.

And Sonia, you are somebody who, I didn't do it at the beginning, it happens a lot but you are the first Black woman to represent Britain, you were the first Black royal academician, a whole series of firsts, and I wonder if each you at different stages, how you navigated the expectations which were partly internal, probably but in both of your cases because of your huge success and profile and that people admire what you do, how you handle that ... call it the burden of representation? But maybe you don't want to pick it up as a burden. Do you have reflections on that?

SONIA: I suppose it is why I made the reference to Adria Piper and my decision to colour‑at this point the films and the project, Colour People, it is because of the decades'‑long conversation I have been in around questions of race and racialisation and the ways in which people take up or don't take up identities that either have been projected on to them or that they feel that they want to put out there in the world. I suppose for me, there is, where we are in a very different place as to where we were in the 80s. I know that the 80s is often, signalled as a benchmark or when the questions really came to the fore quite falsely and that questions around race, identity and politics and the body politic, are not as ... yeah, they have just shifted. They seem much more nuanced. You know? I think back and of course one can always think back and there being a misstep in thinking back but in my experience of the 80s, it was that the questions around race were quite didactic. And not in the same way now, I'm not even sure that I would say that they are didactic now. I think some things are more of a given and there is much more manoeuvrability. I may be wrong but it does feel like that.

PRATAP: Tanita?

TANITA: Well, I guess that my biggest success is when I was very young. I think that lot of focus was on my youth.

PRATAP: Song writing from the early teens. And then the Twist in my Sobriety, about 18, 19, still a teenager when it happens.

And I think in some ways, that is attached to the question of ego and the way we may have formed our own sense of our identity, that when you let go when play happens, it makes one's sense of oneself a bit shaky if you sit back from it. When you're in it, you're just in it.

PRATAP: Through that day and the solo you created, was that at the end of the day?

>> Different sections the lyrics.

PRATAP: You began with play and the push and pull of that.

TANITA: I mean, I was just making stuff up because I thought, I really thought that's what you wanted! Yes, it's quite strange watching this this concentrated for me, because I guess when it's in the ‑‑ when I have seen it in Venice and Margate, I had lots of other stuff going on, so I was quite emotional, really. Sorry, I forgot ...

PRATAP: No, that's perfect. I will keep my eye on any questions or comments because it would be good to feed that in as we talk. I'm going to shift gear a little bit because I don't think you were here in the morning to listen to Professor Mark Sealy, among others, but one. Very significant things he was drawing out is the post war story of race in this country. Sonia, you're somebody who ‑‑ I didn't do it at the beginning, it happens a loft, but you're the first Black woman to represent Britain, you're the first Black Royal Academician, a whole series of firsts. I wonder if each of you at different stages, how you navigated the expectations which were partly internal probably but in both of your cases because of your huge success and prime and the people admire what you do, how you handled that, we can call can the burden of reparation, maybe you don't want to pick it up as a burden. Do you have any reflections on that?

SONIA: I suppose that's why I made the reference to piper and my decision to colour tin the films and a particular approach called Coloured People is because of the, you know, decades long conversations that I've been in around questions of race and racialisation, but also the ways in which people take up or don't take up identities that either have been project on to them or that they feel that they want to put out there in the world. I suppose for me, we're in a very different place to where we were, say, in the '80s, I know the '80s is often signalled as a kind of benchmark for when those questions really came to the fore quite forcefully, in that questions around race, identity, and politics and the body politic, not as ‑‑ yeah they've just shifted, they seem much more nuanced, you know. I think back and, of course, one can always think back and there being a misstep in thinking back, but in my experience of the '80s was that questions around prays quite didactic and I feel they're not didactic in the same kind of way now and I'm even sure I would say they are didactic now. I think some things are taken as a given and I think there's much more manoeuvrability around the question of how one identifies oneself now. I may be wrong, I don't know. But it does feel to me like that.

PRATAP: Tanita.

TANITA: I guess my biggest success was when I was very young. I think a lot of the focus was on my youth maybe.

PRATAP: You have been song writing since your early teens and there is Twist in my Sobriety when it happened.

TANITA: There was a lot of focus on that, I think one of the things that I‑‑ envious is the wrong word ‑‑ but that I admire, the sense of community that I have of and when I see you as the artist that you started out with, that you found a community and maybe for me, because maybe I'm in the music industry, there wasn't really a community, it was kind of much more isolated and it would have been really a wonderful thing at that age to have felt I was part of a group more than being by ... does that make sense? I feel there's so much affection and I mean I think in the documentary I saw ...

PRATAP: So, that's Alan Yentob's Imagine which is still on iPlayer. You will meet Sonia's daughters there who have lots to say about your work and also one of your daughters talking about burden of representation and not wanting to be seen as a Black artist. But I didn't mean to interrupt you. I wanted to let people know they can see that.

TANITA: Yeah, I think it's such an important thing that you find your support, people who love you for you who are and understand who you are in a way that's certainly something I feel very strongly about, Sonia, just seeing how everyone in her family is and how important other artists and their students and something really extraordinary and to be able to keep those relationships and who you are as an artist is something in pop music we could really learn from that work of the art world or certainly the world that I have experience with you because I'm not sure, I feel that ... just maybe I'm idealising what your experience has been, but I found it very moving, the love that was for you at the end when I saw you at the end of the Biennale and there was your peers as well there celebrating, and what it meant to have a ‑‑ your achievement as an individual but your achievement in in representing a lot of women and Black women, I found that, you know, deeply moving. And maybe a newer generation, younger is much more aware of their identity than when I was younger. I was kind of just a kid who kind of had a success but I don't think ... people are very generalised where I came from. People thought I was Bolivian or I came from ... it wasn't ... yeah, it wasn't as much a focus as my youth, I think. I don't know.

SONIA: I think there's a lot of things here. I kind of struggled when I was writing how much I would talk about race and representation and gender and how much I would talk about the '80s and the question of the burden to be a representative figure because I think what that narrative or way I see that narrative being played out is that we get locked into a particular moment that, that we get mothballed somehow as representing something that was over there, you know. Tanita is sitting here now I'm sitting here now Tanita is making work now I'm making work now. I think that one of the things that was really, that's been really interesting about doing the devotional project as a hole and I've been doing that project for 24 years, is the number of musicians who are still working but I think the system or the structure around how we experience music and the music industry is that it's always just moment, a kind of moment that was then and then oh, we've moved on somehow from then and you get stuck in the then rather than in the now. One of the things that I loved about that day in Abbey Road Studios was the presence of now and the skill set of everybody in the room because that work con have been made without the crew, without the performers without the team at Abbey Road Studios, without myself, without people, there was an enormous group of people that were there for then, for that moment and for that moment to just be, you know, whatever it was going to be but it wasn't about what the past was. It was about there, then, let's just do this, let's see what we can do, let's see how we can play.

I mean, I remember the conversation, we had one Zoom meeting before actual meeting. My very first-time meeting Tanita, Poppy and Jacqui and Arolyn was at Abbey Road Studios. None of us had met before at the studios although we had done a one‑day conferencing and what was really interesting is I was constantly being asked, "So, what do you want us to do?" I said, "I want you to be free and to what you want to do."

PRATAP: I will finish, not on the race point, but on question of collaboration and your working methods. I understand and it's a lived sense of how extraordinarily porous you are and open and wanting to, but we know that the process of, I'm going to call it directing for the moment, but the process of bringing film to focus, making choices between, I don't know how much you shot, but your shooting ratio will have given you a lot of choices. Can you take us a little bit through your, I want to say authorship but I imagine you will resist that word, your way of shaping the work.

SONIA: I'm very clear that one’s performance or session or whatever you want to call it has happened and I have contracts with everybody before anything happens, and so sometimes some of the performances I've organised there's an audience as well as performers and everybody gets a contract. In the contract to says once everything's been concluded, been recorded I then take the material and I'm very clear about that because I've come across many complicated situations where, you know, the question of who looks at the material once it's been done. My job, I see my job or I have given myself the job description of editing and I edit with Michelle who I've been working with for over ten years, who usually she brings the crew together but we sit and we edit and then I sit with the sound recordist and I edit the sound with them and then I go to a post‑production company and I do the grading and I then, in terms of going if the work is going to a very specific gallery, I'm working with the team there about how it's going to be installed and what it's going to look like. My moment of play happens because it's literally, there's a kind of free form and then ...

PRATAP: You become a director.

SONIA: Well, I suppose I try and then organise ...

PRATAP: A choreographer.

SONIA: I'm not sure, one could call me a producer, a director, one could call me an author, but at that stage when things have been recorded I then work with that material and it can have many, many shapes and forms.

PRATAP: I'm looking around to see if there are any questions. We have a few minutes. It is Felicity Coleman from the London College of Fashion..

FLOOR: Thanks, just to follow on from that question around the method, I saw the show in Margate and it was quite specific to the gallery, you mentioned that Adrian piper reference, could you give us any more gems in terms of thinking about the methods by which you then do the installation once you've made those editorial choices of the films. Because it was quite specific. I get the references to the creation online perhaps with the pixelated laminate, the gold fractured sculptures which were kind of cascading off wall and then on the ground which the audience loved and sat on and kids played on and so on, I wonder if you could say a little bit more about the method of installation and that process.

SONIA: One of the things, I was announced at doing Venice and then we had lockdown. Much of the things I have been doing in the last few years have not only had performers that get recorded but then the installations in which people can then interact in a variety of ways with the installation, and so it became this real challenge to think about ways in which the audience might be brought into the work. Of course there's the voice and then there's the beautiful way in which the performers sing and there was a lot of clashing and one of my key things to ‑‑ Emma Ridgeway, the curator for Venice, I said I don't want to be easy listening, I don't want to be an easy listening experience. So, I knew already that I was bringing people into a space in which they kind of had to figure out something and for some people, it might have been too much, for some people it might have been a place they could sit and figure out something out between these very different rooms of sound and voice that they were hearing. By bringing in the memorabilia which is really the root of this project is a devotional and actually wanting a form of display, and I knew that actually the memorabilia would connect people in ways they wouldn't necessarily have expected. So, I was constantly thinking of ways in which to connect people through voice, through CDs and LPs and names that they may recognise. One of the way interesting things when we were installing in Venice and the team that were installing were all Venetians mainly and I don't speak Italian, they didn't speak English. But one of the technicians nor days on end was singing Spice Girls songs to me! And actually for me what that says is that he's connecting his memory in that space because it's to do with him as much as the Spice Girls and to let me know he understand what is going on here. One of the reasons for the reflective surfaces where I was trying to find ways in which people could be in it but not have to touch each other. So the reflective sculptures that ‑‑ team got very confused, is it sculpture or is it seating? Well, it is both. I want people to sit on it and be able to interact with it. I wanted people when they were walking past and that's also included in the England wallpaper that their reflection is happening throughout the various spaces. But on a subtle level rather than you've been told this T and, you know, wanting people to find a way that they can be in that space in the way that they wanted to be in that space or not be in it.

TANITA:

FLOOR: That came through really clearly, especially the hall with the memorabilia and everyone was like, "That's my record. I've got that." Connected community. Very good. Thank you.

FLOOR: Hi.

PRATAP: Hi.

FLOOR: Logical. Usually as researchers we're asked to have a very clear question or objective with our research. You're talked about not directing and I was wondering if you've ever not directed something and you didn't get what you hoped to get. If that's the case, how did you deal with it? [Laughter]

PRATAP: A good question.

SONIA: I often get way more than I can ever imagine. You know, there's always the possibility that a group of people will sit in a room and then just look at each other and I will record that! I try not to ask people do something that they can't do which is why I brought up the thing of a conversation. We know how to have a conversation of, we don't know where the conversation is going to go but we know how to do it. But we don't have anxiety necessarily about having a conversation because we have them so repeatedly that we don't realise we're doing a thing that has a form, that has a kind of ...

PRATAP: You also give the gift of confidence in that way. Tanita, when you first heard of the project, you said why me, that's not the sort of thing I do, I don't do jazz or improvisation.

TANITA: I was really puzzled at the start. I thought oh, man, there are people who do that for a living and people who improvise and have avant‑garde improvisation. I guess it is also about the whole devotional series is as well. It makes sense you were asking, yeah, Black British female vocalists, that was kind of a major part of Feeling Our Way. But initially, I thought, I don't know, this is asking, I don't have the skill set for this. This is a real skill. This is not what I do.

SONIA: But you did what you do?

TANITA: Eventually. And I really love what I do. That is basically what you do when you write a song, trying to catch a welfare and hopefully it will develop into a song and then you try to capture the bits of sound, melody and lyric. So, that's a really ... that was so cool to do in front of people and not to feel shy. That is probably the best part of that, before you finish a song, it is all the playing around. An essential part of that feeling your way. It is so much about playing. And the beginning ... with the four, with Erilynn, it is like being five years old, going to the best teacher in the class, making you run around and doing groovy things. It is really ... it's a very emotional to watch it now. This, in a very concentrated way.

It's really beautiful. It is really powerful.

PRATAP: We are pretty much at time. Is there a question or a comment at the back. We will have that, we have 3 or 4 minutes, so the comment first and then the final word.

SONIA: Sorry, before you asked you questioner, often a course of academia, doing practice‑based research, there is a sense of the definable point, so the question, what is the question, it can take years to figure out what the question is.

Then you have to, it becomes a target that you are going to.

I suppose one of the things that I am interested in is, non‑purposeful activity.

Besides wanting a group of people with their particular skills, I just wanted to see what they could do but I didn't have: I want them to do this ... I just wondered what they would do. So it knocks the idea of a research question to the side a little bit. But I know that we are in the business of identifying the question and trying to answer it.

PRATAP: So we have time for the last comment or question.

FLOOR: Hi.

I'm going to slightly go off on a slight tangent at the end. So, I am wondering about, yes, I Hear You and the process by which you gained and maintained trust with the interviewees and to what extent the interviewees could be considered to be performers as well? So, how does that fit into your general process, I guess? And if there is time for time to comment on how it may differ from Pratap.

SONIA: It was really, very, very challenging doing the Yes, I Hear You, project not because of just lockdown but of course the nature, the subject of the work. So I struggled, would I do this or not. How to approach making a work about this subject without being exploitative, without being, without being clicheed.so I was having internal discussions with myself. Then through working with social workers and those who work in the care system, the professionals in the care system saying that they think this person may be interested in doing an interview for you, there what a whoa whole support system for those who it was suggested may do interviews with me. They were one‑to‑one interviews, going through all the process, and I'm sure anyone who has had to do the ethics procedures, all of that, ensuring that they understood the nature of the project, that it would be made public, I made the decision with the interviewees and those who gave testimony, on, in that one‑to‑one or that history, format, would be anonymised so that the material is going to go into an archive but anonymised. I realised in the process of doing the interview, first with the survivors that a lot of the interviewees that I conducted the interviews with were still very, very fragile, still in that traumatic state, you may say. Even though, I think most of them were out of the relationships that had brought them to the attention of social care professionals.

So, all the way of going through this process of interviewing them, recording it, sending them a copy, sending a transcript, reassuring doing the process of the interview, if you don't want to say anything, to take a breath, this were moments when people broke down. I was not in the room to put my arm around them, to say, let's take a breath. So doing that process online it was incredibly challenging but it would have been anyway because of the nature of the subject and realising that I can't ask the, these interviewees to go into a group workshop scenario where they are having to share with everybody else, as if it is something that they can throw off, somehow.

Then we did have a process of people coming in after the interviews to work with the people that I had done the interviews with. Sorry, this is a really long response.

And working with the team at the certainly Tyne, the civic Programme Team, they were brilliant. We were working for a really long time on the process of excavating stories. I did have a lot of trouble convincing everybody that I should try to speak to a perpetrator, to hear that side of someone speaking and actually that person also was very fragile, that I could speak to, so brought in people that had somehow had some relationship to a question of domestic violence but had spoken at conferences or had done spoken word performances or one was an actor but turned out that in his own life had experienced ... and so felt much more able to work in terms of doing the art work, getting from the process of getting these testimonies, and how to turn it in to an art work that others can come to. It took a really long time. It was really difficult to make that in turn.

PRATAP: The process is thorough and done it is done so ethically. Thank you all. I feel if we try to respond we will be here for a very long time. We will not go there. Thank you so much. Please join us for a drink outside. [Applause]

ORIANA: That was amazing. Thank you so much. Thank you to all of our speakers. It's been an amazing day. I hope that audience thinks that too. It's been a wonderful audience. I special thanks to the AV staff here at Central St Martins. And a thanks to Lynne and to the building staff to help us to set up. And to Advance, who have arranged the drinks outside. [Applause]

PRATAP: Thank you to company professor Oriana Baddeley ... [Applause]

We are so fortunate she has decided to stay on at UAL. So, now, able to concentrate on her research. But the way she has curated the network of relationships here has so much insight, so thank you. Please, do join us for a drink outside. Fantastic! [Applause]