

BERLIN STATEMENT

Liam Gillick

Hamburger Bahnhof – February 12, 2009

By the time a generation born in the early 60's had become activated recipients of a post-war social dynamic, they were simultaneously told that the physical manifestations of it—in varied forms of applied modernism—were failing. They were told that they were within something that should be succeeding and functioning in theory, but certain markers of progressive modern existence were dysfunctional, would never work, and no one ever really wanted them in the first place. Reconfiguring the recent past may start to account for the tension between this attack on progressive structure and the desire for individual expression. Such a rethinking of structure is a crucial component of a need to be involved in a discursive cultural framework that is often marked by these architectural and structural legacies of the recent past—from public housing projects to communal experiments—which were viewed as potential and failure by both right and left.

At the heart of the discursive is a re-examination of the “day before” as a model for understanding how to behave, activate, and present. It tries to get to the point *just before* the only option was for activists to role-play in front of the workers or cities to speculate rather than plan. In the past I have used this quite frequently as a device: the day before the Brass Band became the only option; the day before the mob became the workers; the day before the factory closed; the day before *Hotel California* was released—the idea of a French bar in the middle of nowhere, with nothing to listen to and everyone waiting for the arrival of the “soft” future.

We are currently in a situation in which suspension and repression are the dominant models. There is anxiety about who controls the reshaping of the stories of the recent past and attempts to capitalize on the near future. As a result the discursive framework is predicated upon the rejection of the idea of a dominant authored voice. Clear-cut, authored content is considered to be politically, socially, and ideologically suspicious as it denies the potential of difference and collectivity. However, there is still the feeling that stories get told, that the past is being reconfigured and that the near future gets shaped. There is a constant anxiety within the discursive frame about who is doing this, who is marking time. The discursive is the only structure that allows an artist to project a problem just out of reach and to work with that permanent

displacement but the problem is that it does so without a dominant critical voice. Every other mode of practice merely reflects a problem, generates a problem, denies a problem, and so on. The discursive framework projects a problem just out of reach, and this is why it can also confront a socio-economic system that bases its growth and collapse upon “projections.” In the discursive art process we are constantly projecting. We are projecting that something will lead to something else “at some point.” True work, true activity, true significance will happen in a constant, perpetual displacement.

Maybe it’s possible to explain the discursive cultural framework within a context of difference and collectivity—“difference” being the key word that defines our time, and “collectivity” being the thing that is so hard to achieve while so longed for. We have to negotiate and recognize difference and collectivity simultaneously. It is an aspect of social consciousness that is exemplified in the art context. Difference and collectivity as social definitions and processes of recognition feed to and from the critical presence of modern and contemporary cultural work. But art is nurtured and encouraged via cultural permission to be the space for what cannot be tolerated but can be accommodated under the conditions of neo-liberal globalization. This is its strength and its weakness.

Difference and collectivity are semi-autonomous concepts in an art context. The logic of their pursuit leads us to the conclusion that we should destroy all traditional relations of production in order to encourage a constant recognition of disagreement and profoundly different aims within a context of desire. The focus of the discursive is more on the aims and structural efficacy of the cultural exercise than what is produced. In turn what is produced operates in parallel – unfettered by the requirement to be the total story.

All of this is problematized by the idea of nostalgia for the group. Art provides a reflection of values yet within the discursive this is inextricably related to role-playing as part of an educational legacy of co-operation. We are sometimes in thrall to structures from the recent past that were not supposed to be a model for anything. Some of the structures that we use, as cultural producers, echo a past that was part of a contingent set of accommodations and dynamic stresses within the post-war social project – producing a socially flexible group of people who could accommodate their own redundancy. Yet around this there remain old relationships of

production that still exist outside complex theories of the post-industrial that are at the heart post-war “developed” societies. The discursive thrives when we are increasingly alienated from sites of traditional production owing to the displacing effects of globalization and the increasing tendency towards infinite sub-contracting. Struggles over ideas at the site of production still exist but they are constantly displaced and projected – the struggles are reported but are resistant to identification across borders within a context that offers an excessive assertion of specificities and tense arguments on the left about how to accept difference and protect the local at the same time.

If you try and use art as a fragmented mirror of the complexity of contemporary society you might try and develop a system of art production that is equally multi-faceted and misleading and that functions as a series of parallels rather than reflections of the dominant culture. If you emerged during a period of difference – of revised forms of identity and new understandings about relativism in relation to cultural meaning and social structure – then you must also dissolve a little as an author. The sense of responsibility for authorship, or the level of authorship, should be questionable. The location of the art moment will not reside with a consistent presence. It will intentionally exist at different moments within the work, in different forms and at varied intensities.

In early Modernism you can see a quite urgent exchange between the process of modernity and the critical reflection of Modernism but, as time goes on, these things get further and further apart. And it's that gap that is interesting to me: the space between the trajectory of modernity and the critical potential of Modernism and Postmodernism. I always used to say that I was more interested in Anni Albers than Josef Albers. I am interested in applied forms of Modernism, the attempt to have a more functional role in relation to daily life yet I want to do this while primarily operating in an art context - an undermining of exquisite values rather than a Habermasian attempt to provide a horizontal terrain of responsibility. People describe me as, 'Critic, writer, designer, artist'. My artistic practice includes different activities. Together these things are the work. Together they is the only way to occupy the gap. There is no differentiation.

Yet art is a place where you can develop modes of refusal that are qualitatively and ideologically different from the production and negotiation of other objects and ideas in the world – in terms of intentions and results. As such art is a place to heighten contemporary discussions of the way we

reconfigure relations between each other and the places that we occupy and/or are forced to operate within. However many artists take a cultural form of the Fifth Amendment or a refusal to engage. By doing this they attempt to allow the work to sit as the location of complexity, contradiction and even beauty that might be necessary in order to create alternative visions of the world without conditions or explanations but never free of them. In my work there is a constant rechecking across from the ideas to the realizations and back again but no resolution of these parallels. There are moments when the conceptual discourse at the heart of the work overwhelms the lightness of the objects and vice versa. But there are also times when you could argue that the multiple entry points into the work overwhelm any singular reading. Art is a problematic territory once people assume that it might carry more inherent significance than any other complex structure in the world. When you are primarily operating as an artist there tends to be an assumption of potential and particularity. There is a sense of being “artisted” at all times. In common with most artists, I am interested in areas other than art. Art is a convenient term for a mind-space location where you need new forms of cultural permission to carry out certain corrective tasks in relation to the society in general.

In the work there is a critique of the centre ground, both socially and politically, so there must also be a critique of liberalism as much as there is an echo of liberal ideologies. At some level I am negotiating the idealism of others, which of course is an activity with its own specific history. We are surrounded by dynamic re-workings of language; generally these changes and shifts are absorbed by the dominant management culture. So you could argue that I am working against a verbalisation of neo-liberalism via challenging relativism and trying to avoid getting caught up within the same language games, for these are my subjects. Of course to do this I must reclaim and play with some of those modes of language and behaviour. As such I remain interested in literary and scripted modes of complexity and idea development. You could argue that one of the great ideological battles of the twentieth century was between speculation and planning. It looks as if speculation has won and lost in equal measure. My idealism is rooted in discussion, negotiation and examination of these devastating compromise states via a play with discussion, negotiation and recuperation.

Art has a pragmatic function. What takes place is connected to a flickering sense of function, ideology, aesthetics and critique. So when the work operates best it is in constant state of flux

between these perception states. Titles exist for many different reasons – many of them operate as rhetorical tools, to reclaim certain territories and try and find a way to address middle-ground ideas. If you try and do this while avoiding didactic information as material, you end up with some notional space where ideas are set in motion, rather than over-determined and described back to the culture in general. There are clearly designed moments within the work that are not completely incorporated into the language of the built world. The work stands as a series of markers that offers a temporary series of specific non-places that function because the viewer or user of the work brings applied ideas to bear on what they are passing by or considering. As long as you remember that the work might be addressing how the near future is controlled in a post-utopian situation or how to function in a culture that is supposed to have been resistant to crisis, then you can see both the problem inherent in its construction and the potential when it works. We are not seeing a picture or a description. The question of whether the work is fiction or documentary might be a better one. The focus is on production, not consumption.

I am interested in the idea of continuing the legacy of the late modern project where you occupy small spaces within the society and open them up. Exposing moments where there is an inability to know how to proceed within the terms of classic neo-liberal capitalism or didactic self-consciousness alone. Since the battle between planning and speculation was won by speculation we have seen the rise of the consultant and advisor with catastrophic consequences. I was never really interested in this idea of the consultant as a subject, but I am quite interested in the ongoing question that was very central to the book “Discussion Island/Big Conference Centre” – “How is the near future controlled in a post-utopian environment?” How do we function in a managed and infinitely analysed culture. The work has therefore also been scenario based. What happens when there is no collective vision of how to proceed within an architectural, design or art community beyond the contingencies of reconstruction, development and pastiche. How do things still get decided? Not what will they look like next week, month or year. My interest is in creating and occupying an aesthetic that can engulf these complications. Speculation as planning and planning as speculation. What traces does that leave – within a context where fiction and documentary constantly pull in and out of focus.

My work concerns the construction of ideologies in relation to the built world. I am interested in a populated environment, but not overly defining the relationships we are expected to play in

relation to those environments. I present a generalised and specific perspective that is corrected by moments of scepticism and enthusiasm in equal measure. I come from a distracted background where there is also an element of delusion towards what you feel you can address. I am interested in whether it is possible to play with this middle ground. I want to see if there is something within this central zone where you can activate without escaping to the reassurance of the sub-cultural on one hand or hyper-referentiality on the other. I decided the way to avoid role-playing or picturing was to look structurally at pre-production and post-production. To use a cinematic analogy, I am more interested in developing a scenario, editing and distribution rather than directing the movie myself. The key to the work is the fact that you end up with some work, you end up with some stuff but the thinking behind it is based on pre-production and post-production rather than on the articulation of some fundamental values or reflection of the way it is. These are very important structural games that I use to ensure that the implications of authorship are no more over defined than they need to be. There is a lot of “becomingness” and “artisting” that takes place around visual culture, which means I don’t have to get involved too heavily in the things that overly emphasize the authorship element of the work. So if I look at strategic planning and dissemination or car production and Georgian opium eaters then the art in the middle and at the edge emerges as a set of functional tools around which you can sustain these other discussions but only if you are prepared to try.

My work functions in parallel to the collapses at the centre of neo-liberal, Anglo-Saxon social organisation in tension with the legacy of articulated mini-utopias. I am therefore obviously influenced by conceptual art as it emerged in the dominant culture and remain in a dialogue with many of those artists. However, I am not as involved as they were in a clear statement about the potential of art. Most conceptual art was involved in projecting a set of terms into the future under which the artist could function without having to alter the initial ideological base of their work. My work is a constant renegotiation of the nature of an ideological basis. This does not mean that I am against conceptual art, just that I am working within the influence of their legacy and making use of the options that they revealed for all of us. Their reinforcement of the potential of art as a semi-autonomous component within the broader cultural sphere is crucial, especially in the work of Lawrence Weiner. Especially if you view his work as an applied art that does not attempt to negate the potential of an art of critique even as it sits integrated into its various sites.

My work is rooted in a negotiation of the way ideologies leak through into the built world. I am not interested in architecture alone, but in the revised practices of the most dynamic and potentially most dangerous people involved in changing the way our urban environment looks and feels. The problem with many people involved in contemporary art in relation to architecture is that they ignore the most dynamic set-ups that are possible in the discourse around contemporary urbanism. They focus on the products not the production methodology.

So if we agree that we are in a post-utopian situation, where consensus has exploded into the devastating logic of the neo-liberal, then how are things still being planned and executed? I am interested in apparently secondary factors, like this twentieth century battle between planning and speculation rather than detailed discussions around the ironic failure of modernism. I am also involved in researching and playing with the suppression of the left in a US context and looking for earlier pragmatic visions of how things could be. I am interested in the gap left behind by this twentieth century battle between speculation and planning. Strategy, compromise, renovation, critique are the tools. These factors all affect the final look of any project. I am not trying to synchronise with a building or site, but attempting to overlay a set of concepts on top of the structure that functions as a structural alternative. Within this frame, some of Bourdieu's ideas remain relevant – the relation of the cultural sphere to the corporate sphere and a play with all the tensions that result from a consciousness of social and cultural capital. Maybe this is the tragedy and potential of an artist born in the suburbs.

The contemporary exhibition is a place where the visitor is occupying a specific type of negotiable location, which is very different from the classic late-modern idea that the visitor completes an exhibition. However, the contemporary exhibition is still activated by people in the sense that the work does not necessarily function best as objects for consideration alone, it is sometimes good as a backdrop or as a décor rather than a pure content provider. Self-perception has changed in the one hundred years since the development of cinema and the subsequent arrival of television and the dispersal of focus that results from the Internet. Self-image has been heightened for long enough that we no longer sense the cataclysmic shift. This doesn't necessarily mean that self-awareness has improved it has just been shared, atomised and dispersed. We have a reflected sense of an image of ourselves in space while we carry out certain given tasks. Children, when they play sport, commentate on their actions. This stems from a sense that we can picture

someone else watching an image of ourselves as we take part in something. This fundamentally altered the way we address art and our relationship with art-like structures.

Artists should therefore try and find grey areas, which are easier to expose and occupy through art than with most other activities, despite the rhetoric surrounding neo-liberal business practice. Working by default without being purely aesthetic or purely formalist is one option, but it is the world of settings and even décor (as a partner of the scenario) that can be really productive. The creation of provisional structures carries the potential to provide temporary ideological shifts. We should be interested in reversal processes, where you are not necessarily using art to tell a story but you are using it to play with certain conditions that might be towards or derived from narrative structures. Within the work it is possible to apply varied conditions to similar thinking and assess what happens each time. The introduction of an incomplete character is quite useful in this respect as it replaces the artist with another personality who can operate in the space alongside the trace left by the artist and the distracted presence of the viewer operating simultaneously in the spaces of encounter.

These are the spaces in our socio-economic and psycho-sociological space that are constantly reframed. This leaves enormous gaps that can only be described with difficulty, but they need some degree of analysis if their effects are to be understood. Many artists find productive territories within a search for fundamental moments and effects. Others remain within a purely analytical play with the products of complexity. I was interested to develop a sequence of parallel relations with the areas of our life that are most vulnerable to exploitation and control. The implicit freedoms implied in the notion of discussion are not value free. They are hard won and offer an alternative set of tools towards making dilemmas and disagreements less dangerous. In my case the work does not direct discussion but uses the notion of the discursive as a subject.

This central zone was traditionally seen as problematic in relation to creating functional art. Whereas in the past many artists flirted with the central zone of administrative activity, I was more interested to look at some of its environmental effects. The notion is elaborated in the work around my book "Discussion Island/Big Conference Centre", just before and just after publication. The book was an attempt to address some of the structural social and political implications of my earlier texts and scenarios like "McNamara" which concerned a series of meetings between

Robert McNamara and Herman Kahn of the RAND Corporation in order to define a culture of management and speculation and “Erasmus is Late” a text that focused on the potential of the “other” in framing the dominant discourse within the framework of pre-Marxist thought. In both cases I wanted to look at the notion of how the near future and recent past is controlled. I always wanted to escape the “eureka” moment, where art is based on a revelatory singularity and found that the creation of a condensed core of ideas could lead to a more complex set of parallel starting points. Yet when I began “Discussion Island” I found only collapsed narrative problems for I wanted to push on to an examination of the results of those earlier social and perceptual manipulations. Initially I attempted to create a series of backdrops and contingent structures that could shift around and create settings for the emerging narrative. At one point, I put the text away completely and concentrated on addressing some out-of-focus ideas. I began to make work around the idea of discussion, negotiation, compromise and strategy. Not creating structures that might illustrate these ideas, but things that could designate a provisional space where it might be possible to consider and reassess such effects. This process of aesthetisation of the abstract middle-ground unlocked the text and allowed me to write a book without having to project the kind of space it might be taking place in. The book runs parallel to a sequence of structures but does not describe them. Equally, the work itself spun free and became a productive series of visual markers in its own right.

I began to refer to art as prototypes and provisional structures in order to address certain ideas from the compromised centre of action and thinking – to denominate the art object. I began to create a series of overhead platforms and related work that could offer up a space where it might be possible to consider key issues before too many words had been written. The objects really work “towards” a text. They are not emptied out because no one is expected to fill up some notional sublime void with complex thinking, instead it might be possible for the work to act as a backdrop within which a series of scenarios may be thought out. We are no longer dealing with mute object meets profound thought – the relationship is more functional and brittle – a constant flickering of idea, intention and potential towards an excess of access and a reclaiming of the middle ground. Playing out some scenarios within a visual context that mashes design and dogma. At all times elements spin off and affect the reading of the work in a corrective way. My interest in time and the middle ground ensures that hierarchies are corrupted but not suppressed into useless structural equivalence.

If you are a distracted and deluded person, you can become interested in complex social phenomena as a way to mirror your sense of multiple entry points. You might also develop an interest in the way art has historically worked as a locus of scepticism. This will inevitably include self-conscious ideas in terms of cultural refusal and sidestepping. I always found the idea of consolidating form and content difficult. Another big problem in the recent past has been the question, 'What is the idea behind your work?' A lot of my work is derived from how to get around the singularity problem and instead find multiple sources, often self-created multiple starting points. Certainly, a lot of my structures and projects are not resolved in the sense that dealing with any specific thing doesn't necessarily lead you to a moment of consolidation or sublimation or any of these other things that art traditionally did. The point of entry into the ideas is multiple. Certain things work as lures or attractors while other things hold you away in a web of text. If you are interested in providing a critique of the middle ground, then you have to consider questions of contingency, strategy, negotiation, compromise, and refusal. These are the abstractions at the core of the work. And recently, I have realised that the key marker here is a re-examination of the notion of difference in relation to cultural production.

I tend to work on many things simultaneously. I am generally trying to sustain multiple entry points, multiple ways of thinking and multiple ways of operating within the proviso that there is some conscious recognition of the potential of the art object as a "critical exception" that exemplifies "difference". This crosscutting allows you to retain a degree of criticality without creating didactic or over-determined structures that merely reinforce what the dominant culture already knows.

I am looking for a new methodology rather than a new form. My ongoing project *Construcción de Uno* has been connected to the idea of trying to get a grip on some slippery elements concerning how shifts in European culture have had an effect on recent modes of cultural production. It has therefore emerged gradually, slowly revealing the ideas necessary to develop a potential text. The whole project and the related lectures are rooted in an examination of the notion of production and the social in primarily northern European social democracies. A lot of the source material is derived from Brazilian academic papers on industrial production methods in Sweden, but the scope of the lectures reaches into many assumptions about how things accumulate value

within European social democracies.

I used to ask people “Where’s the local glitter factory?’ and no one could ever tell me because, in fact, very few people knew where glitter comes from. Subsequently I found out it was invented on a cattle farm in New Jersey in 1934 where you can still buy it today. At one point I found out that glitter, kilo for kilo, is a drug-like commodity. You can go to Vienna, buy two kilos of glitter for the same price as a tiny vial in Stockholm. It has a very under-exploited commodity status. Part of this is to do with the fact that very few people could ever tell me if glitter was made by Chinese children or was a by-product of the arms trade. Maybe it was an innocent material made by well-paid artisans. To this day, I’ve still never been to a glitter factory. I can’t tell you if people are happy in glitter factories, whether glitter factories are organised collectively or a “Glitter Board” regulates them. I have used it in my work as a constant. My use of glitter exposes certain production complications along with an acknowledgement of modernist art history and a fairly pragmatic task: cleaning the floor with whisky or vodka mixed with glitter. Once you have done this you can see where the floor has been cleaned and labour is exposed. The works are a cumulative negative: so if cleaning is a reductive act, then cleaning with glitter is an additive reduction. At the Palais de Tokyo in 2005 I just spread vast quantities of red glitter with no cleaning, but of course, red glitter is red snow and red snow is what you get in times of revolution. My work is often about defining the softer, unclear spaces within the social context that were intended to ameliorate conditions. It is diagnostic rather than viral. But there are times where you need a picture that has been transposed.

I am increasingly interested in the question of the ‘post-war’ as a completed historical period in Europe. This is concomitant with an examination of the history of the post-war as an era of realignment within European culture and subsequent neo-liberal attacks on the progressive legacies of post-war social structure within a context of the suppression of the productive aspects of extreme resistance to that system. I became very interested in the way the neo-liberals first went after industries that were at the interface with the people. How do we proceed and what aesthetic traces are left in the culture from this process of strategic privatisation embedded in populist strategy? What I am trying to do through the work is look at some of these processes: see how they function, how they collapse and how they leak into the forms that surround us. But it

is not a consistently stable mode of practice. There are such allusions in the work but very few didactic or transparent references.

I'm a European Socialist. I believe that people need to get together, organize and make things work better without rationalising their own redundancy. The 1970s were a moment of failure and confusion on the left and the emergence of a significant new pragmatic radicalism as the neo-liberal agenda was forced into place. It was also a disturbing time. We were told that the post-war experiments towards the creation of a better living and working environment had already failed. This was generally an attempt by right-wing politicians to use the urban fabric as a site of "otherness" that could be demonised and used as a scare tactic towards gaining political support from the suburbs and countryside. The developing narratives of "difference" and "progress" were turned into an accusation. My work is often related to attempts to recuperate the progressive moments of applied modernism in the context of "difference". Not to picture or illustrate, but to produce a parallel narrative of potential. The idea that the post-war is complete and the claim that the edge of Europe is being reached are important points of departure when trying to imagine the potential of the discursive.

Loss is a term that is beloved of people who are not interested in addressing what is actually taking place. It is a part of a melancholic tradition and extremely important for retaining a critical position in relation to the culture. I am more interested in locating moments in the culture where there is a sense of possibility. Where people come together and attempt to image productive environments. The notion of loss is political, it can only occur to people who have sensed or experienced the potential of something. It is understandable that people are drawn to discuss loss when faced by the collapse of ideologies and progressive social models. However, loss can easily become a default notion for people who don't want to address the actual conditions under which we operate. We know that there is an acceptable form of art that revels in loss as an indicator of its seriousness. I am more interested in constructed critical structures than any broad singularity. Loss may be an element, but my work is not about an ironic response to the failures of the twentieth century, but an attempt to examine how ideas are expressed within the built world. It is stranded, beached and terminally parallel. I have written a number of small books over the years, each one has a conceptual base, which attempts to expose key elements that determine contemporary Western conditions; the incompleteness of the 18th and 19th Century revolutions in

Europe; how things are still decided in a post-consensus environment; the legacy of communal practices in societies that rejected communism; the legacy of applied utopianism in modernist architecture and how we can resuscitate the progressive practices of the last quarter of the twentieth century in order to understand how to proceed. These are precise interests. But can only be expressed in partial episodic form if I am to avoid the reassuring lure of the didactic and the documentary and retain a mutable role.

I address decision-making and the role of the scenario within the social. Within an art context it is an attempt to bypass singularity, and to delaminate the “work” itself from a moment of completion. The work becomes “provisional” “prototypical” and “potential” rather than a direct statement in relation to other art. Of course this may not be immediately apparent by looking at any specific work alone. The “what if” is a tool of modern projection within the post-industrial period. It is connected to cinema and television and the rise of consultancy and strategic play. When other people remain interested in sex and death or refusal and subjectivity, I find it more interesting to examine the activities that are determining the way our society develops. The “what if” has now merged with the “here you are, in this rendering, having a café latte”. Or more lately, here is where you were going to be until we ran out of steam. We have to rethink the “what if” in an age where old superstitions have returned, where the dominant culture and the resistant culture both pray to their gods for guidance. The “what if” has turned into an episodic eternal. The first scene of the book “Discussion Island/Big Conference Centre” where a character is thrown through the window of a newly developed Conference Centre and lands on top of a Toyota positions my work at the centre of a collective critique of the speculative terrain that has predictably collapsed.

This is about wanting to be separate, but not marginal: a legacy of my Irish Heritage. In the book “Literally No Place: Communes, Bars and Greenrooms”, I told the true story of a bar in Derry in the north of Ireland situated in close proximity to a functioning British army check-post. This story had little to do with going out onto the street and banging dustbin lids or trying to shoot a soldier or making art about things we already know. It was about the setting up a social checkpoint opposite an army checkpoint – a place of discourse within confrontation. Sitting in a bar in a bunker right underneath an army post. A normal bar on a Friday night with chintzy things hanging on the walls, nice red wallpaper, old ladies, children, and Guinness settling up on the bar. From the outside it’s a concrete bunker and an incredible site of resistance and on the inside it’s a

place of the familiar and of difference. A site that refuses to reflect back to the dominant system that which it already knows but muddies the message within the chatter of the everyday. Separate but not marginal, an articulation of difference rather than contradiction. A site of exclusion within the context of a desire for autonomy. The picture of a series of relationships where the question is not “Am I included in this structure?” “Does it represent me?” “Does it fulfil a fantasy of social work within the cultural terrain?” or “But what about “them”” but an implicated space of pleasure and resistance.

© Liam Gillick 2009