

Réponses des Noisebringers à la conférence de Paul Ardenne

Maria Sappho :

Thank you for bringing with you a perspective. One which comes from a mind I feel has gotten very used to looking forward in a certain way. My personal opinion is to never dwell on anything too long, so instead I propose 3 points from one other way of looking, which I hope you respect.

1) I do not appreciate your comparison of the work of a young Latinx woman to heavily Eurocentric artistic examples. I understand these trapping are made often in academia (I write of them frequently in my PhD), and comprehend also that they are written into our systems and ways of thought. So I ask next time, you re-read your thoughts, as if you were a young Puerto rican woman. Imagine you are the first of your family to ever travel across the sea, since your colonised ancestors first met Europeans. Is it really all you could think of - the Lyon Biennale?

2) I offer you to reconsider the choice of the word 'synthesis'. Another term artistically too aligned with more European men. And If we want to think about the meaning of words beyond their creative loft – it is still a word which connotes degradation, chemicals, compounds, and processes (all also in dictionary descriptions). These for me are rather man made. I propose instead (as I did in the talk) the concept of hybridity. The becoming together, of things without force, or action. Speculative, spontaneous, survival perhaps in line with Ana Tsing, more than any relation to 1880's art.

3) One should never presume a woman's age, or her generation.

Henry McPherson :

With due thanks to Mr Ardenne for providing some passing comment on our work, I confess that I feel dissatisfied, given the discursive framing of the conference, and the spirit of openness and celebration in which

Barbara Polla invited the speakers, in the lack of clarification relating to some key points made. In brief (because it is more important to move constructively with the present than to hang oneself entirely on the past):

It is unclear to me why the easily iconized and easily recalled Dada and Fluxus were upheld as weighted points of reference for Mr Ardenne rather than, for example: Yoko Kanno, Georgia O'Keefe, Stephanie Black-Daniels, Alejandro Jodorowsky, Robin Wall Kimmerer, Louise Bourgeois, Tunga, Pina Bausch, Barbara Hepworth, Hokusai, Kofi Agawu, Frida Kahlo, Hans Abrahamsen, Jennifer Saunders, Kazuo Ishiguro, Shunryu Suzuki, Pauline Oliveros, Julyen Hamilton, Elizabeth Jennings, Béla Bartók, Johnny Greenwood, Michael Schumacher, Isabel Allende, Benny Nemer, Paul Blenkhorn (etc.), or any other individuals I might personally cite as having made a more substantial and impressionable impact on my artistic practice, my contributions to the Noisebringers, and the means by which I present my work, than the aforementioned often-cited entities. Incidentally, leaving aside the numerous and quite overt references peppered throughout the exhibition, I would have been happy to divulge this list of names, and others, had I at any stage been approached.

It is unclear to me why Mr Ardenne deemed it either appropriate or necessary, in the context of having been invited to a public event to discuss the work of exhibited artists, to subscribe publicly to the tired epithet that we three (named deterministically as 'Millennials') have seen more of the screen or of digital life than the "real world" or the "street". Passing over the unsubstantiated, inexplicably uncited nature of this generalization, I feel quite confident that even a superficial discussion of our individual or collective political engagement, attendance at protests, residencies, exhibitions, workshops and public events, voting history, passport stamps, academic qualifications, citations and publications, professional biographies, curriculum vitae, religious inclinations, bookshelves, cultural upbringings, family histories, anecdotes, or disclosure of personal encounters with trauma, systematic violence, bereavement, love, fear, privilege and power (etc.), might have indicated otherwise, had it been pursued. Of course, much of this information is – perhaps ironically – available online.

It is unclear to me why Mr Ardenne's reading of what he names Synthesis, in relation to the work of the Noisebringers, manifests as strangely apolitical, somehow amorously disengaged from a primary reality, and as derivative of a specific European context (given the transnational, transcultural nature of the Noisebringers and our invited guests). Speaking

quite frankly, from my perspective as a queer artist, I experience the blending of media, the transformation of identities, the process of self-forming, self-reforming, the multiplicities of practice, and the recognition of pluralistic and networked ways of being in the world, as a vivid and politicised articulation of queer living, as an individual in interrelation. In addition, engaging fully and expressing via such diverse modalities as have been presented in IS THE NEW PUNK is very much, contrary to Mr Ardenne's indications, a matter of choice; it is to choose to exist maximally as oneself, and not to be reduced.

I thank Mr Ardenne for the opportunity to reflect on the above, and hope that, in the future, we might all make space and time for dialogue, to facilitate a more comprehensive and representative understanding of each other.