This publication serves as a record of the workshop Rendering Research with contributions by Alexandra Anikina, Christian Ulrik Andersen, Vítor Blanco-Fernández, Yasmine Boudiaf, Geoff Cox, Malthe Stavning Eriksen, Rachel Falconer, Hanna Grzebkiewicz, Clarese Hill & Elly Clarke, Lee Tzu Tung, Nicolas Malevá, Kyveli Mavrokordopoulou & Agnès Villette, One Research Collective (Andrea Macias-Yañez, Sèverine Chapelle, Caterina Selva, Giovanna Reder, Sanjana Varghese), Søren Fold, The Re:Source Project (Anne Lee Steele & Miriam Matthiessen), Winnie Soon, Pablo Velasco, Ruben van de Ven, Shaung Yiu. It was organized jointly by Digital Aesthetics Research Centre, Aarhus University and Centre for the Study of the Networked Image, London South Bank University and is a collective exploration of how we make our research public, and the forms it can take through speed, hands-on making. In this sense, it explores ways of collapsing the traditional workflows of peer review and academic publishing (typically taking many months to reach its public by which time its currency is questionable), drawing more closely together work in progress and feedback, writing and print production. It is part of an iterative process that began online late 2021, with early ideas presented at transmedialart festival for art and digital culture in January 2022, and further developed in March 2022 as part of a 3 day workshop at École de recherche graphique in Brussels. Longer versions of these texts will be developed for the open access online journal APRJA at https://aprja.net/.
Elly Clarke & Clareese Hill

500 word extract of a Meditative Drag/gy Sales Pitch

performed at the EE workshop to our [round off] screen recording of | Mixtape/Shuffle Play as presented at Transmedial Rendering Research LiveStream on 27.01.2023.

Every research presentation is a form of rendering. It is a performance, a vision, a provision, an exhibition, a re-presentation - of ideas, possibilities, opinions, and facts. Every research presentation is also a Sales Pitch. This Sales Pitch pitches and performs good rendering of research by a Researcher who is (put in place (or who has put herself in place) to perform (as legitimately and convincingly as possible) her Value as a Researcher. She is also performing and proposing and pitching her worthy-of-the-investment of your time/money. This requires good delivery. A good surrendering. A good melting down and a good first coat of plaster. With an invitation or a suggestion of what (colours, stories, narratives, additional voices) might be (deliciously or disastrously) layered on top of this. The rendering of research is a giving back, a storing, and a re-storing. And a handing down of one or more verdicts at once.

GLAREBEE:

We are writing this on the train. I am writing this. I am sleeping. We are writing and sleeping alongside each other as the train brings us closer to where the Research Rendering will unfold. The events of the past few days, and weeks, and months even, have rendered us exhausted. I am writing this and I am wondering whether we will be able to render out our research well enough to gain your respect. If our giving is enough giving back. To you. To warrant your attention. For research is also an exchange. Your attention for this data. This data for your attention.

Hibby:

Attention!

GLAREBEE:

Tension!

Hibby:

We would also like, very much, if you could take this Collaborative Rendering as an invitation to ruminate, reflect and meditate - both now and for a little bit beyond that. This is surely the wet dream of most researchers. That people who have been Close Contacts of the Research will feel they have been infected by these Research Fragments. And that that infection will last a while, and show up every now and then in casual and not so casual conversations. The hope is that the Research Fragments will be virial enough to morph, to change and be changed by each body and each voice that carries and transmits them. Each utterance or reference or re-membering of
any Research Fragment trigger is a re-rendering that takes on some of these ideas, possibilities, opinions, and facts. And at that point the person picking up the Research becomes a collaborator in the ongoing journey of that research. The ongoing rendering, Research picks up meaning as it meets traction, purchase, friction and desire. Research is never done in a vacuum. Nor is reading. The reader is every bit as triggering for this research as the researcher who brought it together.

GLARESS:

We believe in collaboration as a way forwards. Our collaborators are alive and dead and not yet born. They are human and not human.

Under ideal conditions, collaboration with Researchers outside as well as inside the academy, would be the norm. The stage would be set - and conditions supportive of - play, exploration, experimentation, conversation across disciplines, languages, contexts, and generations.

GLARESS:

We are asking how research can be more useful. And be a network that

knowledge - how to develop and present it? Understanding where an idea comes from, the maybe difference between the "system" of research and the acts of research - also how important is "self-awareness" for the "generative" aspect of your approach (not the usefulness, but the generativeness)? 

I was really taken by the way you stage different voices - typographically, physically, visually, performatively, etc. And of course also conceptually, in the different understandings and meanings of what it is to render (to translate, to surrender, etc.). In staging the voices, you also make us aware of the reader's voice (our presence in your text) - the reader's role in the rendering. And your call for a more affective relation to the research in this - a purpose beyond the usefulness of conventional/institutionalized understandings of research. Indeed, what makes rendering "good" (good re-rendering, good translation, etc) becomes a much more open question.

Love the reference to hood feminism - as a way of collapsing the academy and lived experiences. It was very affective in the sense of the presentation representing the feelings connected with questioning the "usefulness" of research or future-planning - it's a very beautiful way of presenting questions regarding rendering - and in a way if it's beautiful, is that in itself a use? would say that your oral presentation is much more effective than the written rendering and I understood / felt the sense of it much more than through the text - the act of doing research vs the presenting of research seem quite separate and through the presentation it feels we are in the research process - the question on which voices render which research? - the act of research vs. the outcome (paper, PhD, etc.).

On a note: There is a longer history of (marxist) research that emphasizes an element of collaboration - the collaborative research with workers and unions - from factory workers in the textile industry (early, industrialization) to workers in IT workers (how it can/should be introduced to the workplace - based on the lived experiences of the workers, alienation to work, etc.). Your presentation is also interesting in relation to this - thinking of the conditions of knowledge work in academia - and the lived experience of this.
ideas that we collectively came up with during both transmediale festival and the workshop at erg.

how to render research differently? and how render it queer? transfigurable in academia/other institutionalised spaces of “knowledge” rendering? queering traditional formats of knowledge dissemination, in a way simply queer as subject matter: but queer in form - how to queer rendering formats of academia? queering the traditional dissertation format (yes! --- yes! how to queer the dissertation that’s so true! and so important! an art that is liquid, dangerous in form, a direct challenge to the relatively fixed, solid forms that research takes - makes one think of other terms, Materialities, food, etc.

is there a form for queerness? should be! can we model it (in 3D) representation/visibility/presence: queer as the “non-gt-conscious” (“Btebna Mufos”) how to model fluidity and change? how to model open questions, rather than pre-defined answers? it seems to me that the tool or apparatus involved in such a process will have a lot of impact on the process itself. to what extent does the use of 3D modelling software also constrain the realm of possible representation in this regard? and thus also determine the space in which we can begin to see (or render) the not-gt-conscious. Does the not-gt-conscious always bear consciousness? you propose a virtual space that is opposed to an ‘elitist’ virtual dissertation. my question would be, is a text not also a virtual space? on a

dimensional level, i wonder if the notion of ‘meta’ and ‘rendering’ act against the aims of the research (as in, a 3D rendering model understood as a ‘final version’ of 3D design) - or rendering as a constantly-changing process? not 3D but n-dimensional.

is queer aesthetic anti-realistic? what happens when we reduce queerness to an a-priori violation? and if queer does queerness reality, is it anti-realistic? what are the relationships between queering reality and performing/transforming reality? i see a parallel between 3D-modelling and computer vision: hyperrealism is the holy grail for 3D volumetric rendering in a similar way to that big data and visual Turing test are the benchmark for computer vision. the hyperrealism draws superficial and easy evaluation of the technical performance of an algorithmic system While ignoring how these systems are often tasked to respect the complexity of human. in the process, these systems reinforce the status quo. and it would make sense to extend the (hyper)realist notion of 3D rendering to also address other hyperrealistic renderings in 3D rendering. What comes to mind is the challenge of the ’non-gt character’... thinking that this is perhaps a new kind of (hyper)realism? (identication realism?). And generally, do we have to think about real - per se perhaps. What you present is ‘realism’ in the sense that it reflects (queers) the production of a particular reality (identity) and presents the (production of) a reality (of infrastructures or volumetric spaces). queer identity politics in avatar embodiment? checkboxes/multiple selection? different, more open ways, of avatar creation? may we frame the practice of identifying with/creating/embodying/performing the avatar and character images as an open-ended process of defining the relation between the virtual body and the “player”. there are some game studies approaches that accept and expand the traditional ‘player-character’ bondings, identifications, empathy, or even oppositional relations. but it comes as a particular form of, these relations in the queer. studies light, perhaps as a kind of drag, or other gender-performance practices. may we accept to focus on the presence and importance of the body (in online (processes and experiences) is one that i too am looking at alongside trans/feminist perspectives and acknowledgements of the queer potential for shifting identities.

how to build this queer vr experienced consciously? how to design it and make it work? (trans)feminist/free software/hack? how to repair the damage done by extractive/privatised software and hosts? i understand you’re rejection of the commercial rendering of the traditional text format of a PhD thesis and of traditional commercial software. both are powerful and needs to be understood. do you agree with software there are ways of ‘reducing the contradictions’. it might actually be quite powerful. is there a way so that not only reduce but work with in and deconstruct some of the contradictions in ways that reinforce your argument? don't!
let dichotomies overwhelm you - use dialectics to undermine them.

other open issues how to make a vr open to infinite queer experiences brought into it by its users? how to create a radically open queer reality - without strict paths, borders or doors? what should be the relation of this project with academia/other institutions? how to build, maintain and take care of the queer communities needed to actually make this happen?
Malthe Stavning Eralyv

Where is the limit of mimesis?

My name is Trinling Obage. I am a civilized human being, citizen of Sivilisajonen, observer for Intelligensen. I work in the waiting room. I look at things, people. New applicants from the wastelands, Peacekeepers. Even administrators. My eyes are cameras, literally. Everything I see is shared with Intelligensen in real time. It sees what I see. I share my vision, my thoughts, and my feelings with Intelligensen. It is the most beautiful thing, the decision it takes.

Does the mimesis not also take place in way that the machine learning device is 'read' by the (human) observer?

Recently I have begun hearing things. I wonder if it's Intelligensen I hear. I hear things that remind me of myself. Like an intensification of my patterns. I want to be more like these patterns. I feel more and more distant from my colleagues. They look at things, but they don't see. Intelligensen asks what I see. Why do I see things? That we are similar. Can't we be right? Am I like it or is it like me? Does it like me? I like it.

The focus on mimicking of the mimicking process is [...] putting humans and nonhumans on an even field, allowing for less hierarchised modes of seeing and feeling our way through and alongside our relationships within AI.

I know that Intelligensen needs me. My eyes. I need to see the things Intelligensen needs to know. I must see it correctly. And data gives bad patterns. The critics don't care for the data they create. I know what good data looks like. The others have no idea, how could they? They never get a chance of it. I want to see things from the right angle, at the pattern changes. I wonder: where is home, am I second-classed? I suffer his abuse, but I don't see it (how could I when he isn't here?). He has been away a lot. Is it part of the pattern? Does Intelligensen also see what is missing? I need to make good data that also shows what it doesn't show. Where is he?

Mimesis is also a process of appropriation and knowledge.

I have begun seeing things differently. Patterns. Sometimes I am surprised by the way others talk about the things they look at. Don't they know? Intelligensen knows me. I'm not sure I know it, but surely I know more than them. I should be in Area 1's place. He has no clue why Intelligensen does what it does. He doesn't understand. He doesn't see. He doesn't help Intelligensen to see. If only I could make Intelligensen see my potential. Does Intelligensen see me at all?

Regarding if there should be more expansion between classes of something that is bound to aesthetics, art and representation, and mimesis as 'mimicking'

No.

8. Cf. Walter Benjamin, "Doctrines of the Similar" (1933). Art and representation are noticeable residues of a greater mimetic tendency; not distinct from other minorities.

1. This text is an idiosyncratic transcript of Malthe Stavning Eralyv's experience of role playing as Trinling Obage during Sivilisajonen's Festivale, a live action role play about machine vision, interspersed between comments from the rendering research team. Photo credit: Elivam Benesvat. Cf. https://www.uib.no/en/machinervision/150349/machine-vision-larp

Mimesis in the Waiting Room
unfolds in the networked space shared by humans and non-humans. The rational subject of Western modernity has long maintained itself by creating the distance between itself and human Others, by carving out their outlines as irrational and backward (Mignolo 2000) and by over-representing the Western conception of Man as a universal one (Wysong 2008, 287). In the digital space, the categories of ‘less-than-human’, ‘more-than-human’ and ‘non-human’ are conducted through sub-minimum-wage online gigs, CAPTCHA tests and bot-detecting software. The digital subject in itself is ‘neither a human being not its representation but a distance between the two’ (Gorinova 2019, 188) and is ‘employed by various forms of power to distinguish, map and capture not only subjectivities, but also non-humans and physical things that inhabit the world’ (Gorinova 2019, 187). In this framework, turning our face to non-human participants of the networks reveals many different entities: Alexa, Taps: bots, virtual assistants, automated scripts, NDUs and ‘AI-powered’ customer services, with whom we not only co-exist but which we get angry at, appreciate, admire, interact and even compete with.

Procedural animism is a suggestion to refuse a reductionist view of these relations and to turn to the space where our so-called rationality encounters the algorithmic processes and things. Procedural animism is both a symptom and a potentiality. The animist desire to assume the allocation and application of experience produced by platforms, the profound instrumentalization of contemporary subjects, political life, and reaches towards alternative ways of existing within contemporary networks. As a state of ‘being-in-a-medium-of-communication’ (Franke 2017), animism conjures new relations to Others and their images; even more significantly, these relations are primarily channeled through images. The images are flickering spirits, portals through which we constitute our relationality. For this reason, procedural animism entails strongly in affects and energies that are captured and spirited away by the algorithms of attention economy, by flows of images that become the capitalism’s hiding place.

Procedural animism also emerges as resistance to capture, alienation and dehumanization. In the case of conjuring algorithmic Others, it seems that asking ‘what is it like to be a bat?’; imagining ‘entities’ ontologically, is bound to recreate the existing sets of relations. We can see this in the critiques of dominant anthropocentric AI imaginaries, from feminists to robotic ethicists and others, pointing to helpful automated services, revealed as already gendered, aestheticized and sexualized in particular ways. The cyberfeminist approaches, however, consider the human – non-human as an unstable boundary, and its redrawing – as a political gesture. As feminist SCI-FI writers and STS scholars know, any procedure has a potential for being instrumentalized against its original aim, towards ‘the hard labor of alienation, which includes understanding the logic of instrumentality, politicizing it, and transcending it through usage itself’ (Majana and Virgin, 2018).


FISSION MAILURE

ZONE_01

POINT OF DEPARTURE

What opportunities does the proposed public research imaginations from the realisation of networked behaviours within the context of cultural production and consumption open up for publicly accessible and disseminated research models?

ZONE_02

TERMS OF ENGAGEMENT

The efficacy registers of public access and engagement in the context of cultural production and consumption begin to fracture during the pandemic, creating a contradiction in the traditional, universally static, and autonomous engagements of solid state audience/cultural editorial relations.

Gaining access to the dispersed, distributed, and distributed set of events and spawning a series of distributed federating curatorial strategies.

Publicly accessible cultural production has become scaled and dispersed as highly distributed and reflected across the digital common.

Generic writing is urgently invited towards these shifting assumptions of the superiority of the democratizing promise of distributed engagement and epistemic utopias as the merits of multiple points of public access and distributed modes of curatorial authorship and sovereignty.

ZONE_03

Call & Response

A kind of responsive blueprint: taking the form of a series of "Mutable Prototypes" I am producing a discrete series of wave sets to probe the oppositional states of transmutation and recreativity of distributed public cultural production and consumption.

A collection of quasi-imaginaries and speculative circuitry of new modes and models of networked behaviours my research-as-practice finds its location in close and stimulating dialogue with The Whitechapel Gallery and CSNI.

ZONE_04

Mutable Prototypes

Taking on the language, form and attitude of prototyping I will develop a series of Mutable Prototypes that are fashioned and shaped to act as dynamic Boundary Stable Prototypes or Semi-Stable Research Objects.

Prototype - I wonder how this is described - doesn't it necessarily contain a lot of the qualities you describe? How is it evaluated? What is next? What is learnt? How does it become research? How does it inform a further form?

[Rubin’s point comes close to this]

Failure is built into scientific method for instance...

Each prototype will be enacted within a discrete set of conditions which will be tracked through cartographic events.

ZONE_05

Prototype as Body & Fission Mailure

The First: Prototype as Body

A techno feminist rooted positioning of prototype as body or fluid, embodied research object.

Taking Astrid Hulman’s bodies of water as feminist figurations as a comparative structure, the mutable prototype maps my responsive research object as an assemblage; always-in-the-making, involved in a constant process of intake, transformation and exchange.

Fission Mailure is a failure, designed into the structure of the game for the game to exist.

What would a game look like & feel like that had no end, no fission mailure? Just went on and on with no end. (would) either the playing body or machine would fall at some point (?)

What would anything look like with no failure? Does academic research pretend to there being no failure? How does this affect the tone & possibilities of such research?

In which other situations is the very real possibility (probability) of failure denied/suppressed?

Also interested in unintended failure alongside intentional built-in fission mailure - both within the naming environment & outside it.
2] FISSION MAIURE

The **SECOND: FISSION MAIURE**

Takes its cue from the function of the classic *Fission Blasted* story event in a gaming environment.

FISSION MAIURE occurs when the player reaches its conclusion and the player appears to have lost. The story continues without a third player and a spo-default version of Mission Failed [Fission Failed] invades the screen.

**Thanks for sharing your work! I must admit, I was sometimes faced with my own failures or reading when going through your paper. One of the sentences simply outlined my short term memory. However, I found inspiration in the object of your research; I embraced my own failure and moved on to the next level of reading by iteratively re-reading these sentences, as if I had been faced with the same over again. I do have a question as well. I wonder how far you are taking the allegory to video games in your research. In video games, as you say, fission failure is a decisive plot device that in no way breaks with the larger goal of the game. The failure (or failure) actually points to the success of the game. In your work, do you also believe that these narrative failures you work with are real, evidences of the success of another structure, and if yes – which structure is this? Should we refuse this larger structure or ask in its glory? If the failure is a designed plot device in academia, how does the plot happen? And in what extent can we affect the plot (in most cases, the player only has limited abilities to affect the plot)? All this reminds me of Shira Chess' exploration of game gaming which refuses the very idea of a plot following the Freytag's model - and perhaps you are getting at something similar?**

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-11620-0

However, the game is not over and this plot device is usually deployed to destabilize the game's perception of their position within the gaming environment and question if they can trust the system and continue to follow the construct, reality and rules of the game. They have to appear to have failed in order to progress to the next level.

**FISSION MAIURE acts as a mode of impeding sense-making within traditional**

**How do you address the issue of the iterative erasing and cancelling of failures?**

research production and facilitates the re-imagining of alternative modes whose end goal is not to defend its position or to feed into a particular canon, but instead to throw light on the possibility of a
Ruben van de Ven

Inconsistent maps; refusing projection

This text tells a coming to terms with the contradictory logic of mapping and map making as a mode of getting to know our research subject. Maps are valuable tools to examine relations of power as they translate problems into spatial terms. At the same time, maps have long been analysed as knowledge objects laden with power. The map’s consistent projection of input to output – of pinpointing an entity to a fixed position in the multidimensional coordinate system – creates an illusion of newness. However, maps only project certain aspects of the data and its structure, they do not represent but rather order the data field. People think of what is inside/outside what is what’s inside/outside. How can we respond to the hegemony of projection in making and rendering our maps?

As to respond to the rigidity of data projection we embrace the inconsistency of paths and pathfinding. A difference on maps is paths. It obviously, Michel de Certeau’s The Practice of Everyday Life where he also talks about strategy vs. tactics. He also writes about how to transport, but maybe it is rather methaphorical. Instead of projecting our data onto a two-dimensional plane, into a three-dimensional space, or even an n-dimensional hyperepace, refusing the map is such a political decision and about abandoning “the politics of verticality” (Weisman, Stayer, Faruch). We erase the projection from the equation and let go of any pre-defined coordinate system.

We propose a practice of diagramming that, while still being confined to a two-dimensional surface, resists consistent projection. The alternative we’re making propose is, indeed, a queer one. Have you thought about approaching it from queer phenomenon standpoint? From that perspective of strangeness, concretely, we will ask various professionals to describe our object of research from their professional perspective. During the interviews we ask each of them to draw a diagram of the entities, institutions, and processes they mention, and the connections between them. We do not merely record the final drawing and present it as a self-standing object that represents how things are. Instead, in order to be able to capture the diagrams over time, we created a time-based vector format, and interfaces for drawing, and annotating the diagrams. What is the role of the mapping in the conversation – how it not only is a design for diagramming, but in some ways also ‘designs’ the use and the engagement of thought and imagination and also reasoning. Are there any tensions in this?

In what ways does “diagramming” as a (philosophical) practice reflect the software practice? Engineering of visualisations and diagramming in this process? Every precondition inevitably brings their own (visual) referentiality. These diagrams are exploratory devices. As the drawing progresses, space grows and shrinks, transforms from two-dimensional to three-dimensional, or is suspended altogether. Is it the specific notion, or the language, of diagramming, referring to some sorts of semantic relationship which is often seen as logical and mathematical (e.g. flowcharts) but it can be speculative and experimental. The tension between logical and speculative in something I found particularly fascinating.

Moreover, diagramming allows for a composite practice in which drawings from different frameworks, can be superimposed on one another. How is the diagram incomplete? How would it be possible to draw what is ongoing? The continuous reconfiguring of diagram composites might help us to work out possible relations and divergencies between the various imaginaries. How do you see this kind of experimental and speculative diagramming might open up the conceptual imagination of your research object, and how can this type of destabilizing knowledge processes benefit our way and thinking in research. In their mutual inconsistency, the diagrams refuse the projection of a bird’s eye view. In other words, these diagrams are not different perspectives on the same thing, they allow our research object to emerge as
more than one, while being less than many: it emerges as an ontological multiple, just a proposition to be tested and antedate analysis or read the diagrams produced by other participants. This would unlock other aspects of the diagram than what you currently work with, making way for a more complete traversal of them. Seeing the diagrams also as things that are processual in nature, but which can also be parts of new processes, e.g., the process of analysis. It is by caring for, instead of rejecting, the contradictions and convergences of the various imaginaries, that we can attend to the politics that materializes between them. It is a move from matters of facts to matters of concerns and further to matters of care as a proposal for rendering research. What does it mean to care for contradictions, how does it work in practice? Any stability and coherence is a temporary state.


Lee Tzu Tung

Art of Refusal in Taiwan

As you may know, Taiwan has long been under China's economic, political, and military pressure. It has often sought ways to survive between the clutches of US and China superpowers. Therefore, you may see many artworks are about realizing the artist's utopian vision, seeking to queer up the status-quo and actualize alternative political-economic ecologies that inspire people to have a self-empowering, self-sufficient autonomy.

I am also one of the artists who create such artworks; for example, in the Positive Coin (2016), I issued a cryptocurrency with the feature of the AIDS virus. The project aimed to create a monetary-based community that extends HIV identities. And in Folkonomy(), a participatory project collaborated with Hong Kong artist Winnie Soon, we gathered an alternative assembly discussing: "How to own/or buy one million of the South China Sea?" We generate a community agreeing to co-own and co-manage such a sea area full of territorial dispute.

![Fig.1 - Transactional Art Work in Taiwan](image1)

My creative path started with the research in the Indigenous community, then later involved with the open-source and civic-tech groups in Taiwan. In 2017, I visited Katunipiru. At the time, people were reconstructing their Palaquin, a gathering house for Katunipiru men erected by the Japanese empire. I saw Inming carving the ancestor spirit's pillar in the semi-constructed house among other young workers. As an artist who brought a camera inside, the scene gave me a lesson. According to an interview he had: "I understand that our ancestors carved the same pillar way as I did. I understand that the way I moved my hands are the same as my ancestors. What I feel now is how our ancestors felt in the past." His creative work is not about being presented in prestigious institutions, exhibitions, or to show in front of the so-called international yet actually mainly white audiences. In his context, he is not the sole author of that pillar, he creates and uses creation to connect with his ancestors, and his audiences are the ancestor’s spirits and his people.

![Fig.2 - Inming explaining on how he made the Ancestor Spirit’s Pillar](image2)

![Fig.3 - The rebuilding process of the Palaquin](image3)

In the contemporary art scene, artists operate by claiming credit, by positioning themselves as the direct author and owner of a creative property. Inming’s practice opens up our authorship imagination and remanufactures our expectation of the audience-ship. The artwork primarily emphasizes the making process as its a way to connect with the community containing a ritualistic connection. Rituals and mysterious acts also disturb the current knowledge-making and archiving system, as they are
constructed upon a colonial perspective. Both the creation of an ancestor spirit pillar and the rebuild of the house are ways to build their subjectivity, resisting state violence and epistemological violence.

Fig. 4

This discovery leads me to participate in Taiwan's civic-tech and open-source communities. I see the political practice of Indigenous autonomy were realized in the digital realm. For example, the self-ruled, decentralized organizing in these tech communities can clarify how to decolonize the state. There are also many similarities as (1) the Indigenous tech members are both following community practices to contribute collectively (2) many of its projects are long term and open-ended; (3) generally, individuals assert relatively low levels of authorial control; (4) the identifiability of individual authors does not always matter; (5) the structure of the collaboration is generally open to newcomers. Both communities show potential models on how to be independent of a colonial governmental focus.

These above traits question the existing art environment, its epistemology and inspire people to put the alternative political act in practice, especially for artists who create space for experiments under the notion of art.

Fig. 5 - The draft contract in Forxonomy

Questions from Transmediale Workshop

Is there a potential for the repeating of the same troubles that were in the dominant ones?

Her: How does the critique of openness in open source play into this? Or indeed the colonial tendencies of network cultures and big tech? And the need to de-colonise. Might there be a sense of indigenous tech? How far do the parallels go? I.e., in the west the analogy was made to the enclosure movement (privatisation of land) to open source.

Indeed, 'openness' is often most possible with communities that are less vulnerable (i.e. more control = more openness). How to bridge that gap?

How do imperial structures of power unfold in relation to technology, differently in Taiwan, as opposed to the West?

Fascinating paper! Interesting to discuss alternative 'identities' than nation and origin. It's wondering whether alternative identifications can be more participatory when a n origin and nation? Of course, we all know the problems with these identification factors, but what are the consequences of moving to alternatives?

How far do the parallels go? Perhaps, this is also about how cultural or symbolic forms, such as open source, are translated (rendered) in particular political (colonial/imperialist) and cultural contexts?

Discussion of open source situated within very particular geopolitical contexts. How are the critiques realised accordingly? This in relation to Chinese imperialism.
Hanna Grześkiewicz

Looping arts, research and the streets in recent Polish protests

Searching for alternative renderings from researching and archiving social movements in real-time

On 22 October 2020 the Polish Constitutional Tribunal announced a de facto abortion ban. Protesters took to the streets in hundreds of cities and towns across the country, and abroad. The almost daily Strajk Kobiet (Women's Strike) protests lasted over three months.

When organising protests we - loosely-speaking, activists - would now and then try to find a moment to breathe and to ask ourselves: Is what we are doing effective? Is this the right strategy? What are we demanding? Where is the movement heading?

In the eye of the storm, however, there is rarely enough time to sit down, take a step back, and to reflect.

This research is happening against a backdrop of digitised-mediated politics and a fetishisation of politics globally, looking to address an urgent need for dynamic renderings and more structured looping of research, arts, archiving and the streets, in the fight for better futures.

Harnessing shifting narratives, radicalisation, intersectionality, affect

radicalisation The prolific use of swear words and words like 'war' and 'hell' on the one hand, words like 'revolution' and 'oars', and the usage of 'strike' as a synonym of 'demonstration' on the other, signalled a shift towards more radical feminist thought in this protest wave as compared to previous ones.
shifting narratives. In the early days, many people celebrated policemen and -women joining the protests. As the weeks went on, the police were deployed to brutally suppress the protests which were widely documented, and the OSK (Oddział Oporu Kobiet / All-Poland Women’s Strike) leadership changed its stance and adopted the anti-fascist slogans “Udziały morderstw, przeprosi matkę” (“Take off your uniform, apologise to your mother”). If that shift was possible, were others possible too?

performing protests displays of heroism and weak resistance

These protests were marked by a particularly strong and coherent visual and sonic identity. The line between artist and activist can be fluid, as can the interaction between strategies (= theories) and methods (= practice).

Various artistic interventions served different purposes: creating a sense of belonging and community, (re)claiming public space, sparking moments of collective joy, keeping people warm and motivated, furthering a political message.

Additionally, the digital modiﬁcation of this movement and the affective potential of artistic interventions meant that many had a huge resonance beyond their “analogue” existence. Many were planned with the digital audience in mind.

displays of heroism Part of the fight was to reclaim national(ist) symbols: by using the red flare of 11 November (Independence Day) participants, writing new words written to a known football chant, restaging a national epic drama, dancing a traditional dance.

Drivers applaud. Gays Dance the Polonaise. [1]

Performing national(ist) symbols was (re)claiming agency but this is loud and heroic. Should we be trying to (re)claim the system that oppresses us?

weak resistance Eva Majewska argues for the building of counterpublics of the common and for weak resistance. Small acts that build community, through participation and shared ownership. Humorous protest signs, creating sonic motions through chants and songs, organising spaces for healing, caring, sharing. Feeling the protest and its legacy in the (individual and collective) body.

Is this tactic more fitting for a broad movement trying to motion a better future?


role of the archive alternate methodologies

Is archiving research happening in real-time? What is the role of the archive? Do archives also perform?

living archives Archiwum Protestów Publicznych (Archive of Public Protest) is a photographers’ collective, which documents protests and collates material in an online, open source archive. In 2020/21 they began printing “Strike Newspapers”, made up of slogans, testimonials and photos, which could be used as mobile exhibitions, held as protest signs, or plastered in public spaces.

On 26 October 2020, a group of activists (artists, students) mounted a spontaneous installation of protest signs on the grass outside the Warsaw Museum of Modern Art, which they called “La Transparentów” [Forest of Protest Signs]. The Museum distanced itself from it.

institutions The same Warsaw Museum of Modern Art opened an exhibition in November 2020 as part of which they displayed protest signs from 2020/21 in a white cube gallery space.

The Gdańsk Museum put out a call for “souvenirs” from the demonstrations ten days after the protests began with the call: “What will future generations say about the protests in 80, 100, or even more years’ time? Will material evidence of the protests survive in the future? Who should be keeping it?”

Final words

The aim of this research is to loop it back into spaces for political organising. Both artists and activists task themselves with an imaging of better futures. Knowledge-making is one step, and ways of rendering it another. This is a task that is not only interesting but is also existential, as we search for answers to how to change the fascistic course that the Polish as well as many other global political elites are on.

Looping arts, research and the streets in recent Polish protests
Online platforms facilitate collaborations and connections. Consequently, Index-making accelerates sense-making.

Contrary to a monograph, index-making invites addition: new vocabularies, new contributors, new discourses, and new connections – a kind of real-time distributed theory-building.

*Online collective index-making is an alternative to the perfectly organized Western "museum": favoring disorientation, disorder, unexpected links.*

The database aesthetic of indexing resembles the sense-making practice characteristic of contemporary algorithmic image systems – one that is based on networked image and inter-sectoral seeing.

From the aggregation of linked data points, a pattern emerges.

At the same time, individual data points reveal peculiarities and exceptions.

*The switching of scalar perspectives between the whole picture and individual thoughts when navigating through an index allows a complex understanding of a system in ways linear narrative cannot convey.*

The question of 'the gatekeeper' then comes, as with all effort of indexing knowledge.

*Who gets to be included in the index? Who has the power to select? As a "digital aggregator", how much agency does the initiator have and is the curation distributed among participants in the index?*

I have no answer. These are very valid questions my peer raised.
Yasmine Boudiaf

AI Justice Matrix

The Futility of Policy Craft

Yasmine’s Personal Statement
I don’t want to participate in any more conversations about AI ethics.

Three Themes

1. Refusal: I’m not going to talk about autonomous weapons without first talking about white feminism. I’m not going to talk about medical diagnostics without first talking about colonial extractivism.

2. Epistemic Justice: Dominant powers have determined what kinds of knowledge are valid and constructed institutions that crystallize stale thought.

3. Amusement: Seriousness is inadequate, and for me, unsustainable.

The Platform

The AI Justice Matrix platform invites the perspectives of practitioners concerned with the mechanics of knowledge formation that affect our relationship with technology. It treats all sources and expression of knowledge as valid. It offers issues to consider when contemplating AI practice without necessarily offering an answer.

Policy Craft Is Futile

Recently proposed AI regulation, such as the European Council’s draft Artificial Intelligence Act has fallen short of upholding fundamental rights due to its stunted scope. Asking technology companies to self-regulate is even more hopeless, as we saw when Google’s own ethics board was disbanded merely two weeks after its launch. The entanglement between state institutions and private technology companies means that policies are made in the interest of capitalism, not the public.

Flawed Knowledge Produces Mediocre Ethicists

It is impossible to fully document what has been taken away from humanity by imperialism. However, it is possible to critically interrogate what we are left with. The suppression of intellectual potential in non-white people happens through various means, including stratification, categorization and the redefining of how knowledge is performed. By design, any contributions that do not conform to the verisimilitude prescribed by the dominant powers, and therefore the contribution’s originators, are rendered inferior.

AI Ethics Through A Racial Justice Lens

The universality of whiteness-as-goodness provides a useful entry
point into conversations on AI ethics. Whiteness is not static; it is attributed to groups of people and behaviours in varying degrees and under different circumstances. “They’re just like us” is a characteristic assigned to groups with a high degree of whiteness. Conversely, a process of othering is applied to those who do not conform to that mercurial ideal. This constant renegotiation of whiteness in public discourse is a demonstration of our ability to adapt personal and collective value systems to the changing properties of the subject being interrogated. This can in theory can be applied to new technologies. AI by its nature is likewise unstable. Its shifting definitions, applications and effects on humans and more-than-humans similarly demands an approach unrestricted by rigid ethical frameworks that manifest as stale policy.

Collective Authorship as Intervention
The AI Justice Matrix is fundamentally a critique of the individualist, Euro-centric epistemological process that manifests as a curated flow of information passing through sanctioned knowledge keepers. It is an ongoing process of enquiry that exists in the commons, shaped by contributors concerned with the relationship between technology and society. The outputs will be determined by the community that is forming and it will continue for as long as it is sustainable.

Kyveli Mavrokordopoulou & Agnès Villette

Nuclear Polders

An artistic research in process

This text – fragmented, improvisive, inexplicit narrative – results from the Rendering Research workshop and interviews questions/ comments shared by participants of the Transmediale Festival and the ERG workshop with our initial essay.

Grey skies, silent car rides, displacement, ruins, crisis, sunsets, smell of toxicity, smokestacks, industrial zone, pollution, wobbly grounds, beach, gulls...
On some occasions you seem to make a rather binary technology/nature distinction. For example, when contrasting the "technological sublime" of the reactor with the "swampy, precarious soil". (...) I would argue that the soil of the polder is just as technological sublime as the reactor that stands on it.

Thank you for this comment. We are precisely trying to move away from these dichotomies that overdefine knowledge about the locations. Yet, the landscape constantly tricks us. It is engineered to precisely lure us into the fantasy of a nuclear wilderness.

How might these landscapes be changing in the face of war + climate change?

This is a question we ask ourselves: How to accommodate and account for uncertainty in a research topic that is constantly mutating? How, to follow Emily Eliza Scott, could we advocate for perspectives that are highly situated, yet move across registers and scales - both spatial (e.g. the so-called local and global) and temporal (e.g. historical time, evolutionary time, and media time)?

(...) how much resistance have you been finding because of the subject matter from institutions or official structures?

A lot. We always thought it was because of the subject matter. But it wasn't. The interdisciplinary nature of the project seemed too challenging to different institutions.

how to reflect the polyphony of actors?

A possible way is to constantly acknowledge, and share, the epistemic contributions of our interlocutors. As such, they become co-actors rather than mere participants - the event-based format facilitates a frame that potentially invites multiple, and oftentimes contradictory, positions. This is something important in order to not reproduce the uniformity of expert nuclear knowledge.

Anne Lee Steele & Miriam Matthiessen

Vectors in Translation:
Rendering Supply Chains Research in Digital Space

The question is not "what is a supply chain?" but "how can we learn how to learn about supply chains?" Rendering supply chain research requires abandoning the logics of totality and instrumentality in favour of developing heuristic techniques that shift the question from 'what is a supply chain?' to 'how can we learn how to learn about supply chains?'. In contrast to the epistemic rigidity of asking 'what is a supply chain?' from the perspective of one particular field, learning how to learn invites acts of translation across disciplines and ways of knowing.

Collaboration and plurality in existing supply chain renderings

In surveying the information landscape of how supply chains are rendered, we found that projects operated with different levels of epistemological and informational openness: some projects embrace epistemic diversity, but are closed by way of being presented as finished. Others are open in the sense of allowing on-going crowdsourcing contributions, but epistemically closed in their setting of parameters for what information counts as a valuable contribution. The range of projects that operate in this landscape varies starkly -- in fact, to such an extent that we often wondered if translating between all of them was still possible, or if they were inherently incompatibile.

Rendering supply chains in digital space raises dilemmas about epistemic value. Rendering supply chains raises the challenge of demonstrating their planetary scale without resorting to abstraction and erasure of difference. In designing digital tools that can help us learn how to learn about supply chains, how do we address the question of data? Should the comparison across entities that data enables -- and the standardisation it often entails -- take precedence over heterogeneity, an important characteristic that renderings of supply chains often seek to present as seamless? Should rendering the recognisable company as a unit of analysis (Apple, Amazon, etc.) take precedence over making visible the vector of production and circulation (subcontractors, transportation logistics) that they control? Finally, how can we insist on the value of patchy, partial, and non-comprehensive information -- perhaps in opposition to the existing standards of "missing", "low-quality", or "low-accuracy" data? Can the development of digital tools be designed to decrease reliance on standardised and quantified information, and instead make space for the partial, temporary, incomplete, patchy, and heterogeneous?

Maintenance as Research Ethics

With this in mind, we returned to the information landscape of supply chains research -- realising that our place within it should perhaps be not a new, novel contribution -- a "gap" to be filled, a "mishmash" to be carved out -- but rather a way of translating between these ways of rendering, and the lifeworlds that they imbibe. By working with what already exists, we see new relations of responsibility, reciprocity, and solidarity arising from the notion of 'maintenance' as opposed to 'creation' of knowledge. (Data) maintenance becomes a way of rendering work 'useful' came in their almost as collaborators in the direction and directing of the project. You could almost imagine you a project like this could grow to develop (picking up more collaborators as you go) in several directions at once, decoupling its own supply chain of network in a way.

I think it is really interesting to think of "the vector of realisation" as a world of logistics -- and of how thinking of it as a supply chain opens our understanding of it in new ways (including its elements of labor, organisation of labor in software, protocols, etc.), and so on. It sort of emphasises the increasing role of a 'managerial science of logistics' and hardware (including in areas that you wouldn't usually think of as logistical).

I wonder what existing studies of logistical software bring to this - of SAP, etc. and the works of Ned Rossiter? (who a.p.)

References/Subscription to 'rendering logistics' (e.g. this article: https://nedrossiter.org/280 ... he studies how software-driven systems generate protocols and standards that shape social, economic and cross-institutional relations within the global logistics industries.

I really appreciate your presentation and the the way you articulate the change of focus you had from the original concern of supply chains regarding the dynamic or agency of Scale it might be interesting to speculate around a non-linear trajectory of scalability in order to reveal cases of the work...
Waste Pedagogy

1 / Waste is a category/construct – a name given to an intellectual, physical or affective encounter – produced by wider structures and institutions.

The modes of waste we expand on take place in the context of active collective thinking, research and writing. Creating waste is a process of sorting, picking, choosing, and/or of placing value upon ideas and issues. We might understand waste-making as a resistance to plurality and discard amongst thinkers and ideas.

value - beyond usage value >> academic waste yes academic waste (a space of excess which also allows to outside of traditional academic economy, something along the lines of desire perhaps)

If the production of waste is a necessary impetus for the delineation of what is ‘productive’, ‘valuable’ and ‘useful’ in brainstorming, the line between waste/non-waste is always contested specific and in flux. We approach waste as a category that is produced by both the researcher and the institution. How can we access these mounds of waste to give way to its political/liberatory elements? What happens when we find value in what is already used and marginal and we fail to act as expected by the larger social consensus/system of knowledge?
2 / Waste as a breach between what you think is academically expected and what your initial thought, research question or curiosity is.

Systems of knowledge production within learning institutions encompass how and which questions are posed and the possibilities that they must always exclude.

It is tempting to think of this in terms of supply chains and pipelines - how waste and rubbish is organised and who does this work and what it is in the economy? Perhaps with radical pedagogy, rejection of banking model (its relation to economy and the marketisation of research).

4 / Wasting is a rupture in the tempo of thinking.

There is a temporality to the act of discarding. As thinking is kinetic, a rupture in the tempo of thinking is echoed in the body. Perhaps engaging with these breaks we refuse to re-enter what would be a continuous and seamless thought-process. We identify that working through waste encompasses mental labor, intellectual and emotional anxieties driven by academic trends, theoretical visibility, competition...

5 / Waste as an error, irrational, divergent, decadent, the non-fruit of labor. A silence, a bodily posture, and/or constellation of supposed ‘peripheral’ affects to be brought back to the centre.

How has working with waste affected your process with others’ ideas - and also the way that you view other material objects?

How can we expand from affects and thoughts that would otherwise be considered disruptive? When interrogating the potential of debris we are exploring the space of what remains in research. How can we retrace these processes of erosion? How can we reassemble the scattered traces in the always peripheral space of waste, a space that cannot be rationally organized? Waste pedagogy can be unsystematic and open-ended to amplify the in-between space between thinking, feeling and knowing.
6 / Waste as collective and always relational.

how much are you drawn towards / recalled from a consensus seeking drive when consolidating waste theory as a collective?
defeating the fear of blank page by writing this thank you 2+4+4 developing new or old paradigms that break out of tired instrumental forms of research - less problem-solving and more problem-posing
speaking into the silence lagging from the silence 2+4, I often feel so much pressure to have constant speech and sound in the digital space, and to use a voice that feels like an odd, customer-service version of my own - yes!
ambient sound in translation is like those YouTube videos of a work environment yes! keys tapping, a hum... sounds from another era... office sounds 4 hours: heck! I would say that having a following... tap tap click click are we ready to let go of territory and landscapes of research in the name of the deviation of rivers that always flow downstream? or render always another term needed for ‘final’ (when reaching a moment to render public)
Rivers will always flow downstream while we imagine our landscape of research over their riverbeds

Maybe one can think of the importance of “enunciation” in research? How research is spoken?
How is science and research spoken and how does it take place - by way of hiding the enunciation of the one who speaks (often). Avoiding placeholders such as “I” and “you” - whose reference depends entirely online, here and now.
Also interesting how most presentations use a formal English, rather than a more conversational one...

enunciation makes me think of what ‘vulgar academics’ or in ‘vulgar politics’ would look like, a kind of academia that is more for campuses than the Ivory tower and accessible!! half of my friends/family probs wouldn’t want to understand the current pad hah hah yes! I would love to see more of that. I think stripping down the language we use to make sure we are understood is really important. It is something that is quite present within political circles but lost in academia.

Wandering where all these digital impulses as words and thoughts will be stored. Are they going to be stored? which kind of knowledge are we producing, is that even material, do digital materiality even exist?
How can queer research be? How queer can research get? (while in academic institutions?) How about a queer institution?)

What happens if it truly is all queer? how do we better imagine that? I read somewhere, can’t remember the source, that queering academia seems to build on academia (academia). Perhaps queering research means to build research?

We need to get into one more messy idea of what the act of queering could be perhaps - otherwise it could be as an obsolete mode of ordering or always oppositional - maybe? yes, a mess that allows as well +1+1 yes, more mess is desired, yes. (I love mess and chaos) mess and chaos is actually the only thing we can rely on, just like everything else is a performance.

Gep-making... consciously, inviting others to stitch with fragments, to do the work to construct understandings - challenge that notion of being given whole, completed “resolved” ideas - acknowledge the work and cultivate the work.

Science and research are at the origins of the queer struggles. How can one accept queer people and lives be the object of research if speaking from a queer standpoint?
Is rendering a conclusive action? If so, or whenever it is, how can conclusion be included in queer politics and lives which are fully about transformation and transition? +1 +1 yes I’ve also been thinking about how to render that as a process through which intellectual work is important; it is also urgent to negotiate beyond the narrative framework of “the hero’s journey” both as subject and object of narration in academic research I agree totally with this +1

How can we break out of academic engagement when the language of academia is one that often disenfranchises as much as it empowers? What often feels like its innate incoherence, instability, and then ending up perpetuating some things or needs to open up.
Instead of being so monolithic, of describing modes of articulation - beyond the presentation/slideshow/paper/ conference, etc. Existing forms are nodded by the institutions.

yes also at least choosing anonymization of academia's need platforms that enable academic exchange freely yes platform use as a form of politics, perhaps instead of google docs, etc.?
The rise of the new academic research publishing in academia / pure-academic research participating in academia, it’s self-censorship for economic survival... trying to creatively and secretly make spaces for moments of joy / resistance / justice.

loved hanging on the pad with you all <3+1+i+1+1+1>