



Discussion among members of Taring Padi and students of the MA in Transcultural Studies and Art History, Heidelberg University, at Documenta 15, Hallenbad Ost, Kassel, June 28, 2022. Photograph by Georgy Radchenko.

Learning with Documenta 15: Principles, Practices, Problems

MONICA JUNEJA AND JO ZIEBRITZKI

In 1982, visitors to Documenta 7 encountered a pile of seven thousand basalt stones on the grounds in front of the Fridericianum. The artist Joseph Beuys had initiated an action to plant an equal number of oaks throughout the city of Kassel, each accompanied by a stone. The pile would progressively shrink, as the cityscape grew greener. The artistic, politico-ecological act of planting trees in an urban setting, re-performed in various cities across the globe, continuously gained in symbolic power. When we remember the seven thousand oaks of 1982 today, the artist's persona is as present as the socio-ecological relevance of the project. The simple fact that we continue to speak of "Beuys's oaks" reveals the valorizing habitus of the art world. It foregrounds the artist's initiative to generate urban renewal, whereas the participation of innumerable collaborators—community workers, politicians, administrators, staff members of Documenta—who did the actual work of planting the trees has not found its way into recollections. In the meanwhile, postcolonial and feminist critiques have relentlessly challenged a historiography that privileges the centrality of individual artists and masterpieces, and yet the power of these categories persists. Some four decades later, Documenta 15 (d15) set out to radically reconfigure basic pillars of the institutionalized art world—the individual star curator, the artist celebrated as a pinnacle of creativity and producer of the "masterpiece," and, not least, a canon that is at the same time complicit with the commodification of art. How did the fifteenth iteration of Documenta, curated by the Indonesian collective ruangrupa, part with entrenched conventions? How did d15 seek to reshape the roles of curator, artist, and visitor, by which means, and to what ends? To what extent did ruangrupa's clarion call to "make friends not art" generate discomfort or puzzlement among visitors, even those who came prepared to embrace different ways of experiencing art? The following account, based on our personal experience of d15, informed by conversations with members of the Taring Padi collective and the ruangrupa team, explores some of these questions. As we engage with principles, practices, and not least problems, we are aware that such an exploratory exercise can proffer only tentative conclusions.

A sprawling affair distributed across thirty-two venues in the city of Kassel during the summer of 2022, d15 exuded little of the spirit of a classical exhibition. Rather, it offered a festival-like constellation of events, open networks, meetings, together

with a handful of conventional exhibition venues, all extending backward to the months preceding the official opening and projecting toward the future. The visitor, now encouraged to become a participant in the composite process of making and doing, confronted an exuberant heterogeneity of positions and projects that made a “(re-)distribution of the sensible” palpable.¹ Audiences, often pre-schooled in expectations and viewing practices, were challenged to make sense of the different worldviews and specific histories and to find ways of engaging with these rather than contemplating finished works. To what extent the above dimensions, transformative in intent and challenging through their very proposition, effected a sustainable paradigm shift within the curatorial dynamics of a recursive global exhibition is a complicated question for multiple reasons. A major obstacle is that our assessment depends largely on personal impressions, experiences, and memories, given the informal nature of decision-making and many activities undertaken within the exhibition process, for which no centralized archive may exist for the future. Individual collectives may or may not have written records of their positions and activities at d15, though some did provide insights into their work in the form of interviews. While we have declarations of intent and framing principles from ruangrupa, the written record of their praxis as it unfolded in the course of planning and executing their programs is hardly available for research.² On the whole, the commitment to decentralize the organization and build interactive solidarities on the spot has left us with, at best, a fragmented and highly selective record. Till today, the bulk of the written record has been decisively shaped by the unfortunate turn of events that rocked d15 and dominated media reports in an inevitably reductive reading of it. What makes this Documenta somehow illegible to many of its visitors and scholars is a question we will address at the end of this article, even as our reading is likely to remain largely speculative.

Every iteration of Documenta since at least 1997 (Documenta 10 curated by Catherine David) has sought to treat the exhibition as a discursive space from which to question the foundations of the institution. Of these, Okwui Enwezor’s “postcolonial constellation” (Documenta 11, 2002) was the most acclaimed for its critique of capitalist modernity and the fresh hierarchies created by globalization and, following from these, of the universalizing claims of art history. Such critiques, however, in spite of efforts to go beyond the global art world’s stance of multicultural inclusion, remained within the epistemic framework of an elite art system that subscribes to a normative understanding of art as individual intellectual property. The model of curation introduced by ruangrupa (the word stands for “a space form”) at d15 proposed a praxis that is explicitly dispersed and decentralized. Relational modes of creating art and knowledge are meant to unfold in a space not segregated into the domains of production, consumption, and distribution. The exhibition, activated by the artists, collectives, and other

groups present on site, was a space that could be continuously used, making it more than a place for display alone: engagement in coproducing exhibitions was conceptualized as part of a process of community building. The Gudskul, to take one example, is both an educational platform and a pedagogical model located in Jakarta. Operating from the premises of an abandoned warehouse, it serves as an infrastructural space for art groups, as well as for high school and university projects related to curating and art education. Over the years, it has offered courses, short residencies, an art camp, studio space, and a place for collectives. The term is a compound of *gudang* (warehouse) and *skul* (school). The objective of such a setup is dynamic: that of transforming, rather than simply disseminating, knowledge into praxis through collective experience. This understanding, once transplanted in Kassel, sought to make



The Fridskul Common Library, Documenta 15, Fridericianum, Kassel, 2022. Photograph by Nicolas Wefers. © Documenta Archive.

d15 a knowledge resource fertilized by the creative participation of artists from across the world cemented through the *lumbung* network. The Fridericianum, renamed Fridskul for the duration of d15, was curated as a “storage of all knowledge, stories and experiences.”³ It was declared a library, archive, living space, and kitchen, in addition to its function as a museum. Mutual exchange through practices of sociability—such as cooking together, playing games, conducting workshops, running classes, and organizing childcare—was seen as an extension of Gudskul principles that eschewed the objective of presenting artworks for the limited duration of one hundred days.

The set of principles that governed the curatorial process of d15 drew on a premodern system of sharing resources in an agrarian society, poetically termed *lumbung*. Ruangrupa reconfigured *lumbung* as an artistic practice based on sharing, communal living and caring, and collaborative creativity. In the twenty-first-century megacity of Jakarta, ruangrupa’s hometown,

this is clearly an attractive invented tradition with which to confront the pressures of rapid urbanization, ecological crises, and rising sea levels.⁴ It is at the same time an articulation of solidarity on the part of groups scarred by the experience of political repression. And yet *lumbung*—together with related notions that suggest natural processes, such as “ekosistem” (where ideas and the making of art are conceived as living components of a shared system) and “composting knowledge” (relationships developed organically over time without formalized arrangements)—is more than a mere metaphor. It is at once a guiding principle and operative method to give a particular direction to curating, understood as a form of worlding that seeks to challenge and transform established modes of exhibition making.

At d15, the principle of *lumbung*, by calling into question a single, central curatorial authority and making it instead a shared resource among the participant collectives, worked to undermine the gatekeeping prerogative of institutionalized curating, enabling the return of marginalized knowledge and the integration of groups that continue to be dropped by the wayside or that at best are relegated to distinct and segregated spaces. A powerful example of this enabling stance was the group show *One Day We Shall Celebrate Again: RomaMoMA at documenta fifteen* in the central light-filled hall of the Fridericianum.⁵ *RomaMoMA* was curated as a joint enterprise of the Hungarian grassroots collective Off-Biennale Budapest and the European Roma Institute for Arts and Culture (ERIAC). The works assembled queried the (im)possibility of a Roma Museum of Contemporary Art. By presenting the untold past and unfolding present of Roma artists, whose works have rarely found an institutional space, the exhibit challenged the principle of “inclusion” that characterizes the global art world, following which artistic practices from beyond Euro-America are “added on” to the mainstream art world without questioning its canons and foundational principles. The group show introduced viewers to the work of ten artists emanating from different regions, all of whom share a kinship with the Roma. Together they raised the question of how to define “Roma art” and where to place it, given its nonexistence within the prevailing canon. Framing the show was Ethel Brooks’s *RomaMoMA Manifesto for documenta fifteen*:

We have relied on our own archives, our own transgenerational sharing of knowledge, our own pedagogies of practice. The beauty that we share with the world, the ways that we teach, learn, and thrive, have been built by us, for each other—and, yes, for you. We have healed each other, and, through our fortune-telling, our metalwork, our horses, our art, our caring for the Earth, we have strived to heal you as we heal ourselves. This is how we educate. This is our heritage.⁶

The creation of such an exhibit was facilitated by the horizon-

tal forms of decision-making within different units (*majelis*) that sought, among other things, to collectivize economic benefits, thereby challenging the commodification of art within a capitalist system.

Among the most empowering and enriching effects of eschewing a single, overarching goal—namely, to bypass institutionalized systems of evaluating “projects”—was the opening of Documenta as a space available for an unprecedented plurality of lived experiences, knowledge systems, and specific counter-hegemonic practices. Understanding the situatedness of each, so the underlying premise claimed, would lead to a permeable constellation of shared yet nonflattening solidarities. The range of positions to be experienced—and temporarily lived with—were full of unexpected turns, constantly challenging the visitor to engage with the dynamic bond between art and life they spun. An installation composed of hundreds of bound bales resembling a gigantic garbage site struck visitors with dystopian



The Nest Collective.
Return to Sender,
2022. Documenta 15,
Karlsaue, Kassel.
Photograph by
Nils Klinger. ©
Documenta Archive.

force as they strolled across the baroque lawns of the Karlsaue facing the Orangerie. Its powerful and grotesque quality was meant to upset and distress by drawing attention to the compressed magnitude of waste—unwanted or unusable textiles, sneakers, industrial and electronic waste—the leftovers of massive overconsumption in the affluent societies of the Global North. *Return to Sender* is an intervention by the Kenyan Nest Collective that summons to consciousness the routine microrealities of innumerable African locations, the recipients of this daily “gift” of leftovers. Its sequel, *Return to Sender—Delivery Details*, continued the narrative: within the hollow interior of the mountain of litter a video recapitulated the different moments and voices that make up this story that connects distant corners of the world, a story of giving/throwing away, of dissonance, hardship, grief, destroyed existences. *Return to Sender*, we learned, is but the uppermost layer of a deeper relationship embedded in Kassel’s colonial past. The installation stood facing the site of a colonial exhibition that

took place in 1897, which showcased alongside ethnographic objects a panoply of raw materials from the African continent—cocoa, tobacco, sugar, coffee, ivory—all of which were then processed into commodities to quench consumerist desires. “Restitution 2.0” deploys aesthetic disturbance to complete the circuit of this exchange.⁷ Further exploring the spread of the exhibition, visitors encountered a rich plurality of positions and propositions: be it the Atis Rezistans from Port-au-Prince; or the Britto Arts Trust, whose gesture of retaining agency over food and locally produced foodstuffs was a gesture to save that which was disappearing through the dispossession of land and resources; or the remarkable Project Art Works, which has over the years nurtured a practice conjoining art and social care. This latter collective, made up of forty neurodivergent artists, explores through collaborative work among artists, families, activists, and carers the meanings of “producing” art for those who depend on different forms of support and therefore understand the idea of making and achieving in divergent ways. Their exhibit at the Fridericianum included an archive that made transparent some of the processes of art-making, often nonverbal, less about the product and more focused on experience. This handful of instances points to the unlimited plurality of stances, resistant to categorization or compartmentalization into a politics of the Left and the Right.

The multiplicity of agents involved and the focus on communities challenged not only curatorial conventions of the institutionalized art world in the Global North but also the visitors. The d15 discarded the notion of the autonomous artwork and impressive “masterpiece” standing for the highest form of creativity. Instead, through contact with the accumulation of creative practices and practitioners, visitors were urged to engage, understand, share, discuss, and eventually reflect on their own situatedness. The experience depended on their readiness and ability to engage through informal *nonkrong* (hanging out) with the collectives and artists present in Kassel, through organized workshops (the *lumbung* program), or through “walks and stories” offered by the *sobat-sobats* (the art mediators). The visitor’s experience was thus contingent on factors such as expectations they brought to the site, their handling of language and cultural barriers, or how much time and energy they were willing to give to the challenge of deciphering “process” rather than contemplating finished works. The curatorial focus on practices rather than objects turned d15 into a constantly evolving event, which, in addition to the multiplication of agents and the international crowd of visitors, makes generalizing the visitors’ experience nearly impossible.

Such a potent intervention in an established global institution was expected to set into motion a transcultural process. But to what extent was that process—that is, the dynamic of encounter and transformation—effectively realized? And what was lost to it? We have been frequently cautioned against romanticizing collectivity—*lumbung*—as per se nonhierarchical

and nonexploitative.⁸ And some of d15's structural dimensions do raise questions about its smooth relocation from an agrarian to an exhibition context. Ongoing discussions have posed the simple question of scale; that is, the logistical difficulties of applying, on a global scale, to a collectivity of over 1,500 artists, each embodying different forms of knowledge, principles of sharing originally intended for a small community.⁹ The refusal to take up a position of curatorial authority raises in turn the concomitant question of responsibility. Dispersing both authority and authorship ends up obfuscating responsibilities by rendering individual positions difficult to locate within the large collective body or even clusters thereof. What fills the void that is created following a withdrawal of authority? This becomes a particularly tricky issue when raised in relation to the selection of artists. We are informed that fourteen collectives were invited by ruangrupa as *lumbung* members, each of which in turn invited other collectives and artists to participate. The responsibility for principles of selection and exclusion in such a decentralized system becomes elusive here—and, as we know too well, the noninvitation of Jewish-Israeli artists became a contentious question that cast its shadow over the entire process.

The dispersal of responsibility in this instance was, in effect, a decision that responsibility, by default, would be carried by all. A transcultural process of communication between the *lumbung* members on the one side and the institution of Documenta (GmbH) on the other—that is, the self-reflexive dialogue regarding organizational structures that might have promised a long-term transformative effect on all participants—faltered from the start because each side consciously adopted a different style of communication. The Documenta administration, in its adherence to an obsolete understanding of autonomy, espoused no need to nurture such a relationship informed by dialogue and learning once the initial act of “inclusion” was accomplished. The members of ruangrupa in turn consciously positioned themselves against discursive exchange, castigating “theory” as a mechanism of an oppressive “Western” episteme. Instead, “stories and storytelling” were privileged as a “distinction-reducing approach” that extended to most modes of communication.¹⁰ Such rejection of what is potentially a critical mode of reflecting on one's own history and positionality became a barrier in many ways. It got in the way of a critical self-questioning of the essentially masculinist ethos of the ruangrupa team and its use of the rhetoric of friendship to overlook the pitfalls of precarity among young mediators.¹¹ Finally, it became a barrier to productive communication even in those collaborative projects in which ruangrupa participated, such as the two-week summer school “Commoning Curatorial and Artistic Education,” organized by Dorothee Richter and Ronald Kolb together with Documenta's art education program, CAMP. The workshop space of the summer school was placed inside the exhibition space, with

artists present and engaged in discussions, effecting a shift from the representational mode of art to its performative aspect. Richter, however, underlines the “impossibility of establishing clear communication,” ostensibly over organizational aspects. Essentially, according to her, this mode of evasion was “an indirect means of power.”¹² Exacerbated by the antisemitism scandal, the much awaited and hoped-for transcultural process of recalibrating the relationship of profoundly different exhibition practices hardened into a polarized struggle for hegemony, into a different form of transcultural relationship resting on refusal to communicate.

Visitors, too, had to confront challenges of communication that sometimes took the form of frustration induced by well-worn habits of cultural consumption in which they had been socialized. Because d15 was part of the longer history of Documenta, which in turn is an integral part of postwar (West) Germany’s cultural identity, the recasting of the roles of the curators, artists, and visitors provided much ground for misunderstandings due to the incongruent cultural codes of the parties involved.¹³ The unrealized dialogue between ruangrupa and the Documenta administration was to some extent reproduced in the challenging dialogue between artistic collectives on site and visitors in Kassel. Not only did the incompatibility of cultural codes make encounters difficult but so, too, did the very languages spoken by the artists and visitors. The call to “make friends not art” could cut both ways. Many visitors experienced the conviviality they observed in the social hubs as a closed group of “friends” to which they could not find a ready entry point—an experience often recounted by German visitors. Any form of community that uses friendship as a key category also operates, by definition (“friends only”), as a selective mode, enacting its own inclusions and exclusions. As the polemics of the antisemitism scandal acquired shrill tones, the lines between “friends” and “others” were inevitably drawn.

And yet, paradoxically, the exceptionally large number of visitors to d15 testifies to the magnetic pull exercised by what came across to many as a joyous collectivity of welcoming spaces that consciously sought to discard the exclusionary hierarchies of established art and exhibition systems. The relaxed atmosphere at the various venues and the focus on encounters rather than masterpieces offered visitors the potential to engage creatively and socially, to discover in workshops and informal talks their artistic, discursive, social, or playful abilities. Visitors were invited to connect as creative agents to the social-artistic practices of collectives, which, even if they chose different strategies—such as painting and protesting (Taring Padi), cooking and eating (Britto Arts Trust), or inclusive, queer parties (Party Office b2b Fadescha)—all used art-making to shape communities. Other collectives sought to show how they deployed historical material and narratives as a mode of resistance against colonial and racist structures and hegemony—these include the Asia Art Archive, The Black

Archives, Centre d'art Waza, and Komina Film a Rojava. And many collectives attempted both to create a community and to engage as activists; for example, by developing alternative models of cultural and artistic education (e.g., Arts Collaboratory, Centre d'art Waza, *foundationClass*collective, Project Art Works).

In contrast to Beuys's one-man show as shaman/artist/ecologist at Documenta 7 (1982), ruangrupa's reconfigurations challenged the flow of attention and money not only during the one hundred days of the exhibition in 2022 but also before and after. The multiplication of actors, together with the blurring of roles and responsibilities, made it difficult to idealize and canonize any of the actors or practices involved. Their model of curating proposed another way of being with the world, through sharing—



Top: The Black Archives. *Black Pasts & Presents: Interwoven Histories of Solidarity*, Asia Art Archive, 2022. Documenta 15, Fridericianum, Kassel. Photograph by Frank Sperling. © Documenta Archive.



Bottom: Britto Arts Trust. *PAKGHOR—the social kitchen*, 2022. Documenta 15, Documenta Halle, Kassel. Photograph by Victoria Tomaschko. © Documenta Archive.

of resources, space, knowledge, authorship. This proposition of solidarity responded to the needs of many experiencing the deep alienation induced by the global COVID-19 pandemic. While the motto of Documenta 14 was “learning from Athens,” d15 invited its participants to learn *with* one another. And yet, one of the many questions that remains is whether art critics and historians are willing to embark on the journey to learn *with* d15: How do we write about it? What modes of writing could capture or even further develop the radical redistribution of creative, organizational, and financial agency and the strong dedication to shared practices initiated by d15? Why does this latest Documenta, in spite of the novelty and excitement that it brought, continue to elude us by its illegibility? We can only

speculate on the reasons—one of the factors being the fragmented nature of the record. While “process” in theory was elaborately represented through complex diagrams and flip charts, the actual process, as it unfolded in all its minuteness, unpredictability, and oral interaction, has remained opaque—as could be read in the lost expressions of many visitors as they stood before the graphic representations that filled the first hall of the Fridericianum on the ground floor to the right.

This opacity further manifested itself in habits of communication that were more often than not premised on an avoidance of committed response or directness, making dialogue on concrete issues an uphill and initially frustrating trial. This is an experience we had several times and has since been confirmed by others. Our interactions with members of *ruangrupa* were friendly and sympathetic. And yet, at the end we were left in the dark about the operationalizing of their curatorial principles, about how metaphors such as “ekosistem” and “composting knowledge” could be translated into material strategies. Declaring their approach as “nonsystematic, not crystalline, dynamic,” as one that “changes according to conversations between people and their needs” makes that approach unavailable to most analytical ventures.¹⁴ Socialized within an authoritarian political system, this would seem to be a form of carefully cultivated resistance to institutionalized power, as the collective strove to rearrange the terms of its own peripheral existence. This is in marked difference both to practices that have grown within democratic, multivocal civil societies elsewhere and to the discursive modes of communication that many of us take for granted. While this practice of collectivity resembles avant-garde movements such as dada and surrealism, or the form of institutional critique that came with Fluxus, it escapes these available models, given the emphasis on dispersal. On the flip side, the proclamation of core values such as solidarity, friendship, sustainability, trust, responsibility, and sharing remained abstract to many within the exhibition setting. David Teh describes *ruangrupa* as “more a spirit of curatorship—not limited to a single body, yet somehow tied to a place.”¹⁵ Perhaps we should read the “show” not as a unified whole translating an orchestrated politics of site and display but as a form of redistribution, of celebrating plurality by making it resist existing categories. Curating as a transcultural process of world making can only unfold through long-term interactions that cannot be viewed as seamless or linear. We can extract many nuggets of creative experimentation from what we saw and experienced through the work of individual collectives, which would no doubt travel further to fresh exhibition sites. Attending to the empowering dimensions of Documenta 15 and analyzing their fault lines are important steps toward making sense of transformations over time.

Notes

1. Jacques Rancière, *Le partage du sensible: Esthétique et politique* (Paris: La Fabrique Éditions, 2000).

2. These are put forward in the *Documenta Fifteen Handbook* (Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz, 2022), 8–43.

3. *Documenta Fifteen Handbook*, 34.

4. Jan von Brevern explores the historical meanings of *lumbung* together with its contemporary transcultural attraction in European urban settings in Jan von Brevern, “Ästhetikkolumne: ‘Lumbung’—die Rückkehr der Scheune,” *Merkur* 75, no. 869 (2021): 59–65.

5. See Burcu Dogramaci, “Das imaginierte Museum,” *Texte zur Kunst*, 17 October 2022, <https://www.textezurkunst.de/de/articles/burcu-dogramaci-documenta-das-imaginierte-museum/>.

6. “One Day We Shall Celebrate Again: RomaMoMA at Documenta Fifteen,” *ERIAC Newsletter*, June 2022, <https://eriac.org/one-day-we-shall-celebrate-again-romamoma-at-documenta-fifteen-2/>.

7. The phrase “Restitution 2.0” was coined by the curator and cultural theorist Mahret Ifeoma Kupka. See “Restitution 2.0,” *Texte zur Kunst*, 17 October 2022, <https://www.textezurkunst.de/de/articles/mahret-ifeoma-kupka-documenta-restitution-20/>.

8. For a discussion of power structures embedded in the idea of *lumbung*, its communitarian values notwithstanding, see the position of the anthropologist Judith Schlehe, cited in von Brevern, “Ästhetikkolumne,” 62. Its recent appropriation by the Indonesian government to designate a controversial food program points to its contested nature. Discussions of community and collectivity in the Global North—as, for example, in the writings of Claire Bishop and Grant Kester—have focused on an opposition between neoliberal economics and artistic collectivity. In other contexts, such as in Indonesia, such a duality is often transcended in an attempt to strategically connect social engagement and peer support to working relationships within production systems. See Elly Kent, “The History of Conscious Collectivity Behind Ruangrupa,” *On Curating*, no. 54 (November 2022): 25–28.

9. Ronald Kolb, “The Bumpy Road on the Third Way: Fragmentary Thoughts on the Threats and Troubles of Commons and Commoning in Contemporary Art and Knowledge Production,” *On Curating*, no. 54 (November 2022): 57–94, here 76.

10. As articulated by Farid Rakun of the ruangrupa collective, cited by Kolb, 73.

11. Of the ten members of ruangrupa, three are women. During our interactions with the group, we observed a demarcation of domains along gender lines—male members were the ones who addressed the public and responded on discursive issues, while women invariably (and by their own admission) took a backseat. Tasks conventionally considered “feminine,” such as child-care, were assigned to a female member of the group. These observations have also been confirmed by the more extensive research of Claudia König, a doctoral candidate at the Heidelberg Centre for Transcultural Studies working on the collective ruangrupa. Personal communication, Kassel, June 2022. In her discussion of “Freundschaftsökonomien,” Nanne Buurman critically examines the nature of “affective work” at Documenta 15. She refers to a publication by the *sobats* calling for greater solidarity in the face of precarity. See Nanne Buurman, “Im Hirtenstall geboren? Governmentalität bei der ‘Documenta Fifteen,’” *Texte zur Kunst*, 17 October 2022, <https://www.textezurkunst.de/de/articles/nanne-buurman-im-hirtenstall-geboren/>.

12. Dorothee Richter, “Curatorial Commons? A Paradigm Shift,” *On Curating*, no. 54 (November 2022): 29–50, here 35.

13. Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994).

14. *Documenta Fifteen Handbook*, 31.

15. David Teh, “Who Cares a Lot? Ruangrupa as Curatorship,” *Afterall: A Journal of Art, Context and Enquiry*, no. 30 (June 2012), <https://www.afterall.org/article/who-cares-a-lot-ruangrupa-as-curatorship>.