Editors’ Introduction

Jordana Blejmar (University of Liverpool) and Cecilia Sosa (Conicet/Untref, Argentina)

This special issue is the result of a series of screenings entitled *Meeting the Directors: Dialogues Between New Argentine Cinema & Theatre* held in 2013 at Senate House in London. A joint venture between the Institute of Latin American Studies and the Institute of Modern Languages Research, both part of the University of London, the screenings were open to the general public and were designed to explore the dialogues and exchanges taking place between so-called New Argentina Cinema and the less-well-known New Argentine Theatre. The series was the first time that such a range of diverse experimental productions were shown in the UK accompanied by conversations with the young directors, who were either present at the venue or interviewed via video-conferences on the day of the screenings.

This special issue builds on those conversations, identifying here a new and upcoming genre in contemporary Argentine cultural production marked by a hybrid aesthetics with elements from both theater and cinema, a blending of fact and fiction, a playful spirit and transnational dialogues on stage/screen. Thus, the various contributions included in this publication highlight the innovative use of technology, humour, live music and dance that characterises this up-and-coming body of work, one that, over the last few years, has challenged the rigidity of genre boundaries. The essays engage critically with a particular series of films and theatrical pieces by talented directors such as Romina Paula, Lola Arias, Mariano Pensotti, Alejo Moguillansky, Matías Piñeiro, Edgado Dieleke and Daniel Casabé, among others. Whilst most of these pieces were screened at Senate House, some of them, such as *Minefield*, which debuted in 2016 in the UK, were included especially for the analysis in this volume. It is our contention that together these works exemplify the emergence of a fresh and exciting generational, transnational and trans-disciplinary voice in the performing arts in Argentina.

**Beyond the New Argentine Cinema and Biodrama**

While the emergence and development of the so-called New Argentina Cinema (NAC) during the 1990s and the new millennium has received considerable attention from local and international scholars, critics have suggested that this trend has recently reached a standstill. As Jens Andermann has pointed out: “after the cusp of social and political emergency in Argentina had passed and the initial excitement had worn off, critics could predictably do little but detect the ‘exhaustion’ of the very movement they had conjured up” (2011: xxi). Thus, Andermann concludes, “the time has perhaps arrived for looking at new Argentine cinema without the capital letters” (ibidem). In contrast to the arguable exhaustion of the NAC, a community of Argentine theatre-makers and young filmmakers has fashioned a unique and lively space within both the domestic market and major international festivals. In the current post-New Argentine Cinema period, this collection of essays addresses the way in which cinema and theatre have recently been experiencing a fruitful exchange of interests, directors, writers, castings and audiences, giving room to a new circuit that renovates and enhances both art forms.

More specifically, this dossier examines how a playful overlapping of documentary and fiction has managed to push forward and reanimate not only the ostensible wave of neo-realist stories and dry humour introduced by New Argentine Cinema, but also a particular form of documentary theatre that has come to be known as “Biodrama”. The term ¨Biodrama¨ was originally coined by director Vivi Tella to describe a series of biographical pieces in which the performers re-enacted episodes of their real lives on stage. As Philippa Page explores in her contribution, Tellas came up with the term “Biodrama” in 2002 as a response to the critical aftermath of the massive economic and political crisis of 2001. Page argues that Biodrama “used theatre to explore the possibilities of rebuilding a sense of community in what was, at the time of its inception, a severely debilitated post-crisis social fabric.” For Tellas, the return of experience was also the return of the personal, albeit a particular type of self, immersed in politics and culture.

Many of the films and theatrical plays studied in this issue could arguably be considered as enhanced forms of Biodrama. Not only have they acquired new and more sophisticated individual characteristics but they have also gained a collective sense of belonging and status. For that reason, we suggest that they be analyzed in relation to the original Biodrama trend initiated by Tellas but also that they be seen as having their own distinct characteristics. As many of the pieces studied in this issue demonstrate, the real lives of the directors and those of the fictional characters play an continual game of hide-and-seek in this new body of work, confusing and blending fact and fiction, autobiography and imagination, in ways barely evident in previous productions. This is particularly notable in, for example, *El loro y el cisne* (Moguillansky’s film) in which the real biographies of the protagonists function as embodied back curtains from which fiction re-emerges. In many cases, the autobiographical playfully re-enters into the realm of the fiction simultaneously regaining an extra testimonial power. This enhanced form of truth resonates between stages and screens generating novel forms of spectatorship that constitute a new type of audience.

In sum, cinema beyond NAC and theatre beyond Biodrama constitute the main shifting paths along which this new body of work can be traced. To define the main features of the pieces that comprise this new genre we could arguably say that they are neither completely testimonial nor autobiographical accounts but rather auto-fictional performances. They are made out of the fabric of the real but are more playful and imaginary than realistic. They are clearly “Argentine” and especially *porteñxs* but also proudly Cosmopolitan. They are, ultimately, subjective but also highly political, communitarian and immersed in history.

**Kirchnerism and Aesthetic Autonomy**

The body of work addressed in this issue was mostly produced during the administrations of Néstor Kirchner (2003-2007) and Cristina Fernández de Kirchner (2007-2015), a highly controversial political period which supporters championed as “la década ganada” while detractors dismissed as the opposite, “la década perdida”. During this period, certain claims that were not at the forefront of the state’s concerns during the 1990s, occupied a privileged place in the political agenda. These claims include the Argentine sovereignty over Malvinas/Falkland’s islands, the trials against perpetrators of human rights violations committed during the 1976-1983 military dictatorship, a progressive legal framework in relation to social equality (including a universal child allowance, same-sex marriage, and fertilisation and gender transition laws). With the novel intervention of the state as a safe keeper of certain progressive political rights and values, the field of art and culture allowed itself to be less “testimonial”, more playful and even more irreverent with previous sacred topics of the Argentine traumatic past. Lola Arias’ performances, but also Mariano Pensotti’s sophisticated installations and Casabé’s and Dieleke’s melancholic “mourning film” addressed here are good examples of the new relationship between aesthetics and politics established during this period.

The articles included in this issue also show to what extent the Kirchnerist years that officially ended in December 2015 also included a performative element. As Sosa argues in her piece, there was something very much corporeal about *Kirchnerism*, something which brought to light a new idea of performance and redefined the meaning of the Spanish expression “poner el cuerpo”. Indeed, as sociologist María Pía López contends, during the neoliberal 1990s it was difficult to imagine “modos de la política que impliquen apuestas corporales.” (1997: 79) Despite notable exceptions such as the *escraches,* organized by the children of the disappeared gathered at HIJOS (HIjos por la Identidad y la Justicia contra el Olvido y el Silencio), the 1990s was mainly a decade when politics became a spectacle that people watched passively on television screens from the comfort of their homes: “cuerpos encerrados en el hogar y conectados con lo público a través de la recepción” (López, ibidem). By contrast, during the Kirchner era, the multitudes resurfaced, exhibiting a joyful sense of being together. Thus, this highly controversial period brought back the idea of remaking the street and of bodies literally re-appropriating public spaces in open acts of solidarity and political and affective encounters.

In December 2015 businessman and former football club president Mauricio Macri and a “CEO cabinet” took office putting forward a regressive political and economic programme with the explicit idea of “deskirchnerizar” the country. In this new political and cultural context, the corporeal flair that defined the Kirchnerist years became a new form of resistance, as illustrated for example by the various “*abrazos*” públicos [public hugs] that are still taking place at the time of writing, a means of showing solidarity with the thousands of people made redundant as a result of the policies of this government.

It is worth noting, however, that even in the political context of recent years, most of the directors whose work is addressed here managed to remain loyal to some sort of aesthetic autonomy. With some exceptions, these productions have engaged with controversial issues of the past in a completely novel way, being reluctant to deal with those themes explicitly, as if they were protecting a playful tone from contamination by over-exposed political questions. The autonomy of subjects and styles among this wave of directors became a sort of aesthetic platform that subtlety addressed (if not ignored) the demands for a political revision of the past called for by many Kirchnerist artists and practitioners. This apparent disengagement has been, paradoxically, their silent political platform. In this aspect, the trend seems to have followed Albertina Carri’s groundbreaking film *Los rubios* (2003), released at the beginning of the *Kirchnerismo*, and the way in which the actress that plays the director’s role in the film expresses a feeling of “tiredness” when confronted with the testimonies of the survivors of the dictatorship and the discourses of the past that had governed the field for so many years. In similar ways, both Carri’s film and the productions analyzed here sought to refresh the ways in which aesthetics engages with politics and speaks to new generations with a renovated language, thus shedding light on an alternative way of being political.

**A New Hybrid Genre**

The new genre that we identify in this issue involves the multi-layered circulation of subjects, styles and techniques (in)between cinema and theatre. Firstly, the sense of contagion between both fields is accompanied by the physical presence of cinematic screens within theatre productions as well as “theatrical echoes” within cinema. At the same time, filmmakers explore dramaturgy while theatre directors make incursions into film production. Similarly, actors (from both fields) move from one territory to the other, bringing to each medium techniques and styles learnt as part of their respective training and their work on stage or in front of the camera. Secondly, the inclusion of experimental episodes of live music, poetry and dance within both cinema and theatre act as a “surprising resource” that fosters a sense of community among the practitioners and challenges the purity of traditional genres. Thirdly, the directors of the productions addressed are children of the digital age and, as a result, have been trained to work across diverse media. The use of new technologies and new media in both fields enhances the generational mark of this body of work and blurs the boundaries between virtual realities and the physical realm in their narratives. Fourthly, the recurrence of a playful and comical style fosters the self-referential imprint of these productions in contrast with the dry sense of humour typical of many neo-realist New Argentine Cinema productions. Fifthly, this cross-pollination between film and theatre generates new and wider audiences committed to the spirit of experimentation that characterizes the genre. More specifically, far from passive forms of spectatorship, this body of work stimulates its audience on an intellectual and emotional level with inter-textual references and affective triggers. Thus, the spectators become crucial allies of these productions. As Jacques Rancière argues in *The Emancipated Spectator* (2007), spectators also *act*: they participate and refashion the performance in their own way, as if completing a poem. Thus, many of these productions redefine what we understand by “testimony” or “writings of the self”, changing the rules of autobiography and blending self-exposure with (auto)fictional poetics and experimental strategies.

**From Buenos Aires to the Global World**

Together with the aforementioned attributes, this up-and-coming circuit of practitioners has built a sense of belonging mostly related to and engaging with the megacity of Buenos Aires. At the same time, however, these film and theatre makers have produced their work in close dialogue with counterparts in Europe, as well as with some productions and independent trends in the United States, via the circuit of international festivals where Argentine “products” are presented (and seen) in a very different context. Indeed, most of the artists and directors have studied and sometimes lived in different European and US cities, acquiring new languages and familiarizing themselves with the cultural landscapes and affective idiosyncrasies of each place. A case in point is Matías Piñeiro, who has lived in New York since 2011 but regularly returns to Buenos Aires to shoot his films. For instance, in his series of Shakespearian comedies (*Rosalinda*, *Viola*, *La Princesa de Francia*) these global classics are relocated in the Argentine capital and reinterpreted from a gendered and sometimes queer perspective. Similarly, Lola Arias, a peripatetic director, lives and works intermittently in Buenos Aires, Berlin and London. Some of her plays, notably *My Life After* and *The Year I was Born* (2012, the Chilean version of the former), was also performed in different locations, keeping the original idea (what she calls “a portable concept”) but changing the actors, the language and the historical events addressed in the play. The theme of globalized identities, polyglots, and transnational places are also explicitly tackled in works such as *Airport Kids* (2008), *Maids* (2010-2011) and *Parallel Cities* (2010-2011). In both *Minefield* and Dieleke’s and Casabé’s *La forma exacta de las islas* the issue of national identities and affective territories is also the focus of the plots.

Taken together, the selection of productions addressed in this issue, therefore, mobilize transnational dialogues which also involve affective forms of contagion and transmission: from Piñeiro’s reversions and re-inventions of Shakespeare in Buenos Aires, to the contestation and mockery of the American way of cultural production displayed in Moguilansky’s latest film, Romina Paula’s revisiting of Dickens in *El tiempo todo entero,* or the way in which she plays out the fantasy of more beautiful and blurred gender possibilities in *Fauna*. As a result, this body of work crosses interdisciplinary boundaries at the same time as introducing emergent Latin American paradigms to the English-speaking world. Given the trans-national nature of the corpus, many of these productions raise important questions about the act of making theatre in marginal locations, and about translation and trans-culturation. More than that, these works also manage to play back their own sense of precariousness and occasional marginality to transform that into the focal point of a rebellious and sometimes ludicrous fight that playfully destabilizes gender positions, locations and accounts of the self beyond trauma. In that sense, it could be argued that many of these productions emerge from what the postcolonial critic Homi Bhabha called the “third space”, a process of “cultural hybridity that gives rise to something different, something new and unrecognizable, a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation” (Rutheford, 1990: 211).

Born in the late 1970s and early 1980s, many of these filmmakers and theatre directors graduated from La Fundación Universidad de Cine (FUC) in Buenos Aires during the mid 90s. “Cuando nosotros empezábamos a estudiar actuación, el cine y el teatro eran dos esferas separadas. No había actores de teatro en el cine. Y esto cambió completamente, ahora hay una circulación natural entre los dos espacios”, says Romina Paula in an interview quoted in Brenda Werth’s contribution. As Matías Piñeiro puts it in another interview, “yo trabajo en Argentina con actores que son muy buenos, pero que además montan sus obras de maneras similares a como yo filmo mis películas. Hay una conexión, una identificación” (*Otros cines*, Piñeiro, 2016). Alejo Moguillasky has also made of this blend of film and theatre the materiality of his own work. His latest film, *El escarabajo de oro*, features a community of friends and artists who act themselves. To some extent, this form of production can be seen as a strategy to confront the precarious network of funding. “Hay un prejuicio de que somos chicos ricos que nos gusta filmar”, says Moguillansky (*La razón*, 2014). And he goes on: “Me doy el lujo de filmar, pero al precio de poner en riesgo mi economía constantemente.” As in most of his productions there were no salaries involved and he took all his family and friends on board. Thus, he proudly argues that his films share the same “moral identity” (*La razón*, 2014). Thus, the circulation and exchange of names, themes and skills become “natural” and a key feature of this new genre.

Many of the directors have also preferred to exhibit their productions within alternative cultural venues, such as the Museo de Arte Latinoamericano de Buenos Aires (MALBA) or the Museo de Arte Moderno de Buenos Aires (MAMBA), both of which usually feature independent authors. Some of the films have also been shown at the annual Independent Film Festival of Buenos Aires (BAFICI) inaugurated in 1999. In one of the scenes from Moguillansky’s *El escarabajo de oro*, which won the award for Best Film at the 2016 edition of the Festival, the theatre director and performer Rafael Spregelburd, who plays the role of one of the actors, refers to those “Argentine artists who go to Europe to get some Euros”, the directors who “set their productions in tiny venues where no one comes” and those “who make that sort of film who nobody cares about”. This crucial and revelatory self-reflexive moment in the film might also describe a whole community of producers and artists who have learned to play with their marginality and make it the center of their fantasies and their sophisticated, postcolonial work.

**A New Subjectivity**: **A Feeling of Community**

One of the main hypotheses present in these articles is that this generation of artists (theatre-doers and filmmakers but also performers and musicians) has revealed the emergence of a new type of subjectivity. They were born during or after the 1976-1983 dictatorship and are mostly contemporaries of the generation of the children of the disappeared, but they have reacted to the resonances of trauma in their own terms. As their productions show, they are capable of being playful, irreverent and even narcissist. To some extent, they have explored that recent history mostly as outsiders or bystanders. However, at the same time, not only have they approached the traumatic past in subtle ways within their sophisticated stories but they have also transformed them into enhanced fictions, a move evident, for example, in Pensotti’s and Arias’ work. The freedom of playing with postcolonial identities and bringing into play more fluid gender fantasies and real lives also functions as a highlighted endeavor performed by this new wave of prestigious directors. This renovation might also stand as a response to attract funding coming from festivals abroad and appeal to international audiences. In this struggle, they have also transformed the materiality of the local traumatic past into fictional layers of transnational tropes that circulate and provide new bursts of energy to their mischievous productions.

Some critics have accused this ludic approach to the traumatic past as self-absorbed, disrespectful to victims, egoistic and apolitical. The authors of these works have been also accused of being a bunch of elitist children. However, it would be unfair and narrow-minded to reduce their complex body of work to such a judgmental and moralistic view. This new group of directors has instead managed to bring to light a new body of work that blurs the boundaries between theatre and cinema, reading and writing, producing and directing. They are also the free heirs of a traumatized generation who have learnt to tell stories and approach the real with a new affective tone. Coinciding with a political period that transformed memory into a national and also official state platform, they have managed to reinvent themselves within global theatrical trends and markets at the same time as reinventing the updated narratives of collective memory, challenging positions of gender, politics and transnational belonging.

In sum, this new body of work defines a generation of artists that is not afraid of playing with disparate materials and of making fiction out of them. Moreover, this group of directors shares a way of working and producing which does not seem to be independent from camaraderie. Thus, most of these productions become an exaltation of friendship and re-emerge as a place of joy and experimentation.

**This Issue**

In the first article of the issue Philippa Page analyses the complex relationships between fiction and reality, theatre and life, stages and screens, virtual and organic spaces, as well as experience and imagination in Mariano Pensotti’s theatrical piece, *Cineastas* (2013), a work of biodrama that she sees as emblematic of a new generational gaze in Argentine theatre. In her words, “Pensotti casts out existing categories and asks us to consider the more integral role that virtual spaces, such as cinema, play in making contemporary worlds, inflecting both our sense of being in and (dis)belonging to a specific place”. For Page, this piece exposes “the theatricality inherent in intersubjective relations” and the “image-conscious arena of politics”, meaning the fact that “reality must be dramatized, or performed, in order to be thought (stripped of its theatrical artifice, that is)”. This aspect of Pensotti’s performance, what Jorge Dubatti calls “*la teatralización*” of life, defines in fact many of the pieces addressed in this publication. For Lola Arias, for example, not only are we all somehow performers in our everyday lives, but the re-enactment of real lives on stage highlights the performative nature of our existence.

Cecilia Sosa’s contribution analyses *El loro y el cisne*, Moguillanksy’s quirky and hilarious piece that presents the rehearsals of the experimental dance company Krapp. Sosa argues that the enfolded puzzle of screens, stages and lives at stake in the film sheds light on an upcoming hybrid genre within Argentine contemporary cultural production. In particular, she examines how the local version of a classic ballet fable provides a playful overlap between documentary and fiction, at the time as calling into question traditional boundaries across the arts. In dialogue with Homi Bhabha’s postcolonial literary theory and insights from affect studies, she shows how *El loro* can be read as a powerful critique of what it means to be an artist in Latin American postcolonial landscapes. Ultimately, she argues that the “never-ending layers of documentary and fiction”at stake in the film feature a new affective and generational language to address the aftermath of Argentina’s dictatorship. Sosa’s piece also helps to conceptualize the “corporeal” turn that characterized the Kirchnerist years. She makes the case that Moguillansky’s documentation of the dancing bodies on stage becomes expressive of epidemic tensions among regionalization, globalization and renationalization. In this context, she argues that these bodily encounters “stand as an exploration of broader intensities that awaken during the Kirchnerist administrations which witnessed a rediscovered passion for the collective”.

In the third article, Brenda Werth offers a reading of Romina Paula’s acclaimed piece, *Fauna*. For Werth “while works by Argentine artists such as Vivi Tellas, Lola Arias, Mariano Pensotti, Federico León seek creative opportunities for the real to interrupt and ultimately break down the theatrical frame, Paula’s *Fauna* offers a poetic reflection on what this slippage between the real and the fictional means, and indeed what it means to aspire toward capturing the real through performance”. Werth’s understanding of “the real” is more sophisticated than the mere intrusion of “real lives” in theatre. For her, the “real” is “as an ephemeral flash of ineffable truth, as a strategy belonging to both fiction and non-fiction; as a sensation constructed through biographical intimacy; and as a normative category, against which characters in Paula’s play enact the fantasy of gender”. With a specific focus on, precisely, the relationship between gender and the real and following Judith Butler’s theoretical insights, Werth argues that “*Fauna* provides the fantasy of a new gender in which the masculine and feminine are blended, reconfigured in new combinations, and made indistinguishable in the form of a ‘beautiful, impressive’ being”. As Werth contends, Paula’s work forces us to think more critically about the real and how it has been privileged in contemporary theater as a way of exposing its limitations and surreptitious normativity.

Constanza Cereza’s contribution analyses Matías Piñeiro’s *Viola*, and the way the piece constructs meaning through intertextual references (to Shakespeare’s plays and also to local texts), the blurred boundaries between cinema and theatre, being and appearance, reality and artifice, and “an unstable affective network in which bodies, sounds and gazes contaminate the characters’ everyday lives”. In similar fashion to Werth’s essay, Ceresa also looks at the way this piece “creates an indiscernible zone where gender identities and meaning are dissolved” or at least contested. For Ceresa, in the task of redefining identities or re-writing classical texts, repetition and iteration play a central role as a way of de-naturalising both habits and discourses. This idea is in tune with Arias’ concept of the “remake”, meaning the idea that re-enacting past events always implies the subversion of the original reference.

The last two articles offer a post-dictatorship generational reading on two contemporary works of theatre and cinema that address the same event, the Malvinas-Falklands war. In her contribution, Jordana Blejmar analyses one of the most recent pieces of the corpus, Lola Arias’ *Minefield*. She argues that Arias’ ludic piece, in which both Argentine and British performers re-enact their experiences of the war on stage, is a perfect example of the autofictional turn that she sees as being characteristic of many of the works by the post-dictatorship generations that emerged around the turn of the millennium in Argentina. Unlike many of these works, however, ones mostly centered on the experiences of authors living underground childhoods, being persecuted by the military or being forced to witness the disappearance of their parents, *Minefield* focuses on the 1982 South Atlantic conflict, an episode that until recently was widely underexplored in the narratives of this particular generation of writers and practitioners. While Blejmar recognizes the risks involved in her “social experiment”, as Arias calls her performance, she argues that far from re-victimising the veterans or creating a horror show to feed morbid spectators, Arias’ idea of theatre as a “living creature” and as a “social experiment”, “fosters and legitimizes an alternative place of enunciation to those in which ex-combatants are often placed by other narratives of the war.” Instead of suffering bodies looking for mere compassion, ones reducible to collective labels (such as “chicos de la guerra”, “pirates” or “heroes”), the performers of *Minefield* are introduced as complex characters that have split subjectivities with more in common with their former foes than the hegemonic narratives of the war would often have us believe.

Finally, Irene Depetris Chauvin’s reading of *La forma exacta de las islas* highlights how, unlike other films concerning the Malvinas/Falklands war, this production “eludes the discourse of the ‘just cause’ and questions the validity of the epic narrative.” Casabé’s and Dieleke’s film looks at the conflict with a more melancholic gaze than Arias’ play. According to Depetris Chauvin, *La forma exacta de las islas* is indeed a “mourning film”, an “affective travelogue” and “a narrative of return” that explores the islands utilizing two trips as the starting point of a personal quest. The film also entwines fiction (in this case, the literary fictions written about the war that Julieta Vitullo, the protagonist, studied for her doctoral thesis) and reality (the real lives of the veterans that accompany her during her first trip, but also of her own involvement with them, an engagement that produces a love story and an unexpected tragedy). With a careful exploration of the affective landscapes, cartographies and geographies of the postwar proposed by the film, Depetris Chauvin highlights another main feature of this corpus, namely the transformation, after the 1976 coup, of the relationship between the public and the private and between the national and the intimate into a political tension.

To accompany these six articles, the issue also features an interview with the theatre director and filmmaker Federico León and the filmmaker Martin Rejtman, authors of *Entrenamiento elemental para actores* [Elementary training for actors, 2012], a short co-directed telefilm. The telefilm was the result of a public initiative led by Argentine National Television in 2007, which brought together seven pairs of film and theatre directors with the idea of creating a new collective piece. As Sosa argues, *Entrenamiento* is a “small, perfect, almost unnatainble piece of work that addresses the unpredictable encounter between two outstanding, obsessive directors”. In this vein, the short telefilm – which became a cult object – addressed a process of an encounter between both friends and disciplinary fields. This unnormative piece featured theatre lessons for children led by an eccentric professor. Ludic and strangely performative, *Entrenamiento* has moments of recklessness that make the piece not only an improbable acting class for child-actors but also a school of life for its entire audience. In the context of this issue, the interview marks the beginning of a timely process of exchange between theatre and film, one which has now become much more organic and which shapes the cross pollination of fields and disciplines that has marked subsequent years. The interview was originally circulated alongside the script of the telefilm in a book published by *La Bestia Equilátera* in 2012 and we are very grateful to the editors for allowing us to include it here. The issue closes with the thoughts of Professor María Delgado and Dr. Joanna Page, who offer their views on the genre conceptualized here in two short afterwords that enhance and enrich the discussions and provocations proposed by both the artists and contributors of this publication.
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