

Envelope 1: 'Kickstarter dialogues'

In this envelope, you'll find some examples of special forms of dialogue.

You will use one of these dialogues in your subgroup as a 'kickstarter' for a quick first dive into the subject of interest of this week, the Paradox of Safety and Transgression, to find dilemmas that are currently at stake for us in regard to this issue in order to formulate a communal 'burning' question. This burning question will serve as a 'campfire' to gather around within your subgroup. At the end of this exercise there will be 6 campfires, that we will present to each other

The examples in this envelope are excerpts of existing forms of dialogue; background texts are in the syllabus that was sent to you earlier. These dialogues are not necessarily what we call 'imaginative' but they can serve our purpose for this moment.

Example from 'Subversive Affirmation' (Kicurovska & Cornelis, 2022)

Think with your hands, or prototype. Rapid prototyping workshop.

Introducing situations:

- Work in pairs (or trio's). Think of 2 situations with an obvious experienced tension related to the theme the Paradox of Safety & Transgression.
- Each pair introduces these 2 situations to the others, each pair selects one of the situations from the other pair.

Affirm

- Affirm what you just heard by visualizing the situation using the materials supplied to you. Try to take out the specific elements that mark the situation, what strikes you especially?
- Ultra -short presentation of the prototypes. Clarifying questions can be asked.

Subvert

- Each pair takes over another pairs' prototype
- Subvert the affirmative prototype by adjusting it, exaggerating it or repurposing it.
- Ultra-short presentation of the prototypes, clarifying questions can be asked.
- Give both prototypes a title
- Formulate a communal burning question regarding the paradox of safety and transgression in your subgroup.

Example from Building Conversation: The Scripts: Impossible Conversation (Aers, van den Berg, Lotker, 2022).

Inspired by a practice developed by Jesuit Monks living together in monasteries. Although the Jesuits believed in the same God and (...) were used to the same belief system that is based on lived experiences, they found it difficult to have concrete and committed conversations about several concepts (...) Therefore they developed a practice in which writing from personal experience, reading and listening play an important role.

- ...bring your attention to a personal experience, a moment in your life in which you encountered the paradox of safety and transgression. An experience so intense, when remembering it you can still feel it in your body". Who played a role in this and what role did you play?
- Three rounds of exploring the theme:
 - > Round 1: Writing, Reading aloud, Listening.
 - > Round 2: Writing about what you heard from the first round, Reading aloud, Listening. >
 - >Round 3: Talking together about what we have heard during the first two rounds.

- Formulate a communal burning question regarding the paradox of Safety and Transgression in your subgroup.

Example from Building Conversation, The Scripts Parliament of Things (Aers, van den Berg, Lotker, 2022).

Related to Bruno Latours' actor-network theory, wherein he states how we as humans exist in a network of things (...)that also act (...)he calls these things 'actants'.

- Think of an experience you had with the paradox of Safety and Transgression and choose a thing from table 1 that for you represents this experience
- Everyone gets the time to put this thing on table 2 and tell why it is connected to the experience.
- Try out replacements of the things, talk about what you see happening. The spatial arrangements highlight different perspectives on Safety & Transgression.
- Sit down and take the thing in your hands. From that moment onwards you will speak as that thing.
- Evaluate: What did the Parliament of Things tell us about the theme of Safety and Transgression?
- Formulate a communal burning question regarding the paradox of Safety and Transgression in your subgroup.

Example from Building Conversation, The Scripts: Time Loop (Aers, van den Berg, Lotker, 2022).

Based on work of storyteller Joseph Osawabine from Canadian indigenous theatre group Debajehmujig in which ancestors from 7 generations ago and descendants seven generations ahead are consulted when making important decisions in life. This one opens a time-space to think in.

- The conversation will be about the paradox of Safety & Transgression, about the individual and communal dilemmas that are currently at stake for us.
- Mark different lines on the floor: the middle line is now, on one side is the past 100-1.000-10,000 and on the other side is the future with the same distances. You speak about the paradox of Safety & Transgression from different perspectives in time
- Each person chooses a position in this time-space standing in the place of a person who has lived or will live. Speak and listen from the perspective of this person. You can draw on what you know or what you imagine about people living in that era. Use also physical experiences and feelings while standing in a certain position in time.
 1. One designated facilitator who stays on the middle line, the now, is responsible for gathering questions from the group and will give advice after consulting with the ancestors and descendants.
 2. People standing on the lines of past or future persons give direct advice, a teaching or a story about the way to deal with the questions at stake
- Change positions during the conversation to change the perspective on the theme.
- Formulate a communal burning question regarding the paradox of Safety and Transgression in your subgroup.

Example from Building Conversation, The Scripts: Agonistic dialogue (Aers, van den Berg, Lotker, 2022).

Inspired by books of political scientist Chantal Mouffe and Maori meetings in New Zealand this dialogue addresses conflicting and polarizing topics that are at stake in the group itself or in the social political context. Agonistic means 'opponent', not enemy. Opponents have a shared system of values, they stand on common ground. Agreeing on main values, while disagreeing on the definitions of these values.

- Propose three topics concerning the paradox of Safety & Transgression and give space to the group to make suggestions or state it directly when it is clear
 - Propose the topic in a polarizing way from the start: a choreography in 3 positions: two groups opposite each other. Polarize differences between the groups, talk in 'we' and 'you' terms: you are all about safety, we are about progression etc. Don't discuss, just listen. Explore what it does to you that your group is more and more strictly defined.
 - New position: in what way do you want to approach people from the other group? It can be anything, what feels best for you
 - New, last position: lying down, take some moments of silence, then speak from your personal perspective, use 'I'. Explore how this changes your arguments and your relation towards the arguments of the others.
 - Formulate a communal burning question regarding the paradox of Safety and Transgression in your subgroup.
-

Example from a dialogue of Sparklab, art & philosophy lab for children (Beekman, 2021).

In this lab, art and philosophy with children are intertwined; philosophical themes are explored through words, images, movement, building and music. The following dialogue form is

- Use tape to make a dialogical space on the ground together. Be aware about the shape and the format of this space. Note that our theme is 'the Paradox of Safety & Transgression'.
- Make a triptych. Everyone makes 3 very quick drawings: one about safety, one about transgression and one about 'a third thing' (an unrelated notion).
- Put all the triptychs on the floor in your dialogical space and see what these triptychs tell you.
- Give a vivid sensual, embodied description of a personal experience of a situation in which either safety or transgression was very important for you. After this: ask each other at least two of the following questions: *Do you need another person to feel safe? Can safety be transgressive? Are flowers concerned with safety? Is art always transgressive? Is transgressive art safe?*
- Look at the dialogical space that you have made with the tape. Do the shape and size of it fit the dialogue that you have been involved in? Alter if you feel like it and give this dialogical space a name.
- Formulate a communal burning question regarding the paradox of Safety and Transgression in your subgroup.

Envelope 2 The Adventure of this Week

Working in subgroups on developing Imaginative Dialogues and Dialogical spaces that offer conditions for these to happen.

1. Developing imaginative dialogues.

- An Imaginative dialogue involves the creation of new experiences by artistic means and an exploration of the unexpected.

- In this dialogue participants notice and question their assumptions and prejudices. The dialogue involves curiosity, play, humor, attentiveness, sensing, silence, listening, relaxedness and interest in otherness and the unknown
- In Imaginative dialogues the language of different art disciplines is spoken, there can be interdisciplinarity (between disciplines) or multimodality (multiple literacies within one medium)

Try out some preparatory exercises to wake up your senses before you start your working sessions. Everyone can bring in exercises from their own experience.

- auditive exercises
- embodied exercises
- theatrical or dance exercises

You might have done preparatory reading before the Intensive Week, there is interesting background information in the syllabus about dialogue, For example about Building Conversation: The Scripts (Aers, van den Berg, Lotker, 2022) or about Subversive Affirmation (Kicurovska & Cornelis, 2022) or about Sparklabs' dialogues (Beekman, 2021).

2. Building a Dialogical space.

- A dialogical space is both a social & a physical space that has its own 'rules', configuration of actors (roles), meanings and relations, providing fruitful conditions for imaginative dialogues.
- It involves a conscious and spatial arrangement of all physical and non-physical elements that constitute the dialogue.
- The dialogical space is different from the surrounding space, this means that it has a 'border'. Entering it involves a threshold experience thus it needs a ritual that marks the partition of space.
- Explicit ground rules of dialogical space relate to those of 'brave space': 1 agree to disagree 2. Don't take things personal; be aware of the gap between intention and impact 3. challenge by choice: what keeps you from challenging yourself? 4. Maintain an increased mindfulness of different (cultural) ways to demonstrate respectfulness to one another 5. Distinguish explicitly between a personal attack (don't do this) and a challenge to an individual's idea or belief that makes him/her/them uncomfortable.

Preparatory actions during the Intensive Week

- Define and be transparent about the general rules of the dialogical space and about the different, fluid roles that you as guides take up in this space. Write them down.
- You might already have done preparatory reading before the Intensive Week, there is interesting background information in the syllabus about space, for example: From Safe Spaces to Brave Spaces (Arao & Clemens, 2013), Building Conversation, The Scripts (Aers, van den Berg, Lotker, 2022) specifically 'Preparing for conversation' (locations, material, catering, preparing conversation space, the role of the guide, the role of the participants, the walk to conversation space, introduction and preparation in the conversation space) and Revisiting Social Space. Relational thinking about organizational change (Friedman, 2011 p. 241-249).

3. During the work in process: reflective documentation.

Integrate reflective documentation in the process. Consider what the documentation does; how it frames and highlights something and in so doing, what kinds of new thoughts and ideas it may generate. Also, what does it leave out?

Capture/document in an imaginative, reflective way:

- the process (the way you collaborate)
- the performative quality of the imaginative dialogue and the dialogical space (what does it do?)

On Tuesday and Thursday subgroups give short participative presentations of their imaginative dialogues and dialogical spaces and reflect on their collaborative process and the performative quality of their dialogues and dialogical spaces.

After each presentation there will be feedback from the other subgroups.