

Feminist hospitalities, para-sites and parasites.

CLARKE, J.

2024

《研究ノート》

Feminist Hospitalities, Para-sites and Parasites

Jennifer Clarke*



Introduction

This essay emerges from an anthropological and artistic exploration of the concept of the parasite or para-sitic used as a developing methodology, in the context of a long-term, ongoing project I call ‘Feminist Hospitalities’ (2020-). This project was the focus of fieldwork and practice I was fortunate to undertake through a Visiting Professorial Fellowship with the Center for Northeast Asian Studies during the summer of 2022 at Tohoku University. I would like to thank Professor Delaney

* Gray's School of Art, Robert Gordon University

『東北アジア研究』28号(2024年)、91-105頁、<https://doi.org/10.50974/0002000664>

© 2024 Jennifer CLARKE

本著作物は、特に記載がない限り、クリエイティブ・コモンズ 表示 4.0 国際 (CC BY 4.0) ライセンスの下で提供されています。<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.ja>



for her support while at CNEAS. I was invited to exhibit this art work in the summer of 2023, in Sendai, in June 2023, at ‘Gallery Turn(another)Round’, thanks to funding from the Great British Sasakawa Foundation for Arts and Culture. I am very grateful for their support. In this research report, I do not present a traditional ethnographic account of research activity, and instead outline anthropological and philosophical concepts (feminist hospitalities, para-sites and parasites) that underpin my hybrid ‘art-anthropology’ approach, which I introduce and reflect on, here as a form of autotheory, interspersed with a selection of the 20 visual works I created. This entanglement of theory, life, and artistic practice, involves transformations of form, across image, language, and indeed across languages performatively ‘translated’, filtered and rendered through a variety of digital tools, performative events and visual art making. Finally, I share a small example of this work, a para-sitic poem, published alongside art works, entitled ‘Parasites.’

This essay begins with the question of being a feminist, and a parasite myself and of creating ‘para-sites’ in my anthropological work. As a feminist anthropologist and artist working for some time in Japan in relation to the post-disaster context, my research deals with complex politics. However, this particular project is a form of ‘auto’theory in that it also addresses a changing sense of self related to becoming a mother – and in a different sense, hosting a parasite, and being subject to parasitic interruptions. It is also driven by an interest in language – in thinking the parasitic through translations and mistranslations, in (mis)understanding across forms, as well as languages. This directly relate to recent collaborative work in the wider Feminist Hospitalities projects, as well as my evolving experiences living and working in Japan. It is here that such parasitic experiences are most viscerally felt and political questions emerge: who am I to speak *for* others? Is that what Anthropology aims for? In what ways can artists and anthropologists be parasites, or hosts, or both? These specific questions emerged from my recent experience leading collaborative socially engaged, bilingual art projects about feminism and motherhood, such as ‘Voicing Care’ (voicing-care.net). This was a transnational, bi-lingual artistic project (now archived online) that addressed feminisms and motherhood in Japan and Europe, and artistic responses to topics such as feminist anti-nuclear campaigns, and the idealisation of motherhood in Japan. I begin by considering the context(s) for my work around ‘feminist’ hospitalities briefly considering the language of feminism in contemporary Japan. This work occurred while navigating life and my own ‘respons-ability’ (as Donna Haraway reframes responsibility) under covid lockdown, asking how to connect with and be responsible for, or to, others? How to share experiences of motherhood, that had (yet) no words? In the chaos of multiple forms of isolation, from the world, and myself. How to understand the seismic shifts in my sense of self?

Feminist Hospitalities?

I use the broad umbrella term ‘Feminist Hospitalities’ (FH) as a platform to explore the intricate dynamics and tensions inherent in socially engaged art and feminist practices, including how hospitality is employed (and co-opted) in contemporary art contexts (particularly in the realm of ‘relational’ or ‘socially-engaged’ art and curatorial practices). Hospitality and related ideas, such as conviviality, have become central to socially engaged art (SEA) and relational art practices, especially those that are, or claim to be, activated by audience participation, that don’t exist outside of the relations it generates. This mode of SEA is a transnational, rising phenomenon. Most often, my FH projects have been collaborative, and as such I feel I take on the roles of host and guest. This work can be considered in relation to explicitly feminist ways of thinking about, and practicing sociality and hospitality, which I have (co) written about elsewhere (Clarke and Gausden, 2020). It is important to note that in *European* contexts hospitality (along with care) is often employed to address and intervene in urgent social issues such as the politics of migration and refugee crises. Yet hospitality is also co-opted by ‘luxury’ art fairs, from Marrakech or Hong Kong. In Japan, the culture of *omotenashi* (which can be translated as hospitality; reception; treatment; service; or *entertainment*) offers a particular history and quality to hospitality in Japan. Ostensibly, this involves a sense of mutual recognition and thus, a sense of self. *Omotenashi* has been simply defined by a Japanese hotelier as ‘to show care for others and to put their well-being and needs first’. This is also very clearly linked to commercial practices, where the roles of host (very often women) and guest (perhaps a customer, or a tourist) are differently conceived. When an outsider, or a foreigner (*gaijin*), there are other layers of hospitality to consider. This may relate to the concept of *uchi* and *soto*. *Uchi* meaning home, or the inside, by extension refers to the group to which one belongs. *Soto*, on the other hand, is something outside, the ‘other’, a distinction made daily in Japan, forming the basis of many social codes. These critical anthropological and social concepts have been explored in much depth elsewhere, but I wanted to note how the ideas explored in this paper have emerged from such wider anthropological work, *and* the artistic context of the rise in socially engaged art in Japan post disaster, which is a key context for my own current research.

In particular, I am exploring the absence of an explicitly *feminist* discourse or criticality, not only in Japan, but in wider relational aesthetics as well as examinations of hospitality which relate specifically to women’s work and roles in contemporary art. Even more explicitly, the notion of a *feminist* hospitality felt even more urgent to me after becoming a mother, trying to make art, and find and make nourishing and careful connections and communities. Key collaborations have involved the creation or curation of spaces where we might collectively care for one another, addressing shared issues: identity, work and labour, inclusiveness, care, reciprocity. I have both led

and been invited to participate in transnational, bilingual, collaborative projects (e.g. ‘Voicing care’ and ‘Speculative Fiction: Practicing Collectively’, *ibid*). All of this is context for how my work might contribute to an alternative, feminist, *theory* of hospitality, but a theory that is, more importantly, a practice.

This work is therefore a reflection on my experiences and relationships as an artist and anthropologist in Japan, and as a mother, and a mother making art. It is personal, intimate work that has roots in relationships I have developed with (often Japanese) artists, curators, mothers, others, mostly in the last ten years. It is intimate partly because it is a reflection of my changing sense of self, especially in Japan, where I have lived and worked in spates, since 2003, and most obviously, becoming a mother. But another of its intimacies is no doubt because of the context of my research in Japan after ‘3.11’, the ‘triple disaster’ of earthquake, tsunami and nuclear ‘accident’ in March 2011. Thus, for me, it carries a particular question of witnessing; the aftermath of loss, and death, and the way that I developed art work in response, which I have written about with reference to ideas about endurance and resilience (Clarke, 2020). While the activities of mostly male dominated arts organisations generated important debates about Japanese art post-disaster, research suggests that a ‘culture of disaster’ has emerged, and that this “new phase of cultural production” and its discourses around risk and resilience are inherently *masculine* (Koikari, 2019). My personal experience bears this out. I am most interested in women’s experiences. In projects *about* and *by* Japanese women, often explicitly feminist women, it is men (with authority, voices), who speak. Or at least, speak first. What might be framed as the anthropological part of my art-anthropology project, centres on understanding the diverse roles of women in such contexts, the influence and versions of feminism, and femininities, considering the “invisible” labour at work in art, who gets to speak, when, where, and how decisions are made.

Part of my research therefore questions whether, and how, a *feminist* hospitality is possible in Japan. This is happening, if only in pockets. I was honoured to be invited to present some of this work to the Japanese Association of Social Anthropology (JASCA), as part of my Fellowship. Made up primarily Japanese academic anthropologists and graduate students but conducted in English. I was invited to consider an important question about the differences between a *generous* and a *feminist* hospitality. Could the word ‘generous’ be used, instead? The implicit question, I imagine, may have been, why use the word ‘feminist’ so explicitly? Since the 1950s, loanwords, mainly from Western languages, transcribed into *katakana* have substantially increased - particularly those of English origin. To give a relevant example: the Japanese language dictionary, *Kojien*, officially integrated the term ‘gender’ as a Japanese loanword in 1991. This one word has sparked controversy, possibly for its potential to bring about socio-cultural change, according to Eto, a Japanese political theorist. Despite government proposals in the 1990s to paraphrase these borrowed terms into more

accessible Japanese equivalents, the Japanese public have consistently preferred adopting the loan-words ‘gender’ (*jenda*) over their paraphrased counterparts (Okamoto, 2004 referenced in Eto 2016). Although initially embraced by feminists and ‘equality’ proponents aiming to reshape Japan, the term *jenda* triggered opposition, mainly from social conservatives, intent on maintaining the socio-cultural status quo. Thus, ‘gender’ became a focal point for backlash from Japanese reactionaries. Japanese feminists termed the resistance against ‘gender’, again in katakana, as ‘*bakkurasshu*’ (‘backlash’) (ibid); a concept that has permeated government policies, prompting efforts by reactionaries to obstruct its usage and curb calls for gender equality. Indeed, more than a hesitation to use ‘feminism’, the word ‘equality’ is apparently rarely used in policy and politics, replaced by “co-participation in decision making”. The emphatic and explicit use of feminist, therefore, is a political act. Many of the (Japanese, young, female) artists and curators I met, interviewed, or had casual conversations with during my Fellowship, follow such hesitation, sadly. Feminism is ‘unpopular’ or ‘old fashioned’ according to some. It is often aligned with ‘other’ minority perspectives, within LGBTQ+ politics. I use the term feminist in solidarity with Japanese friends and colleagues who work as artists and activists in Japan and internationally. For example, I was invited to collaborate with the *Back and Forth Collective* (Sakamoto Natsumi, Taki Asako, and Homma Mei), in the making of a film work, ‘Speculative Fiction’ (ref. Clarke, forthcoming). The Back and Forth Collective are now based in the Japan and Indonesia, and are actively engaged in feminist activism in Japan, through exhibitions, events, and collaborative research. Their focus on gender issues also incorporates activism on behalf of migrants, Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights, addressed through collaborative film making and public screenings, which allow discussions on the Japanese feminist movement.

Para-sites

This kind of creative collaborative, public work has been influenced by the American anthropologist George Marcus’ discussion of ethnographic para-sites, described as sites of *alternative* knowledge practices.

“... a space of excess [...] a site of alternativity in which anything, or at least something different, could happen [...] when a researcher “actively creates a field of inquiry “and then follows it” in a way that “always involves a material dimension, a kind of labour, or a *making of things out of the way they are supposedly or otherwise given*” (Marcus, 2000: 7).

In a recent article (Marcus, 2021) he reflects on an example of a students’ para-sitic anthropological

fieldwork as a *dialogue* with what he calls alternative “domains of reception” (most often, for anthropology, collaboration with NGOs and government), where the audience is also the subject of research. The reflection focuses on forms of knowledge production, and bringing collaborators into the university, e.g. in a seminar context. However, he emphasises how it is not through formal presentations, but rather through informal, open, ‘cross talk’, that the para-site operates. The increasing effort to create such para-sites as sites for anthropological fieldwork relate, I believe, to the changing nature of anthropological research, and the significant shift towards greater engagement: from being an observer, faithfully documenting one’s ‘subjects’ to, if not activism, at least a *license* to engage. The para-site in this sense is an event, or *eventing*, where articulations of practice are shared.

For Marcus, it is this impetus that make it possible to “enrich similarities and disentangle differences” between respective inquiries (Marcus, 2021:45). A para-site in this experimental sense is a gathering of specific ‘communities of reception’, whose practices are somehow lateral or adjacent, where complex relationships of partnership and collaboration are performed, are created, through sharing a common object. For my own (parasitic) practices, and cross-talk between art, anthropology and activism, I employ other parasitic crossings that use similar language, for example ‘paragogy’ a mode developed by artist and educator Neil Mulholland (2019) as a set of developmental principles that offer a flexible framework for peer learning and knowledge production in art. I have also found the multi- or ‘indisciplinary’ notion *transpedagogy* useful, following Portuguese artist and writer Pablo Helguera. He argues that the term pedagogy is employed in a too-vague and ambiguous way, defining transpedagogy as “the migration of the discipline and methods of education into art-making, resulting in a distinct medium where the artwork is constituted simultaneously of a learning experience or process and a conceptual gesture open to interpretation”. (Helguera, 2010). I have used transpedagogy as a name for some of my art-anthropological, trans-national, para-sitic projects, such as *Voicing Care*, which sought to create temporary communities, of artists, designers, mothers, others, where bi-lingual, translation itself is described as ‘an act of care’.

Parasites, and the Eventing of concepts?

‘Para’ means by the side of, beside, or alongside, but it can also imply an alteration, perversion, or simulation. The essence of parasitism as generally understood lies in its non-reciprocal nature, characterised by taking without giving, as a subtractive relationship with an unwilling host. For the French philosopher Michel Serres, however, the parasitic relation is the ‘most common’, or ‘atomic’ social relation. In his work *Parasites* he explores its presence in ancient customs and habits of hospitality and conviviality, and plays also with the dual meaning of the French term ‘hôte’ for both

‘host’ and ‘guest’. In French, the term parasite encompasses four distinct but related meanings: the poor, permitted to dine alongside the rich; a ‘freeloader’ who appropriates from others, an organism that extracts (vitality, life) from its host, and, finally, a disruptive noise. According to Serres, these various meanings are intricately linked, so that when we refer to one type of parasite, we implicitly invoke the others. His poetic writing goes beyond metaphorical use of a scientific concept. It is by being pests, he suggests, that minor groups become major players in public dialogue, responsible for creating diversity and complexity vital to life. They, generating a potential *third* position, the creation of new logics, attention to parasitical relations simply illuminates how relations are always not only fundamentally unequal, but are so in multiple, non-linear ways. *Parasites* employs fable to explore relationships and the dynamic between a parasite and its ‘host’.

I was drawn to this material as described above as a means of exploring themes of motherhood, interdependence, care, shared bodies, and material intimacies, as well as the politics of the ‘relational’ in art. Many socially engaged art practices rely on preconceived notions of a fundamental or ideal *equality* among subjects or actors, which is to be pursued, maintained, and restored when destabilised. Attention towards the parasite as a way of thinking of ongoing inequality, or lack of equality raises ethical questions that gives rise to economic ones too, since ethical systems tend to function on the basis of implicit economic logics, or at least a relation of reciprocity, such as that inherent in gift-exchange. But also, most importantly, attention toward parasitic relations demands we pause, and consider an ethics of hesitation (Burton & Tam 2016). For my work, this means a pause to reflect, acknowledge, and question, the relationships, roles, and voices - who speaks for whom, how, and why? It means identifying and accepting the constantly transforming relations of mutual *interdependency* (between Artists, Anthropologists, families, funding, institutions, audiences, before we even consider making, or the more than human). In the context of socially engaged art, what are considered ‘ethical’, caring practices usually hinge on often presumed notions of a fundamental equality between artist, host, guest, audi-



ence; what is important for me to note is that the idea of the parasite challenges such assumption, by pointing to the ever-evolving relations of mutual interdependency. Rather than striving for a static ideal, the parasite encourages an understanding of relationships as a dynamic interplay of forces in constant flux, requiring adaptive responses.

In my work, like that with the Back and Forth Collective, I place a significant emphasis on *presence* and on process, employing forms rooted in feminist practices and methods. By *eventing* I mean the ongoing process of creating and *holding space* - spaces that are capable of holding - that allow an 'intensification' to borrow a Deleuzian term, of an encounter. The eventing of ideas is about creating and holding para-site spaces, where it becomes possible to problematise apparently self-evident concepts. Problematising apparently self-evident concepts is partly what drew me to the parasitic, in relation to rethinking ethical possibilities. Because of course a parasite is generally perceived as something negative; the word conjures images of tiny but menacing creatures like tapeworms or infectious microorganisms, which penetrate, infiltrate our bodies, eliciting a sense of harm and disgust, and consequently, a compulsion to eliminate them. The essential character of parasitism is a non-reciprocal subtractive relationship with an unwilling or non-consenting host. These associations often transfer on to the ways in which we think of parasites metaphorically. But I think it's interesting to step back from this instinctive range of associations and ask whether, under the right circumstances, a parasitic relationship might be beneficial? And when it might be essential? It might as Serres says, be the 'atomic' relation. Can a parasite help the flourishing of a social group? It's also possible to think about the parasite as a means of opening up new ways of interrogating social relationships. To ask, is it productive to take rather than always to give?

Serres: The parasite as the noise in the system of relations.

Reading *Parasites* by the French polymath and philosopher Michel Serres introduced to me, via the translation, the idea of a parasite as a noise or interruption; to pay attention to its temporal qualities and disruptive nature, to how 'noise' in the system can be seen as a creative interference. This inspiration became a critical methodology for me, operating as a kind of excessive but necessary condition. It offers an intensification of the parasitic, more than a part of the making of the work, it is the work. Incorporating Serres' writing and concept as a kind of parasitic device in my artistic research and practice, it became as a way of working with/in transformations, or corruptions (of programs, forms): documenting and working with mishearings and (mis)translations, in experimental and playful ways. Of moving between or across words/text/images, description and speculation. The core of the poem that follows was based on recorded close readings from *Parasites*, recordings of related domestic sounds, songs, conversations and interruptions, as well as intermittent birdsong.

An important parasitic method then involved using various quotidian computing tools, like machine learning and translation tools, to speak back, to work with interruption, static, noise, and allow for and invite not only hesitations and pauses, but glitches, dissonance, frictions, excess of “alternative” sites, and knowledge practices, disruptions via machine learning language errors, translations, and chaos. The development of visual work and writing in this project is therefore also parasitic: made through performative, parasitic readings (of *Parasites* and other poetry), lecture performances, and recordings using accessible machine learning translation tools. The visual work also echoed this process, working with layering, appropriation, and poetic polyphony (Clarke, forthcoming).

The poem presented below is the culmination of a series of lecture performances themselves constructed from rehearsals/recordings performative readings using the methods mentioned above. There were two primary parasitic elements to this reading process, allowing the pauses, play, attention towards, questions. First, listening to, and singing with my child, then an infant (18 months old or so when I started). His discoveries in language, and in the world ‘*boo, oh boo! He breaks the dialogue*’) effected not only interruptions to my readings, performances, and thinking, but also provoked and *created* meaning for me. The second pivotal element for this work involved tools of trans-national communication, i.e., trans-national video conferencing across time zones and translation, mistranslation, understanding and misunderstanding, across multiple languages, which remains a critical part of my art-anthropological projects including intense bilingual translation work across Japanese and English, for other projects. The text draws on Serres’ philosophical text *Parasites* but also incorporates interruptions into those readings, of various sorts, from my son singing with me, to birdsong. It is constructed via (mis)hearings made through machine learning recordings and/or translations, literally responding to and appropriating, at times, the text. The creative process in this project developed *interdependently*, chaotically, and carefully. Parasitical, performative reading, sometimes alone, sometimes with others, or with my child; documentation, recordings, online lecture performances, and various methods and aesthetic forms such as layering, appropriation, poetic polyphony, all filtered through obtuse machine learning/ listening, and autobiographical documentation. This parasitic approach is always-already parasitic in that it is about, and represents, experiences of motherhood, including miscarriage, and breastfeeding, but the interruptions, corruptions, and transformations, what moved and enabled the work, are the work. All of this was, it is, a means of attending to this question of *respons-ability*: *How do we understand the context we are embedded in as we are embedded in it?* The parasite brings to life the complicity, or co-imbrication, of making for me: impels me to ask: What parasitic relations might exist in this group? Who’s hosting? Who’s asking which questions? Who is *leaching from* whom (and how and why)? Is there discrimination in the negotiation? What is shared? As a white, western, academic, woman, can I even *talk* about troubling the boundaries of (Japan’s) patriarchal culture? Do I bring a perspective that is

entirely outside others' embedded experiences of patriarchy? Is it a valuable perspective? I remain parasitic. *Open to both*, holding open spaces, contestable practices, and thus, coming to the *problem* of knowledge itself, perhaps (and the question of love – as Serres might have said).



Autotheory as Feminist Practice in Art

The parasitic is also perhaps a way in to the personal-theoretical, or autotheoretical research. I am drawn to its incidental and “gut-centered” nature (Fournier, 2021) and interested in the implications for the integration of theory with personal experience. In her book *Autotheory as Feminist Practice in Art, Writing, and Criticism*, Lauren Fournier explores a variety of ways art and life and theory mingle in the incorporation of everyday life into theory. Autotheory, as she defines it, breaks down barriers, validating bodily experiences as integral to knowledge production: it is the “integration of the auto or “self” with philosophy or theory, often in ways that are direct, performative, or self-aware”. (2021:11). Autotheory then is an integration of theory and philosophy with autobiography, with reflections, or representations on/of the body, and other so-called personal, explicitly subjective modes. It exposes the interconnectedness of art and life, theory and practice, and the self and research. This aligns with the perspectives of feminist artists and scholars who have persistently advocated for breaking down artificial distinctions between these realms. As Fournier notes, “Autotheory reveals the tenuousness of maintaining illusory separations between art and life, theory and practice, work and the self, research and motivation, just as feminist artists and scholars have long argued.” (2021: 2).

According to this criterion, using the term autotheory makes sense for me, in so far as it is feminist, and making the private public, allowing the personal to interrupt, to shape, to speak, to be heard. To allow for interruptions, not only in the margins. Of course, disclosing or sharing lived experience, “so-called personal” issues, is what allows us to even see what is structural and systemic – from idealisation of motherhood to the traumas of childbirth, miscarriage and loss, experiences which are not only personal, but isolating, in how unsupported, unacknowledged women are (not only but certainly in poorly staffed and sometimes badly managed, under resourced hospitals, as well as academia). This also goes for the challenges of work and motherhood, challenges specific to art and culture but way beyond this. The search for community, and the *reconciliation* of myself after having a child. This acknowledgement leads to complicated questions about what constitutes philosophy and theory in the first place, though “autotheory” does not refer to a “theory of the self” so much as to theory that emerges from the self (Lorentzen, cited in Fournier 2021:35). Fournier refers to Mieke Bal, who defines autotheory as both a “practice” and an “ongoing, spiralling form of analysis-theory dialectic” that she turned to after being confronted with the shortcomings of written documentation. It can also be a way of talking about, or just doing, art making *as a form of thinking, or life-writing*. Fournier describes autotheory as a very self-conscious way of engaging with theory as a mode of *thinking and practice* alongside such lived experience and subjective embodiment that is prevalent, in “spaces that live on the edges of art and academia” (2021:7). For

me, now, several years on from this experience, I am able to see the generative potential of parasitic practices and what can be, has been, made with/in, through, a reframing of the parasitic relation. A community of support, if temporary. Autotheory or otherwise, I see the work itself as advocating for an ethics of hesitation. I try to insist on, in that pause, paying attention, and valuing the complexity and nuances that parasitic relationships can bring to artistic and everyday life. Embracing the parasitic, my practice has permitted a whole series of temporary pauses, ends, and outcomes. Listen to the interruptions, acknowledge 'corruptions, accept mistranslations, mishearings, misunderstandings. They auto-operate, between and across languages, and between and across forms, from image to text, reading to writing, through the biases and privileges of technological interventions and tools. Together they offer a transformation. These practices require parasites. The relation is the work.

POEM: The introduction of a parasite in a system is equivalent to the introduction of a noise.

This 'concrete' poem was created via a series of lecture performances, drawing on Michel Serre's work Parasites, (mis)translations, interruptions and other noisy interventions.

Although this [story] passes through my body, it is not mine alone. Nor am I entirely [by] myself in the re(w)ritings that become this work.

No parasite is.

(There is no parasite).

Repeatedly.

Intuition speaks. Silently, softly, emerges, so as near silence.

The parasite is a res-of-chaos! A chaotic thing and a way, between. It is il trattino, o il rumore, it is the hyphen, or noise *che esiste tra due siti qualsiasi* that exists between two. Between self and other, good and evil, individual and institution. Between bodies, between bodies of matter.

I'm speaking, polyphonically.

Poro(u)s knocked up poverty; she gave birth to love, emerging from a black box, the conj-

gative box of hunger and plenitude. Box of resources.

This love, this parasite, this viable foetus, this unviable child. Flesh become dust. Vlees wordt stof. Aarde.

Stone deities shaped liked children, silently observe an increasing sequence of noises. The trees, listening, too, hear the first little noise, a sob. She can't breathe. A parasite chases it out – erasing an order and reconstituting another: the breakdown. The arguments begin, and never really stop *e non ci fermiamo, mai, veramente*.

The city of being, of ontology, brings us to atoms.

The theory of relations brings us to the parasite: He is the relation, he is what passes: quasi-object quasi-subject. He [always, he?] is the law of the series, the son of lack, of passing, passage; pass and lack. *Ik hou echt van het woord gebrek, deze leegte. "Dat het omhoog schreeuwt"* this lack that screams, shouts in the void. Emptiness sucks it up.

Behind them, they leave fragments: shards of text, shadows of references, facing towards anger or towards tomorrow. Tomorrow, there will only be quotations. There is noise in the system, there are parasites. That can happen, that can happen by chance (and perhaps that is what chance is?) and as it was now in the beginning is now and ever should be world without end.

Someone or something must intervene in these cities of light and shade. But the trouble with knowing what to say, and saying it clearly and fully, is that clear speaking is generally obsolete.

The observer becomes the in-observable, being supplanted, becomes observed; this is the position of the parasite. The parasite is what living together is: *ce qu'est la vie, ce qu'est vivre ensemble mais, vraiment?*

And as I said before, and as I've said before: this the law that we have followed since the beginning

sigh.

We are going backwards again.

Who is love?

She is a relation.

The intermediary, the intervention that complicates the system, that multiplies the borders.

We enter into a bifurcating system that becomes more complex, gets more noisy. We are exposed, to more parasites, and this growth can be fatal. She must intervene, again. A third system is created, with the branching of parasites, it never stops, the system, never stops ... breathing.

Birdsong emerges

like love, coming out of that black box:

What do you say now, old midwife? Who is love?

The mouth

is the organ of the parasite, previously used for eating, and for speaking.

A close-up. A close-up of a picture, a close-up of a picture containing a person, a person become.

A close-up of a breast, a heart, my heart, a hand. And him: a mouth.

Everything is there, everything is there where it belongs. Mmmmm mm bigger bigger bigger!

“You owe me” You, of, me: *tu me dois, vous deux, moi ; vocês os dois eu, vocês os dois, eu?*

You to me you two me. We are two, you: pure noise.

Boo oh Boo! He breaks the dialogue.

Between spirit and breath, noise interrupts, straightens it out, rights its wrongs.

The introduction of a parasite in a system is equivalent to the introduction of a noise.

Everything is there, everything is there where it belongs.

References

- Burton, J., & Tam, D. (2016). *Towards a Parasitic Ethics*. Theory, Culture & Society, 33(4), 103-125. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276415600224>
- Clarke, J. et al (2020) 'A story of she: collective feminist film making at home (between Japan and Scotland In *Entanglements* [online], 3(2) pages 97-102.
- Clarke, J. (2022) The Introduction of a Parasite in a system is equivalent to the Introduction of a Noise', *TYPP Sint Lucas Journal of Artistic Research*. Antwerp.
- Clarke, J. *Forthcoming 2024*: 'Parasitic projects and the politics of research-creation' in *The Trouble with Art* Edited by Roger Sansi and Jonas Tinius. London: Routledge.
- Eto, M. (2016). 'Gender' Problems in Japanese Politics: A Dispute over a Socio-Cultural Change towards Increasing Equality. *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, 17(3), 365-385. doi:10.1017/S1468109916000141
- Fournier, L. (2021) *Autotheory as feminist practice in art, writing, and criticism*. Cambridge, MIT Press.
- Helguera, P. (2010) "Notes Toward a Transpedagogy," in *Art, Architecture and Pedagogy: Experiments in Learning*, Ken Erlich, Editor. Los Angeles: Virallnet.net.
- Holmes, Douglas and George Marcus (2005) "Refunctioning Ethnography: The Challenge of an Anthropology of the Contemporary" in *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Third Edition in N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln, eds. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Kapil, B. (2020). *How To Wash A Heart* Liverpool University Press.
- Koikari, Mire. 2019. "Re-Masculinizing the Nation: Gender, Disaster, and the Politics of National Resilience in Post-3.11 Japan." *Japan Forum*, 31(2): 143-64.
- Marcus, G. (2000) *Para-Sites: A Casebook against Cynical Reason*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Marcus, G. (2021) 'The Para-Site in Ethnographic Research Projects' in in Ballesterio, Andrea and Winthereik, Brit Ross. *Experimenting with Ethnography: A Companion to Analysis*, New York, USA: Duke University Press, 2021 <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781478091691-006>
- Mulholland, N. 2019. *Re-imagining the Art School: Paragogy and Artistic Learning* Palgrave MacMillan
- Serres, Michel (2007). *The Parasite*. Univ .of Minnesota Press.