CITIZENSHIP AND BELONGING transcript

Barby:

Welcome to 198 Contemprary Arts and Learning. It’s been a long journey to bring the DreamMakers together in this exhibition. Which has been great and a lot of work. Four very interesting places. We had a very wonderful time with the young people when they came here for the opening last week.

We are pleased to have Engin Isin, Professor of Citizenship, Politics and International Studies and Director of Citizenship, Identities and Governance at the Faculty of Social Sciences at the Open University. We have also got Eva Sajovic, the artisti who has worked on this project. We also have chair Gilane Tawadros, chief executive of DACS (Design and Artists Copyright Society). She is also founding Director of the Institute of International Visual Arts (Iniva).

Engin:

Thank you for inviting me. It is both, pleasure and privilege to be here. I’m very interested in the project DreamMakers as well as this space and the activities you are undertaking, connecting arts, politics, citizenship and belonging.

I want to say a little bit about the kind of work that’s taking place in the academy and my interest. How it gets connected with the relationship, the interface, between art and the politics, citizenship and belonging. Citizenship as you may imagine has been mostly understood in mainstream culture, if you like, as passage, or the right, to belong to a particular state. It is very state based, institution and symbolised by nothing other than, most sort of poignantly, that particular instrument called the passport. We are asked for our passports everytime we cross borders, when we switch places and so on. But all the last twenty years around the world has been a lot of interest in migration and travelling. Travelling not as in tourism, but as people who travel, who do not stay put in the place of their birth and they do this for a variety of reasons.

Whether it’s for work, lifestyle, enjoyment or just simply to escape the boundaries that bind them. And as soon as this happens people run into a very complex mesh of regulations. These regulations protect borders, nations, and specific ways of doing things.

So migrant experiences, what we have learned over the last twenty years, migrant experiences of travellers, travelling people as it were, not so much has been about their particular experiences of how does one for example translate, how does one negotiate different languages. I was reading for example at the exhibition.

One is born into a particular language and does not have a choice in that and we call it native. That’s the language that you learn; then as soon as you switch places for whatever reason, one of the first things one has to negotiate is how to communicate, how does one translate one’s experience that evolved in a particular language to another and the difficulties. So that translation is not simply translation. It’s not just simply switching from one language to another to express the same thing but each language has its own conventions. Each language has its own norms with which it speaks about experiences. So, if you learn as I did, for example, Turkish as your native language and then switch to English, things don’t translate. So learning how to translate, learning not the other language, but translating experiences. We learned much about that in the last twenty years from travelling people and also all the prejudices, xenophobia, misogyny, and Racism, ethnocentrism, that these kinds of switches put people into. As soon as you make this kind of switches you realize that many closed boundaries that states protect also use variety of prejudices to protect those boundaries. So it’s not about border controls and passport, but it is also culture and cultural homogeneity, cultural uniqueness. Speaking from experience, I now realize people have been told lies. There isn’t such thing as quintessential Canadianness or, that there isn’t such a thing of being quintessentially German. That it is non-negotiable, that one has to impose on other, that notion of Germanness or Britishness. There is this very strong call and how the media, the culture… and then you realize that these things have been invented. And through various practices that are beyond border control they’ve been inculcated in people’s ways of thinking. So it is very real to people just because something is invented, such as Britishness, we realize that it doesn’t make it unreal. People have invested themselves. So then travelling becomes that culture translation, is also about translation, how does one negotiate these differences. How does one for example, negotiate one’s own invented identity. Because, that’s one of the things that one experiences. That what you were taught as native and ingrained, you realize that is not so. You are much less pure. Much less sort of invented than you were first told. I grew up with Turkish nationalism and Turkish nationalism is one of the worst as the world goes, in terms of its own belief of racialised purity and so on.

And I come from a family that is anything but racially pure. My father is of Cypriot origin and both, soft of Greek and Turkish mixtures. Also different religious mix in there. He himself migrated to Turkey from Cyprus. So, it’s anything but pure.

My mother is…a migrant family. I don’t know if anyone knows about this, but in 1920’s there was a tragic moment in Turkish Greek nationalism, where there was a population exchange. Basically, rise of nationalism in both Greece and Turkey. Greece and Turkey as states entered into a treaty, saying that ‘you claim yours and I will claim mine’. They told people, like people of Crete that they have to make a choice. Well, how do people make choice when their everyday lives and experiences are not pure. They did not think of themselves as Turks or Greek. So they had to make a decision. So my family, my mother’s family was actually Greek. They could speak both Turkish and Greek. And they chose Istanbul to go. And so my mother comes from that mixed background.

For me translation started very young, trying to figure out why is Greek music playing at home. And my mother saying to me, don’t mention this and make sure that you speak Turkish, not quite figuring out what is there to hide, why there is this. But then you know, when your mother is telling you this is what you should do. Your first instinct is, ok, I’d better go with that. Later I think you begin to negotiate that. Call that into question as well. But then there is something about the safety and I better do it.

So, in a way, I’m even contradicting myself when I said earlier that the experience about migration and travelling, to be exposed to it, one actually does not have to move much either in our world. Our world is already a world of travelling ideas, travelling experiences. Before even I took many steps, I realized that I had to already encounter the problem of translation or the question of translation. How do I translate my mother’s experiences, my father experiences into my own. Those were the questions I had to tackle, not being able to have the language at that time. So, many years forward, there was a fixed interest in citizenship for me. Of course, I was always intrigued by the question what do people do to be invited, to invest themselves in this particular identity? Why some people develop thick sense of these identities, So much so that they find it non-negotiable?

‘I am British. Do as I say’ kind of thickness or ‘I am German’. And by contrast others are much more fluid, in flux with it. Almost there is the sense of these are the things that as we move through our lives we have to negotiate. It’s a give and take. So, what is it? Is it just travelling experience because for example my own trajectory began with already a family that had experience of travel or maybe it’s not even that. What is it that states, education, systems do to protect borders and educate people to make investments in these pure identities, and why this is. I became interested in that question as a question of citizenship. So to me citizenship was not so much as the passport one holds but the investments one chooses to make in life. And how do people make those choices. Some people make these kinds of choices. These kinds of choices they lead people to either thick loyalties path or thin loyalties of various kinds and no less rich for that. That really became sort of over riding question for me. But in academic terms we have come to articulate this.

I’ve been involved in academic aspect of this for more than twenty years and when I entered into it by accident, this small field called citizenship studies and how do we study citizenship, it was dominated by lawyers, political scientists and people who just thought that nation states existed from the time immemorial, boundaries exist as rivers and mountains, as real as they are. (CONSIDER REVISING)

And it’s the question about studying laws that regulate citizenship. I struggled through and kept saying that when you understand citizenship like that you miss so much of social, negotiated, anthropological aspects of this and so on.

The field is much less lonely twenty years on. There is a lot of people. And the most I think, welcoming aspect, and that’s why I was really excited when Eva and Barby invited me for this, is also that it is not only anthropologists and sociologists became interested but also artists. Why interest in artists? Art is a different language than signs. Not necessarily better or worse than signs but it brings a different lens onto human experience and provides different languages by which to express that experience. And in expression it brings into focus certain richness that typically even anthropologists and sociologists are much more attuned to human experience than let’s say some other fields or some other approaches.

It brings into focus the richness of those experiences that signs don’t have, the social sciences, humanities have difficulty articulating. And so in the interface between humanities, social sciences and arts there is much to be gained. So much as we sit in a room such as this, it is vitally important to start with experiences of people. How do people negotiate that language that I’ve just described. It serves two functions, that are really significant. One that we’re not alone, that I think is really significant part of sharing experiences. I, for one, for a long time felt as being alone in that path. Because when you don’t have an opportunity to express and opportunities to share, you kind of put it aside. Thus gettting on with life without reflecting much on the translation business you are doing. Only through time but sharing with others that you begin to develop a more conscious reflection on. We’re all fellow travellers on the road of translating our experiences and then you begin to focus on what does it mean to be constantly translating those experiences. That’s really significant in terms of sharing. The second one is of course, developing language of these translated or travelling experiences. Language inevitable is a social product. We do it collaboratively, we do it together. It cannot be done and it never is such a thing as private language. It is public and social product. Product in the best sense of that term that we collaboratively engage with one another and produce such languages. If indeed what I said earlier, art has access to experience and expresses these negotiations of translation in a particularly effective way, then it is also significant to develop the idiom, the language of art collectively and socially in communication and collaboration, not only with each other, but also with humanities and social sciences. I think humanities and social sciences would be much poorer if we don’t simply reach, but instead fully open ourselves to artistic expressions and artistic engagement with experiences. And the other way around, I think artistic expressions and language also can learn from all sorts of things that study comparatively and in other places and in history and so on. My first entry into citizenship was historical. I learned a lot about how in other cultures historically, how they negotiated these differences, developed languages. And then I realized there is so much to do for example: In Greek archaic poetry, I found incredibly poignant expressions of Greek politics of citizenship. That is not less valuable as much wanted Aristotle and what he says in his polities. So I got drawn into more poetry than just simply political philosophy. And that was my really important entry into the relationship between politics and art. And in the end when I was writing a history of citizenship it became history of poetry ad its relationship to politics but without really realizing I ended up opening every chapter in the end of the book with a poem. And then work my way through how that poem came into being. So that is really the significance of that.

Gilane:

You raised a lot of very important themes and questions. When I look around this beautiful installation of images and words by the DreamMakers, these questions seem to connect and resonate very much with the work Eva has been doing with the young people in this project. I wanted to start by picking up on some of these themes and, in particular, two themes which struck me in your keynote talk but also as I walked around the galleries. One is this question of how one negotiates difference. I guess the starting point for you and Eva and the young people involved in this project is that difference is something to be negotiated? I think maybe it’s worth just pausing there because, in contrast to that, is the assumption that there is no difference to be negotiated at all. You refer to the way in which cultural homogeneity informs borders and barriers and protects us against difference as much as any legal regulatory framework or set of rules. In my own experience I remember as a child having been a migrant and a political exile, desperately wanting to belong, wanting to have that assumption of sameness and belonging before realizing that actually that wasn’t such a safe or secure or desirable place to aspire to be. So I think there is always that tension between a desire for belonginess and homogeneity before one arrives at an understanding of the possibilities of difference. And perhaps that’s partly because in a sense the things you’ve been talking about - negotiating differences and the difficulty of translation- operate on two levels. On one level we have an experience of globalisation where things travel very easily. Capital moves effortlessly across boundaries. Certain people, objects and commodities move seamlessly between different spaces. But then there is another level of movement, which is constantly blocked, protected, resisted. So these two things are happening at one time. The second theme I want to pick up on is this idea of translation and your insight around the visual. One of the things that’s always struck me working in the visual arts and working with artists is that, (particularly in a culture like that of Britain, which is very literary and very engaged with language and where the word is the predominant mode of communication) the visual is seen to be subordinate to the linguistic. But actually the same difficulty of translation happens with the visual. And also the same possibilities. The visual allows space for the negotiation of difference; for that gap between what’s immediately known, immediately understood, immediately comfortable. I’ve always thought contemporary art probably is the opposite of what the French painter Henri Matisse claimed. It’s not a comfortable chair. It’s actually the complete opposite. It makes you uncomfortable. You have to work at it. There’s a gap between you and that object, and you have to figure out how you connect with it, how you make sense of it. We see this articulated in these galleries. It is that continuous process, almost a default among these young people and anyone who’s had that same experience (and as you say, lots of us have) but it’s not legitimated in public forms of discourse and our perception of what citizenship means. These things somehow seem to be an illegitimate discourse if you like, in comparison with more formal discourses of belonging, of citizenship, of what constitutes statehood and belonging. I wanted to pick this up with both of you. Perhaps we could start Engin, then bring in Eva on the question of negotiating difference and the difficulty of translation, and how these connect with the practice of making visual work.

Engin:

Thanks… Those are helpful reminders. You put your finger on two very significant issues. One of them is this negotiating of difference and translation is not experienced the same by different people. This is one of the paradoxes of our time I think. On the one hand we live under illusion and fantasy of globalisation and its virtues, often we’re told. But when it comes to actual practices we realize that there is really globalisation for some and globalisation is easier for some than the others. Like you said capital flows and so on. But there’s the emergence of all new class, sometimes it’s called ‘super rich’. And they experience the world very different, as travellers. But ordinary people come up against all sorts of resistance, all sorts of prejudice. And it is not really the same for them. I think that’s really important to remind ourselves and why. And maybe the two are related. They’re not separate phenomena. Just so that some people’s lives are made easier, that has to be made different for other. Than we have to look at the logic of why that kicks into place.

The second thing that you raise, I did not think of that, You’re so right. Especially living in England; This primacy about the spoken word and the primacy of linguistic competence rather than visual competence. It’s just so deeply ingrained. That even the outsiders such as myself in the few years that I’ve been here, you’re unable to just sort of break out and question: why this incredible focus on linguistic competence, so much so, that as you know citizenship test now is in linguistic competence as there are no other competences that migrants can master and that could be their pathway into citizenship. It’s so singular.

I think it is really worth thinking about that. This is perhaps also politics of visuality. So I really like that point, me also being amateur photographer on the side, that is particularly significant why I find photography as the language that either liberating or a space to escape from that linguistic empire as it were.

Eva:

I would like to pick on both at the same time. What I felt about the project was that the visual language was actually the tool that was bringing the people together. So it was the tool that was making connections between people. Exploring perhaps similar themes, like religion or culture, traditions…for example dance. Just certain themes were coming out of the project that a person that immigrated from Pakistan was able to relate to with somebody who immigrated from the Check republic. So it was very powerful and in particular, for example in Glasgow, where language was not very well present; the young people recently immigrated to the UK, Scotland, and the tool of photography, sound and video were the democratic forms of bringing people together. And really finding a way to communicate and perhaps just to share little moments. That then, when we looked at them again, became big moments.

G:

It’s interesting what you’re saying. That the experience of working with these young people in the project, that this idea of connection and difference, don’t have to be mutually exclusive. Certainly, one of the central ideas within the tradition of history of art is the idea that certain categories of art have universal relevance whilst others are very specific and stuck in silos. But I think what’s very exciting about what you’re saying is that it is possible to find connections across cultures and difference without, in any way, invalidating those differences and those specific experiences.

Eva:

And also open new paths in space, as understood literally in space and also symbolically. For example, going to interview somebody at the court and the new kinds of language that developed there. With not much presence of the language as spoken. But just with the moments that happened there. How the person at the court was perhaps able to look at the young Roma in a different way, though the interest that the young people were showing at what he does and what the court does. New paths being started I thought were very important and charged. [opening new discourses or at least willingness to start new, different discourses. As a disruption to old narratives that are very embedded]

G:

Is this connected perhaps with what Engin was saying about these formal structures of citizenship and statehood which are somehow having to negotiate other forms of belonging, participation and civic engagement and which aren’t framed or contained by those structures. After all, the court is a very powerful expression of that, architecturally, politically and legally.

Eva:

Exactly! These kinds of invisible lines running through the work are very much pulled out.

G:  
I was struck, when both of you were speaking, by the thought that there may be some new possibilities emerging.

It’s not just about crossing borders anymore. But actually what we’ve seen in the last two or three years within the nation state, within the city state as it were – expressions of difference and different kinds of political imagination; whether that’s happening in the Occupy movement outside St. Paul’s or at Documenta, the big five year exhibition that happens in Kassel, Germany. There was an Occupy protest and pitched tents, outside the Fridericianum museum, while very wealthy collectors and curators flocked into the exhibition. What I’m thinking about is that within the nation state or the city state there are competing narratives about what citizenship, belonging and participation mean. Is this project pointing to another intervention?

Engin:

I’m collecting my thoughts. It’s interesting you say the occupy movement and also indignados in Spain and Greece. Right across Europe. They have been narrowly interpreted as being only about one things. So I just want to pick up actually on this notion of whether these kinds of expressions have to develop homogenous and singular messages. Because throughout it began actually with Tahrir square in 2011 and all the way though 2013. So over two years we had this experience from Tahrir square to Syntagma square to Sol de Madrid square. The mainstream media rounded on this notion that these things were too multifarious, too fragmented to mean anything, as long as and is so far as they fail to develop a singular message. This has been hammered time and again. But I’ve been to actually these squares as these events were taking place, from St Paul’s to Madrid, to Tahrir square. I didn’t go to New York. That these experiences, you realize that in fact their significant contribution was to resist developing a homogenous language. And this was not for lack or better thinking. These people, young and old, they actually deliberately resisted in articulating singular, homogenous language. Because this is precisely what is wrong with the state as we experience it. So as forms of politics that called organised governmental politics into question, they didn’t want to produce the same politics by articulating, for example, the hierarchical structure that you have a leader, you have lieutenants, you have the masses and then the leader gives representation to what the masses say and that message is singular. Reproducing the state politics. Instead they chose multiplicity as language and they kept it at that. The multiplicity and the plurality of languages. When you read the mainstream and not so mainstream media, in reflecting upon this, I was amazed how much focus on this notion of singularity. And the same thing was repeated for example in the Turkish case and now in Brasil. Even people in the Academia don’t feel inhibited to say that these movements will amount to nothing unless they articulate the message. A particular politics, that singular politics. But for me, and this is I think where visuality comes into place, because these squares and streets were also significant in keeping languages multiple, rather than one, sort of dominant narrative, dominant language. Ok, it’s going to be social science, philosophy or this or that. They kept these languages also multiple. And in the multiplicity they dedicated themselves to keeping these multiple and plural ways of describing. And I think the visual has been really significant in maintaining that distance, like you were saying between what is experiences and what is communicated. So, in the end I think the real things I learned, one of the lessons, is this commitment to multiplicity and irreducibility of various experience into singular, audible messages by the very nature of modern capitalism. Its dependence on singular homogenising, advertising languages; there is the strong will to unify messages. That they have to be reduced to circulate easy, easy to sell, easy to commodify message. And then only and in so far as you use that language, that you will be successful. I think each of these events, and it’s really important to just keep coming back and saying that there isn’t a singular message.

Eva

I just want to pick on that and relate it to the project and the exhibition itself. Because the exhibition was a very important moment. The project happened in four locations, about which I will talk about more later. After every set of workshops we exhibited the work in these locations, to celebrate in the community and to make it available to friend, families and so on. So, exhibitions were a very important moment. The connecting point.

In general on the exhibition as the concept: I think it is the invitation for the viewer to come in and connect on a personal level. For me that happens differently for every single individual or slightly differently, because we are all different. And that was the point we were working with from the outset of the project. We wanted to work with individuals as individuals as well as a group (we were working with this idea of group identity as well). But primarily everybody’s experience is very important. And that’s what we’d like to convey. So there wasn’t a definite methodology used. It had to be very fluid and responsive to the participants and the experiences they were bringing, and their skills ultimately. We also decided to split text so you didn’t have text from one person, or very rarely. It’s glimpses that are interspersed with other people’s images so as a viewer, you travel through this, between sound, video, visual and make your journey, create your narrative with the route you take throughout the work.

G:

As you were both speaking, I was thinking that there are many politicians who are worrying about why people aren’t voting in European elections. Why people seem to refuse to participate and engage with political processes as they currently exist. And I’m wondering about whether, in the way Eva that you and Barby have conceived the project, that what we have here, is not so much a failure of politics but a failure in imagining different forms of participation and engagement?

Barby:

It was interesting what you were saying around citizenship and idea of multiple voices. Going back to the politics and participation. You know, meeting these young people, they have totally been immersed in this and perhaps also don’t even think of their own voices being political or think about the work they’ve produced being political. And when you think the way citizenship is. You described citizenship in education. What does education do to serve nationhood? Well, citizenship is not a really very fluid subject for young people. They do teach them a form of politics, but that form of politics that’s not a very satisfactory form for young people. One of the things I’ve been frustrated about is, having a young person, who is constantly trying to think about how you describe yourself, your politics. Simultaneously this fear I think as well. A lot of young people have a lot of fear around how they can express their voices. This is probably more a comment then a question, and there’s something in this that I’ve certainly seen with some of the young people. I can see Daniella there. This opportunity to kind of move into different spaces, to open up spaces. Like Eva was talking about visiting a court for example. To cross boundaries that the young people never see nor they can cross. And this is to me extremely powerful politically. Going back to your point about the government; basically the arts being cut, these kinds of projects being cut, these opportunities. It feels very important to find a different kind of language for the young people to be able to express themselves.

Sireita:

Political participation within the arts, I think a lot of the time, is taken for granted from both, the policy maker perspective and even the practitioner and participant perspective. How politically involved they are in articulating their voice, their position, their social position. And I think one of the conversations that we probably need to have is how can we have all of these people: a.) recognised and involved in this process and b.) taken seriously.

Not just producing, going beyond political art for activism. Irrespective of how the work speaks it should be thought about as a serious engagement in politics.

G:

Yes and a constructive, productive contribution to imagining another form or other forms. Multiple forms of political participation and positioning perhaps.

Mark:

This is more a sort of reflection I think. There’s something about, it may be about aesthetic and the aesthetics within the visual language and the choice to use documentary photo journalism as an approach. And whether in a way that sort of celebrated the difference and it cut through difference at the same time. Because of the type of art it was being created. Because if sort of allowed it to be not bound up in or symbol or metaphor but also the material stuff of paint or things like that. And there is something in photography which in a way does this sort of commentary making. Turning the camera on yourself sort of thing. It’s two things at the same time. It seems to be about we’re all the same, the medium and the choice of we’re all the same. At the same time it’s saying but we’re all different.

Hilary:

I think I understand what you mean. It’s expressing difference without judging it. Although that’s perhaps too strong to say, the word to judge it. But it’s celebrating difference. You talked about desire for belonging and individuals who seek to learn about what is that cultural identity. And I suppose I wanted to ask how strong is that in every individual. That it must be bound by your own personal experiences. Or that of your parents or grandparents. Cause I’m sort of thinking, well in my case, I’m white British. Therefore, I perhaps feel more connected to a place and the language and yet, I think I had a desire to travel rather than stay the same. And as a teacher I’ve encountered young people from all parts of the world, who have very different stories. And some of them very traumatic stories, And I think being involved in this project has enabled us as teachers, when we don’t always have time, to sit and think about the theory behind what we do in projects like this. And we’re always conscious we don’t want to focus on ourselves or think about ourselves because it is about the children. But it has enabled that. It’s enabled us to think about our own individuality and our own identity. And raised so many questions about what we do within citizenship in schools, what the course is and why it is. Who’s defining what the curriculum should be and why, more importantly. And I’ve not thought about that before. And I think it’s been citizenship seen as it’s just the latest in. Something for personal and social education. It’s something that gets done by certain teachers who quite like perhaps the methodology that’s used more than the subject material. They have a good report. Kids are all clever. But it made me feel: we’re going back to school tomorrow and I think about what do they do in the citizenship lessons? Should we review it? Is it political? Probably not. Because it links to this desire to equality and equity can mean that we loose that sense of interest in difference by making everything seem the same and equal. We loose that sense of uniqueness. And I wonder what is happening sometimes.

G:

I think what you’re saying is hugely important. It connects to what Engin and Eva were saying. In a sense the young people involved in the DreamMakers project have had no option but to engage with questions of identity, belonging, statehood and citizenship. They’ve been compelled to do so. It recalls what Engin was saying about playing Greek music at home but not being able to acknowledge this publicly. So, automatically that sets up in you, as a child, a split between private and public space, between what is legitimate and illegitimate. Already as a child, before it is even understood rationally. What these young people are articulating is a very deep and profound understanding of that split and those contradictions. I don’t think this is the unique preserve of the young people in this room. Or those who have had the same experience because it’s been forced on them from a very young age. I think that it happens to people at different points in their lives and it is about questioning what is validated and what is not. Around class, around gender, around your life, around your sexuality. Around all areas of difference or anything which distinguishes between what is a legitimated, validated experience and what is not. So it is, in fact, the domain of all of us.

Barby:

This made me think of teaching as also a political action. And how it’s been depoliticised over the years.

G:

Or more politicized in a way. Because there has been so much attention on it, a focus on what is taught and what isn’t.

Engin:

You are right paradoxically both of you. Both politicized, re-politicized, de-politicized. I’ thinking this government and what they are doing with education, in particularly history. It is deeply politicizing; on the other hand it’s deeply de-politicizing the contents. So it’s obvious that they’ve identified this as a battle, political battle to wage, the hearts and minds of young people in what kind of history.

But I wanted to quickly mention something. You point to this tension between sameness and difference. The actual necessity of both. That’s why I think if we just simply understand either politics or art or science being just, expressing difference. We would be loosing something. I think that notion of difference acknowledges that there is also the sameness; there is also identification, sharing of certain common things. That you were saying is the same but there is also difference. As we negotiate differences we also articulate what is common, what brings us together in what we share and what we decide to keep different. So it’s not one or the other in terms of thinking. Sameness versus difference. But the problem with sameness: when it declares itself as non-negotiable. So it closes the dialogue and creates a monologue. That’s when it becomes a problem. This commitment to being open to dialogue is something that we could say, paradoxically again, using the same word twice. But here, this is another paradox. Saying for example that from my point of view it would be non-negotiable to close the dialogue. This is a value that we have to declare adherence to. This is what brings us as humans together. So that we can actually articulate and negotiate our differences. But if we create the politics of non-negotiable monologue, that becomes a problematic. There is also, one could just reflect on this from the family politics. Any parent who thinks that they are going to raise a child that is going to be identical to what they imagine a child should be is of to a bad parenthood. We know that this is not a good path to follow. While you realize that this is negotiation and it starts amazingly early.

G: This has been fantastic and my head is spinning. Eva and Engin, thank you all very much for starting the conversation.