



O C T O B E R P R O J E C T

Larissa Babij, Sönke Hallmann,
Lada Nakonechna, Nikita Kadan,
Inga Zimprich, Anna Zvyagintseva

October 16th 2011
at Flutgraben e.V.

6 pm
Viktor Misiano
talk

8 pm
October Project
performance

Flutgraben e.V.
Am Flutgraben 3
12435 Berlin
+49 30 53219658
www.flutgraben.org

October Project attempts to relate to and re-narrate moments from the recent history of contemporary art in Ukraine. Within a minimal staged setting we discuss a few situations and scenes from this history in a public performance structured by means of narration and commentary. Though these situations – from major events to personal anecdotes – are first and foremost singular occurrences, they contain in a condensed form questions and conflicts that may be paradigmatic for the processes of contemporary art. An important element to appropriate, unfold and re-narrate these scenes consists in the negotiations amongst the participants themselves, diverging opinions, doubts, misunderstandings and questions.

Image: Leonid Vojtsechov.
Straight Speech. Odessa 1984.

October Project / CCKK
(Center for Context and
Communication Kyiv) has been
supported by ERSTE Foundation.

October Project has been supported
by Rinat Akhmetov Foundation For
Development of Ukraine.



We are building all our discussions on the documents we can find. And the stories we have heard. But I guess, a lot of things are left in the past, which were not documented.

Different interpretators may have different ideas about what happend. It is a question of re-narrating. We choose the details. But we choose from the existing list of details.

It is possible to find reality in that points, where those different narratives come in confrontation. When they start to narrate in one space at same time, it is the turn towards real.

As far as the production goes, the idea of rehearsal and repetition in theater, we are staging past events in the present, in a sense repeating them in a new context but really it points to our absence at the scene of the original event.

Maybe to some extent the documents are not just a representation of that, what was explicitly or not choosen to be remembered and inscribed in some kind of history, but they may as well bear in them some sort of abyss to what has been forgotten, some trace that opens up to another modality of documentation or else.

While I think somehow we engage with different moments that are meaningful to us, because they can show something that has been possible in art and that can be possible now. I wonder, if it is some form of resurrection?

There is a practice of pointing, of playing, of developing language and systems and jokes. Which, I wonder, are maybe still open? Still available. I mean, it is also about the archive function of art and exhibition making, if these gestures are still active, so, if their performative acts are still ongoing.

Seriously, history resurrected after death will never return to previous condition. And Ukrainian mid-2000 amnesia somehow was a measure. Now that, what returns, has absolute different quality. Let's look at the term of resurrection and amnesia and the return of forms.

Why is there this break in continuity?

Y.L. wrote: *Right versions just don't exist, except only the space between the presence of the viewer here and the presence of the author or the event in a not recognisable elsewhere.*

Reality could be read – maybe this is as well a cipher for history being a mean of interests, while at the same time we could wonder, if there can be at all a telling of history that is not entangled in particular interests.

Maybe we are also trying to write history just for us.

That is why some small things, details, differences are not visible, but some details start to be crucial, how a small thing can help to enfold an entire narration.

So, *reality could be read* would be a strong case of this task of translation, I think, not just from one language to another but from one interpretation to another.