

[datum]

If the RHEME-project has an output of *recommendations*, it is on account of a perceived *need* to get out of the loop of publication-counts in academia, and to attempt a more *direct* interaction with interested and contesting parties. Rather than proceeding aimlessly with *hard-won* insights, it is based on the idea that the cost/benefit of knowledge should be conceived in *proportion*.

That is, *not* in optimal proportion, but not *without* proportion. The liberalist equation of making publicly funded *freely* available research—experimentation, analysis, mediation—an equivalent of *democracy* doesn't work in the same way as the free movement of people, goods and services. Even as *research* is disseminated by policies of *open access*, much of it lies dormant.

No one is "out there" scouting for critical research, -analysis and -theory. Which means that this kind of *investigation* must be followed up by affirmative action. This adds a *performative* dimension to investigation of this type. Our initiative to do a *lineup* on the proliferation of the *precariat*, and the KHiO joining the ranks of the art-schools that are similarly affected, is of this kind.

It is conducted within the framework of the *learning theatre*, in which demonstration *precedes* argumentation, does not lead to conceiving dissemination teaching and mediation—*downstream* of research, but is performed alongside in (almost) real time. The present system, unable to *account* for such work in the wheels of *value creation*, must simply be insufficient and un-performant.

We are *not* arguing against economics. In fact, we are to a large degree proceeding *with* economics. But if the wide range of transactions aiming at *getting a job done*—without the <u>minimax</u> principle of growth-capitalism—are not considered as contributing to economic value creation, some assumptions of growth-capitalism must then be faltering, under the present circumstances.

That is, the accelerated sequence of *crises* we have been living through recently, at school and in society, define quasi-permanent states of exception: under such circumstances it is the <u>maximin</u> principle that applies: making critical outcomes *as good as they can* (maximising minimal damage). This defines the space within which our politicians now find that they have to work.

Under these circumstances the major tenets of growth-capitalism are likely to cause cultural- and environmental damage. Unfortunately, we are at KHiO in a situation where *both* principles apply *at once*: the minimax principle applies to the school-facilities' private owners (the Brothers Jensen), while the maximin principle applies in the government's/ministry's restrictive budgeting.

Clearly, it is *not* the school's place—neither its prerogative nor province—to *solve* this problem. What it can do is to develop a performant framework in which information about the theme is *not* contained by the general clause of 'running a school': whether defined in political- or in business terms. We must make it our business and policy to occupy, claim and populate this space/gap.

We hope that the RHEME project has contributed to demonstrate and argue this possibility. We also feed the hope that it is possible to make a *valid* claim on value creation—departing from the assumptions of growth-capitalism, which has had its day—in demonstrable and arguable terms. Obviously we are not closed to counter-demonstrations and -arguments. On the contrary.

This is the kind of exchange that democracy was *intended* for, in the first place. The challenges we face in our time are enormous and time is short. That is, we stand the challenge of developing meantime activities, standing in between the *haste* of crises, and the need for *long-term* strategies. If the call of art school is to educate for life-long learning, the *meantime* is our zone.