



The crisis of care indeed becomes a thorny matter, when doing the ethical thing entails a risk of being categorised as an immoral person. When norms are sleepy from an unchecked moral code/standard, it will irrupt in a way that can appear as violent, from a position of the prevailing consensus.

This risk invariably exists when ethical conduct does not reflect moral consensus, and has a long historical precedent of emerging whenever matters of knowledge—as a standard of what should be accepted/not—is at stake. That is, when knowledge standards are set aside for moral ones.

Moral standards are here seen from the point of view of *doxa*, assumption and opinion. These standards prevail in any area where argument/demonstration neither is required, nor prevails. It is the dark side of *tacit knowledge*. Artistic research asks what is the place of knowledge in artistic practice.



To an anthropologist, *culture* and *institutions* are the equivalents of *philosophy* and *politics* to a philosopher. It is a *lopsided* relationship because the anthropologist is immersed in the cultural reality, as the philosopher is immersed in philosophy. How, then, do we relate to an *institution*?

The institution at cause is 'freedom of speech': in a [Dutch pedagogical seminar](#) we were tasked to write about an episode when the freedom of speech had been in question... read it out loud; then write down the testimonials we found significant... read again. And then select a motto.

The two first exercises were done two small groups, the last in the plenary. All on Zoom. Almost everyone had written—in the given narrative form—about episodes in which they had been the *victim*, and not about situations where they limited the expressive range of someone *else* for *some* reason.

I raised the question during the seminar, and got some nods and attentive eyes. But it was not a discussion-seminar. So, what is this freedom without discussion? This question surfaced in the autumn, in the wake of the BLM rally at KHIO, when tagging hostile memes on instagram was at cause.

It was argued an issue relating to the freedom of expression, and the climate of expressing oneself freely was accused by a little group of individuals, in the national news press. It was then the question surfaced: does the hit-and-run logic of memes fall under the freedom of expression?

Or, rephrased: what is the freedom of expression without the will to stand up for it? I decided that we are free as long as we stand up for our freedom. And the expressive liberty of tagging memes on instagram is rather a matter of good/bad taste. It cannot be argued in the name of expressive freedom.

The bigger question is of course if it is in the nature of art to articulate expressions of a private nature in public space. Or, is it to stand the risk and trial of public debate and objection? This is a big/old question. I will not answer it here. But what about school? Is working at KHIO a private matter?

Are the reasons for studying here private? The nature of art education is to develop professionally through constant discussions and occasional objections. The idea being that through the look of the other, something will hatch that will bring our work onwards. This is part of the art school culture.

But it is not—or, marginally—part of the art/school institutions: here difference regularly entails adversity. Objection equals transgression. Knowledge standards (requiring a reasonable degree of memory, consistency and consequence) are therefore difficult to establish.

It is a system in which fantastic/mythical claims, inconsistency and lack of consequence are permissible. It conjures situations in which objection may be ethical—in the sense of working for a better life of institutions—but will adversely affect the moral person, for whoever stands up for the *other* view.