

## Marc Ferrante - Jean-François Robic<sup>1</sup> (Strasbourg, 2010)

**MF:** I started working in the early 2000s on radiography. In other words, I based my work on ambiguity and bias in radiography as a material: for example, if you light a sheet of plastic behind an X-ray, it is transparent, a bit dull, whereas in normal light it becomes opaque and as shiny. Moreover, such an image has a depersonalizing effect and even if your name is mentioned, someone else could certainly think it is his own image.

So, for this first project I created an environment consisting of five large volumes built with radiographs, five "ossicles", a way of giving the radiograph a third dimension while sticking to an approach that partakes both of the monumental and the human scale. I wanted the viewer to physically feel the ambiguities that the type of imagery convey, only by moving from one of these "ossicles" to the other. To that purpose I designed these volumes as bubbles of X-rays, which you could not get in except by your head through a window made in the back of each sculpture. I wanted to create frustration, forcing the visitors to stay out of the bubbles, so that they would feel what is physically happening outside of those bubbles: thus, when he approached any of these volumes, it became opaque and when he walked away from, the radio became transparent. Moreover, these imposing dark masses cracked and shook when someone passed by. There was something both very fragile and very impressive in this project. The four "hand games" series started from that, because the radiologist with whom I had made the invitation card for the 2003 exhibition had suggested I worked on radiographs again, but as pictures, this time.

**JFR:** At first sight, radiography causes concern because of radioactivity but also because of all that it represents...

**MF:** Of course this material is all the more interesting as it generates fantasy and is very meaningful too. There's also the fantasy of complete strip tease attached to it... behind, there is our fear of suffering or of death... and the mask we wear to keep both at a distance. Working on X-rays is obviously a school of humility.

However, one must not forget that an X-ray is also a codified picture which has its own past outside its context and regular use. That is why I tried to define radiography by confronting it to the imaginary processes it generates one way or another through the devices used to make or show radiography, but also through its history or that of the other arts which led to its invention. Right from the first sessions with the radiologist, I connected radiography with the Chinese shadow play: one is led to anticipate in shadow play that which is going to be X-rayed, as a light in the focal point of the machine signals in advance the opening of the window through which the X-rays will come, consequently one can anticipate the size of the surface to be displayed on the table. Moreover, X-ray acts just like a shadow since the hand which screens the rays more or less according to the density of the constituents, will then mark the plate with phosphorus accordingly. So I asked puppeteers and shadow players to replay the bestiary of shadow play, that was not always easy because it involved distorting some models of shadows to be able to re-draw them with the skeletons of the hands.

**JFR:** I understand, you position the human elements in a different way so that the image of the skeletons image represents or suggests an animal of the bestiary, but do you afterwards bring graphic changes with digital tools, for example?

---

<sup>1</sup> Jean-François Robic, artist, University professor, leads a seminar on reproducibility and Intermediality in Arts at the University of Strasbourg. He recently published *Copier-Créer*, L'Harmattan editions, and *Bruissements dans le jardin d'Éros et de Thanatos*, books-research, University of Strasbourg.

**MF:** No, these X-rays are digital but the different software packages used by radiologist do not allow digital alteration of images, the way this would be possible on a graphics palette with Photoshop style software. Thus I just used special effects in the traditional style, so as not to lose the specificities of the radiography software package when printing. So, everything was made live so to speak straight on the radiologist's table. Because the sessions were quite short, everything depended on preparatory work.

**JFR:** This play on the shapes of animals is quite interesting from an anthropological viewpoint. We are in front of totems: eventually the animal image bears specific qualities typical to the clan. Thus, the animal represents a part of the human community, allows identification, something quite archaic in us and which goes on in today's societies, in media images, in affectionate words in French (mon petit loup, ma puce). That appears in shadow play in so far as it portrays the humanization of animals as well as the bestiality of humans, which reminds me of La Fontaine fables or of cartoons.

**MF:** All the "natural" images which rule our connections with the outside world, such as shadows, reflections, marks, echoes, are sort of duplicates of real life, reflecting our condition, our environment as well as our desires, of what is beyond our control in other words. It's the old story of an image that oscillates between reproduction of what is similar and deliberate creation of make-believe.

**JFR:** The 2 or 3 founding myths are based on a projection of the self. I think it's also the starting point of reproduction. The negative or positive hand we find in prehistoric galleries, of which we do not know the real meaning mostly interests me, as it is the other side of art. Until a very recent period, art was always the expression of genius, of man and of his singularity... Here, the "artist" is simply the person, who, at the side of the great animal frescoes, makes a very simple sign with the means at his disposal; by spitting paint on his hand, he invents a gesture that can be very easily reproduced, a gesture that is far more peculiar and connected with the artist's identity...

**MF:** My first relation with things is tactile... I'm sensitive to things, their volume, their textures, and to my environment in general. As far as I'm concerned, the hand, instead of being a tool is that which embodies my presence and my relationship with the world: that which allows me to touch the other as well as push him aside.

That is why the hand comes back quite often in my work. In some performances I involved people putting rattles in their hands: they were thus confronted with social attitudes associated with the object in accordance with its ergonomics or its materials.<sup>2</sup>

With radiography, I wanted to move away from the stereotype of the skull and to make the hand expressive by itself, beyond its links with the other parts of the body, which is not really obvious<sup>3</sup>. For instance, when I wanted to work with people who translate from and into sign language; it didn't work because for them movements of the hand only get their meanings in relation with the bust, the head or facial expressions.

**JFR:** As far as image goes, the hand is a metaphor, a metonymy which means mankind. And at the same time, like many contemporary artists, in your practice, the hand is involved at very crucial moments, but does not perform the task. Up to the XIXth century, and even, as long as

---

<sup>2</sup> *Hiccup of rattles* 2000-2007: series of 8 rattles from ten copies the public is led to appropriate depending on the context, to make books, musical instruments, rakes (...) as concerts, parade...

<sup>3</sup> *Speaking with hands. Photographs from the Buhl Collection*, Art publishers, S. R. Guggenheim Foundation, New York, 2004.

there will be painters it's the hand that does the work, the tool it holds being just an extension; you can paint without your hand, but you need it to take photographs, make videos or X-rays. That's interesting because you associate the hand with some kind of primitiveness and to something located deep inside a grotto. Finally a radiologist's practice is somehow a grotto; shadow play is archaic in what it shows, the similarity between man and animal, and also in the way it is created: only darkness, a candle and a wall are needed.

**MF:** Any way, that is why I have stuck to a display in luminous boxes. On the one hand because technology allows fabulous adjustments of light. The magic of the image that is lit is kept, which the media screens remove as pictures are unwound.

**JFR:** Many contemporary artists use light boxes with a view to getting the photography "vibrate" not to evoke light itself: Ciba in light boxes, a great must of contemporary art, does not evoke light. There are no religious dimensions in your work, but don't you think that some of the somehow mystical quality of light may be found in your X-ray photos, whether you call them X-rays of the human body or of God's body made man?

**MF:** In fact to play at miming a wolf or a deer with their bones is of course, a means of going beyond one's mortal condition, of inhibiting one's fears or those of the medical world we have to cope with, at one time or another... I think something supreme lies there, something that goes beyond a feeling of strangeness to the self experienced when looking at one's own X-ray photo. An X-ray photo needs to be decoded, but this time not by anyone but by an expert. That is all the more tasty as shadow play challenges the idea that a shadow can be defined as the outline of a figure, since here we have a skeleton.

**JFR:** Are there things that become invisible? Does X-ray ignore the depth of shootings, the depth of the field?

**MF:** As regards the shape, it all depends on the adjustments; let's say that everything with a density inferior to human flesh remains invisible. And the farther the object is from the inscription area, the more blurred it becomes.

In fact, X-ray only shows a very partial image of oneself. It reveals your anatomy and its constituents, but it remains a screen that hides your person with its complexity. What you get from your own X-ray photo is the picture of a body stripped of its flesh, which has lost its skin and all that makes a being opacity (its real life experience, shadows, masks, affect...). Thus X-ray photos eliminate all possibilities of transcendence (symbols, desires...).

In this way, radiography performs the miracle and the illusion of transparency: the human being is reduced to his body which would be no more than a map one would unfold and lay before him, which would not raise any problem.

**JFR:** At the same time X-rays are opaque material. How do you conduct your work?

**MF:** On a radiologist's table I really work in the same conditions as for a photogram. A hand is placed between the recording area and the source, which cannot be directly handled, just like a photon-ray. You can only intervene in that space. As regards X-rays you can only set the time of radiation and the power of X-rays infiltration.

With radiography, I can only to work blindly with samples, like a chemist, writing down the slightest change from one experiment to another. Roughly speaking, I alternate preparatory sessions in the workshop where I have learnt to sew up a chicken and to remove its bones without opening it, sessions in the radiologist's room where I discover other possibilities of doing things, and eventually shooting session on radiologists' computers. Add to this preparatory session during which I videotape artists' hands... In the end it is time-consuming. Sometimes it took me 6 months to adjust some transparencies.

**JFR:** At first sight, one might have thought that as you used a technique dating back from the end of the XIXth century, you did not work with a new technology as we think of it today, but in the end, X-ray photography has integrated the new technologies completely.

**MF:** It is obvious that these images could not have been made without digital management of X-rays. Having said that I could not have imagined the results I obtained in front of a computer: these images are the fruit of experiments which mix up recent technologies with methods inspired by Méliès or Moholy-Nagy... Moreover, I think that the appearance of X-ray photography<sup>4</sup> was not totally due to sheer luck. Röntgen invented X-ray photo because he knew how to manipulate photographic plates or perhaps because he was aware of the *modus operandi* of shadow play or even photogram. Let's bear in mind that at the time he made scientific research in that matter, popular shows, shadow plays, puppets, made more and more frequent use of XVIIth, XVIIIth, and XXth century optical inventions. I'm thinking of Reynaud's pantomime show, of Radriguet's phantasmagoria...

**JFR:** I think it is not only a technical or scientific discovery, but a cultural discovery as it implies knowledge and cultural references. It did not appear at that time by chance. The idea of seeing beyond appearances is really typical of the period of time that started with the symbolists to end up with the surrealists: it is an era in which the fantastic is very important, in "rationalist" literature included, Jules Verne and Marcel Duchamp inherited this "spiritualistic" culture, each in his own way, by imagining a lot of devices which break the barrier of what is visible and of distance...

In addition, in some way, you "deceive" people in the surrealists' way; I mean "ironically". You mean one thing by showing another.

**MF:** To establish a link with the current period of time, what has eventually interested me, is to make X-ray photo "lie".

**JFR:** It tells a revealed truth, because the medical doctor is able to spot what you cannot see.

**MF:** The problem with X-ray is that it allows you to believe that you can see whereas you only recognize or guess things...

**JFR:** You recognize something you have never seen. Besides, one is always tempted to believe an image...

**MF:** Not one week passes without TV news presenting us with a report on the latest discoveries in medical or scientific imaging, stimulating all kinds of fantasy at the same time. Here, as in common language, radiography is associated with a series of notions of purity, truth, or of disclosure as part of a simplistic view of transparency. It is not surprising that this imagery of your body eventually becomes a fascinating non-place supposed to immerse the consumer into pastoral-like contemplation. It is also convenient as it allows for the human being to be completely materialized, reduced to a few genetic or biological issues.

**JFR:** You also work on death... It's quite normal as you work on reproduction material. It's Kafkaesque. Reproduction techniques have been closely linked to the imagery of death since XVth century engraving.

---

<sup>4</sup> Monique Sicard, *L'année 1895. L'image écartelée entre voir et savoir*, Paris : Les empêcheurs de penser en rond, 1994.

**MF:** Obviously, there is a link between transparency and death. The first magic lantern<sup>5</sup> made by Huygens in Europe in the XVIIth century was called "the lantern of fear". It showed a gruesome dance copied from Holbein's. The fantasy of transparency appeared at the Renaissance when the *écorché*<sup>6</sup> enabled science to get control over the human body. It's one of the great cultural and technical challenges for the Western world as this fantasy refers to the human and social condition... Starting from 1800, all sorts of optical inventions have developed in this way, following the democratization of aristocratic leisure activities: I think of transparent sceneries painted on canvas coated with wax and oil, which were animated by lighting a candle behind them to make them lifelike. I think of panoramas being unfolded, inspired by Japanese makimono and which announce dioramas, the photography, the cinema... And no wonder if this has remained topical. Thanks to peddlers, the magic lantern was already a symbol of claims and popular fantasies in the XVIIIth century.

**JFR:** This has ended up with Marcel Duchamp's "Large Glass".

**MF:** Duchamp has interested me for his relation with prints, which has necessarily something to do with prehistory of photography: radiography is a differed print like photography. That's why I logically moved from "shadows" or "skins" to "Ergon", a series which helped me materialize the print of the void between two hands.

**JFR:** These images are strange, there's something mystical in them that reminds me of spiritualistic photos.

**MF:** It is not deliberate but I am not surprised. There is obviously the religious tradition of the imprint which the spiritualists used to play with appearance and disappearance. You just have to remember the "sudarium" which inspired the spiritualists: it is a simulated imprint whose "aura" effect results from the contact between casting and cast<sup>7</sup>.

**JFR:** You also often refer to theatre.

**MF:** With the objects theatre I tried to transform puppets into masks for one's hands, the puppet being a sort of second skin; at the beginning it was a great laboratory that allowed me to test all sorts of materials. Nothing new in itself: Albert Londe and others did it in their own way as soon as X-ray radiography started. Gradually I restricted my field of activity and went further by focussing on the relationships between the values, playing with stereotypes, cultural conventions, comparing different types of images, be they medical, folkloric or archaic as you states before... Several images in this series such as the chicken made into a glove puppet were made thanks to the collaboration with artists from the theatre. This enabled us to look at one another, to combine know-how. As a matter of fact, collaboration and discussions with radiologist were just as fascinating.

---

<sup>5</sup> The magic lantern inspired by chinese fire, small lamps imported from China at this time. This little gadget foresees even kinetic and optical reproduction that will be developed in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>: film, all types of still images, projected or backlit and of course the quest for transparencies.

<sup>6</sup> David Le Breton, *La chair à vif. De la leçon d'anatomie aux greffes d'organes (Exposed flesh. From a lesson in anatomy to organ transplants)*, Paris, Métailié, 2008. *Anthropologie du corps et modernité (Anthropology of the body and modernity)*, Paris, PUF, 2008.

<sup>7</sup> Georges Didi-Huberman. *La Ressemblance par contact. Archéologie, anachronisme et modernité de*, Paris : Minuit, 2008.

**JFR:** Things take place in the workshop but not only; they always involve other people. You have always involved lots of people whatever you did or performed. It is not something collective but something done together... as is the case with your handling of musical boxes or walkmans. They are technical tools for personal use but in the long run they can work together: the meaning of such manipulations or of the object itself only has value through their relationship with all the other objects. We keep wondering, for example, which one is going to stop first and which one last... These are things that are not a matter of competition but of symphony. They are as many scores...

**MF:** Fears that we all share more or less were the starting point of all these projects, so why not try to create harmony out of this? What is interesting in a performance, as in an X-ray photography, is that you combine personal and collective identity. With my "hand games" I have tried to study how imaging of a person ("I") which addresses one patient, can become imagery of "we", with a collective dimension.

**JFR:** Are your past experiences related in some way or other to "hand dancing? "

**MF:** In fact, this series comes from a work protocol I set up to be able to work with other artist, I video shoot each person's hands. I get them do exercises so as to find out, one image after the other, those that might be suitable for an X-ray photography.

As a result, I developed the dances of hands as portrait focusing my research on the hand ability to grasp the void or time. I am referring to movement, to centring, to people's mania or dancers' rituals, to puppeteers warning-up... I think for example of a very uncomfortable position a dancer had unconsciously chosen to relax or to enjoy himself and which became a real odd habit. Such positions can be really surprising. It is maybe the reason why I took an interest at about the same time in pre-written postures for traditional dances that artists have repeated tried to improve throughout their lives.

By dint of hard work on sign language, I ended up making X-ray photographs with four hands that simulate the analysis of movements... it is fake E.J. Marey or rather, fake Eakins! Then I downright X-rayed movements.

**JFR:** What is interesting here is that you divert a means of production<sup>8</sup> to take it elsewhere as far as images are concerned; you capture movement in particular.

Don't you think that the distortions you do and the discoveries that they entail might incite those who manufacture radiography material to restrict the use of the machines so that they could not used to other ends.

**MF:** It is very difficult to have access to radiography. I have been lucky to work directly with the manufacturer of X-ray apparatus related. They taught me how to make X-rays, to use their software and their devices as I asked much more from this apparatus than radiologists do. There was no suspicion but mainly curiosity. Besides, they are already aware of how the existing apparatus might develop in the short run, which an artist's work will not interfere with: the graphic channel necessary to make radiographs will become simpler, especially from the user's point of view; This will make it more and more difficult for an artist to use such apparatus for his own purpose, as its use will be rationalized, pre-defined. In fact it is already very complicated to work with apparatus that is always evolving. I'm never sure to find the same one during from one visit to the next.

**JFR:** There is less and less room for fantasy the practical and poetic approach of industry. In the 70's and 80's when digital technologies appeared, those who devised them felt stuck in front

---

<sup>8</sup> For thousand years, artists have made their own tools. Dating from mid XIX th century the artist's tool is most of the time one made for Warhol with screen process printing, Paik with video and Vostell for concrete work...

of those mainly visual tools when they had to duplicate or devise pictures in 2 or 3 dimensions. They were not really culturally trained to invent new use for this apparatus and did not have the capacity to see in 3Ds or to in a plane for. Thus manufacturers like Xerox or Telecom called artists to experiment their machines and see how far they could go. After the 80's, they trained people to take their places, but the first period allowed cooperation with something related to artistic fantasy in the making and the conception of apparatus. Did other artists use such machines?

**MF:** So far, artists have rather used radiography, making use of the edifying and voyeur aspect of this medium or of the loud and performing side of this technology. The thing is I had nothing to reveal apart from some clown's tricks. I preferred to show what these devices could not record, that is what a human being can see, or what makes each and every person impenetrable in order to trouble the expectations of those who look at the radiographs and to disturb conventions to read X-rays, photos, 3D imagery or even comic strips.

**JFR:** You do not only use X-rays as a technical tool but you also make pictures which are first mental representations, stage design. You have worked with dancers, puppeteers, purposefully I suppose. There is something in common between your images and spectacular practices such as the theatre or contemporary dancing. There are no props, the backdrop is black, like your inscription surface; there is nothing beyond.

In painting, drawing, photography, the inscription plate lies in the middle between the artist's eye and the world he is going to reproduce: the field is deep, allowing one to see everything. On the contrary, your X-ray photos do not allow us to see anything beyond the black backdrop. What is the nature of this blackness?

**MF:** This darkness gives the image its depth; it corresponds to the strongest X-ray print, when there is no opacity and no obstacle in front of the inscription surface. Contrary to appearances, radiography is rather a question of opacity: the transparency we have been used to with radiography is actually a certain level of opacity commonly agreed and accepted. Many other different types of transparencies exists as I show in "attendance changed". In fact, opacity is inherent in the way we perceive the world; shadow is the trace of that. Again, this leads us to our primary condition which we cannot really come to terms with, and for which we have invented all kinds of loopholes: the great myths, transparency or even mapping!

**JFR:** Do you bear in mind the aesthetic principle of Caravaggio when you achieve those figures that emerge from darkness? There never is any drawing in the Caravaggio. I even think he used a dark room or something like that. As for you, do you make images emerge from darkness without any medium?

**MF:** There are many other mediums than drawing to draft a project. I use the video, I resort to sampling; I carve or I make my own accessories. I did not think of things in terms of chiaroscuro even if at the beginning I had a negative, which is not actually one, since on radiographs bones are the way they are in ossuaries, for instance. I strived to widen the range of values on which I could work.

**JFR:** Several times, something like a room on different scales can be seen in the imaginary dimension of the work. The radiology room, place where you make the X-ray photos that is, is a sort of *camera obscura*. At the same time these images take us deep inside the body in a space that has hardly any reality, where light does not penetrate. We are in the darkness of fantasies, of dreams, of thought, where imago takes shape. "It's the primitive room from which the apparition will come"<sup>9</sup>.

---

<sup>9</sup> Marie-José Mondzain, "Aborder l'image", in Colette Tron (Dir.), *Esthétique et société*, Paris : L'Harmattan, 2009.

Let me evoke Eros and Thanatos. In the way you talk about your work, you emphasize relationships with people who work with you rather than mention the great archetypes that are obviously present in the medium to allow you to escape. You look surprised when I speak of death...

**MF:** Let's rather say I'd rather give that imagery another distance, give it another cultural and symbolic dimension, cultural and symbolic, and why not a lighter dimension.

For instance it is rather funny to realize that people do instantly forget that the bones have disappeared when they look at one of my transparent skins.

**JFR:** More than anything else, this transparency makes it possible to lighten the image from behind on the light box. From the point of view of the viewer, there's a mirror effect as on every glass screen. The image on the radiograph, the reflected picture of the viewer and the glass can be seen at the same time.

**MF:** The specular, the reflection is the kind of problematic that interests me most, but I have always dealt with it indirectly. Here again, it must be a way of making pleasure last longer; for me, it is one more way of articulating "I" with "we". That being said, I do not necessarily conceive of reflection from a visual point of view in my imagination; I rather think of reflection that is created, in the same way as Vermeer thought of space between the card and the curtain.

**JFR:** What's the meaning of the image of a hand stripped of its skin? Is it the passage from one world to another? It reminds me the trick Cocteau used in *Orpheus* when Jean Marais goes through the mirror of his wardrobe to go to the other world?

**MF:** We are not far from that: it always follows the logic of fabrication of Méliès. The skin is necessarily an excuse to play on appearances... fantasy establishing radiography as striptease is staged.

**JFR:** When you show bones, you show mankind entirely: but when you superimpose the skin with all its details, you get the person hidden by the skin to appear again and some kind of sensuality comes up...

**MF:** The most frustrating aspect of my work was to have been working on the hand for several years without evoking the sense of touch or the skin, I felt really frustrated. Could colour X-ray photography be prevented?

**JFR:** Would anything prevent you from making colour X-rays?

**MF:** Adding colours would only be an arbitrary code since the values of grey are enough to transcribe the effect of X-rays on the material. Colours in ultrasound is just there to remedy the affective needs of the customers, not of the patients. One may deem excessive such expectation of imagery that is technologically sophisticated and which I do not think really interesting... All this is just the dark side of the coin of problematic at the centre of which medical imagery can be found. On the one hand, there are ethical and technical problems, on the other hand the radiologist's difficulties when he has a bad diagnosis to give his "im-patient".

**JFR:** Communication between the patient and the physician is one of the difficulties in medicine.

**MF:** Well, it's an up to date debate now but it goes much further than appears when you mention it<sup>10</sup>. The dominant discourse imposes norms on behaviour beyond the healing functions

---

<sup>10</sup> Didier Sicard, *La médecine sans le corps*, Plon, 2002.

of medicine because the models of medicine are economic and technological: the glorified body is incensed by performance and techniques, while the suffering body is transferred on to screens more and more, hidden behind numbers, genes, because pain has become less and less acceptable. Also men have always burnt their fingers so to speak with images and technology.

Today some speak of "increased reality" in microsurgery, while others complain about a medicine in which the body is more and more cut off from our person. This current terminology should not prevent us from speaking of presence in the strongest sense of the term once again. Because even if he cannot do without these images, a doctor will make a diagnosis by dialoguing, palpating and directly observing his patient.

**JFR:** It is no longer a matter of science, but of techno-science that is to say such science as is completely subservient to profit, to monitoring...

In "We" Zamiatine, in 1924, imagined a monitoring system in which people kept an eye on one another. There everyone polices himself thanks to a transparent architectural system. You are at home, you can see your neighbour who also sees you. It's a political vision of transparency, which is supposed to be one of the wonders of democracy.

**MF:** The problem is that by making everyone responsible for his own body, medical policy makes us feel guilty more and more: "I'm free and therefore responsible, that is to say that I am potentially responsible for my illnesses and of my death"... Thus it is easy to mix up technology and the quest for interiority it allows, with the narcissistic desire inherent in that I think of the people who take their body for a capital in trace elements or who think they are clothes hangers and worship their body, their physical appearance, or their muscles...

It is easy to fall into traps of the impasse by confusing the search for interiority and the search limits of their bodies or their individual.

**JFR:** By referring to scientific practices, we imitate science: we focus, we select, we cut, by extending Zamiatine's effects of transparency, who produced a panoptic vision. But all the tools used by science only deal with small parts of a whole: scientific medicine is no exception to the rule and finds it very hard to connect the different parts.

**MF:** While those images only reflect something ephemeral, they are as difficult to grasp as an ice cube that burns your hands as it melts between your fingers. The images are coded, fragile, stuck between the box and the projection, between everyone's involvement or distance. Thus I tried to make some collective imagination emerge rather than denounce some people's point of view while serving as a foil to others.

(translation Marie-Jeanne Da Col Richert)