

The objects.

An object, any object, holds and releases energy. All matter is energy, vibration, movement, and is modified by energy flowing through it, (de)generating it, eternally modifying it from the inside and from the outside. We ourselves are part of this never-ending movement. So how do we relate to objects? In an infinite number of ways, of course. Shouldn't the task of mystics, artists, and philosophers be to search beyond the form, function, and solidity of objects, and to end up with another form, another function, another solidity? Objects change at a metaphysical and cultural level whenever someone takes the role of spectator, researcher, or manipulator. Despite us doing all we can to archive, restore, or assign value, objects are in eternal transformation. The more we describe them, the more they lose energy. The more the concept detaches itself from form, function, energy, the more it becomes 'other' to the object itself. By describing them, objects assume new value; the more we describe them, the more they will lose energy, their intrinsic value. The more the concept of the object detaches itself from form, function, materiality, and energy the more it becomes another object.

We therefore believe that it is important to leave behind both the expectations of those who look and of the object. Some might ask – “Why expose them? Why salvage them, curate them, clean them?” Because we believe these objects must be shown and not studied, catalogued, restored, or locked up. Displaying without adding any descriptive information is not a neutral act, but a political choice. We do not go for objectivity. Our experience and perception of objects is always wholly subjective.

We want to turn will on its head. Silence it. And do the same with the illusion of causality. To choose is both to include and exclude. The choice to save these objects is a way for each of us to keep them alive.

To represent is to simulate. The universe is a jungle of signs: a great misunderstanding. You can even choose to renounce. What can these objects do, then? Those who redefine the object reconstruct it, while those who save it have already placed it on a new level: from rubbish it has become a stratified symbol. The same happens with the bodies of migrants. They are constantly represented by the media, but in reality there are no 'Migrants', 'Clandestini', or 'Turks'. These categories are created for the benefit of politics and language, the same language that gives us the illusion of being able to choose and define, but is really the one who always chooses us. Language is a narrow road without exits. It traps you in a cage where what you are able to say is what is accepted. First, migrants are created through physiology: they are hungry and thirsty, animals escaping from a world that is 'other'. Then they are allowed to exist politically, culturally, and through the media. They are created as silent bodies without possibilities for voicing the centuries of colonialism and imperialism that weigh, whether consciously or not, on their lungs, head, legs and shoulders. Individual stories are stifled by chronicles of numbers, state representations, and by being labelled as a uniform mass, sharing the same needs. All those who arrive to Lampedusa are thus turned into animals/commodities. There is no room left for individuality in this representation, as it would complicate everything. Each individual, whether they be travelling, in motion, or not, is un-representable, albeit through lying or via eternal processes of mutation. Individuals are only representable if turned into exceptions. Their objects are instead expected to have a voice, to speak, or to be spoken for, to be the means for their own voice, their thoughts, their culture. This process aims at packaging the object and giving it not only a voice but a message. The object, instead, speaks but is dumb. It carries un-translatable messages which are, once again, filled with misunderstandings, with constant choices. There is always something missing. Traps are everywhere, ready to pounce at the first uncertainty. We do not mean to say that the practice of studying, identifying and renaming objects is wrong. We don't know what is right or wrong. We don't know what others should be doing. We just know the journey we want to take with these objects (and it is never a conclusive one). Everyone has their own motivations, arguments, and solutions to put forward. We are simply looking for the road that had once led us to that dump.