

same way that nobody notices the disappearance of the letter “e” in Perec’s *A Void* - it’s hard to imagine Turkey without censorship.

The word list wanted us for instance to use “liberty” instead of “freedom”, and tried to convince us these are synonyms anyway. Besides the discussion on whether there is actually such a thing as a “synonym”, they were trying to introduce a rightist language to replace words belonging to the leftist jargon. Tunca Toskay the General Director of TRT at the time, who was the one signing off on this decision, stated in an interview that they were trying to merge the intellectuals’ language with the people’s language. Once again stirring the panic of “We’re about to be divided!” which had worked unfailingly over the past 80 years, the policy of legitimizing each and every measure was at work. So, together with hip-hop MC Fuat, we made a song called *191/205* (because I could only find 191 of these 205 words) - also with an aim to criticize the current system - using each word in a sentence and printed it on an edition of 100 copies of 12” LPs. I chose to make this song because it entailed the possibility of the listeners listening to it not knowing what the song was about and the moment they began to sing along, they’d unwittingly be uttering a whole bunch of banned words.

Süreyya Evren: Should we mark you as an artist with an intense rapport with literature? On the other hand, there are also websites that refer to you as an artist-writer. Perhaps you prefer this yourself. Do you see your work somewhere in-between or are the distinctions irrelevant? Are things different now? How does this state of intertwinement work?

Aslı Çavuşoğlu: I’m an artist with a background in and still very much nurtured by literature. That’s probably why I could so readily relate to the “book”. Furthermore, the “text” has always the fundamental element of the artists’ books I published. Initially a lot of people were giving me unsolicited advice to “go, write a novel!”. Because the use of text in an art work is uncommon in Turkey. My work *Delivery 6* exhibited in *How I Travelled Around the World*, was an experimental text/thesis on the concept of “finding something when looking for something else” and preserved the accepted language and thesis template employed in academia. It was written by a ghost writer hired through the thesis writing offices operating actively in Turkey. About this work, one critic in an art magazine had written something along the lines of “Aslı Çavuşoğlu falls into the misconception that a book is a work of art”. My interest in texts and books causes some people to think that I am an artist who couldn’t be a novelist very much like “the dentist who couldn’t be a doctor.”

As could be seen in the case of *191/205*, an idea opens and expands itself wherever it can. Therefore, I leave myself and the media open. In my practice, writing is an act that has assumed different forms of an article, a children’s book or song lyrics. Since all of these embody an idea in their essence, I don’t think they’re too detached from one another.

*
This interview was initially published in *Sıcak Nal* magazine in 2010, under the title *Burası Türkiye mi Patagonya mı? (Is this Turkey or Patagonia?)*. (Vol. 2, May – June 2010, Komşu Publishing)

→
Born in 1982 in Istanbul, Aslı Çavuşoğlu graduated from the Department of Cinema-TV of Marmara University in 2004. She attended residency programs at institutions such as Platform Garanti Contemporary Art Centre (2006), Backyard Residency Program, Iași, Romania (2006), ACC Galery, Weimar, Germany (2008), El Basilio, Buenos Aires, Argentina (2008), PA61, Mexico City, Mexico (2009), Cite des Artes, Paris, France (2009) and Wysing Arts Centre, Cambridge, England (2010). Producing 6 artists’ books between 2006-2009, Çavuşoğlu recently participated in exhibitions like: “How I traveled around the world”, Gallery NON, Istanbul (solo-exhibition, 2010), *Performa1* NY, USA (2011), “Seven New Works”, Borusan Contemporary, Perili Köşk, Istanbul (2011), “Who Do You Admire?”, La Box, Ecole Nationale Supérieure D’artbourges, Bourges, France (2011), “Transient Spaces – The

Tourist Syndrome”, Neue Gesellschaft für Bildende Kunst, Berlin, Germany (2010), “When Ideas Become Crime”, DEPO, Istanbul (2010), “This Place You See Has No Size At All”, Kadist Art Foundation, Paris, France (2009), “Everyday Challengers”, Hisk, Ghent, Belgium (2009), “Interferencia”, Bogota, Colombia (2009), “End Game”, Galery Loop, Seoul, Korea (2009). Most of Aslı Çavuşoğlu’s works reside on experimental narrative exercises shaped around the interactions of mechanisms of erasure, repetition, reproduction and narrative. In her works Çavuşoğlu utilises artists’ books, videos and installations.

Criticism is an approach that leaves the trading of art’s “promise of happiness” to those souls ready to reconcile with this world

Burak Delier & Zeynep Öz

Zeynep Öz: Burak, you’ve been producing works for a very long time; but especially recently you have begun to tackle art and its institutions. I don’t want to call this a “turn”, but particularly in the process that began with *Collector’s Wish*, you’ve started to explore how art is being produced and by whom it is consumed. Is this some sort of impulse or is it a local analysis?

Burak Delier: We could say both. It is both an impulse -more precisely a drive resulting from an emotion- and an analysis. Actually, to this analysis we could add the handover of art to the private sector and to humanitarian institutions, which became most pronounced worldwide following the 2008 crisis. After the crisis, even in Europe renowned for its tradition of the social state, art institutions faced budget cuts and had to struggle with challenges of finding “humanitarian” support, sponsors etc. from the private sector or adjusting their programs to the new limited budgets. This led to increased control of the market and the market rationale over art. In some way, we’ve exhausted the notion of “the artistic space as a field of activity where we could imagine ourselves outside the reality of the world.” Actually it was never quite outside the world, but now art seems to be seriously stuck in this “real” world. Of course all of these are the outcomes of the unquestioning yielding to the imposition of the neo-liberal program that has been implemented since the mid-70s. Therefore this is an issue exceeding the local. As for Turkey, contemporary art always developed in a sphere defined by humanitarian institutions, sponsorship, the private sector and private entrepreneurship. Since the 50s, the state has abandoned the sphere of art to the initiative of banks and certain wealthy families. In the 1980s, the art market developed under the shadow of Özalism. When we look at the important exhibitions (see *Gar -Railway Station, Devlet, Sefalet, Siddet -State, Misery, Violence and Anı Bellek Memory/Recollection*) of the 90s, when support for and audience of art was relatively less compared to the present, we see that these works were realized with a sense of urgency overlapping with the rationale of free enterprise logic. Artistic production has always rubbed elbows with this logic. At the end of the day Ultimately, the artist is someone who presents an unsolicited statement in as far as the within the scope of relationships and opportunities he himself has built of his own making allow for and strives to make this statement accepted. In the aforementioned cases, curators and artists held realize extremely engaged and, bold and uncalled for exhibitions entirely through their own initiative and in an environment devoid of infrastructure, support and audience. Even though political, social and historical issues were addressed, or –as in the case of *State, Misery, Violence*– they were undertaken with a collective spirit, I think the rationale of entrepreneurship was at work in these exhibitions. As for today,

this rationale largely reliant on entrepreneurship and humanitarianism is celebrating its unrivalled victory... The difference between us and Europe is that as contemporary artists in Turkey, we did not, do not know what a state, municipality, or city art gallery or art institution is. We know the art institutions and collections belonging to this or that family, and we try to create our own space in this web of relations. This obviously reveals a chain of relations involving the issue of art-capital dynamics we've been discussing for a very long time, and disrupts our understanding of art which we associate with a certain naïvety.

In short, my interest in this management rationale did not start with Collector's Wish. The imaginary company I founded in 2007 called Tersyön (Reversedirection) might be the starting point of such a "turn". I was investigating the relationship of market/consumerism rationale and sociopolitical history there as well. Through a product and company, I had brought together Turkey, which had become more "liberal" as a result of the 1980 military coup, as a large market opening up to the international market through the enforcement of all rules of neo-liberalism on the one hand, and the violence instigated by all the social and political impasse Turkey faced on the other. This work continued with Tersyön Feasibility Research in 2011. The intellectual genesis of the Tersyön project was the paradox of the call for a society precluded from expressing itself politically and participating in its own governance since the 1980 military coup, to now realize its inhibited desires in the consumer and market oriented world. Later, I pursued the same thread in the We Will Win Survey, where I tested a political art work using a market research tool devised to ascertain the suitability of a product for the target consumer group's intellectual world. As for Collector's Wish, this was a work pertaining to the conditions of production in the art world, which is largely grounded in expression, self-presentation, visibility, and persuasion through seduction, and as such bears many attributes of the free enterprise rationale of neo-liberalism.

Obviously all of these are the culmination of an analysis effort based on historical and social readings. Yet this analysis effort is not exempt from impulse or emotion. I don't think analysis without emotion, or theory without emotion, or any thought that does not entail emotion, impulse, need and urgency is at all possible. I guess in order to grasp the impulse, emotion and analysis effort in these works, we should look not at the works themselves, but rather at the social and political conditions these works are realized in, and the shifts in perception and desire precipitated by these conditions...

Zeynep Öz: Let's look at your work method. You usually choose to express rather complicated ideas through very simple and direct expressions. On the other hand you work with and through relations. What is your work process like, how do the ideas emerge, how does the maturation process unfold and how long does it take?

Burak Delier: I don't have a particular method, neither a particular time frame... More often than not, works I toil over for a long time and devote a lot of effort, fade out before they are realized and I am left with a whole bunch of notes, sketches, visual materials and bits and pieces of ideas. And sometimes a work just emerges from a fleeting idea. I can say that it's an entirely chaotic process. It's partly due to the fact that I have no production formula and I want to avoid falling into repetition, and partly because conventional, obvious issues, methods and forms do not motivate me enough. I can't pursue any work unless I'm curious about its process. Even being able to remotely guess the process and the ensuing knowledge is enough to turn me off. In this respect I could say that being curious and experimenting is my main method.

I investigate certain ideas, issues and the objects, people, and processes in which these issues come to life. My research method is based more on direct experience. For instance, in Tersyön Feasibility Research or Collector's Wish this performative element is quite evident. How can one speak of neo-liberalism without investigating the company and corporate culture which is its most obvious component? What transpires in the field, on the micro

level? What is the experience, process, operation of this thing which is called "the market" and is often expressed in abstract terms? What is the relationship of this operation with other "things"? What kind of interventions can be made to reveal the rationale of these relationships, transformations? If I am curious about the result, output of a process then I start out from questions like these and investigate the process by experiencing it myself.

I don't have an idea at the outset of what will come out; the content, form, presentation of the work develops through the process. For instance, Tersyön Feasibility Research is precisely the result of such a process. Before embarking on this research, I didn't know that contemporary marketing and public relations disciplines used "scientific" tools like "focus groups". What I did was to utilize the mechanism of this contentious "scientific" research method that entailed a certain power dynamic. Here's what's interesting: the "test subject" we see speaking in these research methods is nothing but a reduced subjectivity. I mean the person we see talking is not really talking in the literal sense of the word. What is actually speaking here and what I am trying to render visible is that which is invisible and silent, and which also produces a certain architectural technique.

Of course these research processes prolong the completion of the work. Sometimes a work can't be finalized due to problems arising within the process or because issues of presentation can't be resolved. Such a method inevitably leads to discarding the notion of a designated timeframe. Another temporality emerges; one that moves slower and that can accommodate the desire for a research and thought process that seems endless, or inconclusive. And the emerging works become certain points, knots in this temporality... I must also mention that producing in such a temporality contradicts the production rhythm of the art world. Production cycles of the art world are very fast and new works are in rapid demand, they are wanted here and now -as if the preceding one has already been consumed and finished. I can't produce in tune with this rhythm and I wouldn't want to...

Additionally, I am good note taker and I have a special interest in theoretical texts. Wherever there is an impenetrable, complicated, dense text or artwork -it is getting harder for me to distinguish the two- that's where I'm drawn.

Zeynep Öz: Let's move on to the significance of writing in your practice. You like to write. In one of our conversations, you said the format of your works might ultimately shift from the visual to writing entirely. Could you talk a bit about the connection you form between writing and the visual?

Burak Delier: Actually separating the two doesn't really seem possible to me. Each is an attempt and effort at thought. And this thought process creates its own autonomous space both in writing and in visual products. Godard has put it beautifully: "a thought that forms a form that thinks" ("une pensée qui forme une forme qui pense").¹ What's important is to be able to propose this thinking form and then follow the possible thought paths. Beyond various intentions, objectives and subjectivity, the ideas, objects and processes form their own relations or expose their incongruities, disaccords. And all I have to do is follow those disaccords or the thought emerging from these relationships, and allow it to unfold itself. Basically, after proposing certain elements intuitively, I later try to form the links between them; I watch these links form at will. And sometimes I try to relate them and thus I test the validity of my own intentions and tactics, and I'm not afraid of making mistakes. Especially my recent writings are pure exercises in thinking; and I continue my attempts to challenge my ideas in my current and future works.

I can say that that lately I am moving away from the visual and more towards a performative and textual direction. I mean, think of my untitled photograph from 2004 often referred to as Girl in an EU Flag or Guard (2005) and compare these to Tersyön Feasibility Research. Guard and Girl in an EU Flag can be considered attempts at visual thinking, or even "visual claim", whereas Tersyön Feasibility Research is a performative research

process. Of course Girl in an EU Flag isn't just a photomontage tactic; that work reached completion not by gaining visibility in the exhibition space, but by becoming an action realized in public space. I suppose this shift from a "visual" language to a more performative, textual approach also has a strategic quality related to the transformation in the art sphere and certain impulses I've become aware of. "Visuality", certain conventional and stale tactics (for instance contemporary versions of the détournement tactic employed by situationists; tactics in the "cultural studies" field still operating on the presumption that a conflict exists between "high" official culture and pop "low" culture and therefore claiming to accommodate, "give voice" or bestow visibility to "minority existences", "sub-identities", and "others" by rendering visible the "low" or the "outside") no longer open up space for thought, but rather have a dulling effect on the intellect. The politics they promote does not correspond to the practice of resistance and freedom.

Distancing myself from the "visual" sphere and concentrating on performative research and textual production lately, is also a result of the need to retain a distance from these theories contemporary art draws from and an attempt to accomplish a critique from within. Such works produced with an intention of being and rendering visible, speaking and giving voice, usually act with an assumption that they are the antidote to the current power construct. However in effect, they reproduce the same pain and exploitation generating construct by becoming simply another face of that power. While "power" or "capitalism" –whatever we want to call it– offers in the form of culture and art the remedy for the pain it inflicts, it also advertises its ideology based on "innovation", "creativity" and "entrepreneurship". My withdrawal from speaking and rendering visible, my research into the mechanisms that give voice, make visible, produce knowledge and my inclination towards a more performative direction by decreasing the dose of visibility, was a response to this double sided siege being imposed on artistic knowledge.

Zeynep Öz: Let's also talk about your relationship with mainstream media. As with your work Untitled (2004) also known as Girl in an EU Flag, the fact that you were embraced by the media also enabled the work to use the media as a tool and a media in return. Is this relationship intentional or coincidental and beyond all, how important is it in your work?

Burak Delier: Actually mainstream media does not constitute a specific problematic in my work. In Girl in an EU Flag, I'd brought together two icons that were presumed to be contradictory: the EU flag and a Middle Eastern woman in a burka. This was not about mainstream media but rather about cultural stereotypes of which we can find representations everywhere. When it comes to recognizing these stereotypes, we are very used to doing that basing our understanding on their various "things". I didn't use the media as a medium or a tool. After I printed the photograph as a poster and hung it around Beyoğlu, it was used by the media as a newsworthy poster and image. Not just then and there either; it was used in various places (culture and politics classes, political party campaigns, article series, magazine covers, various news reports etc.) This was something I had not at all foreseen. In line with my own ideas, I'd wanted to create a work transcending the spaces claimed by art; spreading through the street and public space using its pop culture but unsettling nonetheless. The subsequent adventure of the work developed unexpectedly. The "fame" of the work, originating from this adventure, is not so important for me. Of course it's no longer possible to look at the work without considering this "fame", but I don't think it has a very substantial value.

Today images are produced everywhere in abundance. These images travel far and wide, become easily and frequently visible. The act of infiltrating, being visible, distortion... they no longer appear to be such strategies that signify the practice of resistance and liberation. What we now have is a cultural environment rooted in visibility, where consumption and perception cycles are accelerating. This environment invites images into a competition. As Andy Warhol says, everybody wants their 15 minutes of fame. This logic of "15-minute Fame" also applies to the art world which is regarded

as "high culture". Moreover, cycles are now measured in seconds. Girl in an EU Flag also entered this circulation, experienced its 15 minutes of fame, became an icon and disappeared. Its only redeeming quality was that it was a process that grew directly from below/the street without coming into contact with the art sphere.

Back then the issue for me was to transgress the selective criteria of the institution of art and directly use the street as a stage and expose a void by establishing myself in the visual language of the street. I'd adopted a tactic using the aesthetic language (I mean the language that could overall be called "propaganda aesthetic" that is the source of advertisements, concerts, demonstration posters, political and commercial banners, all of it) we were accustomed to on the street, but left the expectations generated by this language unfulfilled since it did not contain any textual element signifying a given meaning or an aim. Especially in the context of the propagandist aesthetic on the street, it was an eccentric work. Looking back, these intentions of mine do seem rather naïve...

Zeynep Öz: The issue of "power" is very important to you. What is it that particularly interests you in your investigation of power? Is this a personal interest and attempt to understand its workings, or is it an urge to poke a hole in this structure? Of course such simple and definitive distinctions no longer apply today; yet if you were to locate a source of fascination, what would it be?

Burak Delier: Power, its exertion and, authority are issues that constitute the main subject matter of my work. We could say that how the line is drawn between the legitimate and those declared illegitimate; the acceptable and unacceptable; what can be said and can't be said, how that line is transformed and changed, and the dynamics of these transformations are the issues that ultimately interest me the most. Most of the time I take things from both sides of this divide, compare them with each other, merge them or apply them to each other. When I say power I am not only necessarily talking about the question of state or the law. I consider power in the post-structuralist sense; as processes, relationships that are not tied to a certain center or institution but rather permeate society, people individually, as well as their relationships to themselves, to the world of objects and their surroundings. In this respect the state is also an amalgam of power relations, and so is art, social sciences, production, economy... All these various fields operate with micro power mechanisms. And my central concern is these micro power mechanisms... Here my foremost effort is to render visible the borders between what is acceptable and what is not, what can be said and can't be said; investigate how these borders are constructed and achieve a certain critical language. I find that in the present cultural world this criticalque attempt is belittled, found to be "out of fashion" and pushed into the background seat. When I say critique what I am referring to What I mean by criticism is obviously alternative reading and thought processes that do not exclude the spaces of refuge despite the tyranny of the power, to those souls who are ready to reconcile with this world. Above all, criticism drowns itself in questions, problematics. A comfortable moment is like an unbearable void for criticism. There's a paranoid, uneasy, and yet strong side to criticism, therefore it's not productive or fruitful... I think my problem with power is shaped precisely by such a critical effort.

Zeynep Öz: But at the same time doing conducting these investigations/attempts within the sheltered environment of art, isn't this contradictory in a way? When I look at the recent Pussy Riot incidents, I see that the reason it is shock value ing is because we do not believe lies in our disbelief that an art punk group can leave abandon the sheltered milieu of art and generate such a reaction. An assumption perhaps.

Burak Delier: I don't think the sphere of art is a sheltered space. You know my photograph The Guard could not be exhibited. Let's remember that, around that time Karşı Sanat Gallery was raided for exhibiting photographs of the 6-7 September incidents; Hale Tenger was prosecuted for her work in the 2003 Biennial and Halil Altındere was prosecuted on account of three works –one of which was Guard– in the catalogue of his Free Kick exhibition for

"demeaning the Turkish army" under article 301 of the Turkish Penal Code; the exhibition *Fear of God* received raid threats; the galleries in Tophane were attacked, not to mention all the other threats and attacks I can't recall at the moment. Do we feel like we are in a sheltered place? I don't think so. Today in the sphere of art, if like Pussy Riot, you display an attitude critical of conservative values, there is no doubt you'll either find yourself facing an angry mass or a judge whom you'll hope will have some respect for democratic rights.

But above all that, art's concern is not to evoke an "action" or "reaction" targeting social groups driven by the discourse of popular culture and hate. In this world we live in, which is growing more and more intolerant, instigating or being able to instigate such an effect is not the exception but the rule. Therefore I don't think that such issues readily consumed by popular culture have any integral value. I'm not pursuing such an effect or reaction in my work. In this respect, I don't think working in the field of art constitutes a dilemma. Art works cannot be categorized as "readily understandable" and "pop", thus popular and "effective" and less "understandable" and "high", thus "elite" and "ineffective". Furthermore, this distinction often has a side that defends the popular and is therefore populist. This populism also entails an approach that advocates for the need to create art that will facilitate the masses' interest in art, easily serve their understanding and extract a response. In other words, populism dictates what the masses will like, what they will be interested in, and which art will suit them best. I am not interested in this approach, which in itself functions in a top-down manner and in this respect is highly elitist. As I said my main concern is the thought process and critical effort which is bound to create its own audience. There is no ready-made audience neither within nor outside the artistic sphere whose reaction and scope/manner of comprehension we can anticipate and act accordingly.

Zeynep Öz: I want to return to something you mentioned earlier. Let's take a look at a work such as *Last General* (2010) for instance. If we were to go back to the relationship between representation and reality, in this work, the sense of being trapped and the correlation of this feeling with a uniform is quite representational. But then fast forwarding to a recent discussion performance, your work titled *Grasshoppers and Ants*, I'd argue that this other work stands somewhere between representation and reality: Even though it's in a discussion format we call it an artwork based on both its performative attributes and previously refined scenario. Do you agree? Can we say that this is a subject you deliberately pursue?

Burak Delier: Let's start with *Last General*. *Last General* was actually a surprise for me as well. I can say that it emerged involuntarily while I was working on completely different things. I wanted to mark a historical development in Turkey which I considered very significant. In this respect I can say that it's a rather "classical" work based on the attempt to mark a certain historical watershed.

As for *Grasshoppers and Ants*, it was designed as an open-ended debate performance. It developed as a response to an invitation to participate in Mürüvvet Türkyılmaz's *Open Table* project. As can be discerned from its title, it was a work focusing on the forms of production in the sphere of art and the practices of resistance to these forms. In the past five to ten years artistic production has begun to move away from its original format of exhibition-focused organizations and shifted towards various formats where performativity, live communication and discourse production were more in the foreground. While the last Istanbul Biennial contained a reaction to this development, the most recent Berlin Biennial embraced these formats of discussion and communication by investing them with political content. On the other hand, the "relational aesthetics" that had defined the 90s and early 2000s, was precisely a concept coining the questions of artistic form pertaining to this process. In this process, exhibitions of art objects lost their central significance and became supplementary elements besides events like open discussions, lectures,

roundtables, panels, conferences, workshops and performances. I think this development is related to the change in the production logic and form of capitalism. In today's capitalism, production takes place not so much at the factory as the venue of concrete and material production but within the sphere of relations where "communication" is built. It's no longer about producing a commodity in a factory, but about "situating" a product and a corporate identity in the minds and souls of consumers. Therefore production takes place in the world of emotion and information where visual and verbal tools are used. As if following this development, art also moved from exhibitions of concrete and material production to a form based on nonmaterial production placing people and performances at the forefront. While the *Grasshoppers* and *Ants* debate incorporated in terms of its content the complications of being inside or outside the art world and the coding of each statement as a production regardless of its political nature, in terms of its form—as a debate performance—it rendered visible and problematized this transformation.

The debate was designed as a discussion over two propositions that could roughly be stated as "it is possible to step out of, drill holes in and distort the institution of art" and "there is no outside in the institution of art, the outside is producible"; and an open ended conversation with the participation of the audience. (Of course, as the discussion progressed, these two stances began to divide into sub-stances and a transcendence of this dichotomy was indicated.) The participants were people I knew well, and as a group, they'd discussed similar issues, in a similar manner, a number of times. With this debate performance, we tried to present this discussion we'd been having among ourselves, following a certain plot. Here what was interesting for me was to test the applicability of a format like debate, that is prone to generate polemics, as a form of collective thinking and production. This form proposed a dynamic thought process within its own chaotic structure with the parties gradually dismantling, different alliances emerging with each statement, some arguments immediately losing their validity while others endured etc. A small collective brain was at play. And what is the art world if not a collective brain/spirit...

1. Also during the panel realized as part of the archival exhibition *It was a Time of Conversation* organized by Sezin Romi at Salt with the participation of Ali Akay, Emre Zeytinoglu, Vasif Kortun and Selim Birsell, this "entrepreneurship" quality linked to the politics of neo-liberal economy was highlighted.

2. For an example of the relationship between Impressionism's inclusion in this canon and "entrepreneurship" rationale, see: Ulf Wuggenig, "Creativity and Innovation" in the Nineteenth Century: Harrison C. White and the Impressionist Revolution Reconsidered", translated by Larissa Buchholz, Aileen Derieg and Karl Hoffmann in *Critique of Creativity: Precarity, Subjectivity and Resistance*, ed. Gerald Raunig, Gene Ray and Ulf Wuggenig (MayFly Books, 2011), pp. 57-75.

3. Jean-Luc Godard, "J'ai toujours pensé que le cinéma était un instrument de pensée" ("I've always considered cinema to be an instrument of thought"), Excerpts from a conference organized at the screening of *JLG/JLG* and Youssef Chahine's film *Le Claire* at Hotel Raphael. In *Jean-Luc Godard par Jean-Luc Godard, Vol: 2, 1984-1998* (Cahier de Cinéma, Paris, 1998), pp. 300.

→ Born in 1977 in Adapazarı, Burak Delier studied at Marmara University Faculty of Fine Arts (undergraduate degree, 2004), Yıldız Technical University, Department of Art and Design (graduate degree, 2007 and proficiency in Art, 2008). Attending residency programs at Accented Residency Program, Ashkal Alwan, Beirut, Lebanon (2009) and Cité Internationale des Arts, Paris, France (2011). Delier opened a solo exhibition at Outlet, Istanbul in 2011. The artist has participated in exhibitions like; 7. Taipei Biennial, Taiwan (2010), "When Ideas Become Crime", Depo, Istanbul (2010), Istanbul Traversée, Palais des Beaux-arts de Lille, France (2009), "I Refuse To Become What You Call Normal",