

Group 3: Freeze

Keywords: benefits, generosity, for myself/for others, sacrifice, love, caring, good for others, sharing, giving without expectation, making change happen, being yourself, self-care, nature

Method and basic questions:

- Multilayered in-depth individual work
- Searching for a new narrative of connection
- Creative expression as language
- Has *Homo sapiens* moved beyond generosity ?

The work of Group 3 stands out because of its multiplicity of forms of expression, partly because each person has traveled his own individual path and decided to make his own contribution from a highly personal perspective. In that individual expression, a wide range of themes emerged: art, sciences, technology, religion, society and nature. Almost all of the contributions in the group touched on elements such as nature, vulnerability, health, well-being and connection.

It is impressive how the members of Group 3 were not deterred by deep analyses and dared to open up very vulnerable to the transdisciplinary team. The members of group 3 especially looked inward, deep inside themselves. They did not shy away from tricky themes and were very critical of the concept of generosity. Is generosity really as positive and innocent as it seems? From the works of this group we also read that in generosity there can be an element of aggression, of power. Have we been too greedy and eager in our drive for domestication? Have we gone too far in our conceptualization of generosity? And in the process, have we forgotten natural generosity or the generosity of nature itself? Has modern man in his technological world really made so much progress? Have we as *Homo sapiens* moved beyond authentic generosity? And what about the future - can technology be or be made generous?

The work raises questions about both the 'giver' and the 'receiver' and the 'receptivity' of generosity. Where does the balance lie? Should there be one?

In their search, we also encounter expressions of fear and guilt in Group 3: the fear of receiving. Receiving is perhaps also the direct route to a gnawing sense of guilt. That guilt is not only in the receiving, but also in the lack of generosity toward the planet and nature. Parts of their work are reminiscent of original sin from the Judeo-Christian-Islamic tradition, a generational accumulated guilt. Will this individual thinking and the reflection of the TT lead to connectedness, think the unthinkable, within group 3?

The diverse narrative of Group 3 drew our attention to overwhelming challenges such as climate change, social isolation, inequality, mental health, and (individual) guilt.

The chaos, the complexity of the world, and its many-armed relationship to the complexity of the individual and to the concept of generosity can sometimes push us into an impasse.

Although we also read, in several individual contributions, hopes and signals for a future connectivity. A search for and a belief in creativity to acquire knowledge, to understand things, to create a language and a new narrative that can connect.

The contributions of the members of Group 3 are of great authenticity as they touched the members of the TT deeply. They alerted the TT to the idea that generosity is often a very individual experience and that it is not always simple to undergo or apply it. In this sense, Group 3 differentiates itself from the other groups. Their approach required courage, boldness and a large dose of generosity.

Group 3 forced the TT to humility, made the TT question their own generosity, confronted them with their own vulnerability and forced them to also look deep into themselves. At the same time, it strengthened the TT in the conviction that places are needed to think long and hard and how we can create hope from them.

How can we think differently in the face of so many black clouds in the lives of young people? It raised questions about the sense and nonsense of TUE itself. At the same time, the stories contained a subtle invitation to expose ourselves as a project, to gently connect with group members, to share things within the team. How can we change something now, in full awareness of what we are doing, with a clear vision of what the future should bring? How can we strengthen the belief in ourself, in our self-worth, our value as a human being? To come out stronger as a group, a sustainable TUE community. To arrive at a society where fear is not the rule and you are not blown over by the dangers of generosity. How do we build a world together with all these elements of our society in a constructive and creative way, where we do not lose our faith in social engineering, even if it is unthinkable?

ARTWORK: Freeze
By Koen Vanmechelen

A frozen marble homunculus bears silver antlers on his head, accommodating an egg. This group's diverse, vulnerable, yet moving gifts suggest we need a Cosmopolitan Renaissance, a rebirth. In fragile times, there is an urgent need to connect with nature and others deeply. But doing that requires places shielded from the invasiveness of contemporary, uber-interconnected life. These sanctuaries create generous circumstances to explore the self and contemplate long-term actions and attitudes constructively and freely. Being generous can also be making, shielding, and harvesting precious seeds, giving them time to germinate, and releasing them into the world when it is ready.

Freeze, 2022
marble, silvered tree roots, silvered taxidermy chicken
136 x 75 x 68 cm
© Koen Vanmechelen

