

DIGITAL AGNES

Agnes Etherington Art Centre at Queen's University
agnes.queensu.ca

Outrageous Worldmaking from a Bright Yellow Kitchen

With Opened Mouths: The Podcast

August 2023

SPEAKERS

Qanita Lilla and Emelie Chhangur

KEYWORDS

Pedagogies, curatorial practice, worldmaking, futurisms

TRANSCRIPT

[Music]

Qanita Lilla: Welcome to *With Opened Mouths: The Podcast*. I'm your host, Qanita Lilla. Today we speak to Emelie Chhangur, a curator, writer, and artist, and the Director and Curator of Agnes Etherington Art Centre. Emelie has emerged as a leading voice for experimental curatorial practice in Canada and is celebrated both nationally and internationally for her process-based, participatory curatorial practice, as well as for commissioning artworks across all media. Today we take a closer look at the person responsible for the radical change underway at Agnes. We also hear about creative journeys, both personal and collective.

[Music fades into the sounds of Lake Ontario]

Qanita Lilla: Hi Emelie!

Emelie Chhangur: Hi Qanita!

Qanita Lilla: Thank you for joining me today. I feel like this conversation has been a long time coming. I think everybody has wanted to know more about you [laughter] and where you and your ideas come from. I'd like to start by asking you what led you to the Visual Arts.

Emelie Chhangur: That's an interesting question. I like the word led, because I think I was led. It might be through attrition though because my father was a drummer. My grandmother, a pianist, and my cousin is an opera singer. So, it was sort of the thing left. [laughter] But I don't know, that's kind of a joke – sort of. I've always been a visual person and learner. And I'm also an only child. And I drew a lot as a kid, and I had a rad mom who

let me be creative. I had a single mom; it was just my mother and I. And our house was a very creative space, so I drew a lot on the walls. I remember now -- [laughter] now I'm really diving into this question – I remember once when I was a kid, I came home, and I couldn't have been in school, and I came home from something else... Maybe my grandparents'... but my mother had painted everything in the kitchen yellow and had written on the cupboard, fridge, floor, sink -- like that no name brand vibe [laughter] -- she transformed our kitchen into an installation. I was probably three or four and that had a big impact on me.

Qanita Lilla: So, you think that's the moment when you started looking at space and associating it with visuality?

Emelie Chhangur: Yeah, and maybe visual art isn't always contained within a frame.

Qanita Lilla: I think I heard that you started with Drama.

Emelie Chhangur: Oh yeah, well, I was led to Drama. Maybe that's also because I was a dramatic child. [laughter] Interestingly, I ended up going to university – and I was the first person in my family to do so. I was always a maker, an artist. Maybe this was because I thought it should be more serious or something, to study Art History.

Qanita Lilla: No way.

Emelie Chhangur: [laughter] Yeah, I know. And in a way, I think it's because I had a deep interest in English, History, Philosophy, and of course Art – but as a maker. So, I thought, “Oh, well, Art History must bring all those things together.” And then I quickly looked around in my Art History classes, I went to the University of Toronto, and I was like, “This isn't my vibe, and these aren't my people.” I gravitated more towards the studio side of making. Through the studio program, one could take this course offered by the Drama department and it was in set design. I had a very interesting moment – maybe like coming home to the yellow kitchen – a very pivotal moment where I saw this course late, and then called the professor – who was Astrid Janson, a well-known set designer in Canada, which I didn't know at the time. [laughter] I called her in the middle of the Summer, and she said, “The class is closed Emelie, you needed to apply for that class.” And I was like, “Oh darn.” And then she said to me, “You know, I wouldn't be a set designer now if I didn't have a professor who let me into a class.” -- because she studied Philosophy and wanted to take this set Design class; I think at UBC. Anyway, she let me into the class, and I had this profound experience of collaboration, of working across differences, of building something as a team together, and of being able to understand that collaboration is about bringing together individuals with different strengths. It's about respecting their strengths, and receding where you don't have a strength, letting somebody else take over. I really understood that dynamic from theatre, but I was never interested in acting or anything like

that. I was very much into set design and lighting design. I made a lot of videos as an artist and often did their AV stuff.

Qanita Lilla: And Geology.

Emelie Chhangur: And Geology, yes. [laughs] I went from being a specialist in Art History to ending up with a mixed bag degree, of a minor in Art History and a double major in Theatre and Visual Arts, with a minor in Geology. So, Geology is right up there with Art History for me.

Qanita Lilla: Yeah, it's completely crazy. When I was very young, I took part in this production of Bugsy Malone in Athlone, which is a place on the Cape Flats. It was a very tumultuous time in our history, but my mother knew I wanted to be on the stage. She gave me the opportunity and it was really awesome. I also got the sense from set design that you can create a world, and the whole thing of the fourth wall being removed. You're actually capturing people's attention, and it's incredible. It's this amazing feeling. And I also gravitated towards Art History because I've got to do something serious with a love for art. Even though I wanted to produce things and make things. So, yeah. I think that's -

Emelie Chhangur: I love this framing of theatre being world making. I think that's why I was attracted to it - studying sculpture installation wasn't enough. I was always spatial, but this lone studio time or having to create the conditions for making on my own were never satisfying. I think about this world making possibility, which is not make-believe.

Qanita Lilla: Yeah. No, no, no. I started in Fine Art, and I needed to collaborate with somebody in my class. I was also in a sculpture program and wanted to do installation, there were only two of us. They were like, "Absolutely not." Basically, my installation was a giant washing line of underwear that we made ourselves. Coming out through the front steps of this very colonial art school, they were like, "Absolutely not." It was at a time when we were thinking about new possibilities, "What is a possibility of the world." The art world has (always) been very pretentious and white, very exclusive. And then suddenly having this possibility to change the way people see things.

Emelie Chhangur: This is interesting to think about, this presence and this line of underwear, for instance, and how dangerous these interventions in the public sphere or the spatialization of world making possibilities. I find this very attractive. [laughs]

Qanita Lilla: Yes.

Emelie Chhangur: It's a deeply destabilizing practice even if it's a sculpture, it has a vibrational effect on people. I really like to think about this relationship of world making spatialization and visualization, and the role that plays as an interventionist practice.

Qanita Lilla: I think what's important is all the people that you really need to be surrounded and supported by. It cannot be an individual effort. Who were the people in your life while you were growing up that informed your practice?

Emelie Chhangur: Well, I think I'll go down the family route again. My grandfather was pretty instrumental in my life. I would say my grandfather was a visual artist, he was in the war. My mother's side is British. My father's side is Guyanese. I grew up with my mother's side. I think that was influential around what constitutes a rigor and practice, that this is practice. But I would say my mother's deep influence and encouragement around supporting anything I wanted to do and allowing for there to be a kind of outrageousness in that. They were very influential individuals. And I don't think I'll go down the path of all the artists who have influenced me. Maybe it's your first question that sort of led with "what led me here," I feel a bit beholden to talk about origin stories. [laughs] If I blow this out and think about where I am today, the individuals and people who have influenced me are all the artists I've worked with. Situations I've found myself in can be deeply influential and navigating difficult ones that have compelled me to become more radicalized in the practices that I enact today. In particular, inside institutions or within the infrastructures of the Visual Arts, maybe less so as an artist, although I don't make these sorts of distinctions across my practice. I think about all of the things that I do, as being approached by the sensibility of an artist. So, yeah, early on family situations. I would say growing up in a small town was deeply influential to who I've become.

Qanita Lilla: Where did you grow up?

Emelie Chhangur: Paris, Ontario. I was born in Toronto, but because I had a single mom we moved progressively to smaller towns as I got older. [laughs]

Qanita Lilla: Where's Paris?

Emelie Chhangur: Yeah, it's Six Nations of the Grand River Territories. It's close to Brantford, and Hamilton, Southern Ontario. It was a small town, 2,500 people. I was the only person of colour and I think that was a pretty defining subject position to be in. It also influenced my decision to be an artist, or what led me to being an artist. And a scrappy kind [laughs] - a sense of really needing to world make. Let's say to go back to that.

Qanita Lilla: The idea of the scrappy, experimental, and radical. Can you talk a bit about those intersect? I feel that it's a necessity for you, and really important in how you frame and see the world. Why is it the parameters of the world that you see?

Emelie Chhangur: Well, I have a deep fear of the status quo. I have a deep fear of redundancy, not necessarily of myself, but how things play a course and repeat and

reestablish themselves and the status quo. Which I think is also why I've curatorially often gravitated toward existing dramaturgical forms, like street processions or civic ceremonials – all the things that actually reestablish through performativity or status quo sensibilities – and I'm very interested to inhabit those structures, recast the protagonists, and to deter their ends toward other means. I think that's because I am somebody who also – and maybe it's a generational thing, but as somebody who had to grow up in an assimilationist paradigm to fit in. Which is also why I'm becoming more radicalized, [laughs] because I refuse to accept that is the path. Maybe it's a generational thing that I have always found myself. This could be an only child, single mom, only brown kid growing up in a small-town thing too. Where I have taken a path of being on the inside of institutions; feeling the need to go to university, in a way, and following a status quo path, but not fitting into that in any way. So, it's always been a sort of battle with those structures and systems that has made me deeply interested in them as material. But not in an assimilationist way. I think radicality and experimentation is a reaction to being within the confines of systems that I, myself, am not the subject of.

Qanita Lilla: Perhaps, that's why cultural mixing and taking forms that wouldn't especially talk to each other, work so well. It destabilizes that completely. It says that, "You can actually have rappers in a museum." You need to.

Emelie Chhangur: Absolutely.

Qanita Lilla: Besides the fact that you come from a culturally mixed background. What is it that you find particularly rich?

Emelie Chhangur: Yeah, cultural differences I find to be very – and maybe not all curators are going to agree with this, but I'm going to say it anyway [laughs] -- but I think for a lot of artists, our practices and projects are deeply autobiographical. My interest in cultural mixing comes from being mixed and my own lived experience of negotiating multiple worlds, of understanding cultural performativity. And code switching [laughs] in a really fundamental way. Even in my own family paradigm. Not only for me, it's also a very relevant modality of the world. It's really naïve not to think that we're not always already culturally mixed. But I was always striving, in particular in Toronto, to actually bring together individuals and groups who had no perceived natural affinity. And to work for many years, around developing both methodologically – so, mixing methodologies and cultural methodologies, as a way of making contemporary art in a way that tries to open contemporary art up to non-Western traditions, for instance – but also, aesthetically. Like what, for me, in Toronto I was always thinking about what the future visual culture of Toronto could be. And in a way, that was still me operating within a very particular type of paradigm there, and I was working in the suburbs, and the downtown art community had its hold on neoconceptual legacies, very white art world sensibilities. Meanwhile, what was actually going on culturally in Toronto was so radically different from that, so I was always

interested to try to use the methodology of cultural mixing as a way to produce a new kind of aesthetic that could be in and of Toronto. So, I think it's also about non-essentializing, and not relying on a center, not trying to create systems of equivalence and paradigms of side-by-side equalities that didn't ever have to look back to a center or weren't departing from something. So, for me, cultural mixing is also about having to navigate dualities and resting, and it could be multiplicities too – I mean, I'm speaking from a dual mixed positionality – and resting with the fact that they can all be held equally together. And I think that is fundamental to how I operate in the world.

Qanita Lilla: What is a project that is especially close to your heart? Because I know that many of your projects embody these ideas.

Emelie Chhangur: God, there's so many [laughs]. Honestly, as somebody who also has a tiny little family, I have a hard time choosing because these projects have resulted in chosen families and people I still stay in touch with. So, I'm always like "I shouldn't pick favourites," but I would say, a film called, *Rise* with two artists from the northeast of Brazil. Bárbara Wagner and Benjamin De Burca, who I love as humans. It came late in 2018, I'd been working with international artists and local communities, in a non-parachuting way, and working in the suburbs, it was a sort of culminating project, in a sense, but it was a film. It had all the ingredients that I love: it had chaos and hundreds of collaborators, very kind open-hearted artists, rappers and poets from Toronto's east and west ends, and then it was shot at the new subway station. There was also this pedagogical aspect to it where it was also learning about how to get permits in the civic sphere, hoping that a gazillion music videos would be shot in Toronto by these poets and rappers. We were also working with film students from York. And so, it had a civic function and it created great solidarity between Toronto's east and west ends. So, it had all the ingredients that I love in a project, because it persisted, everything in the project and the relationships between the protagonists but also the protagonists in the city and all of these in the suburbs and geographical locations, and the artists, persisted beyond the timeframe of the project itself. And I'm always interested in what projects do.

Qanita Lilla: And how they continue.

Emelie Chhangur: And how they continue, because they're only, for me, constellations that set certain things in motion, in an intense way. Some of these projects take three years to make, and everybody is three years older, but they set something in motion that can't be undone.

Qanita Lilla: I want to talk about 'trust' in projects, and establishing how critical it is, because it's people. It's not communities first, it's always people. How do you maintain and cultivate that? How do you reach out and cultivate it? I'm just thinking of us at Agnes. What kind of lessons can we learn from your previous life processes?

Emelie Chhangur: Yeah. Trust is big for me. I'm also like a little sniffer dog where I can feel things from people. And so, there is always a deep desire to be in relation with people. Sometimes I pursue in this way, and it sounds outrageous [laughs].

Qanita Lilla: I'm thinking of the (Kingston) graffiti artists.

Emelie Chhangur: Yeah, I know. I will persist, show up, and continue to engage. I find every way to get to know who they are. But the trust building, for me, happens over time. These are the two ingredients that go hand in hand in my projects. [laughs] Because it takes time to build trust, and there's two things that I'll use as examples. One is trust building in a project sensibility, or within an institution, I suppose. The history of my projects has been to work with artists over long periods of time, but artists who I've worked with from elsewhere go home. It would be amazing if you could have a residency that lasted three years with an artist [laughs], but no one has that kind of budget. This was important to me, because what I learnt through their leaving was that it was me that maintained the relationship with all the collaborators in the projects. And that would mean I went to all the poetry slams, or the parkour meets, all the pow-wows, all of the cultural activities that everybody who was involved in those projects were working on over those three times. And my whole social life, interests, and world would change. It implicated the institution – and this was a paradigm shift for me, where one could implicate the institution as a being, that it wasn't a nameless, faceless thing that was operating behind the scenes. It showed up, and I was also a part of the institution, it made a collaborator in the project. And it put pressure on the institution to do so. On the one hand, that's a way of building trust with individuals and communities, because sometimes it is a whole community that you have to build trust with, in order to even start a project [laughs]. How that has a bearing on institutional practice. With the graffiti artists here (in Kingston) it was very special because I had met Oriah by accident – and another thing that seems to be the throughline of all my projects is accidents, coincidences, and happenstance – I had bumped into him in an alley in Toronto, the night before I moved to Kingston. He and his friends, and some of them who also participated in Transformations at Agnes. I didn't make the connection right away. But anyway, I just was chatting with them. And I don't know...

Qanita Lilla: As one does, in an alley in Toronto [laughs].

Emelie Chhangur: Exactly, as one's leaving the city that they love [laughs]. I said, "I'm moving tomorrow to Kingston." He said, "Oh I grew up in Kingston." And I'm like "Oh, interesting." So here is this foreshadowing. I'm always interested in how did I meet this person, on this night, in this alley. Why did I turn that corner to meet this one person who grew up in the place that I'm going to move to. And I'm certain that I need to know a lot from this person [laughs], this is a kind of expert, in my mind. I've always been interested in – and I'm going to use this word in scare quotes, but you can't see it – like "the amateur,"

and I don't mean that in any derogatory sense, versus "the professional." I've always been interested in it, there's always athletes, people who do things because they're committed and because they love it, not because it's competitive or something like that, and that's what I mean by "amateur." I bring it up because it's around the way in which I value lived experience, and everyday life as experts. So, Oriah is an expert on Kingston [laughs], and I love that his expertise comes from the street, in fact, that's his practice. Anyway, so I go for a walk, and it turns out I live not far from the so-called "legal graffiti wall" and I bumped into Oriah again, but in Kingston. It's COVID, I can't go out and can't meet people in Kingston, and it's a very strange moment. But of course, graffiti artists are outside and they're hanging out. That's the first community that embraced me here, and that's how I got to learn more about Kingston. And then it was a trust thing, because none of them wanted to step foot on Queens campus and none of them came to Agnes. So, what does that mean? They're skateboarders so I thought, "Okay, I'm going to get a skateboard and teach myself skateboarding." It's also about how you participate and show up, and how you prove your own vulnerability. That was important in this instance because we all know that there are massive unequal power dynamics in institutions, and artists on the margins, or anyone actually. How do you participate at a level of vulnerability? First and foremost, to try to eat a little bit away at that unequal power dynamic.

Qanita Lilla: But I think it's also because you just love people.

Emelie Chhangur: Yeah.

Qanita Lilla: And you love all sorts of people. The more different sorts, the better.

Emelie Chhangur: Yeah.

Qanita Lilla: I don't think that you see yourself as speaking on behalf of an institution, and that makes a difference. Part of the civic role of what we're supposed to be doing, and that's what makes it anti-institutional, it's not dependent on the place, but it's just us as people.

Emelie Chhangur: Honestly, I think when we're talking about art institutions at least, they are the people [laughs].

Qanita Lilla: Yeah.

Emelie Chhangur: I think it's ridiculous to think otherwise.

Qanita Lilla: But it looks like that from the outside, a museum works really hard.

Emelie Chhangur: To eliminate personality.

Qanita Lilla: Yes, and I think --

Emelie Chhangur: To neutralize.

Qanita Lilla: Yes. To make it seem as if there's a front and back of house. And the two don't mix or engage with each other, and that is "professionalism."

Emelie Chhangur: Well, if you come to Agnes, you'll find me in the shop.

Qanita Lilla: Yeah [laughs].

Emelie Chhangur: Or at the loading dock [laughs].

Qanita Lilla: Or in front with the --

Emelie Chhangur: [Laughs] Or in front with reception staff. Exactly.

Qanita Lilla: I just think methodologically, your idea of in-reach encapsulates how it forces an institution to take on all these new audiences that it has to contend with if it wants to engage with that production. Because it's an exciting, wonderful, rich production. How did Inreach come to you? Because it happened at a time particularly when everybody was 'outreaching'.

Emelie Chhangur: Yeah, well, it was related to context in geography on one hand, and in working in the Jane and Finch community when I was at York. And outreach was not a paradigm that I was particularly interested in. It felt unnecessarily top down, and I'm a bottom-up person [Laughs]. Outreach also felt mega masculine and Inreach felt a little more Feminist. But it also was super pragmatic, coming from both failure and necessity. Inreach was developing in the early 2000's for me, so this was a different time. The inability, for instance, to participate in cash or gift economies within a university paradigm. Because there's no invoices to process or receipts to reimburse. How on earth would I ever be able to prove to this institution that this tobacco that I bought wasn't for my personal use? I was starting to understand that the whole premise of this institutional sensibility was already a relationship built on mistrust. The mistrust of me and the expenditure of the money of York University. I think trust is a part of Inreach, you have to get off your timelines and deadlines, and treadmill sensibilities if you want to operate through a paradigm of consensus. The institution is the thing that needs to change, not the communities. That's what shifted for me in relationship to outreach versus Inreach. I was really looking for a non-assimilationist methodology that did not put expectations on the individuals and communities with whom I was working with, in order to participate in the institution. I thought, "This is ridiculous. It's the institution that's the problem." So, how does the institution bend to meet the

methodological demands of cultural lineages that have not been the thing that the Western museum has built its framework on? That could be a whole methodology of Trinidadian mass, and an “each one, teach one” methodology, that's an institutional practice. What would it mean to bring kinder ways of working to institutional practices? To recognize that even the protocols we hold in value, for instance, the payment of artists fees, aren't necessarily commensurable with the particular cultural paradigms or modes of production. This was very apparent in my long relationship with the Mississauga's of the Credit First Nation. Where the funding of a language camp was far more in keeping with how they operated as a Nation, than the payment of artists fees. It was more commodities driven, somehow. I think Inreach is also about being able to negotiate your own cultural protocols as an institution, even the ones that we hold up and value as progressive.

Qanita Lilla: Yeah, but I also think to recognize and realize what it is that we do hold up, and that might not be serving us any longer.

Emelie Chhangur: Exactly, I've been thinking a lot about this lately. In a way, Inreach came into the institution through these territorial projects that were putting demands on the institution to transform. I thought. “Could Inreach be an institutional practice? Could that be the value of the institution?” The more my experiences, for instance at Agnes, have led me to think more about -- and now I'm coining a term in real time here – like a kind of infrastructural activism. It would be “infra/structural,” it's another bottom up, so like “infra” being from like the bottom. Maybe it's not just about the transformation of the art institution – in particular in a university gallery setting, which serves both a civic, pedagogical and social role (which is because we're at a university, funded by the public, and there's always a sociality involved) – but maybe our role, as well, is to put pressure on policies, some of the invisible policies of HR or procurement for instance, within the wider framework of the university itself. Is that the kind of role that the university art gallery plays in the world building as it's changing? And I've started to ask myself, “What is it that a university's, (with an apostrophe s) gallery does? What does it allow a university to do otherwise? How can it be operating, based on the fact that we always work within a cultural framework?” So, social justice, economics, all of these things are a matter of culture for us at an art gallery. How do we help model that within a wider university framework that might not think of those things in terms of culture? And the culture they manifest through these invisible systems that are the most insidious. Procurement is the most exclusive categorizing, defining, and exclusionary practice one can have. And so, I've been thinking about the shift of Inreach and it as an operative concept of difference.

Qanita Lilla: I think that feeds into your idea of architecture as a proposition.

Emelie Chhangur: Absolutely [laughs].

Qanita Lilla: And this new project that we're engaging with, the idea that these systems struggle to co-exist with the kinds of Inreach that we're talking about. How can architecture be a proposition?

Emelie Chhangur: Yeah, I often say, "It can no longer be a container for old systems, it needs to be a proposition for new ideas." And this to me, comes down to the difference between intervention and transformation. While I love intervention, and we started out by talking in a way about it, it's such a rad strategy. Certainly, as somebody trained in sculpture and installation intervention, and my own history of what the art world would call institutional critique; mine's a much softer, non-critique version. These interventions for me are no longer good enough, because they still go back to defining a center. So, we're intervening into something, we're always on the outside. An intervention, to me, is a kind of like disruption, in the sense that it's only ever a momentary shift from the status quo, and everything is allowed to return to the same. You can sort of discursively tuck it under the table, so to speak. But then I'm like "What does it mean to enact radical transformation where intervention is no longer necessary?" These interventions we make as curators, and artists, within our institutions -- what if the architecture is changed? And, the intervention, if there is one, is made in the making of the architecture. What would it mean to have a community engaged design process, and would that lead to? What things would we have to give up? In the context of Agnes, I first started asking, "What does an art centre, center?" And now I ask, "What is it prepared to de-center?" And that's what's going to take us somewhere. In all our research at Agnes we know that the spaces contain us there, and they contain cultural belongings and objects, and also practices, and I would argue, in general beings, as more diverse beings enter these otherwise static situations – they can't be interventions either. So, this is another case where the whole thing has to change [laughs], to accommodate these practices, not the people who are entering these institutions, they don't have to assimilate either. I'm still on that track. But we know that these spaces are incommensurable because they center a western paradigm. So, what does it mean, for instance, the western vaults are built around a western painting? It serves a very particular purpose. What if architecture was built around another object or being, and another kind of practice? I'm very interested in that relationship of architecture being a proposition, that guides us towards the practices we don't yet know and guides us toward what can become. What we can do now to ensure a kind of future that hasn't yet happened but must.

Qanita Lilla: I feel that the new Agnes has the potential to be those things.

Emelie Chhangur: I do too.

Qanita Lilla: Do you want to speak about the new Agnes - Agnes Reimagined?

Emelie Chhangur: I'd love to just pick up on where you - pointing to that, I think it has the potential. The one thing I'll say is: I can't imagine any other circumstance where this potential can take hold. And it's both Agnes specific: it's the nature of the collections, which is sort of unprecedented at a university gallery; it's the context in which we operate, in this first capital of upper Canada; it's got all the trappings of a museum, but it's a university gallery, and nimble enough to change. Where else could you think about proximity, i.e., space adjacencies, vis-à-vis, architecture as pedagogies? Where else but the university gallery? It is our responsibility to make this project enact change. It is a university gallery. Universities are supposed to be the place where free thought reigns, where we have freedom, experiment, and practice-based research. Why wouldn't that be part of an architectural project? This is another way in which I think about not building a container, but a proposition with architecture. We have the opportunity, within the context of a university, that's building a cultural centre to really take experimentation, pedagogy, social engagement, and civic action very seriously in all that we do, more so than a public gallery could. We can define what the new practices of museology are, because we already are a laboratory of learning. I hope that we never stray away from those fundamental facts of our role and responsibility as a public university gallery.

Qanita Lilla: No, I agree. Thank you so much for talking with me.

Emelie Chhangur: Thank you for inviting me.

Qanita Lilla: That was Emelie Chhangur. [Laughs] Thank you, Emelie.

Emelie Chhangur: [laughter] thank you Qanita.

Qanita Lilla: That was fantastic.

Emelie Chhangur: I'm honoured to be a part of your podcast.

Qanita Lilla: Aw, thank you.

Emelie Chhangur: I've been waiting a long time to be asked [laughs].

Qanita Lilla: [Laughs] Aw, man.

[Music]

Qanita Lilla: Thank you for listening – this wraps the second season of With Opened Mouths: The Podcast. As this is our final episode, I'd like to take the opportunity to thank Emelie for speaking with us today and to all my incredible guests this season. Thank you for

being so generous with your stories and for trusting me to join you on what was often a personal, introspective journey.

I'd also like to thank CFRC's station manager Dinah Jansen for generously backing this project. A special thanks to Chancelor Maracle who's done superb work once again editing all the episodes. Thank you for always being there to patiently set things up for us. Your love for all things "sound" shines brightly. We continue to learn a lot from you!

And now to our Agnes team:

A heart felt thank you to Research Assistant, Evan Wainio Waldanki, "The Man Behind the Curtain" who carried the logistic weight of this project. Your gentle smile has led us to uncharted territories.

Thank you to the marvellous Danuta Sierhuis, Digital Development Coordinator at Agnes, for overseeing the production, but more importantly for sharing a belief in the untapped digital potential of the museum.

And last but not least, another big thank you to Emelie Chhangur, Director Curator at Agnes, who this season generously added her voice to With Opened Mouths. Emelie's vision speaks to a reimagined museum, where safe spaces can allow for all of us to open our mouths and be heard.

This podcast is hosted by myself, Qanita Lilla and produced by Agnes Etherington Art Centre in partnership with Queen's University's campus radio station, CFRC 101.9 FM and generously funded by the George Taylor Richardson Memorial Fund.

The music is composed by "Jameel3DN" and produced by Elroy "EC3" Cox III.

All of the episodes of With Opened Mouths are now available, and you can find them on Digital Agnes, CFRC's website and on your favourite podcasting platform. If you liked what you heard, leave us a review and subscribe now so that you don't miss a single episode.

We'll see you next time.

[Music]