

Response by Oleksandr Tokarchuk and Yaroslava Bondar

Dear Andreas,

We delved into your text with attention and interest, and found the content of the reflections and the rather personal way of presenting them an unusual approach—from our perspective. Your great attention to your own experiences in relation to the topic of research is respectable and also fascinating despite that sometimes the subject of discourse itself recedes into the background.

For ourselves, we have outlined and defined the circle of your research interests in your article as the following: variations of discursive destruction that are caused by the radical positions of the participants found in the field of communication, how this polarization influences your view of conflicts in the teaching process, the possible causes of these problems and finally a search for ways to overcome destructive binary polarizations through transformational perspectives.

It was interesting for us to analyze our own experiences with the emotional discoloration of the discursive palette—its transformation into a black and white irreconcilable dichotomy, despair from the lack of half-tones and multiplicity of variations is lost in the artificial completeness of the black and white color itself.

Your reflections on the situation in your social networks led us to think about migration processes in Europe, about the difficulties of assimilation of both refugees and migrants, as well as about the cultural

and religious expansion of the South, as one of the possible reasons for the aggravation of discourses.

The idea of attracting attention on social media on the one hand, as well as the struggle for attention, on the other, be it the opponent's or the readers' to the author's narrative, seemed fruitful for further reflections and analysis.

We have an impression that your practice in the process of analysis, exploration of fruitful ideas, and contemplation on solutions to the problem of polarization relies greatly on feeling. You use your own reflection as a research tool, and we hold great admiration for your method.

The subject of the binary between art and education raises more questions. For example: why is Art *a priori* considered something elusive and accidental? The thesis that there is an unplanned artistic result is surprising to us because of the needlessness, from our point of view, of planning an artistic solution in general. Our views here probably enter into a discursive dispute, which we would like to continue constructively. Here, it would be interesting to discuss the planning and even the algorithmic nature of the educational methodology, which we do not use at all in our practice as we have developed and implement a heuristic methodological logic. Perhaps it would be interesting to develop together the topic of complex logic proposed by you.

Analysis of the discourse itself as opposed to the subject of said discourse is, in our view, a dynamic approach to take. The topic of the directing of paired or collective (group) complements our research on compositional relationships. We thank you, Andreas, for entering this field.

Artistic processing of conflicts or any polarizations is an interesting and fruitful practice, both in psychology and in performative work-activity. The identification of different sides of the dispute in an artistic form gives birth to experiences capable of finding non-linear, completely new ways of implementation. This, in our opinion, is the approach we should take as specialists in the study/research of performative practices.

Once again, we thank you for an interesting journey through the landscapes of your thoughts, experiences and research!

*Best regards,
Oleksandr and Yaroslava*

