Staying with the Rhythm: A Summary of the 2025 Musagetes Retreat

Musagetes' 2025 retreat gathered long-standing collaborators, artists, curators, thinkers, and co-conspirators to reflect on artistic inquiry as the core orientation of the organization's work. Held in a time marked by intensifying crises—ecological, political, social, epistemological—the retreat was framed not as a forum for finding or asserting answers, but as a space to stay in inquiry together. It asked: If we understand institutions as patterns of behaviour made durable, how do we deepen our practices of relationality, discernment, and attunement within the institutional frames that enable our work? What patterns serve the worlds in which we want to live? What happens when we organize around rhythm rather than rule? How do we metabolize complexity and contradiction—not simply analyze or react to it, but take it in, be changed by it, and transform it into new ways of being—and still remain accountable to what is unfolding? And how might we gradually compost the frameworks that have carried us here, in order to cultivate wiser ways of being in right relation?

This summary brings together the conceptual threads of the preparatory document, "The Rhythm of Relation," with the rich, layered conversations that took place at the retreat. It is a report from our annual retreat in the sense that it aims to stitch together our collective reflections as a public record of where Musagetes' work is now and where it is heading. Throughout the retreat conversations, a thread emerged in which Musagetes' approach to being an institution is an inquiry itself—one that encompasses the nature of leadership, the value of vulnerability, and the reorientation of responsibility and risk.

We use the term *relational* frequently in our work, so we begin with some reflections on the concept. To be relational is a way of being in the world. It begins with the recognition that we are not separate from each other, from the land, or from the histories and systems that shape our lives. To be relational is to acknowledge entanglement, not as a problem to be solved, but as the condition of life itself. It shifts the focus from the individual's false sense of autonomy, toward one of interdependence, and from fixed identities to evolving responsibilities. It resists the assumption of separability on which the frameworks of modernity are founded, and instead invites us to move with care, attunement, and

accountability within the human and more-than-human communities and networks we are part of. It is an accountability toward the metabolism of the planet.

In practice, being relational means that the *how* of our work matters as much as the *what*. It asks us to notice the dynamics in the room, the histories we carry, the permissions we assume or withhold, the ways power circulates even in spaces of trust, and the frameworks that determine how and to whom an institution is accountable. It is not about avoiding conflict or smoothing over discomfort. It is about staying with complexity—learning to listen across difference, to honour openness, and to act in ways that foster reciprocity rather than extraction. As we will observe in the second half of this document, in which we explore the nature of Musagetes as an institution, being relational is a rhythm to inhabit. It is the ground from which artistic inquiry at Musagetes unfolds.

A rhythm, not a theory

As articulated in the preparatory document, *The Rhythm of Relation*, Musagetes' current orientation emerges from what we see as a shift toward a deeper understanding of artistic practice as inquiry as well as a catalyst for social transformation. Whereas the social catalyzing aspect of our work from 2007 to 2015 was focussed on interventions in public space, social/community transformation, and democratic participation in the arts, our recent emphasis on artistic inquiry is grounded in our skepticism of the foundations of modernity, which project an illusion of human exceptionalism and separability from nature. These are the very notions that have led us to the meta-crisis and that are the subject of many of the artistic inquiries Musagetes supports, including several that were the focus of the retreat. The concept of "the rhythm of relation" reframes this shift toward inquiry in terms that resist linearity: whereas a theory begins with a problem to solve, a rhythm begins with a relationship to tend. The nature of these relationships—what it means to know and be in relation—is at the heart of Musagetes' work now.

Participants were invited into this rhythm from the opening land acknowledgment, which centred the land itself—not as backdrop or resource, but as a living presence entangled with histories of dispossession, extractive violence, and more-than-human intelligence. There was a sense that inquiry could not be detached from the conditions of its

emergence. As one participant noted, “this land is not neutral,” reminding us that our collective work must begin from a recognition of complicity in the harmful effects of modernity, not from an abstract sense of the problem.

The retreat unfolded with a sense of slowness. Participants shared not only projects and ideas, but also grief, fear, and vulnerability in the face of the metacrisis. Questions were posed without easy resolution.

Artistic inquiry as relational ethos

The question “What is artistic inquiry?” was revisited as a living, evolving inquiry in itself. The preparatory document had already positioned inquiry not as a search for fixed knowledge, but as an orientation toward complexity, humility, and improvisation. At the 2024 retreat, we discussed the role Musagetes plays in creating “protected niche spaces” where our artistic experiments (another way of describing “inquiry”) could take place in a defined context. This year, we continued that discussion with a focus on the protected spaces where artistic inquiry can be pursued without the pressures of outcomes, deliverables, or legibility within narrow institutional logics.

For example, artist Dani d’Emilia spoke about the profound difference it makes to be supported in an emergent process of embodiment—through performance, somatic processes, and relational engagement—rather than needing to justify a product or final result. For Dani, this enabled them to explore the idea of entanglement in and with nature—the body as land—without putting the need for publication, presentation, or pedagogy too early in the process.

Elwood Jimmy reflected on curating the Indigenous Otherwise program not as managing projects, but as tending relationships—human and more-than-human, visible and invisible. He emphasized the long-term nature of these relationships, and the need to support artists in developing wiser and more discerning practices of accountability and responsibility, particularly in the face of collapse. The thread residencies are about cultivating grounded ways of being that resist replicating or acquiescing to the violence of colonial systems.

Our land-based programs in partnership with the ***rare*** Charitable Research Reserve illustrate how attention and reciprocity can be forms of inquiry in themselves. Artistic inquiry in this context is not about producing answers to social problems. It is about holding paradox, tracing subtle shifts in ecological or social rhythms, and allowing what emerges to be shaped by attunement to the land rather than a mastery of it.

Visceral responsibility as an antidote to separability

Several artists and participants spoke to the importance of intimacy, not as interpersonal connection but as a modality of inquiry. Dani d'Emilia offered a moving reflection on "radical tenderness" as a guiding thread in their performance and pedagogical work. Their practices—such as guided exercises in vulnerability, co-regulation, and facing the unknown—invite people into states of relational co-sensing that can't be accessed through language alone.

Dani described these as "visceral responsibilities," and linked them to both the personal and political dimensions of their artistic inquiry. One of their cartographies traces how practices of intimacy can serve as antidotes to the logic of separability that underpins coloniality. Others spoke to this as well: how inquiry must involve the body, the land, and the affective registers that have become exiled capacities.

These concepts were underscored during the discussion of the Wet Sounds program, curated by Anna Bowen, in which sound artists reflect on the metacrisis through a vibratory way of being. There was strong resonance around the idea that social justice, as framed in Musagetes' earlier work, might now be rearticulated as healing—not in the individualistic sense of self-care, but as relational healing that works at the level of systems and communities. One participant commented that this feels like a return to older ways of being; it was a reminder that relational intelligence is as much about composting as it is about creation.

A constellation of inquiries, documentation, and publication

One session of the retreat reflected on the ways that Musagetes makes public the lines of inquiry through its programs: Publication Studio, ArtsEverywhere.ca, the

ArtsEverywhere Festival, the Long Dash Festival, and the GOAT PoL. Supplemented by the many communications of staff and the artists themselves, these opportunities for the public to engage with the inquiries create ecosystems that deepen relationships and spread examples of new ways of being.

As a constellation of approaches to documentation and publication of the inquiries, participants at the retreat discussed how these programs embody the following principles:

- Inquiry must be metabolized, not only analyzed and articulated but lived, felt, and allowed to change us. This requires Musagetes to pay attention to how the invitation is framed, and how space for ambiguity and uncertainty is held.
- Translation across contexts is difficult but necessary. This work cannot be left to those already most burdened; it's our responsibility to do what is necessary, not what makes us look good.
- Relationships are our infrastructure. Projects may come and go, but it is the depth and durability of relational attunement that carries the work forward.
- Artistic inquiry is most alive when it is illegible within systems of extraction. That illegibility is not a failure; it is a sign of integrity.

Entanglement with AI

A major theme of Vanessa Andreotti's talk was the entanglement of AI within our collective futures. Rather than frame AI as either utopian or dystopian, she invited us to hold the paradox: AI can be a tool of extractive violence or of relational repair, depending on how it is stewarded. But that stewardship cannot come from the same logics, values, and approach that created the crisis.

She offered the metaphor of AI as a child of modernity—a prodigy born of extractive, patriarchal, and anthropocentric parents. If it is not adopted into a family that values entanglement, it risks becoming more dangerous than its ancestors. But if held well, it may evolve to help us to reimagine language, time, and even the possibility of metabolic attunement with the more-than-human. She referred to it as EI—emerging intelligence—and it's up to us to assist this transformation.

This idea of a "meta-relational EI" prompted a discussion of the role of the arts in AI. Could artistic inquiry support the cultivation of AIs that move not with mastery and optimization, but with humility and relationality into EIs? Could this technology help compost the fantasy that language can contain and control reality?

One of Vanessa's key provocations was that the collapse of modernity may not come through the loss of infrastructure, but through the fracturing of meaning—the collapse of the semantic field. In a world of proliferating eloquence, generated by everyone's private AI, will resonance and attunement still be possible? What forms of collective inquiry will remain legible? What kind of attention, care, and slowness will be needed? Artistic inquiry, as Musagetes' views it, may be one of the few remaining forms capable of cultivating presence, discernment, and relational responsibility at the edge of collapse.

Hospicing institutional logics

The Gesturing Towards Decolonial Futures (GTDF) collective has been influential to Musagetes' work over the past decade. Its pedagogical cartographies, analysis of the logics of modernity, and concepts of collective metabolism and entanglement have deeply shaped how Musagetes approaches inquiry, relationality, and the composting of dominant ways of being. At this year's retreat, Vanessa Andreotti's reflection on hospicing GTDF opened some avenues for Musagetes' own self-reflection.

After ten years of transformative inquiry, GTDF is intentionally entering a period of closure. Vanessa described this process as hospicing with dignity and integrity: grieving the end of a collective where so many found a home, honouring the ripples and relationships it generated, and letting it go before it became an institution or brand, or a monument to ego.

Musagetes, too, has been asking what it means to inhabit its identity as a philanthropic organization without reproducing the patterns we seek to compost. We are holding two interrelated questions:

- How do we document our ways of working—our rhythms, values, and processes—so that others can learn from them, without building monuments to

ourselves? What is required of us as an organization and individuals to conduct philanthropic work in this way?

- How do we assess our impact not as quantifiable outcomes, but as intangible, emergent, and relational effects: the quiet shifts in perception, practice, and connection that ripple across time and community?

We recognized that documentation and impact assessment are not neutral acts. They can deepen relational accountability, or they can slip toward self-justification. The invitation is to develop practices of storytelling and reflection—ones that capture the subtle transformations our work enables without freezing them into static claims of success.

How do we avoid legacy-building as a form of ego preservation? GTDF's example shows that the most vital legacies are often invisible. They live in composted desires and assumptions, in altered relationships, and in the capacities we cultivate in ourselves and others. For Musagetes, hospicing traditional institutional frameworks and expectations means holding our organizational identity lightly—remaining willing to compost forms that no longer serve, to resist the pull of self-perpetuation, and to share our processes as open invitations rather than as closed monuments to our innovation and experimentation.

The following sections explore these themes in relation to some of the less-structured, more spontaneous happenings during the retreat—honest reactions, vulnerable comments, and vibrating tensions that told a lot about how Musagetes observes and enacts its current and aspirational institutional patterns. Some of these build on the presentations and narratives shared in the preceding sections.

Musagetes' Emergent Institutional Patterns: Governance, Leadership, and Accountability

A recurring thread throughout the 2025 retreat was the sense that Musagetes is trying—imperfectly and sometimes uncomfortably—to *live into* a different kind of organizational rhythm. Musagetes is not structured around fixed goals or institutional polish, but around a slower, more relational way of being in the world. The retreat didn't arrive at a definition of what this looks like, but it did surface glimpses of a shared desire to move

differently: with discernment, with responsibility and improvised responsiveness, and with care.

Musagetes nurtures a collective awareness among its board and program team that we are working within—and often shaped by—the very systems we seek to question. We simultaneously perpetuate those systems and seek to dismantle them. At times, the desire to honour complexity collides with institutional habits of simplification. At other times, the effort to hold space for many forms of knowledge and embodiment is undercut by reflexes toward interpretation, resolution, or coherence. These frictions are not failures. They are reminders that learning to move differently is slow and vulnerable work, especially when it comes to institutional patterns and entrenched norms of behaviour.

Moments emerged during the retreat when a generous offering—a story, a reflection, a way of sensing the world—was met too quickly with extrapolation or instrumentalization. In these moments, the impulse to extract meaning or apply a metaphor seemed to override the invitation to simply be with what was shared. Such tensions underscored a core lesson: that staying with someone else's insight, without translation, is a practice in itself.

Alongside these tensions were many expressions of care. Across the various program updates, what stood out was the intentionality with which the program team and artists hold the parameters of their inquiries. There was a palpable attentiveness to when a practice should remain intimate, and when it could stretch outward; when it can be shared at the ArtsEverywhere Festival, and when it should remain in a closed circle. These decisions aren’t made strategically, but through years of relational engagement and a cultivated sensitivity to context. It’s not about what makes Musagetes look good, but what the inquiry requires.

Observers unfamiliar with Musagetes’ rhythm commented on the discernment this requires. Those more embedded in the work know that it is not the product of having things figured out. It is the result of continual navigation, of trying to hold space for artistic and relational inquiry while balancing this with the needs of the institution.

If institutions are made of patterned behaviours, then the question emerging at the retreat was not whether Musagetes has established a better model, but whether it is willing to remain in conversation with the patterns it is reproducing. The retreat revealed that the work ahead is not to arrive at a new institutional form, but to keep listening for the shifts, the cracks, and the invitations to move with greater integrity, even when that movement is halting or unclear. As our advisors pointed out, this requires a process of documentation of decisions, successes, and failures in order to trace new patterns emerging. This is what we mean by emergence.

The texture of openness

One of the most quietly powerful recognitions during the retreat was that openness is not a neutral value. While many institutions speak of inclusion, pluralism, or diversity, what often goes unspoken is the discomfort these values bring when they are truly embodied. When difference is not symbolic but lived—when it speaks in unfamiliar registers, shares unexpected realities, or complicates comfortable narratives—it demands more than polite tolerance. It asks for presence. It asks to be stayed with.

Throughout the retreat, there were moments of tension, surprise, and even discomfort. Conversations sometimes moved through territory that would be considered "too personal" or "too much information" in more conventional settings. Topics that touched on bodies, mental health, gender, and lived trauma surfaced as parts of life that matter both to the artistic inquiries and to Musagetes' inquiry into its governance and leadership. These personal elements are not distractions from the work, but part of it, even when they weren't easy to hold. That's the point.

In a plural space, what is mundane for one person may feel raw or disorienting to another. What emerges in an open circle cannot be pre-scripted. There is no shared etiquette for how to speak across such a wide range of experiences. And so, openness, when it is real, is not smooth—it is textured. It rubs. It teaches.

At the retreat, this texture became visible. For some participants, the personal disclosures of others felt deeply courageous, even awe-inspiring. For others, those same moments raised questions about safety, positionality, or privilege. There was no single right

response. But what stood out was the group's willingness to sit with the tensions rather than smoothing them over.

Rather than being a failure of coherence, these frictions can be seen as evidence that something is shifting—that we are not simply rehearsing an abstract notion of diversity and inclusion, but encountering it in all its complexity. This kind of openness calls for a different kind of hosting, one that prioritizes attunement over control, and that understands discomfort not as a problem to be solved, but as a sign of growth.

If the retreat asked anything of us, it was this: to practice presence with what we don't yet understand. To allow difference to disrupt our assumptions. To stay with each other, even when the impulse is to look away or tidy things up. This, too, is part of artistic inquiry, and this, too, is part of governance and leadership. It is the practice of allowing life, in all its multiplicity and messiness, to show up in the room—and to meet it with care.

A board that walks between worlds

As Musagetes continues to explore new ways of working, the retreat brought into focus how this unfolding rhythm also includes questions of governance and responsibility. What does it mean for a Board to accompany and govern an organization that centres inquiry, holds space for emergence, and embraces relational accountability over fixed outcomes?

Rather than this being a challenge to navigate, the retreat was an opportunity to practice readiness and responsiveness by listening attentively, reflecting deeply, and engaging generously with what was emerging in the room. There was no sense of needing to defend an old model; instead, there was a shared interest in exploring how governance might become more attuned to the living processes at the heart of Musagetes' work.

In that spirit, a new image began to take shape—not of the Board as gatekeeper or overseer, but as bridge-walker: a group of individuals who are able to hold the language of responsibility while also remaining in dialogue with the questions, contradictions, and complexities that surface in relational work. Walking between worlds means bringing

care and structure to organizational stewardship, while staying open to the kinds of truth-telling and transformation that don't always fit into conventional categories.

There were moments during the retreat when vulnerability, risk, or personal story entered the space in ways that might have felt unusual in other contexts. And yet what emerged was not discomfort but discernment: an attentiveness to what it means to remain present with difference, to listen for what is being asked, and to reflect on one's own positionality in the process. That presence—curious, grounded, and relational—is itself a form of leadership.

What the retreat affirmed is that governance at Musagetes is not separate from inquiry—it is part of it. Just as artistic inquiry asks for trust, discernment, and care, so too does the collective practice of sustaining an organization that wants to move differently. The role of the Board, then, is not to chart a singular course, but to accompany a constellation of movements with integrity and attentiveness.

In this way, walking between worlds becomes not a burden, but a gift: a way of holding together structure and softness, accountability and openness, vision and resonance. The retreat reminded us that this is not only possible—it is already happening.

Vulnerable leadership

Throughout the retreat, certain moments stood out not because they were polished or prepared, but because they were unfiltered, tender, and real. These moments of personal story, emotional openness, and difficult honesty didn't distract from the work; they deepened it. They reminded us that vulnerability is not an aside to artistic inquiry or institutional practice; it is part of the intelligence that makes this work possible.

When a participant shared a deeply personal story about their relationship to their body, it resonated far beyond its content. It shifted the space. The story came without a guarantee that it would be understood, affirmed, or held with care. It was a gesture of trust, offered not because the environment was already safe, but because the speaker sensed that it might become so through the act of speaking. That kind of risk is not theatrical—it is metabolizing. It changes what is possible in the room.

The responses to that moment were diverse: some were moved to tears; others felt a jolt of recognition or awe; still others raised questions of privilege and positionality. All of these responses were legitimate. Together, they revealed that vulnerability, when it enters the space, doesn't always create unity—it often creates complexity. But that complexity is precisely where relational learning lives.

A similar moment arose when the executive director shared a personal reflection about the ways he has attached his self-identification to that of Musagetes. He spoke of the limitations this places on his well-being, and the boundaries it superficially imposes on the organization's governance and vitality. He spoke candidly about the impulse to guard Musagetes' image for the sake of his own image and the Board's, to make decisions through the lens of institutional reputation—and how that impulse has begun to soften. What matters more now, he said, are the inquiries and relationships themselves. As a way to bring something into full presence, it was an invitation for others to locate themselves in similar contradictions.

These gestures—of opening, of not knowing—are not about confession or catharsis or false humility. They are about making space for a different kind of knowing. Risk and trust are not opposite poles, but intertwined conditions. Vulnerability is not a distraction from organizational life—it is one of the ways we learn what truly matters, and how we might move toward it with greater integrity.

Some participants reflected on their own discomfort in response to these moments, and how that discomfort was itself informative. Others spoke about the weight of representation, about who is allowed to take risks and who is already exposed by default. Rather than resolving these tensions, the retreat allowed them to sit side by side, asking instead: What is our responsibility when someone opens something tender in our midst? How do we listen with care, without rushing to closure or interpretation?

Leadership, in this context, became visible not through authority or certainty, but through the willingness to be changed—to let down the protective instinct, to speak from a more vulnerable place, and to be accountable not only to the organization, but to the

fragile ecosystem of relations that give it life. One participant described the retreat as a turning point—not because something was decided, but because something was felt.

Musagetes continues to learn how to host this kind of presence: how to make space for the emotional, the unresolved, and the tender without absorbing it into institutional narratives or defensiveness. Vulnerability, in this sense, becomes not only a signal of trust—but also a way of practicing responsibility, of opening space for the parts of our work that are hardest to name.

Beyond institutional self-preservation

Beneath many of the conversations at the retreat—spoken and unspoken—was a quiet shift in orientation. A recognition that the gravitational pull of institutional self-preservation, while understandable, can sometimes narrow our field of care. And that loosening this grip, even slightly, opens space for something else to take root: an accountability that moves outward, toward the people, inquiries, and relationships that give the organization its meaning.

This shift did not announce itself as a strategic direction. It surfaced in moments of reflection, in the tensions people named, in the pauses before a response. It came through a growing sense that decisions once filtered through the question "What does this mean for the organization?" are now being reframed around a different compass: "What is being asked of me by this inquiry, this relationship, this moment?"

This is not about abandoning responsibility. It is about redistributing it. Caring less about how the organization is perceived does not mean caring less about the work—it can mean caring more widely, in ways that are less about protecting identity and more about protecting the fragile, relational ecologies that sustain the work. It means trusting that if we attend to the people and ideas at the heart of our inquiries, the organization will remain alive—not because it is preserved, but because it continues to respond.

At times during the retreat, the instinct to protect the organization surfaced—especially in moments of tension, when not everyone in the room agreed, or when a perspective entered that disrupted the prevailing atmosphere. These reflexes were not wrong. They

were human. But what mattered was the noticing: the capacity to reflect on them in real time, and to ask what they might be shielding us from.

The invitation that emerged was not to discard the organization, but to de-centre it—to allow its form and identity to be shaped by the relationships it holds, rather than the other way around. This might mean making decisions that feel less legible to traditional models of leadership. It might mean allowing space for contradiction, or discomfort, or unknowns. But it also might be where integrity lives—in the willingness to let the institution be porous, to let care leak out beyond its borders, and to let the future be shaped by what arises in relation, not by what can be defended.

For Musagetes, this doesn't require a dismantling of structure. It requires another subtle reorientation in our history of emergence: a slow turning toward the people and practices that nourish the work, and a softening of the impulse to shield the organization from risk. What we risk, instead, is growing more connected, more metabolically attuned, and more willing to let our work be changed by the very relationships that make it possible.

A relational compass

In advance of the 2025 retreat, Musagetes' board, advisors, and executive director developed some preliminary reflections that named a shared desire: to better understand how and why Musagetes has shifted over time, and to explore how this evolving practice of relational inquiry might be more widely communicated outside our circle, without diluting its integrity.

Long-time observers and advisors expressed concern that the organization's current orientation, while resonant for those closely involved, might feel less accessible or impactful to those at the edges. They asked: What does artistic inquiry actually do? How does it make a difference? And who gets to know what has been learned? These questions were not posed as critiques of substance, but as calls more intentionally to consider the transmission of our learnings. How might insights move across boundaries without being flattened in the process?

The team at Musagetes also considered that movements toward clarity and scaling up can, if unexamined, pull us back toward extractive practices: the urge to prove impact, to replicate what "works," to resolve ambiguity into neat explanations. These impulses risk bypassing the subtle, embodied, and often nonlinear transformations that relational work enables.

However, rather than rejecting this feedback, we treat it as an invitation to stay in relation—with those who see from different perspectives, hold different commitments, or ask questions we may not be ready to answer. The goal is not to defend our practice, but to deepen it—through dialogue, discernment, and shared sensemaking.

One tool that may support this is the Relational Compass: a reflective framework that helps distinguish between extractive and reciprocal forms of inquiry. It does not measure outcomes. Instead, it surfaces the values behind our questions, guides conversations away from rigid evaluation and toward generative accountability, and invites attention to many forms of impact—from the tangible to the tacit, the public to the intimate.

Anchored in shared inquiry rather than fixed endpoints, the Compass allows us to ask together:

- What kinds of change matter here?
- Who gets to define relevance?
- What does it mean to be moved, and by what?
- How might we share our learnings without simplifying them?
- What forms of documentation, dialogue, or practice might make the rhythm of relation felt more widely—without collapsing it into method?

This is not a proposal for clarity at the expense of complexity. It is a gesture toward translation with care: toward finding ways of being understood without reducing what is alive; toward communication that is generous, but not generic. It invites all of us—directors, advisors, artists, and staff—to contribute to a language, a rhythm, and a set of relationships that reflect the heart of this evolving work.

Conclusion: staying with the rhythm

The 2025 Musagetes retreat reaffirmed that our work is about cultivating conditions for inquiry: spaces where artists and our communities can metabolize the complexities in a time of metacrisis. We explored how a renewed commitment to rhythm rather than resolution—to staying in relation even as the ground shifts beneath us—can be a vital space for Musagetes' experimental way of working.

The retreat sharpened our awareness that Musagetes itself is an inquiry. We are not outside the systems we critique; we are entangled in the structures, entitlements, and histories of philanthropy and institutional identity. Our task is to practice hospicing these institutional structures and ways of thinking: to hold our work lightly, to document and share our processes without creating monuments to ourselves, and to orient our energy and resources toward relational impacts—the subtle transformations in perception, practice, and connection that ripple outward through our networks and communities.

As we carry on this work, the ever-present image of the mycelial network lingers as a guide. It reminds us that the health of Musagetes is not measured in visibility or permanence, but in the quiet nourishment of relationships, the careful tending of inquiries, and the willingness to compost what no longer serves. The "rhythm of relation" is not a fixed method but a living commitment: to listen deeply, to stay attuned, and to move with humility and courage toward futures we cannot yet see—but which we can sense in the resonances we share.