

Conversation I: The University and the Museum in the Global Economy
October 15, 2000

SB: Susan Buck-Morss
MM: Masao Miyoshi
SG: Serge Guilbaut
DH: David Harvey
DA: David Avalos

SB: We are glad to have all of you here today. I am Susan Buck-Morss and I'm one of the curators for inSITE2000 and it's my happy task to introduce the chair of this panel who is Masao Miyoshi. Many of you know him. He is the Hajime Mori Professor of English, Japanese and Comparative Literature at the University of California, San Diego. He is the author of many books. The last two are 'Learning Places; Area Studies, Colonial Cultural Ethnic Studies and Received Disciplines.' And then, edited with Fred Jameson, a book that's having a lot of impact at Cornell where I teach and I'm sure other places, 'The Cultures of Globalization.' Masao has been connected with inSITE since at least a year and a half ago when he came to the first residency we held for the artists. And he's been an enormously enthusiastic observer, participant, writer about inSITE. And it was he who really pulled together this conversation. So without more ado, if everybody's got a seat, let me turn the microphone over to Masao Miyoshi. Well, you have your own mike.

MM: First, I would like to start by saying that I think that this is a wonderful place for a discussion. Since our topic is about the museum and the university, we thought that we should have it outside the university to maintain neutrality. That's why we more or less insisted on doing it here at inSITE rather than on a campus over at UCSD. I am going to introduce the three main speakers and they are going to be speaking in alphabetical order, this being a democracy. So let me introduce David Avalos. Our first speaker, David Avalos participated in inSITE97. So I think he's much better known here than certainly I am. And I don't think he needs any particular introduction. But for those very few who may not know him very well, let me just say that he is a professor of video and performing art at California State University at San Marcos. Then at the Centro Cultural de la Raza he was also the coordinator of the Border Art Workshop from 1984 to 1987. And in addition to his many private and public works he has had numerous solo and group exhibitions, at the San Diego Museum of Contemporary Art, at ArtPace in San Antonio and the Spectator Life Board at Times Square in New York.

I read about him when his Bus Poster Project became national news. I'm sure many of you know that this was during the 1988 Super Bowl in San Diego. Working with two other artists he produced a poster, which said, "Welcome to America's Finest Tourist Plantation." And it became national news. And that's when I read about him for the first time. Since then he has done many other things like a donkey cart project, which was placed in the Federal Court and which was moved by the Chief Federal Court Judge, who described it as something like a security threat. I don't know what he exactly meant. And also the Art Rebate project, which made absolutely good sense to me but to some people, like Jesse Helms, it didn't. There recently appeared one director, Tom Finkerball, who published a book about the dialogue on public art and an interview with David is in that. You should take a look at it if you have time, really it is quite enlightening in so many ways. I'm very glad to have him here because he knows a great deal about San Diego. He's a native San Diegan. He knows a great deal about the geography and the issues of San Diego, which I should know as a resident of San Diego but I don't.

All right, now let me move on to the second speaker, Serge Guilbaut. He's a professor of Art History and the chair of the Art History department at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver. He was born in France and then did his graduate work in Bordeaux and then at UCLA. But then he decided to move to Canada, which I think is a very wise choice. But he does have a problem; there's a price every time he crosses the border to Mexico, as he did last night. He was left behind for a while I think. They had to give special scrutiny to him, to his character I believe. I remember the powerful impression his first book made when it appeared in 1983, nearly 20 years ago.

In fact, it was about how New York stole the idea of modern art, abstract expressionism, freedom and the Cold War. It was and still is a bold analysis of the new ideology being constructed as a part of the overall strategy in the Cold War. Although it dealt with art, it has had immense influence since in the humanities as a whole. He has many other publications of course. One is 'War, Folk War, Perception, Known Perception, and Misperception' last published in 1989. And then "Reconstructing Modernism: Art in New York, Paris and Montreal, 1945-1964," published in 1990, and the "Voices of Fire" published in 1996. Last week I received an e-mail message from a graduate student and it said that "I heard about a conversation. I'm delighted because I used both Guilbaut and David Harvey in my thesis." I haven't read the thesis. I'm sure it's very good.

Yesterday I asked David, "What should I say as I introduce you?" And then he said, shall I begin with the Cambridge or Oxford career. And he said, "Oh, not that BS." So I said to him that I'll begin exactly with that, not with that BS. And that's what I'm doing now. He moved to the United States when he was offered the position in the Department of Geography and Environmental Engineering at John Hopkins University and he has been teaching there since. He did go back to Oxford during that time. And last year, I think, I don't think I'm wrong, he was teaching at three universities, am I right, the Sorbonne, the London School of Economics and Hopkins at the same time. Now he has recently decided to leave Hopkins and begin in February of 2001 at the Graduate Center in New York City, part of CUNY, although I'm sure he'll be visiting many more universities in many countries. I've never counted his books but at least there are six books, which I have read and I think everybody should read. And I'm not going to give all these titles, but three books, which I have used as a student, and also have been used very extensively in many disciplines, sociology and geography of course and political science and history, as well as humanities as a whole, including art. Limits of Capital in 1982, re-issued with a new preface last year in 1999, and The Conditions of Postmodernity, 1989 and then Spaces of Hope, 2000. If you want to know more about his work and if you haven't read his works, the July/August issue of the New Left Review has a long interview by Pay Anderson. And although Pay Anderson's questions are long winded and a bit annoying, his characteristic crisp answers are quite remarkable. I highly recommend the interview. Now, without saying anything more, what we'll do is about a 10 to 15 minutes presentations by David and then Serge and then another David. And then after that, I may say something, I may not. And after that we'll open up with discussion. Okay.

DA: I want to thank everyone associated with inSITE for the invitation to participate with inSITE going back to the residency last summer and also to Masao for inviting me to be on this panel of four old men, respected, but old never the less. Anyway, one of the questions I had for him was why me? Why am I going to be on this panel when the other three folks are researchers, people that have published books? And I forget exactly what the answer was. But when he told me what the honorarium was, I said, "Alright, I'll do it." And then as the deadline was approaching for being here, I realized "well I should have something to talk about." So this

morning I got a call from Herman Bauka who's been a community activist going back to the days of the community action programs and the war on poverty under the Johnson administration. And he's taking on Proposition BB in the South Bay in San Diego County, which, for most of you who aren't from San Diego and probably few of you are from the South Bay, is a proposition that is a school bond proposition, 187 million-dollar school bond issue. Some of the schools in the district are 40 years old, no, 80 years old. And in some cases the plumbing no longer works and you can't buy parts for the plumbing because it's so old. So I said, "Herman, you're opposing this proposition." I said, "Why not take on motherhood?" And he said, "Well the feminist have already done that." To forge ahead, let me read from a press release from National City.

The committee on Chicano Rights today accused Sweetwater Union High School District's superintendent Ed Brand of failing to respond to a challenge to a public debate on Proposition BB. According to CCR chairperson, Herman Bauka, Superintendent Ed Bran is hiding from the district's voters, homeowners, or is afraid to defend his position on Proposition BB in a public debate. Bauka also accused Superintendent Bran and the district's legal council of withholding public information and facts from voters who oppose Proposition BB by deliberately stonewalling and running stealth type campaign. According to Bauka, the campaign strategy of the district parallels the strategy developed by paid political consultants in Sacramento, California in an earlier campaign. And according to one of the consultants for that plan, you identify voters early, communicating with them and not letting anyone else know that an election is going on. That is, you identify the voters that are going to vote in your favor, you don't let anybody else know that an election is going on. In a recent school election, previous Sacramento bond election voters were contacted, but only those who expressed support got follow up calls and materials. Those that even hesitated in their support were never contacted again. Supporters held no press conferences to inform the public because that would arouse the attention of potential opponents. Or as consultant Richie Ross stated, "We don't want any attention because I don't want the creeps, voters to come out." In conclusion, Bauka called for an end to Superintendent Bran's stealth campaign and issued another challenge for a public debate so that the Superintendent can explain to the voters the facts of his 187 million-dollar proposition.

A similar bond was floated before the voters a couple of years ago and the turn out was 13% of the eligible voters. So that would have meant about 7% of people over 18 years of age, 7%. So that was a very successful stealth campaign, but they didn't get the vote that they needed. You might ask, what the hell is he doing talking about this? I'm under the impression that inSITE has something to do with community engagement. And one would hope that political campaigns also had something to do with community engagement, but obviously not in this case. The district includes folks that live in brand new homes, housing developments that are protected under something called Mellow Rouse, or required under something called Mellow Rouse to pay for the infrastructure in those new housing developments. So they are supposed to provide for the schools etc. in those areas. This is a letter that Bran, the Sweetwater Union High School District Superintendent sent to the owners in these Mellow Rouse Districts.

He said, frequently asked questions from the homeowners:

I am currently paying Mellow Rouse school taxes. If Proposition BB passes, will I be assessed additional taxes?

No. Your existing CFD taxes will be reduced to offset the cost of Proposition BB.

So this is sweet. They get to vote for the taxes but they don't have to pay for them unlike people like my parents who live in Old Town, National City, on a fixed income who will have to take on an additional tax burden.

Will the schools in our community be repaired?

Yes.

So even though they're not paying any taxes, their schools will be repaired. Down at the bottom, a very interesting question.

I don't have children in the schools. How does Proposition BB benefit me?

And here's Bran's answer.

The value of homes in our community is affected by the quality of schools. Research has shown that well maintained and modernized schools increase property values. The quality of schools is the most important factor prospective buyers consider when purchasing a new home.

So this is interesting, the translation of family values into property values for families without children. I guess my question is in a climate in which politically we're seeing more and more community disengagement, what is a challenge faced by a series of events like inSITE2000 that attempts to get at community engagement. And since I only know, for the purpose of this presentation, what I've talked about with people in the last few days or read in the newspaper in the last few days, let me go to an article that appeared earlier this week in the San Diego Union Tribune.

A \$500,000 ad campaign targets trustee Zimmerman. Some of the city's most prominent businessmen have bankrolled a 1/2 million dollar campaign against outspoken San Diego Schools Trustee, Frances O'Neil Zimmerman with a blitz of television commercials that also tout recent school reforms. Fueled by six figure contributions from Padres Owner, John Moores, Wal-Mart Heir, John Walton, and Qualcomm Chief, Erwin Jacobs, among others, a group called the Partnership for Student Achievement has spent \$545,000 on the unprecedented attack campaign against Zimmerman. The high stakes San Diego Unified School District Board Election, which many see as a referendum of our schools Chief, Alan Bersin, has spawned a campaign against Zimmerman, the Superintendent's most vocal critic. "I cannot compete with this," Zimmerman said, "This is huge money and people need to ask why so much money is being spent to unseat me. The public schools are for sale and people need to wake up."

Now what these folks are doing is legal because back in the '70's the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that money is speech. And therefore, wealthy folks who want to contribute a lot of money to political campaigns would have their 1st Amendment Rights limited if government said they couldn't spend whatever they wanted. All right. The group received \$100,000 each from Moores, Walton, and Jacobs and \$50,000 from businessman, Mellan Burnham.

So they're supporting Alan Bersin. Does anybody here know who Alan Bersin is other than the way that he's been identified as the Superintendent of Schools? Alan Bersin was a U.S. Attorney during the period in which Operation Gatekeeper was implemented. And while he was

not responsible for the INS because as a US attorney, he's a different part of the Justice Department, he was, as one local activist told me yesterday, its main cheerleader. We gathered on Saturday to commemorate the deaths of 600 people who have died in the mountains and deserts crossing into California and drowned in the American Canal crossing into California as a result of being pushed away from the border where the fence is located into the area of the desert and the mountains. So Alan Bersin was a cheerleader, the primary cheerleader for a political process that resulted in those 600 deaths commemorated by Alfredo Jaar's piece. I think that that's interesting. And I think that it's something that needs to be pointed out because in a sense what Bersin was doing in cheerleading that fence was increasing property values in places like Otay where his father-in-law owns property from what I understand. Anyway, just to move on and try and wrap this up in the 15 minutes I've been allotted.

Zimmerman has been critical of Bersin since he was hired a year and a half ago and was the only Trustee to abstain from the vote to hire the former U.S. Attorney. Although Bersin received steady support from Trustees Roto Ottinger, Sue Brown, and board president, Edward Lopez, a three/two vote is not enough to pass on measures. "We are going to have some issues where one person possible, Fran, could stop us cold," said Lopez, who is also up for reelection. A loss for Zimmerman could create a super majority 4 to 1, voting block needed to sell district land and pass other actions.

Now Zimmerman's opponent is a woman by the name of Dubiak. Since July, Dubiak raised more than \$54,000 in campaign contributions from about 200 individuals including builders, real estate executives, and attorneys. That is more than double what Zimmerman collected, nearly \$26,000 from some 600 supporters, mostly educators and professionals during the same three month period. Dubiak said, "The partnership's commercialsÖ," that is this group that includes the Moore's from the Padres and the Qualcomm Jacobs, "...don't make my job any easier. I still have to work hard to get my message out. I assume the commercials will affect my campaign. I am absolutely grateful for extra help."

The partnership does not endorse Dubiak and legally they can't. Nor has it made any mention of the candidate or the school board election. But some of the partnership supporters including Johnson, Burham, and Jacobs from Qualcomm have contributed cash to Dubiak's election bid. Alright, Zimmerman, one of Zimmerman's complaints is that Bersin's plan resegregates low achieving, mostly Latino and African-American children into long remedial classes of literacy and math. So again, here's a situation where we have to ask ourselves what's going on here in San Diego that's any different than what's going on in the rest of the United States in terms of a disengagement from communities from having any kind of vote or say really when it comes to the amount of money that can be pumped into these campaigns in the political process.

And it's interesting because this alignment of a public official Alan Bersin, and elected officials, the county board of educators, San Diego Board of Educators and civic interest is very similar to what Paul Yudice talks about in an essay he wrote recently and that appeared... where was it?... in Ericka Sudaberg Sites or was it Art Matters. What did I call him? Paul, okay George, he's such a great dancer, I don't know how I could get his name wrong. But he talks about this process taking place across the country, this triangulation between business, government and civic interest to the disadvantage of a lot of other folks. Qualcomm by the way is one of the contributors to inSITE2000. I wanted to read from a paper by a colleague, Aneba Yanez Chavez, about his Marxist framing of what's happening in San Diego in terms of a powerful relief faction trying to gain control of San Diego and its future direction. And this faction includes folks in the computer industry, it includes folks in the entertainment and sports industry, and it also includes folks in government and elsewhere.

When we think of Moores and the Padres I think about what's going to happen to Logan Heights, Sherman Heights other areas surrounding the ballpark. When those areas start becoming developed and gentrified what's going to be happening to the predominantly Mexican and Chicano communities that live in those areas. Will they afford the rents? Will they be able to afford the homes? I think about situations where artists... let me just step back and try to summarize this. Clearly what Yanez Chavez is talking about, what George is talking about, is a situation where people are forming themselves selfconsciously as a community to serve their own interest, people with a lot of power and a lot of money. The question then becomes are other communities also involved in coming together to serve their own interests? And you see a lot more union activity in Los Angeles certainly but here in San Diego as well among janitors, housekeepers and so forth.

So there are these multiple communities that are trying to define themselves and to have a greater say about the future development of the border region. My question to inSITE is which community is really being engaged? Which community is really supporting inSITE? Which community benefits? Why is it that you know how many of the intellectuals that have been gathered here have been made aware of Alfredo Jaar's project, have been asked to converse with them, have been invited to converse with him? How many of them have been asked to speak to Michael Schnorr who for six years has been involved with community groups, activist groups in the San Diego/Tijuana region to bring forward what the brutal outcome of Operation Gatekeeper is. And if you want to know more about that operation and the people that have died as a result of it, you can go to a web site, www.stopgatekeeper.com, and find out what some of the local communities are doing. This is a question for inSITE as well. Are they bringing people together with those artists who are working with that other community, with the working class community, the union community and so forth? Which community is being formed? Which community is being engaged? Which community is being served? Thank you for listening and thank you for your time.

Serge Guilbaut: Okay, thank you. Thank you very much. I also wanted to thank the inSITE group for inviting me. And I was always interested in the production inSITE in the last decade or almost a decade, very interested in what was produced here, because it was a different type of a relationship between the artworld and different types of communities. So that's what I was interested in. My little text is going to be, because it is short, a little bit flippant, and I want to read it because I have a French accent so sometimes it's difficult for me to convey clearly what I think. Reading, I think is going to be easier to understand. It's a starter but it's not nouvelle cuisine. It's pretty heavy you see. When I talk about the museum I'm real worried today because I don't know if it's a strategic position but I have just in front of me one of the most famous West Australian curators who is interested in a new type of curatorship. And we have been involved in debates lately, that have been nice, about inSITE, because we were able to share our disagreement - let's put it this way. So my text is about the museum and problems I see, the difficulty that I see with museums.

At the turn of the last century in 1909, the Futurist Manifesto declared that in order to save contemporaneity it was essential to burn down the museum, to destroy those symbols of the past and tradition. At the beginning of this new century, one could still say without fear that museums have taken over the planet, or at least the western world. Indeed it seems that every single bankrupt industrial site has been refitted and transformed into a museum of sorts. Museums are everywhere. Some are about art. Some have history artifacts. We have museums of horseshoes, bees, pots and pans, clothes, corkscrews, that one is in France of

course, the South of France. This transformation of industry of structures into tourist traps or tourist sites has now reached a climax of sorts in the core region of France where the mountains of coal mine residue have been transformed into ski slopes, ski resorts. And this is kind of an amazing site actually when you go there. The witnesses and traces of industrialization of work have now been transformed into pleasure, into a form of art, into a new way of living.

This new century has indeed been born under the sign of the tourist. The museofication of objects does not only happen in buildings, in museums proper. Marcel Duchamp's concept in fact has proved to be a colonizing factor of everyday life. Our western societies have transformed and fused public and private sphere's into museums. The west has become a huge nostalgic space where relics or the new and even the made anew are collected, dusted, fixed, cleaned, classified and packaged in wonderfully entertaining propositions for worldwide distribution and sale. It is a cultural globalization in synchrony with the economic and political war it seems to me. Homogenization and populism have produced a new kind of "universilization" which postmodern discourses and analyses have supposedly thoroughly criticized and disposed of. Democratization and the recognition that anything could be interesting or meaningful makes the task of choosing almost impossible. Shouldn't we learn from the lesson of Flaubert's *Bouvary*, those too charming but overwhelmed pragmatists who weren't able to select, were swallowed by the trash, that they lovingly saved. The maniac habit to copy everything in order to save knowledge without deep understanding seems to me similar to our thirst for collecting artifacts for the preservation of everything for national recognition and identity creation.

Today large museums produce traveling shows, mild enough to be accepted by a large cultural intermittent market which are sent on the road literally to the four corners of the world. Smaller museums in need of celebrated images for their own actual image are fast becoming like railroad stations where a Barnum like circus train unloads of clowns for show time to dazzle the demanding crowd. Art shows are now presented with a minimum of discussion. Shows are rather branded like famous designer clothes. Here comes the Impressionists, the Picassos, the Matisse, the Toulouse Lautrec, the Pollocks, the Jeff Koons. Their shows placed into a space dying for recognition and sales. Package shows bring in the crowd, the media and the school children hoping to sell specially designed products as it was done in Paris at the Boutique of the Toulouse Lautrec Show. There one could buy replicas of those small towel used in the 19th century by prostitutes after their sexual encounters. Visitors to the show were treated like so many Johns. Each towel had emblazoned on it an image of a Toulouse Lautrec prostitute to make the point. One hopes it was deliberate about the closeness of the business of art and that of commodification of sex.

The size of the audience has literally become the criteria, often the only one by which many museums evaluate the success of their programs. Large sums of money are allocated to advertise troubling shows while common curators are denied funding for locally created adventures. Curators, in French there's a nice name for that, it's called *Conservateur*, have to be indeed conservative in such a system. Should we then burn this institution? It's not really necessary since their loss of credibility they have become an arm of the entertainment industry and never really to participate in serious contemporary discussions or prolonged serious cultural and political debates. Like cheese, here comes the process shows. What we have noticed in other respects is that following the business world, the art world has been happily, savagely deterritorialized, opened up, hybridized, decentered, decolonized and diversified in order to offer a wider array of possibilities. Flexibility has become the word of choice for the newly designed world.

The contemporary art world has in fact become a kind of gigantic aesthetic supermarket, the big well-stocked kind in capitalist countries. The art world through its many institutions Art season shows, has given us a wide variety of products, many with new and improved exotic flavors. What we get is an art calibrated, even in its excesses, an art for all seasons the way our western markets give us all year long tastes like strawberries. Art is everywhere, coming from the four corners of the world, creating an international rainbow of tastes and colors and looks. This I am sure is felt as a great thing to those many artists who now have a chance at exposure they could never have dreamed before. But this idyllic image seems to be quite interesting until it becomes clear that such a dissemination often becomes another form of dictatorship through sameness, paradoxically leveling all difference, processing peripheral products through the same but centralized gaze.

Faced with this situation of excess of a global super marketing, one can already see the appearance of something one could call Boutique Art, a type of art prediction detached from the mass market, but also different from the old avant garde strategies. This time, Boutique Art, having lost any sense of critical utopia targets very specific constituencies through a depoliticized but cynical prediction. It is true that the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of the classical Cold War syndrome has opened up the world to the exchange and travel of ideas, products and art, spawning a series of optimistic pronouncements about what art in the end (inaudible) possibilities of universal communication and "reconciliation." Nevertheless, this mobility, this fluidity is never disconnected from the diversity of economic and social realities. The proliferation of international biennales around the world might be taken as a sign of this positive global transformation, but this phenomenon is in my mind a mixed blessing. The proliferation indeed signals a participation of a usually excluded country in the concept of nations and sometimes this can be a strong signal like the one sent by the Johannesburg Biennale after apartheid. Yet simultaneously, the proliferation announces the loss of specific identities or the erasing of particularity in order to have a share in the coveted international capitalist western "contemporary" values. Biennales are rapidly becoming like window dressing for simpleton cultures unable to produce (inaudible) and powerful day to day at market.

Biennales have become the last even the ultimate space where as in the Olympics, the community and culture can show off its prediction and have the illusion of full international participation while in fact often only providing products fitting international patterns. Biennales have become processes of leveling, of entering into the dominant fold consciously hoping to fit neatly into national demands as well as into the international cultural tourism. There is no denying that they provide a much-needed platform for exchange but this is bestowed at a price. This new fluidity, these free exchange of ideas between cities, this incessant travelling by artists and curators is part of the race whose purpose is to offer new possibilities to artists and intellectuals usually locked up in their decentered places. The price to pay for this is the illusion that centers do not exist any more, that the world is one where exchange is encouraged, open and rewarded. It is true, central institutions have changed their strategies, they certainly are visibly less arrogant. They have become suave and well mannered but they are still able, maybe even better than before due to their technological returning, to determine choices. In fact the financial and editorial power is still managed by the few same first world centers but as change is at centers now antennas everywhere searching for product. They have cloned themselves abroad like hamburger franchises.

The Guggenheim Museum, the best example of this trend is using its artistic and erratic surplus to reach the world outside of New York in a kind of artistic blitzkrieg. Their enormous collection

and accumulated cultural power are lent to outposts in a culturally and tourist hungry world. The Guggenheim very quickly understood that in a new open cultural world, museums have become powerful corporations in the business of profitable tourist attraction with the added bonus of national propaganda. Like fast food corporations, museum in order to profit, need many satellites and franchises to invade those “empty” national and international cultural spaces deprived and economically depressed areas in New York, even Berlin, Bilbao and so on. The Guggenheim Museum, despite outcries, has succeeded its passage into the 21st century with a clear understanding of the logic of hyper capitalism. In a world where the US despite its many weaknesses, has become the unopposed world power, in this context, the Guggenheim has understood something that others have not been able to grasp. Today brashness is not only okay, it is actually demanded. It is understood that it pays a lot of dividends to build a franchise in other lands to show not only that your own culture is universal and is unique but also that your foreign implementation helps the economy of other weaker countries through cultural tourism.

This is the contemporary way to the use of culture as compliment of international policy. The big stick policy is replaced here by Jeff Koons’ gigantic but ecologically savvy and ironic loud sculptural cartoonish watchdog. But let’s ask, if contemporary art should still be about reflection, criticism, skepticism, and distance, where could this be done. In fact, with the re-organization of the late work of the distribution of art, is it still possible to function outside of this net cast so wide. In the end, we know that no one can really change the Vatican. We also realize that it is too late to change museums or even to burn them to the ground, you know pollution and all says it would be terrible. But what could be envisaged though is the creation of an international network of parallel minds of historians, philosophers, art historians, artists, anthropologists and sociologists interested in contemporary culture debates to get together and function small independent spaces in order to produce events, to replace the too loaded superficial word shows around issues involving discussion, important discussion about important events that are developing right now, visual statements and action and so on.

It is not the end of museums but it could be the beginning of experimental discourses still produced at times by traditional but upset curators in collaboration with cultural professionals working together in (inaudible) spaces the way artists tried to do in the sixties and seventies. The first of such networking, international networking structure would be the opening up of the past incestuous environment where issues of presentation and constrictions of public debates work at inside art world parameters. What the art world needs in the 21st century is such critical attention and the introduction of different tools of analysis in the process of cultural presentation. Artists, philosophers, anthropologists, art historians should be involved in the presentation and discussion of contemporary art as a counterpoint to the commodification of the thoughts in the museum world ran by boards more interested in numbers than by ideas and arguments. The sharpness of purpose and small size of these new envisioned structures should attract a new but vital public interested in art discussion but systematically dissatisfied by the performance of the Barnum like atmosphere.

To conclude I would like to exchange the metaphor of the train for a boat. If as described the modern museum has become an ungovernable structure, too heavy to steer away from the prescribe but never the less destructive path. The concerns it that an intellectual should jump ship before it is too late before the steamer slams into the iceberg of cold cash and metaphorically sinks to new lows. Let’s instead in the spirit of David Harvey’s Space of Hope, use 100’s of little sailboats to roam around our culture and rapidly respond to changes, needs, battles, desire, and imagination. But as I say this, I am well aware that this is not a panache

either, as I know the danger inherent in such a metaphor. One could choose to go with the wind and we know that all the winds these days blow towards globalization. Come on Sailor, more work has to be done. Thank you very much.

DH: I want to take up two explicit problems. And it's gonna sound a bit portentous in the sense these are I think the major problems that we should really be thinking about at this time. And the two problems are first of all, the issue of the paths of technological and scientific change, in old fashioned Marxist language, revolutions and productive forces. And the second issue is the issue which goes under the name of globalization right now, which is the reorganization of the world economy along rather new lines. In both cases I want to argue that these processes are driven by capital accumulation and that they've been with us for a very long time. The powers of technological change have been connected to the military industrial

complex since the 16th century at least, if not before. Globalization has been going on, the formation of the world market through trade, export of capital, transformation of labor forces in different parts of the world. That's been going on since at least 1492 if not before. So both of the processes I'm talking about are long standing. But I think a case, strong case can be made that of the last 20 or 30 years, that ratcheted into a slightly different terrain, which makes them qualitatively rather different.

I'm not going to spend much time on the technological scientific side except to say the following. Because there's a lot made of the creation of cyber space, the internet, computer technology information revolutions and all the rest of it, and that is clearly a very important component part of the new kind of world in which we live in, which poses a whole set of specific issues. And of course it does connect very strongly to the globalization process. But I think even more important as far as I'm concerned, is the revolutions which have been occurring in biological understandings and biological technologies over the last 20 or 30 years. I think processes of genetic engineering, genetic interventions, genetic transformations are rather critical because they're opening up the possibility that we can actually intervene at that level in the evolutionary process and intervene in major ways.

Now of course, human beings have always been evolutionary agents through plant breeding, habit modification and the like. But this seems to me to be somewhat qualitatively different in that we're intervening at a level and with a set of mechanics, which are instantaneous as opposed to rather long drawn out. And these revolutions pose immediately the question of what kind of evolutionary process we wish to be engaged with. That through both the indirect interventions of habitat destruction and habitat modification and through genetic interventions, we are in a position to control the evolutionary process or intervene in it in these fundamental ways not only in terms of our evolution but also the evolution of many of the species on the earth. This then poses a whole set of issue as to whether this evolutionary process should be left to the direction of the multinationals, should be left as it were in the hands of ...(tape turn)... to construct. What kind of planet do we want to live on? What kind of species diversity do we wish to maintain. So all of these issues it seems to me collect around the notion that we are at this point of either a conscious discussion of these questions in an attempt, not necessarily to come to a specific answer but at least to transform and intervene in the processes that are transforming and intervening in the evolutionary process, whether we're going to do that or just sort of be objects of this evolutionary process and just, as it were, let it happen. And it seems to me there's a very important topic of conversation to be had around that question.

The second issue is the globalization process. Again, been going on for a very, very long time. But over the last 30 or so years it's been connected of course with this strong financialization of

capital, the organization of financial markets, the reorganization of divisions of labor on a world scale. The de-industrialization and reindustrialization, all of those sorts of things, which you may well be familiar with. Now, we can make an analysis of globalization. I don't propose to do that here and the various ways in which it can be understood. But I want to point out a number of specific elements about it because I also want to see it as a somewhat contradictory process and a rather more complicated process than is usually sort of set out in the literature. The first point I want to make about it is that an interesting dialogue is being set up, as it were, between this process called globalization, which assumes very much in consciousness and in representation as if it's something ethereal, something that's so far up there that somehow or other none of us can deal with it. It's operating on us. You know, governments can't control. Nobody can control it. There's something called globalization that's going on. It's sort of, it has this ethereal quality to it. That ethereal quality then connects to, as it were, the opposite end of the scale of things, which is the notion of the individual and the personal. And it sometimes seems like dialogue and discussion gets segregated into this discussion of globalization which is way up there and then personal life, personal well-being, the person as it were, the other end down here. And somehow there's no connectivity between those two levels. One of the things I tried to do in this last book is to say what is the connectivity between those two discourses of globalization and for example the body or the person or the individual. What is the connection between the two?

And of course, if you think of the labor process, immediately you see what the connection is, that the body of the worker in an IKEA plant in Indonesia is being used in a certain kind of way for certain kinds of purposes, which connect to the first. So there's all sorts of connections that exist. But there is also an interesting progressive connection. I want to play on the duality here. A progressive connection. There has been a tremendous resurgence in the last few years of interesting questions of let's say human rights, which is about the rights of individuals and the body in relationship to these global processes. And at that point you kind of start to see the connectivity. And then you start to see it at other levels like some of the international conferences on population and women, talking about, you know, what's the reproductive rights of women and what has that got to do, as it were, with the global processes of population transformation. So, as it were, there are points of dialogue between those two levels, and I want to come back to that a little later.

Because the next point I want to make is that actually if you start to unpack what globalization is about, it doesn't exist to some ethereal aspect up there. It actually is occurring at all kinds of different levels and all kinds of different scales. And I think we'd have to start to look at the different scales at which the globalization process is operating in order to get a better grasp on how to politically intervene in relationship to it. Because one of the things I've been very antagonistic to over the last few years is the sense of helplessness that you can't intervene, you can't do anything. The best you can do is do something in your own back yard. Take care of your own property and it enhances value or something like that. And you can't do anything much else, you know. And that came over in this famous Margaret Thatcher phrase, which I'm thoroughly at war with, which is the notion that there is no alternative. And to say well maybe we should be thinking alternatives. And then the issue arises where can we think alternatives? How can we think alternatives? And it's very hard to think alternatives if you just think about globalization as some ethereal set of processes that nobody's in control of. But you can start to think alternatives when you start to unpack it.

Globalization has implications at the very personal level. And I've mentioned this issue about human rights. And the resurgence in recent years for example with this notion of crimes against

humanity. General Pinochet being arrested in London at the behest of a Spanish judge for crimes committed in Chile. Well, this is one aspect of globalization and it's a very interesting aspect. It starts to say there are ways to hold individuals and entities accountable in some way for events in other parts of the world. And this is as it were, this is one of the places where there are some constructive possibilities that come out of the globalization argument. The globalization also has effects at other levels at for example, the community level. David just talked a little bit about this. I think it's very important to recognize that what's happening in say San Diego, what's happening in Baltimore, is not just something which is just our own back yard politics. It is connected in very important ways to what this globalization process is about. And by acting at that level, you can actually engage in transformative work, which has possibilities when taken towards other levels to do something quite different about the political situation.

Many people have given up on the nation state. They say the nation state is powerless any more. Well, you know, having crossed that border down there twice in the last couple of days, the idea of the nation's state is powerless. Come off it. I mean, this is crazy. And so at that level there is also something, which is crucial. Nation states are not powerless. Nation states are terribly important containers of power with a possibility of engaging with this process in quite different ways. And if you start to look at the ways in which different nation states have responded to globalization, have affected globalization, then you can kind of say national state policy is actual a very important terrain of intervention. There are regional configurations, which are below the nation state and some instances above the nation state, regional configurations which are rather important to consider. And actually the formation of regional consciousness in some cases, you see it happening in many areas of Europe. At the same time you're getting the European Union, a sort of large scale region, you'll also getting lots of regional consciousness movements which are emerging, I mean not only in the traditional centers like the Basque country, but also in Northern Italy and in places like that. So you're getting as it were again a different reconfiguration. Again those things are not unconnected with this very general process that we call globalization.

And then there are the multinational or transnational institutes that's like the European Union, like NAFTA, which are also important in the way in which this process is being worked out. And then there are the global institutions, the IMF, the World Trade Organization, the World Bank and all those things that have been the target of a lot of radical attention in the last few years through Seattle, Washington, Prague, Melbourne and the like. So when you start to think about it you see there are all these layers of activities that occur at different scales. And one of the questions we need to look at is what is the relationship between say what is happening here in San Diego at the community level, the very local community level, at the metropolitan level and what that relationship is also to the kind of regional consciousness that might be emerging across border. What is that all about and how does that relate as it were to processes of globalization. There have been many transformative things occurring in the last few years. Just to give you one example that struck me quite catastrophically yesterday when looking at that, you know, Operation Gatekeeper and the wall.

I mean, I kept on thinking back to the tremendous euphoria attached to the attack on the Berlin wall, when people took sledge hammers and smashed the whole thing down. And frankly my response to that, the balloon event, was I wanted to take a sledgehammer to that damn wall. And then thinking, but why is that wall some how rather regarded legitimate? Why are we putting walls up in some parts of the world and tearing them down elsewhere? Why are people going behind gated communities, living in gated communities and putting walls all over the place? At the same time, we've got globalization going on. What's going on? What's the

relationship between these two? And I want to argue that the relationships are not contingent or accidental. There is a structural transformation going on in the ways in which life is being worked out geographically through globalization.

Now, what kinds of responses can we have to these two processes of globalization and technological change? It seems to me there are some fundamental questions that might be asked. I work in a university and I can assure you these questions are not generally asked inside the university. I'm not sure they're being asked anywhere in any sort of coherent form. A month ago I was in the Vatican of all places. I'm not Catholic. I'm not particularly religious at all. But one of the things that was interesting about the discussion in the Vatican was precisely this issue of saying, what does it mean to be human right now? And can we develop a way of thinking, which resonates with the marginalized, the oppressed, the excluded, and the alienated? And if so, what kinds of things would we want to say? As a force in opposition to, from the Vatican's language the crafts materialism, the nihilism, and the post modernism of contemporary culture and all the rest of it. And I think, for me anyway, what was interesting was the seriousness of the question. What does it mean to be a human being right now with all of these capacities and powers in front of us? And how are we going to understand ourselves?

And some of these issues are being discussed in things like issues about human rights in general, the interests of collective rights, the whole kinds of questions of cultural relativism, misuse of those sorts. So there is, there's a whole a series of sites, if you want to call it that, of discussion of thinking and of feeling. And I think feeling is probably more important than thinking. Feeling that there is something, which is catastrophically wrong. There is something that is really out of whack. We seem to be headed in the wrong direction. We're on the wrong train. We need to get off it. We need to create another one. How can we do it? And if you ask yourself the question, where is the opposition to this whole system we're talking about occurring? The answer is it's all over the place. I find it in my own city in terms of living wage movements and discontent and alienation in many marginalized communities. I find it in many other places, you know the peasant movements in India or movements in rural Brazil. I mean, you name it, there's sort of movements all over the place, which are oppositional movements. All of them expressing the view that something is wrong, that something's got to be done. And it can sometimes take specific issues about you know the environment or cultural autonomy or personal liberties and freedoms and all those sorts of things. But there's something wrong.

And then we have to start to talk about well why is this thing that's wrong so wrong? My answer is a very simple one. It's because we've given up before the powers of capital cumulation and money. It's as simple as that. We lie down in front of it all. Which is not to say everybody who wields that power is an evil, nasty kind of person, but to say basically look, that's where the power lies. And we seem not to be able to mobilize ourselves against it. Look at the elections and look at what David was talking about. So how do we start to configure a conversation about alternatives? And that conversation has to address what for me is really the fundamental kind of issue about who are we and what do we want to become? What kind of world do we want to live in? And if capital can't give us that world, then we should find some way to get rid of capital and construct something completely different. And that's a revolutionary solution. It's a terrible place to say that right here, right? There are possibilities it seems to me that the social democratic possibility would be to control it in some way. Turn it into a servant rather than a master. Control it, and see if it can be used. And actually right now, of course, we're getting all these institutions which are precisely about regulation and control. We have sort of the questions of financial instability, how can that be regulated and controlled? We have questions of the environment. How can that be regulated and controlled? We have sort of social and

political questions. How can that be regulated and controlled? So actually right now there's a whole kind of almost coming back of a notion of there's going to be some global regulatory apparatus. And along with that sort of issue, which is sort of seen as a technical sort of managerial kind of problem comes another problem, which is what kinds of values are going to be incorporated in those institutions, which is what the struggle in Seattle in many ways was about. What kinds of values should be incorporated in the WTO or in the IMF if you can put any values in them whatsoever other than the purely monetary ones? So those are the issues that then come back, these sort of moral issues.

Where can these things be discussed? Will they be discussed within the formal structure of university education? I don't see it. I really don't see it. I try to discuss it but frankly, you know, I get pretty much marginalized in my own institution which is one of the reasons I'm leaving Hopkins because it's all about selling itself to technological change and the state apparatus. It's all about that. It's all about gaining money. I don't own enough research grants. I'm a non-valued person in my institution. And they make clear you're non-valued. And they treat you that way. You're a parasite because you're not making, you're not giving yourself over to government and industry. They have a mission statement. The first draft of which said, "We have to give ourselves over to serving government and industry." When I got up and said, "Well what about the public interest? What about poor?" People kind of said, "Oh, yeah, well, oh yeah. Maybe we should modify the statement." But they're not going to modify the practice. So it might occur not there. Would it occur through I don't know museums and so on? I don't know much about museums and so on.

And it seems to me that organizations like inSITE have a real possibility. And it's a possibility, not necessarily a realization and we might want to discuss that. Of exploring some of the contradictions would exist within this process particularly between the levels, between the way in which the personal is political for many artists and that. And the way in which that relates to something called community, which maybe relates to the question of regional consciousness across border. Are there sort of contradictory elements there that can be actually played upon? And how can those contradictory elements be played upon? I think this is for me the sort of question which arise is inSITE a site where these kinds of issues can be discussed and brought to the floor and how can they be brought to the floor? That is as I say, the major issue from my standpoint. So there are then these two fundamental questions that I would want to look at. And in looking at them I think it's not that we can look at them and say, "Well I have all the answers or you know this is what we should do and this is how we should do it." But it is a moment where I think we need conversations, conversations about alternatives, conversations about where we are. Where we're going with all this stuff, how to understand it perhaps? And having understood it a bit better, put ourselves in a position to intervene in it in some sort of conscious political way through the formation of alliances, through the configuration of linking together, activities at one scale with another scale. You know there's a tendency for people who work with community action to say the only place that matters is community action because people that work at the state say it's at the state that matters. People that work at the global institution say the global institutions matter. They all matter. And if we can find ways to talk across those different scales of political action, I think we'll be in a much better position to confront some of the dynamics of technological change and globalization. Thank you very much.

MM: The time is running out and I'm just a moderator. So I don't think I should or I will spend much time. But just give me five or six minutes. The first thing is, I did get interested in inSITE simply because I thought that there was nothing I could do in the university. That is, the

university's corporatization is absolute. And there I didn't entertain any possibility of hope whatsoever. That is, University of California at San Diego is one of the worst example in the sense that it is willing to just simply develop technological industry actually and then to transfer that into corporation. Technically it's called technology transfer. And that encourages the development of entrepreneurship among the professors who are researchers who are principal investigators for the sake of corporations. But these are not being done only by engineering professors and medical professors and so on, but even the humanities professors are under tremendous pressure the question and more influenced by this. And as a result in the university, the critical thinking that is the observation, criticism, and intervention are almost impossible. And I thought about learning outside the university. Is it possible? And then I got to know inSITE. And I thought that museum too is absolutely impossible. That is it is not just a museum shops and museum corporation with adding museums. No, it's far worse than that. I just came back from Korea. And in Korea there's a ministry of culture and tourism. And I think Korea is the only honest country in the world I thought. But then Yudice told me, there are many other countries where there are such agencies called culture and tourism, meaning culture almost completely belongs to tourism.

Now there I really have almost no hope whatsoever. And I began to learn about inSITE. And last year, I was full of hope. Now I don't mean this year I'm less hopeful. But there is something else that happened. That is two things, I learned in the last several days, or several months, talking with David Avalos about the questions of peculiarity, locality, specificity of the politics in this area, which I did more or less ignore I think all these years. And that is that peculiarity and totality are absolutely the same and that one can't exist without the other. This is something I learned that we talked about. And I still keep thinking about that. And the other one is what David Harvey just now told. This is a question of hope. I mean, it's not just his book, Spaces of Hope, which is a great book. But through words, he talks about this not either/or but both/and. In other words, when he talks about contradiction and capitalism, he doesn't say just one. But rather think about what those contradictions can yield which I have never thought about. And more as of I did not give up actually and you know my struggles. That is not the case. Something is wrong. Something has to be done. But it doesn't mean we stop there. I did not stop. Nor did I say we have to give up. There's nothing else we can do. That's not the point. I couldn't see where we can begin.

Now I don't know. I'm taking David extremely seriously in thinking about contradictions. But it is not quite so easy. I mean, yesterday, we got stopped on the border. And then of course we just wasted an hour and a half waiting for them to just let the bus go by. And of course, Sergio was stopped and so on. But what was there is not a force of the nation state. It is a force of the state. The nation is completely left behind. There are so many Americans and corporate officers and corporate officer's families and so on in the bus. But their words completely ignored at that point. In other words, some kind of state seems to represent. Now, about the destruction of the Berlin wall for example. That too, the Berlin Wall was destroyed not probably because people rarely rose up against an international injustice and so on. But perhaps the US State Department or NATO state powers really saw fit to destroy the whole concept and structure of the Cold War. They don't need the Cold War any more. They need something else. In other words to me, contradictions may yield something but at the same time, the contradictions can become the allowance of poor existence. I'm very worried about that. That is not both A and B. But actually it is a kind of a tentative trying out of two answers. And then to me it is a kind of a delay, kind of a tentativeness, which is extremely intellectually important but can we lead from there to something else. In other words, I have a kind of deeply seeded attachment to despair and hopelessness, which too might yield some sort of action actually. I mean this is, I'm still

trying to change myself. I want to listen to my guru actually. But she can't tell me that easily. And I do want to keep thinking about both his position and my position. And I don't think I'll quit very easy.

Thank you. Now shall we start here. We can very briefly talk about the questions. If not, we can open up the whole floor. Do you have any thing to say now? If not, then we'll open up the floor.

SB: I just want to say that there's the one microphone here that works and it would really be great if people would be patient enough to get it before they start talking. And I also want to invite the artists to maybe initiate a response because we have a lot of them here. And the artist interaction with the intellectualist is one aspect of this that we don't want to have fall under the table. But could we just start with the artist is my only. All right. If there's no artist that wants to jump in at this point. Okay. This is Jordan Crandall.

JC: Well, actually I was really struck by what David Harvey was speaking about and I wanted to ask you what you thought of the various kinds of movements, oppositional groups who are actually now taking to the streets and loosely aligned or identified by the media as anti globalists, in a very simplistic way. But I think in what you were speaking, what we see very much now the beginnings of something very strong to be articulated. And people actually really speaking at street level whether it's in Seattle or Washington or Dabos or Prague. But I'm wondering what we can do to concentrate our energies into speaking with these groups and helping them to consolidate their agendas and clarify their agendas, strengthen their voices. I think that in speaking about the need for these kinds of conversations and voices to be strengthened is very well in conversations and things like this. But I'm wondering what we can really do to take it outside and really concentrate our energies where things are already beginning?

DH: I mean I don't have a specific answer to that. I mean I can only just say that in my own case, I work locally with for example the Living Wage Campaign in Baltimore. And that gives me a lot of connectivity to the sorts of things that David was talking about at the very local level. And I've worked with some of the preparatory discussions in the Washington sort of confrontation with the INF. And you know you just kind of insert yourself into whatever circles you can find. I mean, we can't be everywhere at the same time. And we can't be magicians. And it seems to me that what you of course find, is as soon as you engage in any organizing at any level, it's incredibly time consuming for not that much reward. And you know, the few things I have been involved with have taken a tremendous amount of time and I haven't gained very much. But that seems to be the nature of the political beast these days. I think one point you said is very important is the clarification of the objectives. I got very concerned with some of the things that were going on in Seattle. And some of the things that went on in Washington. I don't share for example US Labor's opposition to China coming into the WTO. And I don't share US Labor's, I didn't share it's position on NAFTA because it seemed to me it's inherently protectionist. And actually at a certain point, I felt that the anti-China stuff was getting to sound down right racist. So at that point it does seem to me that the critical prospect, I mean it's great people are taking to the streets and I think it was significant that in Washington the IFL, CIO turned up on a Thursday and lobbied Congress about the China trade thing and didn't participate in the rest of the events against the IMF.

So again there are, as it were, so many areas where critical analysis of what is going on in the rhetoric at Seattle or Washington or Prague seems to be also constructive on our part. There

are things that we can say or say watch out. And I think for instance just here, I'd be very interested to know how much does US Labor actually try to relate to labor in Tijuana? What is the cross border effort being put in in terms of labor organizing? It seems to me that's a critical issue. If NAFTA is here then NAFTA provides a possibility to do that kind of thing. And again an organization like inSITE might have a possibility to at least ginger up that sort of issue. But on the specific question of what do you do. Well, you know, you grab whatever happens to be in your local neighborhood and work on it and see how far you can get with it.

MM: I'd like to make a brief comment. The person who asked the question is Jordan Crandall. He once asked me to join an internet group headquartered in London. And I said I can't do it because I didn't have any time. And they said they would pay me. And I said I can't take the responsibility for being paid and I refused. But then I did download all of these things that are coming in. And it was really quite spectacular. It is not global but mostly European but some from India, some from South America and so on that are extremely intelligent and extremely informed and they really cover various questions of globalization. And it does seem that these things are being read by many people and there are quite a few famous people actually. Brian Holmes and so on who I have met in Europe. Many people are participating in this. That's one. Two is Michael Heart who did participate in the Washington D.C. demonstration and was arrested, he teaches at Duke and he's a professor, I don't know all kinds of things published about 12 books and is still an assistant professor. But anyway what he said as David said, in anti-W2 movement or anti-INF and so on, it's not one unified or structured ideological body. There are many people really getting together. For example, right wingers are very much against NAFTA for instance, and the left wing is also against NAFTA. I mean, this kind of thing can't be mapped out. And yet, Michael Heart somehow seems to find some hope in this. In other words, there is a kind of strange coalition and that might really be a new form of movement. It's a very cheerful thought since I don't have too many things to hope for and that is really wonderful news for me.

SG: I also work at a university but in a different country. And it seems to me that over there is not as bleak as you explain it. We have a university that is public and we pay but not very much. And we have a lot of support in the humanities and the arts by the Canadian government. And it seems to me that if we don't think we can produce anything of interest in that direction of criticizing, understanding, debate, conversation and so on, there I don't think we're going to be able to get outside because outside is already so committified. It seems to me that what is funny about this, and it is a contradiction between the old concept of university as ivory tower, that in fact, in my university, this is the only space maybe, one of the few spaces where those kind of discussions are happening. And it's very important because they are, we are talking to young students, to a young generation. Well but is, you know it's battles over NAFTA and so on. So it seems that that's what I think museums, even if museums in my mind are not doing the job and will not be able to do the job for all the structural things that I mentioned before, there is still a possibility to have debates outside of that structure. But for certain universities it is very exciting actually with the new generation coming in. It's a very generation now than ten years ago. So I mean my hope, I'm also very pessimistic, my hope is there.

DA: There's an anti-globalism conference going on in Tijuana right now. Are you aware of that? Yeah, that you know, you might have had a tour there, I don't know.

MM: Why don't we get two or three questions first and then we'll accumulate and then we'll respond probably in order.

UF: I wanted to say - excuse my cold laden voice - that I think there are a lot of people in the room, certainly the people in the panel but some of us in the audience and some of us working from academic positions, some of us working from artistic positions who are very much in agreement with this sort of agenda put forth by Professor Harvey. I certainly agree with most of what you said. I have problems with NAFTA. We're not going to stop now to get into it because on the various levels, there are a lot of us who are already working in the process and Serge put forth a whole case study and their more likelys in process of being publish on the interrelationship between the globalization issues as it's applied in the various countries and the various locations that we study, that we work with, that we teach about, that are concerned about how globalization affects cultures. And we do have the culture of the global situation and the culture more locally. And I think it's important to know that you have comradery among many intellectuals across the country. It's not simply limited even to the people on the panel or the people in this room by any means. If we really wanted to try to do something very daring, and I'm not prepared to do it myself certainly, is how inSITE, which is what we're addressing here, can critically review the position that is taken on international relations that are going on at the border considering also that there are other organizations in California within the UC, the University of California system, which have been interested in these things. How can we make a productive meeting between ourselves and the country that's most close to us, which in fact, from my point of view, NAFTA has managed very nicely to do an exploitative job that was impossible previously. So these are my comments and I just wanted to pass those along.

UM: If I understand David Harvey right, basically what we're still talking about is capitalism, whether or not I understand him right. David Avalos, I was wondering was your use of, your choice of describing the nexus between government civic leaders and business as a community, advancing their community and trust was that a strategic use of words? Or would be it more accurate or less accurate to talk about it as a class advancing its interest? And the response would be a class-based response or a community based response.

DA: Could you repeat the question?

UM: You described the nexus between civic leaders, and business leaders and government leaders as a community expressing their interests. And I just wondered whether that was a strategic choice to talk about it as a community. Or would it be better or worse to talk about it as a class identification.

DA: It's really a class-based interest, a common interest in and I think a kind of hope, confidence, optimism that they're in position to shape the development of the region, you know, to their own image. It's interesting that we're meeting in a Spreckles building. Spreckles was one of these folks who at one time in the history of San Diego tried to shape the development of San Diego. He also at one time owned Goat Canyon, which is where Alfredo Jaar's piece occurred. His hand extends to quite a few places. At one point he ran a tourist attraction, Old Town, San Diego, where he advertised that people could take a trolley from downtown San Diego to Old Town and see Ramona's birthplace, Ramona from the novel by Helen Hunt Jackson in 1886 who was a fictional character. She never existed. But he made money showing people where she was born. And this idea of entrepreneurs, big business working with cities, working with the entertainment values of locations is something that's always been part of San Diego's history. Ramona was a novel written by Helen Hunt Jackson to do for California Indians what Harriet Beecher Stowe's novel had done for slaves. But in fact, it became quite a hit on the east coast in the late 1800's and it coincided with a land boom in California. And

people on the East coast reading the novel felt well Southern California has an identity.

There's town in north county called Ramona, which was incorporated after the novel appeared. There's National City where I'm from was a Spanish land grant that incorporated in the late 1800's as well. And there's a real benefit to selling real estate if people feel they're coming to a place that's already been civilized. And the whole point of Ramona is that Southern California was a very civilized place. The Spaniards had already domesticated the Indians. And one of the main heroes in the novel, Alessandro is so domesticated he plays the violin. And so you, the question about once again seeing class interest come together to present this region as domesticated, under control, whether it be by gatekeeper or whether it be by the property values of well run schools, formation of business, civic leaders and government it's something that you know, not only the ongoing history of San Diego, but it's the ongoing history of other places. It's interesting Helen Hunt Jackson was an artist, very well intentioned. And she did make a difference to the Indian population in California. But her book was used by developers. That's why we see so many tile roofs all around California because they were selling the image of a domesticated space to folks coming here to buy land from developers.

Judith Barry (JB): I just had a question for David Harvey and for Serge Guilbaut. I wondered in both of your presentations, which I found very interesting. Serge Guilbaut seems to believe or think right now that the museum is a fairly bankrupt structure in terms of the organization of the art world and the art market. And David Harvey seems to think that the university is also similarly affected. And I'm wondering listening to both of you and being somewhat familiar with your work, I'm wondering I guess two questions for both of you. Knowing the theoretical work that you've done in the past I'm wondering are there theories that you're both beginning to develop that provide specific analysis of some of the questions that each of you raised in your different presentations? And this is a question for each of you. And also whether older critical models from perhaps Marxism or social theory, how are you are coming to terms with those histories in light of the things that you're talking about today.

UF: Unfortunately, this is the first inSITE2000 event that I've been able to attend. And I was just wondering, I was just surprised that there was no feminist scholars. No discussion also of issues of (inaudible) in relation to globalization and nationalism and the border issues. I just wondering what else has been a part of this conference that dealt with these issues. I'm sure you've gone over this terrain before. But I was just wondering if someone could concisely tell me how this conference has incorporated issues around gender and queers.

UM: I want to just throw in a, it's not exactly a change. But it's a, let's say a focusing that has taken place at the economic, the different levels that have been discussed, the economic, the technological and the community level that David discussed. And strategies on the part of corporations but also on international organizations, World Bank, IMF, Interamerican Development Bank and others that have highlighted culture as the main site both of economic development with the kind that Serge Guilbaut spoke about, museums being an agent of economic development. And at the same time, and here foundations are very important, the solving of issues of social strife. And dealing with third sector issues or a shifting of social welfare to the third sector. This is not a US problem alone, it's UNESCO's major agenda. And for example, Latin American governments are jumping on the bandwagon of spearheading economic development and social welfare in these public/private partnerships. This has meant a redefinition of culture, which unfortunately it's the one thing I have not seen at the anti-globalization debates. I have yet to see the student's target Warner, Sony, EMI, the very media by which they receive their culture as part of the agenda of anti-globalization. So there's a

certain blindness to the way in which culture is being redefined and mobilized at the very same time that we're trying to think about what strategies to engage in. And I think that inSITE, since it does work at these levels, is a great place in which to focus on them since their traversing inSITE, and presumably we're suppose to be thinking critically about these issues. But I think that the major agenda is what is the role of culture that, is being disseminated at all these levels tying in progressive agendas like those of the Ford and the Rockefeller foundation with totally compatible capital accumulation agendas. And I think that's one of the challenges.

UM: Hi. Quite a few things have already been placed on the table. I'll add one more. David Harvey, you've written about this theme in a lot of your work but you didn't raise it today. So I thought I would and give you a chance to add it to the pot of how one understands these globalization processes. Here in this region, you talked about two themes, globalization and technology. And it seems to me one thing that both of thoseÖ(tape turn)...from control over their regions or control over their own communities or even control over their own personal spaces. This is a process you talk about in terms of territorial politics. Here in the border, we have a quick essential example of the way in which our own region is being fragmented by outside multi-national interests and that's the maquiladora or assembly plant phenomenon where billions of dollars are being invested in the region by US, German, Japanese and other foreign corporations who don't necessarily have a stake in the actual neighborhoods, the sites of the production process itself. And we see the result of that in the form of pollution, massive amounts of contamination being dumped into the border region in the form of investment decisions made from far away that have enormous implications locally. And in terms of not providing housing and services for the communities who are providing the worker, the labor force for that production process. And it's growing. And the question of how you control that is very much up in the air. So I guess the question I was going to throw back to you and anyone else on the panel is in this region, in the border region, I think one of the great dangers of globalization and technology is that on one side you have a post-modern, post-industrial metropolis, Southern California, San Diego, which is increasingly fragmented. You talk about the gated communities phenomenon. On the other side you have a developing nation where there is a sense of community but it's very strongly impacted by global investment and by the need to try to plug into that whole changing economic structure. These two forces in collision in a sense. Where does this relationship between people and their physical community, their physical spaces, where does that come in? Do you see that still? Do you continue to see that today as a crucial factor and sort of political control over bio regions, political control over communities as opposed to external international investors? That's really relevant I think in this region. I think the whole point of inSITE is to take the artists out of the museums and to put them out into the community to talk about dialogues in specific sites and specific places. That's what globalization and internationalization means in this region. It means the increasing loss of control over what the border is. What it's going to mean in the future. Whether Revolution Avenue is going to turn into a Disneyland or whether it's still going to be connected to some element of what Mexico is as a city, as a culture, ecetera. That's a crucial issue here. And I wonder how much that plays a role in your view of these two globalization technology extremes.

UM: I'm gonna completely pull down to the micro. I mean I feel incredibly privileged having been here the last three days despite the hour and a half waits at the borders getting back, not going across. But I think, just kind of circling around something I'm noticing today. Circling around David Avalos' question about which communities is being engaged and which communities are being served. And now I could be completely off base on this but on one sense I'm seeing very few of the people that I shared lunch with and traveled on the bus with over the previous two days in the room. So there's a kind of a self-reflection on the micro level

about individuating communities for discussion, communities for consumption, and communities for entertainment. And I, and this is nothing about any of the projects or the organization of inSITE, because I think it's been brilliant, but it is an issue that I think will be faced. I'm sitting beside not so many corporate CO's today as I was on Thursday, or Tuesday whatever. So that's just an observation. The second observation that I think and it's agreeing with a lot of what Serge and I have been arguing about the last couple days was a comment that started off the discussions. And that was, it's a bad paraphrase or a quote. And I can be corrected. But I think it ended up with the words from Susan that said, let's start with the artists and the intellectuals as this is so important. I think that's where museums are collapsing today. And that's that they've lost sight of the fact that most of the knowledge that you'll have in the museum walks in through the front door. And that is something that I think inSITE has a capacity to engage the kids playing handball with one of the main sponsors for the event who happened to be a handball player, fantastic. You know, and those are just kind of observations that I'm not sure that any site is going to be outside whether it's Serge's hope for the university. Or David's loss of hope, in one sense commenting about leaving Hopkins. Lost cause, just a couple of comments on that because I think it's some self reflection on the dynamics of this situation and who's served and who isn't and why.

SB: I just want to interrupt, intervene in defense of my study with the artists and explain that because there was some protests by some artists that we were putting intellectuals from universities up here and that this was excluding the artists from the discussion. So when I said, I didn't say artists and intellectuals, but I wanted the artists to be sure to be able to engage and there are going to be other weekends where we actually have only artists that are involved.

SG: I think that's an interesting point but at the same time it's a point that gets on my nerves every single time. I don't understand this division between intellectuals and artists in the first place. That's one thing. But also I don't understand because I'm so caught in intellectual working in the university I cannot be an artist. I've been an artist in 1966. But I'm not an artist the type of artist who runs around, this is my first time in cocktail parties in order to have a platform on the art market. And so I'm not called an artists but I produce things. I'm an activist in every community. I produce images. I work in the computer. I am an intellectual artist. And I think that's a point of my discussion. We should all do this. This is the time to do it and not to have those little boxes, you are this and you are that. What I'm interesting in people who are thinking, discussing, participating and fighting. That's what I'm interested in.

Jeffrey Vallance (JV): I have a question for the panel. Talking about the art, what kind of art do you think is successful in bringing about social change and is that something that artist should do?

UF: I just wanted to ask about the question, whether this panel or the audience here wants to consider the question of time. I think Masao mentioned at one point Dure, or I may have misheard because I'm having trouble hearing today. But I think it's important with an opportunity like inSITE, which is both cyclical and lasts an entire season to imagine how we might want to use this time so that we move out of the idea of one shot events, and toward an ensuing conversation, dialogue, particularly in relation to the community. And then even think between the seasons of inSITE, which are a couple of years, how the community can be consistently engaged and sustained to think about ideas of what they might want to propose to the ongoing committee about new places, new projects, where they would want to invite artists in so that they are more active collaborators with the inSITE process.

DH: Let me respond to some of the questions first. I don't think the university is an entirely a negative sight. It's just that I happened to be in a research university and research universities I think are dead from that standpoint. That's why I'm moving to CUNY where I think we can have these conversations even though the conditions are much less amendable and all the rest of it but it is precisely that it is a space where I think we can have these conversations. Let me make a general comment. Any class-based transformative movement is going to have to engage in what Shampeter Lamago called the creative destruction. It's going to have to create things and it's going to have to destroy a lot of things. Now there's certain periods of stability within capitalist history where things have been fairly cosecant. And then you go through these phases, which are incredibly destructive at the same time as they're also incredibly creative.

I think we've been in one of those phases. But in that, there's a lot of social disruption. There's a potentiality for a lot of social revolt and historically we've seen that. And in order to do that, a class-based transformative movement, on behalf of the capitalist class, if you want to put it that way, on a multi-national capital whatever, has to try to gain its advantages as much as it can by consent or hegemony or whatever else you want to call it. And therefore it has to mobilize the notion of community. It has to construct the notion of community, mobilize the notion of community in its support. And it will do that. It does it through growth coalitions in cities. It does it through you know what we call growth machine politics. It does it in all these kinds of ways. Interestingly in doing that, it can sometimes create forces, which are contradictory to itself, that is by creating a notion of community, you can start to, you know, people can start to say well we really are a community. We're gonna start to control multinational capital. We're going to tell it to bug off when it does things we don't like and all that sort of stuff. So there's all sorts of problematic there. But interestingly enough the left has to do the same thing. Historically, the left has always done the same thing.

Let's face it, it was the Paris commune, right? It was events like that. It's always been you've got to mobilize the notion of community on the left in order to develop an oppositional force. But by the same token, left attempts to do that have also been often contradictory. That a community has actually set itself up and said, "Okay all right, we're going to keep the immigrants out. We're gonna keep the foreigners out." In other words, it doesn't always work in a sort of a simple notion of community gets constructed and it's there for. But you've got to do that. You can't have politics, which does not, as it were, go through some notion of community, however it's defined. I mean, it's a vague, horrible phrase but you've got to mobilize it. And it seems to me that one of the interesting things about inSITE is that it has the possibility to mobilize some notion of community, which is an alternative notion of community to that which is maybe being pushed. But there are also forces above, which seem to me to want to push the kind of notion of community, which inSITE is also constructing.

That is some sort of trans-border notion of community. So that the CEO's from the maquila programs can zip over there and it will be a community of capital as it were. So there's a lot of contradictions there that would be worthwhile to think about and worry about. I'm not familiar enough with the local situation to be able to really offer that much serious comment on it. But it seems to me those are sorts of questions. The other thing is along with the notion of community, any class-based political project has to mobilize the notion of culture. You can't do without it. And it's interesting you see, that the World Bank didn't know that something called civil society existed 20 years ago. It didn't know that something called the environment existed 20 years ago. It didn't know that something called culture existed 20 years ago. Now, it says in order to keep this process going, we have to work through civil society, through culture, through environment and all that kind of stuff.

So it's actually talking about those things. But in doing so, it's also opening itself up to certain contradictions. Okay, you're gonna say, well, women in Tanzania are crucial to the economic development project. Well, so, okay women are immobilized and they're getting supportive and they start to say things that may be the World Bank doesn't like. It's a complicated process. And those are the sorts of things which give me hope because I think if we think about those contradictions then we actually can start to work with them in a positive kind of way. So mobilizing the forces of culture. Yeah, I agree with George, yeah, it's going on. It's being mobilized in incredible kinds of ways and there's not enough critique of it. But nevertheless, there are also certain tensions and contradictions in that process, which need to be looked at. But then when you start to go to the institutional level, institutions need to be captured as part of the struggle. And there is a constant battle to capture them either by processes of stealth that David was talking about where you take them over, or directly by buying them out, through money power and so on. So the institutions are sites which are contested. The university is a contested site. And I think we should see it that way rather than simply totally sold out. I mean my university is pretty much totally sold out, but university systems in general are, seems to me contested sites where these things can be worked on. So what I would argue here is that you know in terms of any kind of oppositional movement, however we want to cut it and what we want to talk about it whether it's environmental or it's socialist or it's egalitarian, whether it's sort of feminist and so on, and oppositional movement, it seems to me has to actually think about that notion of community, mobilizing community, mobilizing culture as part of its political project. And inSITE it seems to me has sort of caught, this is sort of my gut reaction from what I've seen in the last couple of days, caught an interesting notal point within a whole set of cross forces, some of which seem to be coming from, what I would say is a rather negative direction, some of which seem to be coming from a positive direction. And it's sort of a fascinating kind of collision, which brings me back to this sort of question what do artists do. It would be nice if you could sit on the moon and construct your art. But you can't. You're a part of this political process. You are relating what you're doing as a sort of personal vision to people, to community, to formation of things. And I think it's of major, major contribution that could be made from that arena, not in the sort of didactic sense of what well telling people directly what to do but, as it were, opening up possibilities for conversations that the sites should be, as it were, sites where conversations can take place.

But the other thing is one of the difficulties that arises about this process, and I'll just make a comment about what I've experienced the last couple days. We went to the sites. Actually a lot of the interesting things for me were the bits in between the sites. What was going on in between the sites? And even waiting for an hour and a half at the border seem to me should have been part of the inSITE experience instead of just being a pain in the ass. We should have seen it as this is what it's about. This is the daily lives of people in this region when they cross and they try to have work on one side as opposed to the other. And it seems to me, maybe one of the ways in which you could be a bit more didactic, if I could give you my impression, is try to say well, I worked at this site because this site was crucially interesting but look at it's context. Look at the spaces in between and try to find a way to talk about the spaces in between the sites. Because then I think I would have ended up with a much stronger sense of what the whole regional economy, the whole metropolitan economy, the cross border stuff is all about. That would be my one suggestion for, as it were, the way in which the events get presented in the future.

SG: I would like to say, you would like to respond directly. Yes, I wanted to say something about, I didn't get exactly what you wanted out of theory, like I am coming from something. I

don't have one theory. I mean what we have been confronted with a lot of questions in the last what, maybe 15 years. And so I have some kind of a vision of what I wanted to fight for. That's something I always try to know what I'm doing for some reason. And then I read and I integrate some discussions from, not only from art history, but from other fields. And I think that's what is more interesting in the field. But with those theories and understanding the differences among museums, what we have decided to do and to be an active participant into a reformulation of the cultural syndrome we live in, is from a university to organize a program to change the curatorial staff, world. I mean because we think that the curators most of them, I must say, have done a terrible job in the last 15 or 20 years, some places better than others. And so what we are doing is a program mixed with art historian. We have, on our campus, we have a very famous anthropology museum dealing with first nation people and peoples, and doing incredible innovative works for the last 20 years. So they are involved with us with the new contemporary art gallery, and we are going to produce curators and directors so we can create the equivalent of a PhD for directors which doesn't happen anywhere.

We'll bring in several voices from different fields so the curators that come out of the program I call them mutants. And that wouldn't go very well with the administration. I could not use the word mutants. I thought this is what it is. And yes it's like producing a series of people who are going to be dealing with two types of knowledge at least. And those two types of knowledge themselves, conflictual and so on, is anthropology, sociology on one hand and art history and theory on the other hand. And so they are going to be forced those students to participate in those seminars and so on. And in the end there is a practicum. They're gonna have to practice and understand the problems of presentation in one museum and the other one, not one or the other. And at the end we'll have somebody doesn't fit anywhere. But the hope is, the hope is by producing the kind of intellectuals that we are going to produce, the demand in Canada at least, and I know that in some part of Europe is tremendous because a lot of museums actually realize that there is need. And in this way I think we're gonna be able to change things. I know some people think that I'm naïve and kind of utopian. But boy, I've read several books lately saying that say we should have utopia so that's mine. (inaudible question from audience). So what you're saying to me that we cannot do anything. I think, I do think and also by, oh well no neutral. I do not understand that. I don't understand a thing.

Alfredo Jaar (AJ): Yeah, I share some of optimistic tones of David Harvey's comment on globalization. But I also share some of the despair of Masao. I like globalization when Spanish initiative allows the British to arrest Pinochet in London. But if we are cynical, we can see that this is just an extension of a system of power relations that exist in the world today. And the question I would ask who is going to arrest Kissinger for example? So on the other hand, it's not the CECUT Tijuana who is opening branches you know in Madrid or New York. It's a Guggenheim. So when globalization is used as the extension of global capitalism, then globalization is just one way, then I think we have to be anti-globalization. But of course when we reduce globalization to a human scale, to a different scale where we can actually dialogue, then I think globalization can work. But unfortunately I think most of the examples of globalization have been one way.

And then I'd like to make just a comment on the difficulty of being an inSITE artist, and this is as an answer to the comments that are being made about inSITE. inSITE artists are in a no-win situation. And this goes directly to David Avalos comment. If the inSITE artist comes here and brings their own concerns about their own ideas, about their own work, then they're attacked by both communities as being totally ignorant and totally indifferent to the local situation. If they try to get access to some inSITE local issue, and they try to create some sort of dialogue to engage

certain local issues, then they're attacked by all these local institutions who have been doing this work for years. So basically either way we do not win. We cannot win.

What we can do as outsiders, I would like to praise for a few seconds the possibilities of the outsider. When for example, for my specific project, I was able to talk to institutions that do not talk to each other. But who actually hate each other. And they're working with the same issues. But they don't talk to each other because of local politics. So this is at least one thing that an outsider can do. When we were installing my piece, people were crossing the border all the time back and forth. Labor patrol was far away. They didn't want to be within sight of the cameras. People were crossing the borders back and forth. These are little things that an outsider can do that unfortunately because you have been suffering and it's troubling with these local situations and because of the political local situation, you cannot do. Finally, you can also as an outsider try to create this dialogue and try to actually create a frame of reference for those who have been doing certain things becomes more visible.

For example, my case again and I'm sorry to speak about my work but that's the only way I can talk to answer your comments, is that for example, when I wanted to, I worked with different institutions, and all these institutions collaborated with this project. They invited the people like we did. So they participated in the entire framework of the project. When we showed them the invitation cards that they were participating as part of inSITE, Claudia Smith for example would say, "Please don't put my name. No one would come." No one will come. Don't use me. I don't want you to put my name. But this is an homage to you. We are supporting what you do. Yes, but she was afraid no one would come. So basically the outsider can actually create a dialogue and engage the community in certain aspects. And I think this is a value that inSITE artists could do.

DA: Yeah, I'm more interested in answering Jeffrey Vallance's question earlier. But in response to Alfredo, my intention was not to put you on the defensive. I think it's a case of both/and. Rather than having a situation of either/or. Either your way or a local way, I think it was both, I was getting at both and. And I would hope that while you were facilitating all this discussion that you also talked to artists like Michael Schnor and what kind of projects he was involved with over that six-year period. But I really don't want to get into a dialogue about that right now. What I prefer to do is get to Jeffrey Vallance's question about an example of an artist that worked effectively for social change and the follow up question, should artist do that? I think a great example is Norman Rockwell who will be exhibited at the San Diego Museum of Art who was an instrumental artist, he was a commercial artist, he was told what to do. He was told by his editors never include a Negro in any of your illustrations unless they're in a subservient position. And he never did. They were always porters on trains and otherwise. And now his work has been rehabilitated. And now he's a fine artist. And people are writing, putting catalogues together about him. And he's a very popular draw. I'm sure he'll be a very popular draw at the San Diego Museum of Art.

But I don't know if Jeffery is still here or if he gave up the ghost. I think that's an example of someone who worked very effectively for social change because he was used by big capital by advertisers to get Americans to buy into self identity as consumers. And at the same time that they were changing to reassure them that they're old values were being maintained as they purchased these products. I guess my answer would be should artists do it. I don't know if they're able not to do it. I think that they're gonna work for one class or another, for one community or another. And it becomes a matter of you know, in what way are they being instrumental? Right now, people who own Rockwell's are using them. And you know, sometimes the only good artist is a dead artist. Now that he's out of the way, there's a lot of

money to be made in those Rockwell's. And there's a lot of people involved in circulating those images, putting together the catalogues and having the exhibition.

DH: Can I just add a footnote? I think there's a certain advantage sometimes of being in a no win situation. I've often been in it and it sometimes is a very creative point. And it seems to me that what you're talking about is some of the creative possibilities that can come out of that point. But this then raises another, it's a sort of a funny kind of issue, which is the relationship between the process and the object or event. What's been interesting to me here is that every time I've talked to one of the intellectuals who's produced an art object if I can put it that way, it's actually I think been more interesting talking to them about the process than about the event and the object. And this creates a problem because, as it were, the bus tour is focused on the event and the object. And it was only through sort of occasional engagement with people that I learned about the process. And the process was fascinating. And it dealt with I think exactly the contradictions that you're talking about. And I think it's very important to confront those. But I think that that is the point where you're involved with people in a particular way and have managed to create, as it were, conversations across boundaries that never existed before. Sometimes in local political engagements I've been involved in similar sorts of things where it's possible to do those. So don't, don't think of a no end situation as a negative. It sometimes has these positive sets of possibilities.

JV: (inaudible question from back)

MM: We did talk about this as of kind of comment or suggestion for inSITE. That is if inSITE has some kind of an in between conversation even in the bus. Step on the bus and then talk about what they have seen for example, if the artist can join in that would be marvelous. They're on the spot in other words. Instead of having a conversation like this, blend this with each event. That might be much more interesting for both, the ones who created those things and those who have observed them. That would be a much better exchange it seems to me. Now about this outsider and insider business you have been talking about earlier, I, this is another one of those very few hopes but who knows, we may all become outsiders, every one of them, including the corporate executives. Now this is a question of environment. I know that David doesn't like to talk about this crisis, the paranoid catastrophic view. But I do have this catastrophe, an environmental catastrophe as a matrix of metaphor may nearly seriously work for our benefit.

That is one place that no one can escape from and which is becoming very serious. And why can't we make the environmental dead end as a powerful source of our common metaphor, which you can all share and use. And then at that point, I don't think that the inside/outside distinction would no longer be there, meaning people might for the first time begin to think about doing something together, every one of us. Until that happens, we're talking about these contradictions among even politicians, statisticians and so on. But these contradictions are perceived by the hegemony powers. And they make use of these contradictions as much as the politicians who try to make use of hegemonic contradictions. So that I don't think we'll have much hope for me anyway. And so I thought the kind of environmental disaster as a common goal might work.

Michael Krichman (MK): I mean, I'm fascinated particularly with what David Harvey was saying about his perception of being on the bus and that being probably the most important or perhaps the most important part of being, not being on the bus but those in between moments and how you get through it. And I'll say that as one of the organizers, I think that this weekend

has probably been for me the most, or it seemed the most unnatural part of this entire process that we've gone through. And probably one of the things that, you know, to the extent that I think that if there was an effort to certainly change the model that inSITE itself had established in the last several version. It's very difficult to deconstruct the model of sort of touring something that really should not be toured in this way. I mean, the whole notion for me of 50 people going to see Mark Dion's piece for example in the estuary, which needs to be, you know where you want to really spend a couple of hours by yourself is very, very difficult.

And Valeska Soares as far as, I don't know if Valeska is here. She had a suggestion and one nice thing about inSITE being longer this time at least this time is we have the opportunity to change now. But Valeska said that what really we should do is construct a tour of each work to the extent that they exist in the physical space that coincided with, that could almost be put together by each artist saying, "Here's what I went through. Here's what was interesting to me along the way," which might be the frustration of crossing the border. Of course we tried to give a little of that by hiring an inefficient bus company. But other than that, I'll take that as a huge compliment. We're very proud of that because we didn't want you to miss the experience David.

But anyway, I think it's a very interesting question because I do think that this, that the works, the projects that have been developed this time are fundamentally different than anything we have done before and it is because of a process that was set in motion that is different. And of course, we're changing as we go along. But it's something that I think that we need, we will take up immediately because I think it can be interesting in the future.

MM: Well, it's now 4:25. So why don't we now wrap this up? And why don't we talk to each other informally. Is that okay?

DA: Well, there's one more question.

MM: One more? Okay. That's the last one though.

UF: Inaudible.

MK: May I? Well, I think that the whole question of documentation is something that was taken up at the very first moment when we had the residency in July. And I think that it's a really interesting question. It's something, you know, that we have tried to as projects have been developing and as we've tried to deal even through the web, which is something that we've been experimenting with a little bit. But I think the whole question, I mean for me there, and again, that's the side of this I'm on, but what went into Alfredo's piece, you know, that whole process not only with you know, with community groups but also with the Border Patrol and the Federal Aviation Administration and the people that blew up balloons at two o'clock in the morning and whatever. It's not just you know, it's very significant as part of this. And I think in a vast majority of the projects, the story of all that is very interesting. And I think it is one of the things that maybe poses some possibility. I'm not holding out that inSITE as an institution is going to change this world. But I do think it's been interesting the way that the artists have pushed our organization to in turn push agencies and push government and push cities to do some of these things. And it is completely behind the scenes and probably very boring. But it isn't boring to us.

SG: But it is also important for us as the viewer so that has to be made palpable, because if we don't, that's the issue.

MK: And Masao is absolutely right. We have not done that in publications and we haven't had the opportunity maybe to continue on a very rapid basis to construct some of this through the web. But you know, I think that I mean even on the web you should push Alfredo Jaar and you should get that story whether it's through documents or some sort of narrative. And then of course in the catalog, which needs to be a very different kind of thing this time. So the answer is we'll try.

MM: All right, thank you very much.