

I is for Institute Podcast

Episode 7: Featuring Marie H el ene Pereira, Linda Goode Bryant, and Marielle Ingram

12/13/22

Marie H el ene Pereira

I think it's part of the whole story of ours. You know, like, this whole process has been all about transition, I believe, you know, like, and not just, you know, professionally, like going from one institution to the other. But I see even personal transition, you know, like in terms of really realizing, understanding and working towards what's important, you know, what is making us grow, what we are together. I think, you know, like, we've been going through all these questions together when we're doing infrastructure. You know, it wasn't just the infrastructure of the arts, you know, I think it was infrastructure for humans.

Alex Klein

Welcome to the final episode of the I is for Institute podcast. My name is Alex Klein, that Dorothy and Stephen R. Weber, CH. E. 60, Senior Curator at ICA, the Institute of Contemporary Art at the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia. In this series, you have heard from our colleagues working in contemporary arts organizations around the world about their individual perspectives on the work they are doing to shape and imagine different institutional models. At this critical moment when museums and their infrastructures are being reevaluated, these dialogues highlight pressing concerns for artists, art workers, arts institutions and their publics. We invite you to continue these conversations and to access the archive at our website, www.iisforinstitute.icaphila.org. The I is for Institute project began in 2016 as a prompt to take a step back from the many incredible exhibitions in ICA's history and to extend think more broadly about why we were called an institute in the first place. What did it mean when we were founded? What does it mean now? And how might we reimagine it in the future? But the I in I is for Institute also refers to the many individuals that shape institutions and who have the capacity to change them. So in tandem with a deep dive into our archive, we also reached outwards to colleagues to reflect on their work in their local contexts. Through these conversations, we engaged two long term thinking partners, which both culminated in impactful institutional exchanges. The first took place through an invitation from the Kunsthalle Lissabon in Portugal to relocate ICA to Lisbon with our exhibition in 2019, Trevor Shimizu: Performance Artist. The second exchange, with RAW Material Company, and initially proposed in 2017 by its founding director Koyo Kouoh culminated with ICA hosting the ninth session of RAW Academy around the theme of infrastructure and under the direction of artist, curator and filmmaker Linda Goode Bryant with writer Marielle Ingram. RAW Academy is a Dakar based residential program for the research and study of artistic and curatorial practice and thought, that is rooted in the question: How do we learn from each other? For the night session of its Academy, RAW relocated its organization to Philadelphia with two of its staff members: Marie H el ene Pereira, Curator and Director of Programs and Dulcie Abrahams Altass, Curator of Programs. Over the course of seven weeks, we worked alongside an interdisciplinary roster of faculty and 11 international fellows to try and imagine an alternative infrastructure for the arts. And this special final episode of I is for Institute, we reunite with Linda Goode Bryant, Marie H el ene Pereira, and Marielle Ingram, just some of our many collaborators from RAW Academy at ICA: Infrastructure to reflect on our five years of

dialogue, and what we learned from our experience together. We also had the opportunity to connect the work between RAW and ICA with Goode Bryant's larger project as the Founder and President of Project EATS and her groundbreaking exhibition currently on view at MoMA, Just Above Midtown: Changing Spaces, organized by Thomas (T.) Jean Lax with Lilia Rocio Taboada, that revisits the gallery and culture the Goode Brian fostered at Just Above Midtown or JAM from 1974 to 1986.

MHP

No, I just want to hear from you three. I heard from Dulcie. How was the JAM show and experience, Linda because we spoke about it a lot. You know, when it was in preparation, when we're in Philly. And then like seeing it happening, it was amazing, of course, but I felt the joy. I felt the pride. You know, I felt like so many good feelings only from pictures, you know, from seeing pictures and videos. So, I wonder like being there what it was for you and especially for you Linda? I think it was an amazing celebration of JAM, yes, but of yourself, of who you are and what you've brought to all these artists who worked with you or these curators who worked with you. And I think for us, Dulcie was saying that, you know, seeing this celebration was just amazing after having spent two months with you in Philly thinking about infrastructure, and you know, just learning from you and your experience. And I wonder what it what it was for you, Linda? For you too Alex and Mari to witness it, because I think it was a very, very strong moment.

Linda Goode Bryant

I didn't have forethought in terms of what kind of reaction I would have. So it literally happened in the moment. And it was utterly unexpected. And what I'm talking about, and I don't have really great words for it, but I can describe it. And it was this: all of us who were involved at JAM, all the artists who were fortunate enough to be there, none of us had seen each other in 40 years. It was as if we had had breakfast that morning. It was as if no time had passed. We were just as in sync at the opening as we were when we were all living together. The only word I have for it-- it's a kind of love I've never experienced, what we created as a family. It was just really special. I am so appreciative for that. Really, really amazing. I didn't expect... I don't know Dulcie told you about the Senegalese drummers.

MHP

The drummers! When I saw it, I was like, oh, yes! I saw I saw some videos online and I was like, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes. And I saw one part where you were dancing with Thomas.

LGB

Thomas can dance Sabar. So he's taken lesson but he would never do it. I was like, "Come on, Thomas, show us some sabar. I want to know how to do it. I can't do it. How do you do it?" So there we were, they (the drummers) were playing. And I said the only way I'm gonna get Thomas to do this is to be a complete idiot and try to dance. He really got into it. It was it was a side of Thomas that was so great to see. Because he's, you know, he's really buttoned down in certain ways. And it all came out. And at one point, I'm gonna tell you-- the goal was can JAM at MoMA be JAM? JAM was in the house. MoMa did not exist that night, JAM was in the house. And it was most apparent when the playing of the drummers in the dancing, I could see the images of my ancestors in the rafters having a ball just smiling. Like you're

smiling right now. And going, "Yeah!" MoMa was transformed. MoMa was completely fucking transformed.

AK

And I mean, it continues to be so I mean, you are there stewarding the show. I mean, I think that was what was so impactful. The other day, when we came to visit for a tour, you were like, "I'm just here, I'm here all the time. I'm seeing things through, I'm animating things, I'm leading programs. Like I am present." In the way that you were present in Philadelphia, I imagine. Probably even more so. Yeah, I mean, I actually think, Marie Hélène, that this feels like the start of the conversation, because so much of the journey that we were on together was also leading up to this big question that you had about how could relationships come into a space? How could they change the space? And just even you talking about? Maybe Thomas like dancing, like that was also like letting the institution fall away for a second. Mari, how are you feeling?

Marielle Ingram

In general or post opening?

AK

Because it was a lot going from the ICA project into JAM. I don't even know if you, if you two were even able to have separation because there was a moment even when like, the MoMA team was coming down to ICA and like interviewing everybody, and looking at the installation and having lunch with us. And there was a way in which you were just going from meetings to meetings and Philadelphia to New York, the way that you're talking about like the joy of seeing everybody in the room, like I felt that joy when you all logged on to Zoom just now. And we only work together for the, you know, the three years that we were working on this project, but I can only imagine just what a trip of time and space and emotion it must have been for you all.

MI

The transition, it's true didn't really exist, because we're working on both of the projects at the same time, really. But I think what became really clear was the differences between ICA as an institution and MoMA as an institution, and how the people within those institutions operate. And how as somebody kind of working alongside in a close way that I think is unique, even even in the MoMA case, I think is unique compared to how artists work with other institutions, usually, I would say. It made us think a lot about like how to bring everybody along for the ride in working on a project and really make it a collaborative project. And I guess makes me think more about the nature of collaboration between artists and institutions and how how that can work or how it currently works, I guess. Just because as you know, when we were in Philly, it felt so much like a space that I was kind of welcome into and working a part of, even if I don't actually work at ICA, just because of the way that the people in the institution engaged with us. That's something that was very in contrast at the beginning of those projects, and then started to kind of like mold a little bit with the way that we ended up working with MoMA.

AK

I think that's a really poignant observation in terms of thinking about the way that institutions, I think, kind of came into relief. You know, when we started this project five years ago with Koyo and Marie H el ene and Dulcie, who we have to acknowledge is unfortunately not able to join us today. So hopefully, we'll be able to have a part two sometime, because her voice has missed, is that we discussed this idea of, of not just having a kind of colonial import export model, but really thinking about what would it mean for one infrastructure to inhabit another so that we would both see ourselves in a different light. There's a way in which when one institution inhabits, another institution or organization, whatever word you want to use infrastructure, you would kind of see yourselves more clearly, as much as you would learn from the other organization.

MHP

I think there's also something about, you know, that which is you'll see yourself more clearly as an institution, but I think you also see yourself more clearly based on where you coming from and where you exist, you know, like, as everyday institution. The idea of the Academy, as it started was that it would be a program that will also take Dakar as a center, like, Dakar is like one of the main protagonists in the in the program. And in this session, we just thought about it saying, "Okay, what will the academy be if it is hosted somewhere else in another institution, but also in another city?" And I think that those are like, very strong observations, you know, that we had when we came to Philly, where there was a very strong desire to engage with the city, and we engaged with the city in the program, but I think even moreso outside of the program. Like outside of the everyday session, like, we engage very deeply with the city, you know, like being with the fellows going to different places, following the music scene, and all the dinners. And I think that was very interesting, you know, like to witness, but we never took it as part of the learning process as such in the conversation that we had into the session. And I think that would have been something very important to have like, as part of the conversation about this session, this idea of infrastructure in Philadelphia. You know, like, on top of that, as well, like, just the whole learning about JAM, and also Linda's work, you know, once the exhibition opened, I was like, 'Oh, God, this should have been part of the session.' The fellows witnessing, the JAM show should have been part of the session. Because there's something so like... you can talk about it. But it's so much different when you are brought to a place where you you have to experience it. Like your body has to navigatelike all these stories are the people who they're like that energy talking about Linda saying that MaMA disappeared and JAM was there even though you saw each other fourty years after, I would have loved the fellows to see just as a way of also witnessing the energy. Because you can talk about it, but when you're there, it's different. I believe they saw it online, just as I did, but I believe that it would have just added like the perfect element to the whole session if they had a chance to see it.

LGB

I just think following up on what both of you said, I have become more aware of what I meant when I had the tagline for Project Eats, you know, "Art, Food, Life." And the art part: people have been saying like, what is the art, what is their what is art? And the experience at ICA and the experience with the show at MoMA and then reconnecting with people where we built this thing and hadn't seen each other in a long time. There's something about how that family got built. And like Bill Valerio said, Bill Valerio in

Philadelphia, who was an intern at JAM and now is the director of one of the museums in Philly. One of the first things he said was how people at jam hated each other and they loved each other. I don't know what those words are and respect doesn't seem like enough, but there was a connection and etc. And for me Project Eats, while we grow food, while we make plant based meals now, while we are involved in providing support so residents in the community can operate these farms and these plant based food enterprises in their communities. Bottom line, what Project Eats for me is, let's take whatever the elements of those relationships were and put them in communities and see what kind of ties develop, what kind of relationships form that make it possible for communities to have that kind of connection as neighbors with one another. Because I think it's from that and the activation of all of our imaginations, and the ability to create and transform those ideas into something tangible for other people to experience is key to the kind of change we talk about all the time, like the social and economic and human changes that we'd like, environmental changes-- all of it-- that we'd like to see happen. It really, I think, is tied back to both experiences at ICA and MoMA. It ties back to us just being human with one another again. We've gotten so institutionalized, so programmed, so prescribed that we've not only, you know, there's something that's eroding our ability to be human with one another. But even more than that, we're losing sight of the very things that are in front of us and within us. We're losing sight of the importance of our imagination, our unique ability, given the other species and what we know of them today, our unique ability to create inlays from our imagination, so that we have even stronger ties to the things we make. I don't know, I'm rambling on here. But that's what Project Eats is about: How can Project Eats be better at being human, and developing and building and creating the kind of relationship that JAM has been able to sustain all these years, for over 50 years?

MI

I'm going to chime in, because what you're saying, of course, is so relevant to something that I actually talked with Sarah Workneh about. And Sarah Workneh was a faculty in the RAW Academy. Sara has this joke, I don't know if she's made this joke to you, Linda, that you, me and her are three versions of the same person. The conversation we had was exactly this. And so I'll relate it to something that Alex posed as a kind of prompt. So Sarah and I were talking about JAM, we were talking about what happens when you do things that are extremely radical, like JAM, and what happens when you put them in the space of a MoMA, when you put them in the art historical canon, how you do that, how that translates, how that reflection is important for people to know that a space like that existed in somebody like Linda exists, but then also how it can never be a replica, how it always just be kind of like a trace of something. And that's one part of it, which is a good thing that there's going to be some distance, right? Because JAM itself was such a special place and was really a constitution of people, right? And so to try and replicate it would be completely impossible. What also happens when you do exhibitions or when people think about nostalgia, right? It's something you talk about Linda, that can happen. And we're talking about how nostalgia often results in thinking about spaces as utopias. And so Sarah and I were talking about the problem of a utopia and how what the JAM show does especially with the wall of bills is to try and disrupt this idea that something was utopian about the space, right? And so the problem with a utopia, I was thinking, was that for me, it doesn't capture precisely these relationships. And what it doesn't capture about the relationships is this question of agonism that Alex poses in her prompts, right? So for everybody who doesn't know what agonism is, because I didn't know the exact definition until I googled

that this morning before this recording. Agonism is a political and social theory that emphasizes the potentially positive aspects of certain forms of conflict. And so JAM itself couldn't be a utopian space because we think about utopia is we think of something being perfect. It always works every time there's no nobody's fighting, nobody's crying. You know, nobody has to share a single porkchop at Linda's house. That's not the utopia right, or at least what we think about it as. To bring this back into the question of the academy. I think, I wonder if institutions think about utopia as a kind of way of operating? Like there's something inhuman about utopia. There's something that doesn't allow for relationships in utopias, and so how we can think about: One: I guess, should we think about institutions as being able to support these kinds of relationships that you're talking about Linda? Like, can an institution be a space that supports humanity? If it's something that's tied to like a system, something that works perfectly, something that operates to a kind of end goal so that's like a roundabout way but those are some of my thoughts.

AK

So many things, Mari. This was the project at ICA was in connection with this is I for Institute idea, the idea of individuals, of humans, powering these organizations and maybe making them more human and also having the agency to do so. You know, we talked a lot with Linda about boxes leading up to the academy with the fellows, with each other, what boxes do we put ourselves in? I see that also as the metaphor for the institution or the infrastructure that we allow to, you know, shield our vision, control our bodies, control our minds, what boxes do museums create? What did they shield like the rats running up and down behind the walls, as Linda was talking about at MoMA? And I was thinking a lot about how Linda, I think at one point, you said, this isn't this wasn't the academy that I imagined, but it's the academy that it needed to be. And for me, that was really bound up in the connection to a success being bound up with a kind of idea of failure. That an institution, that we that we collectively, were part of a project where an institution was made vulnerable. Vulnerability is connected to the unpredictability of humans and relationships. So everything that you just said, really resonated with me Mari. I think it's also that positioning of antagonism versus agonism, and that agonism is a place where like, humans are maybe productively coming into conflict, but still working towards something. And I saw that in our organizational relationships leading up to the academy. And then when we actually embarked on the academy, itself. On the topic of boxes: do you feel that there was a moment when the boxes were penetrated? Or do you think that we actually just reinscribe the boxes, with this kind of hindsight that we're in right now.

MHP

I believe they were already existing boxes when we arrived, you know, trying to have this academy together and work towards a collaboration that we prepared or started working on Alex, just as you said before, for years, you know, and really, how to meet as institutions and how to create, like a collective moment of mutual learning in Philadelphia, but you know, really bringing RAW and RAW spirit in there. So I think that I would consider ICA as one box, already, I would consider Philadelphia as one box. And I would consider RAW as one box that's coming in. Really thinking about the first conversations that we had, and how we would like to weave all this together until we get to the point where we invited Linda. Thinking about, you know, her ideas, experience and all of that. And I think that we've managed to

penetrate different boxes at different moment. But I also believe that we've left leaving the boxes there, you know, somehow this transformation that happened, but I think that the transformation is not to be seen yet. Or maybe it's being seen, you know, it's a whole process, it's happening. For us, RAW, like, when we came back, you know, we're talking with our colleagues here, etc. And we're telling them that the way in which we are used to work and the way in which we've managed to create this, you know, relationality, between us as colleagues, but we call ourselves family, and a lot of that is great. But it's also a box, you know, because you get to a place where that gets challenged, and it gets challenged to a point where you're like, 'Okay, what am I doing?' You know, and we had this conversation with Dulcie when she was like, 'Oh, I missed our colleagues, I think that if we were more, you know, like, the experience would have been different, all of that different'. Not that the experience was not good, but it's just that I think the intensity of being hosted and hosting, at the same time would have been different, maybe if we were like, more of RAW coming in. But I believe that, as well, the energy that's been put by you, Alex, made, it work to a point that we went all the way to the end of the session, despite what the session was, you know. In terms of conversation, in terms of intensity, in terms of who came in, in terms of how we engage with the city and all of that. So I believe that having boxes or creating boxes is not a bad thing. It's about the box that you create, and like, while, you know, having all these relationship, putting the human at the center, and all of that is great, it's also a way of creating a box. But this is a shield, you know, like it's a box that is to protect those who are there as individual you know. Like it's a box that allows for those individual to exist as individuals. Before we talk about the institution in an abstract way, you know, like it's a box in which we share energy. It's a box in which, you know, we share a vision, we agree and we disagree as well, in a very mindful way like, you know, we can disagree without really turning each others down. We can disagree while still learning about out the process of saying, 'Okay, actually we disagree. Let's see how we do. You know, with how we move forward?' I think we've created boxes, but boxes in which we've put ourselves as human at the center, you know, and we learn from each other in that sense. And I don't know where that fits in, like between agonism and antagonism, I don't we just want to remove it from there and put it somewhere else.

LGB

I love your phrase, putting humans in the center, because it really is about that.

MHP

Can I add to that quickly? Because I think that I'm thinking more, you know, like, when we were there, when we weren't there. In the moment, I don't think that we've had enough distance, you know, to be able to process or think about what it has been, you know, like to do this session. And I think that we are still in the process, or at least I am, you know, like, still in the, in the process. Like, I'm, I'm still trying to process everything. And I was telling, I can't remember who, sometimes something happened, I go, 'Oh, my God, we spoke about this, oh, God, this situation happened.' The learning, like in front of me, because I don't want to put it on you like, in front of me, the more I go, the more I realized that, oh, this is a conversation we had, oh, God, I saw this before. You know, like, and it keeps coming. And the more we talk about it, the more we get reminded of how much it was a learning. For instance, one of the one of the example I wanted to give is when James came. Because James came to came to Dakar. We invited him and he came I mean, we invited him, he helped us, but still, you know, came to Dakar and then we

hosted him with Cami, his partner. And you know, at some point he came to us and said, "Do you know what? I think once needs to come to Rome to understand what you do." Because he was like, "I'm sitting here, I'm like, these RAW people, what are they talking about? He became like, all abstract when he started working with Alex, and then the session started and all of that. But to him, it's when he came and spent like, a certain period of time in the space with something going on seeing the people that he understood what it was as a place, you know, like what type of box it was, actually, to put it like that. And of course, you know, like, it's a bit of utopia in the sense that not everybody can come. So what we have is to talk about it, but it's always different. When you when you experience it, like when you come it's it's never the same. And I wonder how we can, through the work we do, convey that experience and share that experience with others in a way that will touch them, you know, beyond words. And I think that for us organizers of the session, we had that opportunity because we've been speaking for so long and sharing and see, you know, for instance, at some point Dulcie had like a Post-It on which she wrote I can't remember but that's something that Linda said, you know, well... It is saying, "Do you want to die on this hill?", like, translate it easily, you know, and then she had it on her computer. And she was leaving in the office with that saying of Linda for months, until we go to the session and came back, you know, like he does that, like the whole process does that. And I think that the two months in Philly wasn't enough, for instance, for the fellows to be able to get that, you know, like, get that experience and go with it. But we did somehow because you were lucky to take all this time together. I believe.

AK

It's true, I think we all agreed that having that extra that the pandemic time that we had, while traumatic and difficult and logistically complicated for so many reasons, also gave us the benefit of developing a deeper relationship and working through things in advance of the session. I mean, having that two years over Zoom, was just incredible, to forge the relationship together. And I think you know, Mari, you talked a lot about a kind of a another term being built between RAW, Linda and you and ICA and I think that's what the fellows actually stepped into. Because it would have been amazing, for example, for the ICA team to have gone to RAW as well, for us all to go and to understand it. And I think that would have been very impactful for my organization to come along because it was abstract for them as well. So not just the fellows, but for my colleagues, you know, what is it that we're doing? What are we embarking on? The way that, you know, everyone was such a structural part of it, but very few people had a direct access to it in that way. So maybe to shift gears or maybe to continue the conversation, we're talking a lot about the kinds of impacts on the organizations, but in the actual academy itself, the prompt was to really reimagine a new infrastructure for the arts. And Linda, I'm wondering if you could reflect a little bit on that drive to propose that what you proposed pre-pandemic, which now feels like so visionary and anticipatory, even though it's actually just, it is the work that you do, and have always done, how that desire was maybe met with the reality. And the experience.

LGB

It's interesting that you asked that. Because I started in 21, I became a mentor, I agreed to be a mentor at Columbia for the MFA students there. And I bring that up, because so much of what I'm learning through that mentorship from them are some of the boxes that they are in, you know. The box of being

an artist today means that you go through certain MFA programs or BFA programs and certain MFA programs, and you come out of those MFA programs. And you then take residencies and/or, you know, post MFA program temporary positions, and then that allows you to somehow move into a gallery. This list of things you do to get a gallery and become successful. And they're following that path, it's harder, I find, in doing the one on ones, it's harder for them. I would say, I don't know if they're as connected to their work, and what they're making, as they are connected to making sure they're checking all the boxes at the highest level possible, given the competition around them. So that they get in that residency program, they get in a Whitney artists residency, that the, you know. That they're positioned to be successful, I think they're clearer about that than they are about what drives them, what their their own visions are, and passions are, and their need to make things. And so I think, on the heels of doing the ICA, I'm just, I'm just, I feel even more, there's a crisis in creativity in the world today. Because as art is commodified, all forms of art, no matter what the medium, is increasingly commodified. There's been an imbalance in understanding. There's an imbalance between creativity needing to be supported, and not just financially, but supported in terms of the ability to be creative and imaginative. That somehow that's been shut down through the boxes artists are living through now, or creators living through now. And I would say that in terms of institution staff, you know, art institution staff. It's very similar, we lose sight of the reason that we started this thing. And it becomes us checking all the boxes off, we're making, we're generating this much revenue, we're doing this, you know, blah, blah, and everybody is living in a box. And there's such an atmosphere of discontent, frustration, disappointment, and yet people keep doing that every day, you know, and wondering: this wasn't what I thought it was, when I walked in the door. I'm interested in doing this work because of a, b, and c, and X, Y, and Z is why I'm here. I'll kinda like project managers. I mean, I feel like curators, and more and more project managers and their curators, so that, again, it's shaping how we're creative. It's shaping how we're supporting creativity, in ways that I think are really based on the model, the economic model of producers and suppliers. Artists aren't fucking producers and suppliers. That's not what we do. And yet increasingly, we're perceiving what we make and who we are as a producer and a supplier to a market, an insatiable market. Anyway, going into the MoMA environment was part of that as well. I'm more concerned about how we, we reclaim what it means when we decide that we want to make things that are classified as art, and even that. Those are boxes. You know, we classify art in boxes. Yeah. Anyway, I think there's more of a crisis than I thought there was when we were doing the academy. Let's put it that way. And how to respond for those of us who are connecting to why we are doing what we do and our desire to support creativity and the public's ability to engage it or people's ability to engage it, other humans to engage in. It's something I ponder all the time every day. Because that's why I'm here. I believe in creativity. I believe in the human imagination. I believe in our need, our desire and our need to communicate with one another and communicating through art is one of the most, when it's not a product, is one of perhaps, I'm gonna say, perhaps, one of the most honest forms of connecting with one another.

This somehow is also related to the conversation that I had Sarah this weekend. What you're talking about Linda, I think, you know, not to always go back to this reference again, but just reminds me of the kind of general problem or phenomena. I'll leave that up to you guys to debate and also listeners to decide whether it's just a phenomena or a problem of basically the professionalization of artists, right?

That it can be like a profession. So what you're talking about is going into what is kind of like going to med school. You do X, Y, and Z, you get into medical school, you get your residency, and then suddenly, you have this job, right. And like being a doctor, there's a lot of risk involved, there's a lot of debt incurred. But you know, hopefully, you'll be able to kind of do it. And so it has this kind of professionalized track now. And what Sarah and I were talking about, and I think she disagreed a little bit with this. And I disagree with it too, because it is more utopian or kind of, like purist view of what an artist is. But to me, an artist is somebody who refuses to accept the kind of current conditions under which we live. It's somebody who creates despite those conditions, in spite of them and somebody who has an orientation towards the world, that means that they're going to use whatever resources they have to create. And that goes against a lot of what we think of and a lot of the ways in which we operate in society. And so because to me, an artist is like a political entity and a sort of philosophy towards life, it means that there's always gonna be change in engaging with an artist. And so I guess I'm thinking about how institutions themselves are stagnant entities most of the time, and how they can be rebuilt to support those kinds of changes. So in a way, like the kind of ideal institutional, as I'm kind of thinking out loud, and maybe we can do this as kind of an exercise would be somewhere that is so flexible, that it's able to be malleable to becoming itself like a new type of space, every time an artist engages with it. And in some ways, that's what we're talking about with this project, right? Like, we're talking about the ICA and RAW coming together and us coming together and sort of trying to build a sort of new type of institution at the hands of an artist who's kind of imagining what that could look like. And so I guess, I'm just wondering, if there's a way we can see institutions really being able to do that. And of course, making commodities is not compatible with that type of change and flexibility. Precarity is maybe not quite the right word, but being okay, with some precariousness, like, this is what you were talking about Alex with success and failure. And so maybe it's also about redefining success as failure or something like that. I tried to make it short. But again, I kind of went off, so I'm gonna stop.

AK

But as always, it provokes so many other thoughts. And I saw everyone kind of vigorously nodding their heads, in reminds me that, you know, one of the things that we did, because the structural level impacts everything that we were able to do in the galleries, then I think that's, you know, also one of the things that was really made visible for me is really when you stripped everything down, like seeing the harshness of the structure in the US of how you get paid, and all the bureaucracy. But one of the structural things we did is we had every one of the fellows sign a form that said they were not making art in the space. And that allowed us as an institution to give permission within that space for all kinds of things to happen, that are art, for sure. But they didn't have to be treated as such institutionally. And I think that that is that is actually just such an interesting mind blowing observation. And also just thinking to the great lengths that I think collectively, we went to, to try to make what we thought was a permeable space where, you know, basically carte blanche, anything could happen in that space to a degree without dirt, obviously. But you know, as opposed to maybe a place like MoMA or the way things normally happen in ICA's galleries, it was very open and flexible. But as soon as the fellows came, they saw the boxes that we had created. And they couldn't let go of the institution, even to the efforts that we went to, to try to create something different and a space that maybe was like some weird, like Switzerland zone or something. The specter of what was outside kept coming into the room. And so I

just want to also just mention that the academy is specifically posited as not the MFA program. It is specifically a different culture than maybe the university that is outside of the academy's walls in Philadelphia, the University of Pennsylvania, for example. So just really curious to hear everyone's thoughts on, on that.

MI

I want to return to what you said about the art, Alex, because that's super important. Maybe we talked about that before, but I didn't. It's really blowing my mind right now. And it goes to one of the questions that Linda posed for the academy too, which is around value systems, right. And so basically what the fellows did, and what you did by allowing them to sign that contract is to sort of say, like, basically like what I'm doing here doesn't need to be ascribed to value within the current art system, right. And so by allowing you to essentially be value zero, like \$0, you're able to sort of navigate and do more than if then if something were of value, right, and the way that we think about it. And so that reminds me of Linda's question around new value systems. And maybe she can articulate it better than I'm able to now. And then also something that Linda talks about a lot with JAM, which was having no opportunity costs. Which is kind of a larger thing, like opportunity costs look a lot different than art objects being registered by the registrar. Bad lingo, but you know. But one way you do that is also by saying my work has no value. And then the third maybe JAM thing I can bring into that is thinking about the kind of classic David Hammons works, right? Things that are made out of hair, things that are made out of barbecue bones, things that are trash, right in our society, and the way that we value them, and being able to create art out of something that you say has zero value.

AK

Just to add to that a bit, so it doesn't just sound as a negative. This was a structural creative problem that was solved internally, with colleagues to think about ways to support and care because I think when value comes in, at least in our institution, it's very, it's not just are we going to get sued if something gets damaged? It's our job, first and foremost, is care-- curators is to like as caretakers, right? So what does care look like in that respect, so care in this instance, meant actually not creating an insurance valuation and meant creating a space for things to happen. And for a champagne toast to happen in the gallery, and not be collected at the doors you went in during the reception.

LGB

So I'm going to just build on that because the MoMA thing like took me to a whole other, it was probably one of the hardest things I had to deal with during the MoMA show. And it was an installation, when I was told, we cannot touch the work. There are handlers. I have never curated a show where I can't move the work around. Like that's how you become intimate with the piece. You know, it's like you pick it up, you move it, you look at it, you look at it next to someone else, you put it real close so they're kissing, you are getting intimate. That's what informs the story that's told to that installation. And here moment said you can't touch a thing. You have to ask somebody else to move it. And then if they knew that you needed to move in another quarter inch have them move in another quarter. It is so methodical. it is so programmed that I mean, you can see I'm having a visceral reaction right now. I don't know how from a curatorial perspective, you can have the relationship you need to have at the works in

the show without fucking touching them. And yeah, did we do it at MoMA? I mean, it was it was like I had to learn a whole new language. Like my brain, how to make, you know, how to envision that installation was bizarre. You're not in the space until it's time to go in. Like that was another thing: working with these fucking models, or drawings, two dimensional drawings. We had to work with me Mari. Two dimensional drawings of the space, what the fuck. Your lived space. That affects how you move in a space, you know what I'm saying? I can't move in a two dimensional drawing of a fucking space. But the thing that I'm animated about is that no one thought through that, what's another way to ensure your insurance company is not going to in your contract because he's got broken. And because someone handled it, who was not an art handler, figure it out. No one is essential for it to be as impactful as effective, as amazing as the work can be and say, Okay, how do we work around the rules? What we do is let the rules force us to work to work around them.

MHP

I think there is something about because, you know, like that proximity you talk about with the work is the same. The proximity starts in the creation of the work. Like there is a strong proximity between the artists and the artwork itself, you know, like and how it's done and all of that. And it seems like the institution now is completely erasing that possibility of proximity between the artwork and someone else that is not the artist. And that is funny because when you exhibit the work you exhibit it so that you can see how it might affect someone who comes and see the exhibition, you know. Like what's the conversation that happens there? And most of the time, it's a silent conversation, you know, like, how do you encounter it? I think even more, so now you tend to see, I've seen this before, in a museum center, for instance, where they have these cords that are installed, like at the minute you approach it, that it goes "beep", you know, like, it beeps, and it's creates all this stress for the viewer, which I think it shouldn't be doing, like an exhibition shouldn't be doing that, you know, like, now became like, this whole place where you walk around, and you are stressed, because you don't know how close you can get, you know, some people, they have to be very close to really see and all of that. And I think these are, you know, rules that we can remove, you know, ourselves who have institution and who work with exhibitions. And who also learned to do it differently. Because I think it's about that as well, like, not even learn it's it's to dare to do it differently. Because most of the time, we're like, 'Okay, this is how it should be done'. But okay, how can we do it differently? How can we do it in a way that this proximity you're talking about is still there from from what you were saying, Alex, the fact that the fellows were invited to sign this paper saying I'm not doing art, I think was also a way of saying that, I think what we are doing is more important than what you see, a value should be. Because there is that as like, it's not about money, it's not about insurance. It's way more than that. And I think like of course there was a practical level to it. But the main like what it really felt like is that 'okay, we saying that in the frame of the creation of a new infrastructure, we are putting this here and we are putting it in conversation, in relation with, you know, whoever is coming, like between us who are putting it there, and the others, and we are removing all this value system that tends to you know, like, put all these rules and understanding of what it should be.' And removing, you know, what it actually is in the moment from it. Of course, just talking about how all the conversation brought us back to the institution, it was all about the institution, I think there is anxiety that comes with the fact that an institution says here is the space, do what you want to do. It's not easy. And we realized that we realized that in the process where it was

all open, do what you want to do, you know, like, 'Okay, this is what we propose. You think it's not good. Okay, challenge it.' But then it didn't happen! You know like in the beginning, you're like, "ah!" There's some type of, I don't know, if it's fear, I don't know if they were like okay, what's going on? Is it a trap, you know, those type of things. Where it was just all there, you know, ready for you to just challenge it and take it to another place if you feel like it should be in another place. But yeah, I think the idea of the institution does that, like it's embedded into how we think about it. Really, like we think that okay, the institution, it can change. So when it says, actually, it's open for you to do what you want to do. It's a trap. And it wasn't, you know, it was really that was the exercise.

MI

To complicate that a little bit, even though, you know, I was there as well. So I know, I know what you're talking about. But I was thinking a lot about this, as we're talking, what we tried to do was essentially, to do what you're saying, what Alex is saying, right? So like, if I stick with my definition of an artist, as being somebody who refuses to accept the current conditions of society, we essentially said to them, "build a society you want to see in this space." But if an artist is somebody who refuses to accept conditions, then no matter what we did, the productive thing might have been for them to find the rules. And tell us here are the problems and there has to be something that's productive that comes out of that, ideally. But there's something about, and I go back and forth with myself about this, because this isn't actually how I typically relate to situations. But I do think about whether or not it's always helpful for people to have something to push off against. So the further the less constrictions we made, the more of a challenge it became for the artists and curators to deal with that. Right. Because if things were easy if there was an easy thing that they could rub up against, and things might have moved faster, but it made it more difficult for us because we took away so many conditions. And so there had to be the stakes kind of get higher, the more difficult it is to rub up against something if that rub is sort of where things are productive. So I almost wonder if like the question, and this isn't what you're asking, but the question of success or failure within that is kind of moot because the fact that there was so much of the rub might have been because we we did what was supposed to happen, right? Like it was supposed to be that there was there was a kind of agonism. Because that's sort of what artists do. But then again, I disagree. I sort of disagree with that. But just to make to be devil's advocate, should artists always be upset at institutions? Like should, you know, revolutionaries should always be pissed off at the government? If they're not, then we don't make any progress. And so maybe institutions kind of just have to suck it up and adapt as necessary, and know that they're never going to be kind of the friend of the artist, right? Like, what if institutions, were friends of artists, then we might actually lose a lot?

MHP

Yes, Mari. But, Marie, what if we are the institutions like the individuals who were there in those sessions, they were all institutions themselves, I believe. Into like, a kind of bigger institution. And I wonder how then the relationship with themselves as institution kinda existed in the space of the session. And, you know, I'm saying this, because, you know, we all come from somewhere, we all come from some realities, you know, we all come with a certain experience, and like, the constellation of all of that, I think, makes us an institution in a way, you know. And I wonder how then, you know, the meeting of all these institutions happened, like how it can manifest in a space like this. And at some point in this,

Dulcie reminded me, as James said that, for the whole time where he was there, he had the impression that he was battling with his internal infrastructure. With all this conversation, and you know, all these prompts that came all these ideas that were shared. And I wonder how, in a meeting like this, our internal infrastructure plays a role into what is happening, you know, like, collectively, and that's what like, I was saying earlier about, you know, like the building of a human infrastructure. And I think it's very linked to this, you know, linked to how all of us meeting there, we are all infrastructures and how, like we meet in a space where we have to learn together and learn, as well, a lot of things and, you know, we have to bring together or maybe we go through the growth, I don't know. There's so much that happened in that sense, that I believe that, you know, the institution, which is the ICA that hosted us, didn't just host us as a session or our as a program, but hosted us as human infrastructures that came with a whole lot of baggage that also needed to find space in this whole constellation. And I have the impression that a lot of times we've been battling with that as well, like battling with our own positions as individuals on top of our position as institutions, all of us and yeah, I don't have an answer. You know, I don't even know if it's a question what I'm saying, but it's just that this has been there, you know, like this reflection has been there, and it still is here today, you know, and I think it will accompany us in the long run. But in the moment, maybe we didn't really have like the clarity of mind to be able to address it, or I don't know, put it into words in an effective like, kind of constructive way, like in a conversation.

LGB

You know, it's interesting, where the conversation has come through what you were just saying, it takes me back to what was the common denominator of everyone who found their way to JAM, what was the common denominator? So what was the thing that they shared as a resistance point, and it was that no one would show their work, except in the community they lived in. No one would show their work outside of that. No one in the art world would show their work and none of us had money. And so maybe that was one of the things. I mean, I don't know, it's a light bulb that just went off. That made the difference because I keep saying if jam was able to be created, why do we have to break it down, break down, break it down, but just in what you were saying like we all our own boxes, and etc. What is the box we share? And maybe that's the work is identifying the box we all share. And if we do that, then what's what's being suggested which is: we are by nature resistant to blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, like all of that falls in line because we do have the resistant point.

AK

For our listeners. You know, it's also just worth reminding that it was a moment at ICA where everyone was coming back to the office for the first time. And you know, like every organization, I think arts organization, we had lost about a third of our staff who had gone on to other jobs, et cetera. It was a moment within our institution, when we were feeling a little fragile about being back together, being back in the organization. And there was a way that the academy helped us reacclimate towards each other and towards the building. But it was also kind of difficult at first. And I know that I personally felt that you know, really, quite viscerally, I brought it up a few times, feeling both, you know, really feeling a sense of a shift in my own body of being in the academy room, and then being up in the offices taking care of day to day things. So when Marie Helene talks about that individual perspective of infrastructure, I saw that in myself, and it was something that I found, you know, actually really quite

heavy, going through the the academy together was really, you know, wrestling with my own, I guess, invocation in the institution, but also the necessity of that invocation to make it all possible. And that was, it was a really just interesting, visceral experience to be thinking and being both kind of in and outside of, and then also, as the conversations continued, understanding that necessity of having a kind of an idea of an institution. And in this case, via ICA, to kind of rub against, to resituate everyone's own position. And I know you all probably had different versions of that yourselves, in the work that you were doing, and the way you carried yourselves into town and out of town and thinking back to Dakar and to Philadelphia. And, you know, one of the things that I think we also talked about learning together was that words don't all mean the same things to everybody. And it's such an obvious and obvious point, to make the term like infrastructure or a term like hospitality, or even a term like being an artist. These definitions mean different things to different people, and people hold them a different way, and actualize them in different way. And I think that we really saw that coming into tension and fruition in the academy. And I'm wondering if I see some nodding heads, if you have any thoughts on that. That was one of the things that I really took away from the experience.

MI

Yeah, I mean, this isn't so so direct, but it just, it kind of rhymes with what I was thinking about response to Linda's query around the boxes we share, and how that played out or didn't play out in the academy. So I think for us as kind of a team working to produce the academy, we shared that we all wanted the academy to happen. And for it to be the best for the fellows that was possible. And that was very clear to all of us. It wasn't like we ever spoke about, but it was just something that we all really aligned with. And so we worked well as a team because of that. And so then when I think about the the fellows and our working with them, ideally, it would have been that everybody wants to build a new infrastructure, that assumes that the infrastructure isn't working for everybody currently. And it also and so this is another way of saying that, but it assumes that everybody's relationship to the current infrastructure is the same. And so that maybe loss of translation question is related to that too. How we all kind of relate to that infrastructure determines whether or not we want something new or what parts of it, we'd like to pick and take. And so I wonder, I do think that everybody benefits when there's change to certain infrastructure, even though you know, it might not seem that way at first. And so I wonder if it's about defining for all of us, sort of what our discontent is. And maybe it's not something that people are able to sort of define, right, going back to what Linda was saying about, you know, young artists and young curators, there's something that we're all kind of discontented by, but that maybe we're not able to totally name and so getting this definition, going back to what you're saying Alex, as a shared one might be a way forward. But we sort of also tried to do that right, by starting with the question of what is the problem with the current infrastructure? And so maybe it's a different way of phrasing it. So it's not a problem writ large, but it's kind of like an individual, individual box, individual institution relationship to that larger infrastructure.

LGB

You know, Mari, following up on just what you were saying, I think I have more clarity, too, about the individuals that were most consistently resistant to engaging in imagining the infrastructure, were the individuals that most benefit from it. So there was the assumption that everyone thought there needed

to be a different infrastructure. And even if they thought that it is likely that they benefit enough from that infrastructure, it wasn't worth the effort.

MI

I agree. But I think the job is to make people-- and' this again, goes back to more kind of like organizing, honestly, like organizing social movements, which is making even the richest person realize that this system doesn't actually work for them, right. Like even the hardest person to organize, you have to go you have to talk to them, and you have to get them to vote in the way that you want. Because it's not about what that person is rich, it's not about how they benefit if they're white, Black, Hispanic, whatever. It's about getting them to understand that because the system doesn't benefit everybody, it actually benefits no one. And so in the academy and with, you know, young artists today, I feel like even though people think they're benefiting, we're all not benefiting in some way.

LGB

I was just gonna say that, that could have been an interesting conversation, in hindsight, for the group, and early on. Because remember, within the first I don't think I'm exaggerating, 20 minutes of us being together on that first day, because we only met for a short period of time in the afternoon. Within 20 minutes, there were members of the group that were saying, tell us what the rules are. And you know, to have this discussion, it's just opening up space to really end the distanc. To think about it. If we could replay that, if we could rewind that, I think that that would have been a great time to engage in how does the current system benefit you to just start to get people to think that so that a discussion can go from there to if it doesn't benefit everybody, it's not of benefit, no matter how much you--what you were just saying.

MI

Yeah, and it's also going back to your thing. The benefit thing is also then a rethinking about values, right? Like that's what it is because, of course, something can benefit you in one way. And then if you switch the way that you think about value, and what a benefit is, then maybe that thing actually doesn't benefit you so much, right? So this is like these example of courses, thinking about money, which is something you've talked a lot about having money can be a benefit, but it also can be detrimental in some ways. And so I feel like it's rethinking that that kind of value shift, I guess. But of course, we're all sitting here having organized the academy, doing this podcast, in hindsight, from our kind of, like, tower of like, joy and love that we have for each other. But you know, having the conversation around, how do you benefit from the current infrastructure also allows you to be really honest, right? Like, even if you're somebody who wants to be super radical, you want to burn the whole thing down. Okay. But also, you work at X, Y, and Z. Like, that's okay. It's okay to be a contradiction, right. And I feel like that's also something that I noticed a lot today, the desire to be like a totally coherent person who is one way all the time. And it's okay, I think to be, you know, somebody who benefits from the system but wants to change it and acknowledging how your value system is, or how you benefit from something allows us to all be honest and get on the same page. I think so.

AK

Ding, ding, ding. I mean, just like, the big question that I actually came into this with was, are new organizations possible? Are the old ones that we have rehabilitatable? Are the new organizations, do they need the old organizations to survive, we're in a moment where we're all talking about institutional infrastructure change across society at large. And what you're demonstrating is also the way that these things are also really tied into each other. Even the new radical propositions are still somehow attached to the older infrastructures. I'm just really curious to hear from all of you, your thoughts on institutions, organizations, your individual work after this experience, which I think for you, in particular, is probably compounded by the experience that you've also had, with MoMA and JAM coming into real relief with each other. And Marie Hélène, I mean, thinking about Dakar and Philly. And maybe we'll talk more about our own kind of personal transformations as well. But there's, that kind of feels like the big ghost in the room, in a way. Because there are certain identifiable things with ICA that are different afterwards. And they took the entire team to do them. So it's also really important that I mentioned all of the colleagues that I see that got on board, and were part of the conversations, and brought ideas to the table, and participated in the academy, whether it was having lunch, or our director, Zoe Ryan, saying yes, dismantle the lobby desk, and let's see what happens. That happened and it's still not there. So real visible infrastructural change has happened, we will never be the same from the experience. So I throw that kind of back out all to you.

MHP

Definitely. Where I want to start is just what Mari said, the definition of value. So how do we define value? Because I think it has like so many different definitions. And I was gonna say before Alex asked this question that even I mean, the idea of creating a new infrastructure, I think, should have been put in plural like we creating infrastructures like many of them, it's not just one infrastructure that works for all of us. And we realize in the process of the academy that depending on our goals, where we coming from our infrastructure will be different. And especially also, depending on where we are creating these infrastructures. But I think that one of the main investment for this institution has been put in the people who are being brought as a starting point, and also in the value of those people like value in terms of ideas in terms of what they're seeing what they've been putting forward, and also where they come from. As a starting point, the one of the responses was, Okay, I'm coming with with a tribe into brackets, which is that I'm coming with people who might trust and who also trust me in this, but then going into place will be different, different in the sense that the whole process of whatever you imagine happening, will be either long or short or difficult, you know, like, it won't be easy. That's for sure. But I think the main question then is okay, why are you doing it? Who are you doing it for? One of the aspects that has been that have been put forward is the idea of, like, the world we live in, in the multiple worlds inside it, you know, and how do we highlight the multiple worlds we are from? How do we don't we just put everybody in the same box? So how do we create a space that is open for everybody to be able to come and recognize itself? In it? You know, based on its programming based on, like, what's put forward based on what are we talking about, based on the politics of our day, like nowadays, like, based on so many things, and I believe that, in itself is a great proposal to which we all have a role to play. But the process, I know, will not be an easy process, you know, I'm part of those who wants to give it a try and see where it leads us. But But of course, you know, like, there is just coming back to the internal infrastructure, you know, like, there is, there is some work that's happening internally, like, and I'm

talking about myself, you know, in terms of thinking about, what type of energy are you producing? And where are you putting it, you know, and how does that energy contribute to something. And I think that's very important. Moving forward, you know, looking more and more at what is happening, you see that, okay, this is not going to be easy, but it's possible. And there are a lot of things that are happening already that are showing us, okay, this is possible. But then let's see how far we get with it. It's also about opening doors for voices that we believe should be heard, and that are not necessarily voices that are validated, you know, by the academia, or, you know, like all these kinds of hegemonic institutions, you know, but, but voices that are very valuable and needs to be heard and from which we should learn. And it's possible, like there is a possibility for that to happen.

AK

And I think you just spoke really beautifully to the connection between the institutional transformation and the individual transformation and how it's actually hard to separate them. Sometimes it just makes me think back on all the wonderful faculty that we had during the academy, and also how Gudskul, who came to work with us, were so transformative in terms of the relations between the people and when I went to documenter. This summer, seeing such resonances with some of the things that we were also working out in space between people just really thinking about other models that privilege relationships. Not that they devalue making, but they're not putting the pressure on what the end result is going to be. And maybe it's something about the process and the relationship, which was I think, something that was very palpable at documenter. And also, I think, to a certain extent, in our group, with whether it was always joyful kumbaya--it wasn't. But that's also part of what that is. And I think that's what Mari was was talking about earlier.

MHP

Yeah. Because you spoke about Gudskul. And I think it starts even before Gudskul, you know, like we look at around Rupa, for instance, US row we've been working with Rangoon since 2014. And we've been working really towards and learning together about the places of human and human being into everything we're doing, right. And we've seen, you know, what they've proposed for this documentary, you mentioning, the role of good school, the role of so many collective from all over the world, and you know, how that has disrupted the whole institution of documenta without going into details of, you know, like the politics that are embedded in it, but just the very fact that they've taken this to a whole other level in terms of conversation. And in terms of understanding this type of institution and the role they play, and also how they neglect most of the time, this value that is the human value, you know, in the manifestation they have. And, you know, we might say everything we want for this specific document, but this is a document that, that we will remember it in 10 years, in 20 years, wherever, you know, like, it will stay in our minds, you know, and I think that's, that's very important. And having in there, you know, having seen just this energy before, like the whole shitstorm started, but the energy in the city, you know, like the energy of the artists who took part of it, like the visitors like, there was something so wonderful about, you know, just being there, you know, and with this witnessing the proposals and seeing how people are united around their own practices, but in a very human way, I found that very beautiful, no matter what happened, and no matter how we speak about it today, you know, I think that in 10 years, this is something that we will remind ourselves, like, the art historians,

they have a lot to write, you know, no matter where they coming from all of them, you know, really all of them.

AK

But it's such a key point that you mentioned that you would start a conversation with Ron group, back in 2014. I mean, I think it was really struck me was that if you went to the entrance of documenter, they mapped out the timeline of the relationships and the whole journey. And how did how did our academy start, there was a wall with the timeline of the relationship of RAW and ICA, and Linda and Mari and the fellows. So just to say that these are continuing dialogues and relationships, and I've mentioned this before, but our friends at the counselors have been talking about the exhibition being the place where the relationship gets made public, and that everything afterwards is the maintenance of that relationship. There's some synergy there in terms of thinking about these things as living. And the way that Linda talked about being reunited with people she hadn't seen in 40 years, because that was all really based in a relationship instead of relational conditions, right? It wasn't prefaced on like a checklist of objects. Before the relationship, the relationship is what generated everything.

MI

Given one one learned, they were takeaways very hard, because there's so so so many. But I think from this conversation, maybe one thing that I'm left with is, I think maybe a little bit of what Marie H el ene is saying, which is, I tend to approach things almost in a way that's under institutionalized and kind of under boxy, right? So I, I think about people as being basically humans, and so wanting to interact with people all in the same way, no matter if they're, you know, the chief curator at the mat, or they're like the front desk person, right. But I think one thing that real and what you've been saying this conversation, my thinking back to my time at the academy, is maybe being a little bit more sensitive to my own positionality, though I don't need to live within it, if that makes sense. So recognizing kind of what position I'm in, and how people are seeing that, even if it's not what I want them to see. Because oftentimes, I think for me, the space of the institution is not something that I inhabit very well. But working on this project, and working on others, just thinking about how I relate to it, and how people see that, but then also still trying to relate to people as directly as I can.

LGB

What I'm taking with me is that learning is organic, and like I've learned so much from this conversation and learn so much before this conversation, and this conversation is going to cause me to learn more, and there's nothing better. I think it's the best nutrition in the world is learning.

MHP

I think the same like the learning has been happening throughout the whole time we've been in conversation, like really, I think from each time we met, even if there were like the tense budget meeting, you know, like, each time we met, I learned something. And I think, again, you know, like, the most important for me, and that I would like to pursue is to always look at how much everything we do should be done from us as human beings to other human beings. Like really? How do we, as people be together, learn together, no matter which language we want to put in that, you know, no matter where

we coming from, it's really about the human relationship, experience and encounter. And yeah, that I take that with me very strongly from all this time.

AK

Maybe that's what people actually want from institutions that that maybe they're not under any illusion that they're going to dissolve and be the radical subjects of our imagination, but they do want them to be human. They want them to listen, and they want them to understand they have the capacity to learn. To learn more about RAW Academy at ICA: Infrastructure directed by Linda Goode Bryant and the I is for Institute initiative, please visit our website www.icaphila.org. We look forward to welcoming you in person at ICA and invite you to join us for upcoming exhibitions and public programs. I'd like to thank Jason Moran for the original music, and my colleagues at ICA who helped make this podcast possible. Derek Rigby, Audiovisual Coordinator, Jill Katz, Director of Marketing and Communications, Ali Mohsen, Digital Content Editor, Olive Martin, Social Media Coordinator, and Brittany Clotney, Public Engagement Project Manager and Administrative Coordinator, as well as collaborators former Spiegel Wilks Curatorial Fellows Tausif Noor and Gee Wesley. Thank you for listening.