



KAPITEL III
DER KUENSTLERISCHE VORSCHLAG

CHAPTER III
THE ARTISTIC PROPOSITION

Die Unterhaltung, die ich mit John Cage, Allan Kaprow und Benjamin Patterson hatte, wurde im März 1967 auf Band aufgenommen, dann nach Boston zu James Pfeufer geschickt, um ausgeschrieben zu werden. Ich bin nicht in der Lage gewesen, das Ausgeschriebene mit den Originalbändern zu vergleichen. Ich muss mich bei meinen Freunden entschuldigen, im besonderen bei John Cage, der darauf bestanden hatte, dass der Text eine Aufzeichnung von allem enthalten würde, was während der Unterhaltung vor sich ging, im Studio von Alison Knowles (Pausen, Stille, Gelächter, Husten, Scharren, usw.....).

George Brechts Beitrag besteht aus einem Brief, den er von Villefranche nach New York sandte.

John Cage ist natürlich John Cage.

Allan und George waren seine Schüler in dem Kursus in der New School, den er 1958 abhielt.

Eine Aufzeichnung von dem, was in diesem, nun berühmten Klassenzimmer vor sich ging, wurde durch einen anderen Schüler, Al Hansen in seinem Buch "A Primer of Happenings", Something Else Press, New York, 1966, aufgezeichnet.

Allan Kaprow ist der "Erfinder" des Happenings.

George Brecht ist der "Erfinder" des Ereignisses.

Benjamin Patterson ist der erste unter den Afro-Amerikanischen Avant-Garde Komponisten und Künstlern.

Düsseldorf, November 1969

In diesem Monat habe ich dieses Kapitel erweitert. Ich hatte ein Interview mit Diter Rot, und dann mit Joseph Beuys. Diter Rot ist Schweizer, und mein guter Freund. Durch seine Dichtung und seine Bücher ist er der "Erfinder" seiner selbst. Wenige Gebiete der modernen Kunst haben nicht seine Spuren gefühlt.

Joseph Beuys, Lehrer, Aufführer, Künstler, ist der "Erfinder" der "Deutschen Studentenpartei", und auch vieler anderer Dinge. Obwohl wir uns schon seit langer Zeit kennen, konnten wir auf einen Dolmetscher, Kasper König, nicht verzichten.

Last but not least - Dorothy Iannone, die amerikanische Malerin. Sie hat mir ihren Beitrag in Briefform zugeschickt. Sie steht allein zwischen 6 Männern. Doch Dorothy ist ganz Frau, und ich fühle, ihre Worte haben das Gewicht von 5 anderen Frauen.

The conversation I had with John Cage, Allan Kaprow and Benjamin Patterson were taken on tape in March 1967, then sent to James Pfeufer in Boston for transcription.

I have not been able to check these transcriptions with the original tapes, who are still in Jim's possession. I apologize to my friends, in particular to John Cage, who had insisted that our text include a record of everything that went on as we spoke together in Alison Knowles' studio (pauses, silences, laughing, coughing, shuffling, etc...).

George Brecht's contribution consists in a letter he sent me to New York from Villefranche.

John Cage is, of course, John Cage.

Allan and George have been students of his in the course he gave at the New School in 1958.

A record of what transpired in this now-famous classroom has been given by another student, Al Hansen, in his "A Primer of Happenings", Something Else Press, New York, 1966.

Allan Kaprow is the "inventor" of happenings.

George Brecht is the "inventor" of events.

Benjamin Patterson is a foremost avant-garde Afro-American composer and artist.

Düsseldorf, November 1969

This month, I expanded this chapter. I had an interview with Diter Ror, first, then with Joseph Beuys. Diter Rot is a Swiss, and my close friend.

Through his books and poetry, he is the "inventor" of himself. Few fields of modern art have not felt his imprint.

Joseph Beuys, teacher, performer, artist, is the "inventor" of the German Student Party, and many other things as well. Although we've known each other a long time, we had to communicate through an interpreter - Kasper König.

Last but not least is Dorothy Iannone, the American painter. She sent me her contribution in the form of a letter. She stands alone among six men.

Dorothy is all woman, tho', and her words, I feel, carry the weight of five women's.

JOHN CAGE

Filliou :

John, the question I have to ask you is, just as in the field of music you mentioned it seemed impossible to get rid of harmony and counterpoint, and yet, once it was done, the whole field of music was changed..... What would be the equivalent, for instance, in the field of education.

Cage :

Well, one would have to look at the educational system and try to see what its nature is, so to speak, essentially, when it does not have any of the structures which have been placed over it by means of social agreement or conventions. One of the first things that you would get rid of in education that has nothing to do, obviously, which education, is all the business of bureaucracy, which would include forms and the filling out of forms, certificates of degrees, prizes, anything that would indicate that something has been accomplished, or in fact, anything that would indicate the manner in which the thing should be accomplished. Education should become a field in which it was uncertain either that anyone would become educated, or uncertain that they were not educated before they entered the experience of becoming educated. Buckminster Fuller, whom I visited recently, said that when a child is born he is, so to speak, completely educated. He has in his body all that is meant, ultimately, by the word education. He doesn't need anything else than be born. Now I think, however, you might say that about education - a sine qua non - the basis of it is not just the one person, but two people. Now, we know from George Herbert Mead, the American philosopher who lived in Chicago, that one person can, on occasion, be considered as two people, so that you could have the notion of two if you only had one. He gives it the term "I and me" and he says that in each person there is, so to speak, a dialogue going on. Filliou:

You know, I have a piece that consists in my

coming on the stage and giving orders to myself. I come on the stage and say "bow" and I bow. "Say 'hello' to the audience," and I say hello. "Smile," and I smile, and so on - it goes on for the whole performance.

Cage :

Well, we know this fact of education: namely, that one person can do it, and we use the term self-education. However, more and more nowadays we have the sense of society as being, in itself, an individual, if you can conceive, for instance, of the extension of the central nervous system by electronics, thinking in terms of McLuhan, that we share one mind; that when we have two people as you and me, that we haven't departed really from our being together, so that when we conserve it's as though one mind were doing this. In a sense, what we want to have in the world, it would seem to me, is an education of society as though it was one person.

Filliou :

Rather than handed down from above.

Cage :

The great error in the old educational structure was not only what I have already mentioned, the bureaucracy, the giving of degrees and everything, but on what basis those degrees were given and the bureaucracy was established: namely, the handing down, not of a dialogue existing in one person or in a number of people, but rather the introduction of a third body of material which, theoretically, was to be transmitted. This enables people to correct one another. For instance, if I pick up this printed information and my intention in educating you is to get this information into your head and when you repeat it to me incorrectly I then don't give you a degree. I only give you a degree when you repeat it to me as it already is. Well, this we now know to be a waste of everyone's time, because this doesn't have to go into my head in this way in the first place. I don't have to give it to you. If you want it for some reason you can pick it up somewhere else.

Filliou :

Education as we know it now reflects an or-

ganization of society that goes very, very far. Like in France, the whole educational system was created by two political and military dictators, Louis XIV and Napoleon, and it does not correspond to anything anymore.

Cage :

I think, first of all, we need a situation in which nothing is being transmitted: no one is learning anything that was known before. They must be learning things that were, until this situation arose, so to speak, unknown or unknowable: that it was due to the fact of the person coming together with other people or, so to speak, coming together with himself, that this new knowledge which had not been known before could become known.

Filliou :

In very young people, pretty much self-contained and who know everything, very often it is not a process of learning, but remembering what one knows from the very first. So in this knowledge unknown, in what way could people participate or perform, as I call it, so there is exchange, a certain awareness of this knowledge?

Cage :

I don't know exactly what to say - except that when a person is having such an experience it often gives all the appearance of arising without any rational explanation. Actually, it must occur through connections being made which one had not previously made, either between things which were somehow, so to speak, in the head - things that came into the head from the experience. This is, no doubt, augmented when the other person is not in the individual but is actually another person. A greater quantity of information exchanges or experience exchanges immediately come in the more people there are, but that is exactly the situation we are now living in - one of an abundance of ideas and experiences.

Filliou :

So we must have not only a dialogue but a permanent exchange.

Cage :

Now, I don't think we need do anything else than make an empty canvas upon which this

education can be painted. We don't need anything more than an empty space of time in which this music could be performed, if education were music. And when we have now an empty canvas, or an empty space of time we know in the areas of art that we don't need to do anything to those in order to have the esthetic experience, - they already are that. So, we could say of the educational experience, or the learning experience, that we do not have to consciously learn anything in order to learn something.

Filliou :

If we don't have to consciously learn anything we don't have to unlearn it.

Cage :

We are inevitably, each minute, wherever we are, without lifting a finger, without anything being transmitted, unavoidably being educated.

Alison Knowles :

Then what do you call the whole body of technical information that is necessary?

Cage :

That we can more and more leave as a kind of reservoir in the hands of our machines and computers. We know that we can do that. We know that we are approaching a situation where we don't have to remember a single thing, because these machines remember perfectly. We don't even have to have books around because we will shortly be able to get books that will far exceed any library that we can accumulate, through world libraries. But we also know that if we are going to approach those books of the past, all that body of information, that even in the area that we might call research or scholarship and somehow disconnect from creativity - that we can't so disconnect it from creativity. History itself only becomes history when we create it, and as many histories as there are minds and uses of minds can be, so to speak, invented and useful. There can even be from a rational or factual point of view, an incorrect history - by the fact that you had it it would become a true one, a correct one. This was the great point of Suzuki's in connection with the history of Zen Buddhism,

that there were many Chinese and Japanese scholars who spent their time arguing about when such and such a patriarch actually lived, etc -. Suzuki said that whatever we say is true. If we say he lived in the 9th century, that is true. If later we say he lived in the 11th century, that is true.

Filliou :

I accept this. But, you see, we arrived at this kind of knowledge or awareness - most of us have been trained to fit into society as it is now, where first you get into lower echelon of the system and then, if you deserve the rewards as they see fit, little by little you replace them and you have one more round, and a few people of themselves go through the process of unlearning what they have formally learned and challenge the system itself. My very precise question, John, is this: it seems to me what you say implies a complete change of society itself, that is, not education alone. Is this correct?

Cage :

Yes. The entire social structure must change, just as the structures in the arts have changed. We believe, I think, since this has been accomplished in the arts in this century, that it is an indication, at least in the minds of the artists, that there is a need for it to happen in the other fields of society, particularly in terms of political and economic structures and all the things that go beside, like educational structures. The thing that need not so much a change of structure as a regenerative set of changes of a physical rather than revolutionary nature are the utilities: the distribution of water, food, the use of transportation, communication. Those things can change to accomplish more service with less input. This appears to be the pattern necessary in view of great increase of population.

Filliou :

More service with less input of human labor?

Cage :

Less resource input, which would include world resources and labor. We see a trend in this direction of doing more with less and it becomes also urgent to do that.

Filliou :

As an artist, I like McLuhan for pointing this out. Artists have an awareness of the great trends that are developing. There is again a problem of transmission of this awareness, particularly as long as society is dominated by people who insist upon the acquiring of the same skills that allow them to take over the system.

Cage :

Well, I'll show you. It will happen in all sorts of ways. One way is this: speaking of education, changes in education and how they will come about - people will notice more and more, as they already do, that within five years after you get a PHD from a given American university in a particular field, all the things that you learned in the course of your education are no longer of any use to you. This is due to the fact that changes are happening more rapidly than they happened earlier, that the techniques involved, the information useful, etc...., are not the ones which you were taught. So, one will become skeptical about what the function of education is, and ultimately, what one will have to do, is to give each individual, from childhood, a variety of experiences in which his mind is put to use, not as a memorizer of a transmitted body of information, but rather as a person who is in dialogue, A, with himself and B, with others as though they were him, too. Now, there is near Chicago at the present moment already a school without partitions. There are a large number of classes where, in the study of any one subject (I do not know how they teach it, because I have not visited there - but say they were still teaching in the old way of transmitting information) you would at least be hearing, since there are no partitions, not only the information in your subject but the information in the adjacent subject. Now it is conceivable that there would occur at this point, even if you didn't change your seat, what McLuhan refers to as the brushing of information against information. Now, when you see this that is being transmitted to you as being nothing but information and when you see a different kind of information on the other side of the table,

and when in your mind these two things come together, very often a third thing, or even a larger number of things occur in your mind. Your mind invents or creates, so to speak, from this bruising, and it is there that we need to be if we are going to be learning something that we did not yet know - where the learning process now takes place outside of us, obliging us to imitate it, the new knowledge only comes into existence in our heads.

Filliou :

What I had in mind was a kind of pioneer world that should be in the hands of artists, where we will create, and by creating, make claims upon this part of the world. I call this the idea of permanent creation. There would be no difference between students and teachers. It might be just as a kind of availability or responsibility that the artist is willing to take, but anybody might make suggestions about what kind of things might be investigated or looked at and I think it might be in a spirit of fun at times, but many problems may be solved by the way. One principle I have developed is to get rid of the idea of admiration, which is implied in our whole society - the idea of authority and admiration and receiving prizes is implied. You might be, or I might be with fifty young people - if we engage in the type of dialogue that you have in mind, the whole group might come out with, by brushing information against information, all kinds of answers.

Cage :

Right.

Filliou :

Specifically, I am trying to think of ways of suggesting that in every school, at every level such kind of an institute should be set up, without any other part from the establishment, students might be willing to come to this thing and meet some artists and they may raise questions themselves and everybody try to do something about it.

Cage :

I think you have to begin, quite conscientiously, with the notion that education is taking place without its being any effort, with-

out doing anything - that would already be a step in the right direction. I give you two instances. In the 12th century there was a great man in the time of Dante and Meister Eckhart, but he lived in Tibet, and his name was Mila Repa. He studied, first Black Magic because he wanted to get even with his mother's relatives who had been cruel to her - and he was able, from a distance, to bring hailstorms down on their property, but at the same time not to have the hail destroy his mother's property. He was able to bring buildings down when they came together for dances and killed whole groups of the evil relatives. After he accomplished all this revenge and Black Magic activity, he then went to a teacher of White Magic, to study White Magic in a spirit of repenting, you know. Well, that teacher taught him absolutely nothing for years - just let him live in the house and eventually Mila Repa became very impatient, because he was of the opinion that he wasn't learning anything - nothing was being taught to him. At one point he became so alarmed that he secretly left the teacher and went to another teacher, but the first teacher was clairvoyant and knew where he was going and what he was doing and everything and sent a message, mentally, to the second teacher telling him to refuse to take Mila. So Mila Repa was obliged to come back to his teacher who looked as though he were teaching him nothing and by this process, of not teaching, he ultimately educated him, and he became one of the greatest leaders of Tibetan spiritual life.

This story occurs over and over again in the annals of Zen Buddhism - the student who comes to the teacher and begs him for instruction. The teacher says nothing - he's just sweeping up leaves. The student goes off into another part of the forest and builds his own house and when he is finally educated what does he do? He doesn't thank himself: he goes back to the teacher who said nothing and thanks him. Its this spirit of not teaching which has been completely lost in our educational system.

We had a great man in the United States,

Thorsten Veblen, who wrote a book called "Higher Learning in America". The original subtitle was "A Study in Total Depravity". Why? Because the educational system in the United States is under the control of all the things to do with politics and economics. All of these things which are transmitted as though they were the things we had to learn are, in truth, means to force us into the accepted social structure. Therefore the educational system as it is at present distorts and enslaves the mind.

You want to know the basic thing I am interested in? The basic thing, I would say, is to do nothing. The second thing would be to do, so to speak, what enters our heads. It should not be fixed in advance what that would be.

Filliou :

I have in mind jumping a whole generation. I'm thinking of very young children coming up now. Can we do something while we're doing nothing? If we could reach children.... (Transcriber's note: " This is the end of Side One of the tape. Filliou's statement is lost.")

Filliou :

You were telling me about Fuller's ideas, about being interested in everything - that education was only one part of it.

Cage :

I had mentioned the school as a place without partitions and Fuller's notion of the child being educated by being born.... but it - another thing I was saying was more interesting.... something we didn't catch.... Give me a clue....

(Transcriber's note: " Confusion in this part of tape. They both lose their train of thought.")

Filliou :

You mentioned Veblen. The thing that interests me very much in Veblen is that he says that any institution, by the very fact that it exists is obsolete.

Cage :

Right.

Filliou :

By the time you set up something, it is already obsolete, so we shouldn't spend the energy in setting up something that will be obsolete by the time it is set up. Tell me, in your own experience in communicating with younger people, or people who might have been considered students, like when you were in the New School.....

Cage :

Look at what is happening now in the field of music. The structures that are developing now are quite different from the structures previous to the last decade or so. Previous to that time..... and I still, in a sense, belong to it because my music is published for instance by Peters..... Now young composers coming along tend not to think of entering that old structure of finding a publisher to publish their music - they'd rather distribute it themselves. They move about the world more or less as performers. The whole thing of the distribution of information in the form of correspondence is now worldwide. What does that bring about? It brings about a community of individuals who have no one ruling what they may not do. They are free in their musical actions from anything resembling economic or political structures. They are, so to speak, in an anarchic situation with a very few exceptions, and those exceptions are when, as with Nam June Paik and Charlotte Moorman, they step on prejudices which the society still maintains by means of its beliefs. Where else do they fail, in terms of the old structures? They fail when, through their actions to which they are dedicated, they are somehow not able to make a living and starve or have to change their directions because of their desire for food and so forth. I think that all of these things go together in such a way that we don't have to solve just education or just art, but we have to change the entire society. For instance, we can see in the field of economics that, even among relatively conventional minds, the notion of basic economic security and of giving the necessities of life to all the people on the planet is becoming a more and more prevalent and conventional-

ly held point of view. Now, when that occurs it will enormously affect the field of education. For instance, the present *raison d'être* of education is to get a degree in order to get a job in order to pay your bills. But, those jobs which you have been having as a goal are not going to be existing. There aren't going to be any jobs, because the machines will more and more be doing them. At the same time there will be more and more people, so the society will become geared not for employment, but for unemployment. There will be no reason to get a degree. What would you do with a degree in a society which does not offer any jobs? You have no use for it.

So we come again to Buckminster Fuller. What does he say that society will do when the people cannot have jobs and are unemployed? He says they will live their entire lives in the "university". The "university" is not just higher education - it's the whole body of education. All of us will then spend our lives according to him, in the field of education since we won't be moving out of it into another job-life. This alone - the mere thought that you would have to spend your entire life being educated, is revolting now, not because of what it could be, but what you remember it to be. You would not want to live in the universities as you know them. But, we must change the universities so that they would be the places that we loved, as we now love our un-ruled, anarchic, art-life. Filliou:

For me, the whole idea of this study came from the idea of the creative use of leisure. I found that artists are people who organize leisure. In other words, I call art a certain form of organization of leisure.

Cage :

Well, artists are busy as bird-dogs. They never have enough time. They work night and day and they are completely involved in their work. They can't distinguish between that work and play. They require no vacations from this work because of their total involvement. I think, essential, and by essentially I mean by virtue of being born,

people are this way - they all know perfectly well what to do with their time if they are left anarchic. This is what we must move towards, and I can't think we will move toward it successfully by specializing our goal, but rather by generalizing it to the transformation of the entire society.

Filliou :

Yes. I agree with this. When you spoke of the type of work and the kind of thing we need, it came to me, in a strange way, that, once, I saw a shoeshine man in Spain. I realized, all of a sudden, that if we wore no shoes there would be no shoe-shine man. And my whole life changed after that, except that I now I would add something: the shoe-shine man was whistling - he had a few coins in his pockets - and so, I would like to make it that we have no shoes and no shoe-shine man, but he keeps whistling. I think this has much to do with what you said at first : that with less resources we must produce more. Society as a whole, I think, can do it. Right now we are almost equipped to do it. It's really as if we took the world and put it upside down, or rather, I think, that the world is upside down and we are putting it straight. We work hard as we can for the lowest possible reward: most are very happy to work creating, provided they get the minimum rewards that allow them to be fed.....

Cage :

Or even none.

Filliou :

Yes, even none, but this of course goes too far, because.....

Cage :

Well, we have very, very few instances.....I have only one instance, with all the struggles, of really getting down to zero. I always, except for that moment, had a nickle or dime or something. But once, I had nothing.

Filliou :

But we see, still, that even in art, the point of view that you represent for many artists is almost still a parallel direction in the world. I was reading a review in the New York Times or Herald Tribune - something

about music - a critic was writing about somebody who had "a talent for taking John Cage seriously." I thought it was fantastic, after all these years and all the fantastic élan of modern art, that we have all this enormous dead-weight with us. I think it makes us humble: it gives us an idea of what we are up against if we tackle society as a whole, although I feel that the need is urgent. We'd better hurry: we don't have much time.

Cage :

Well, I admit, as anyone must, that the problems of changing society are enormous, but I think they become less oppressive when one fixes his mind, even if he does so foolishly, on the possibility of that change taking place. When you fix that way, you begin to think of things to do that will bring that change about: your whole concentration goes in that direction, just as it would go in the opposite direction of hopelessness and so on if you concentrated your mind on the fact that it was hopeless.

Filliou :

That's right.

Cage :

If I had remained, in musical thought, convinced of the ineradicable character of harmony and counter-point and all those things I was taught, I would have had to remain in those structures. It would not have occurred to me that they were removable, and though not everyone yet agrees, many people are active in a completely different way than they were. I think the same is true of the entire society.

Filliou :

I agree, and it is part of my character not to... I'm realistic in the same way: I know what I'm up against and I do want to change it. Even if we are to do nothing, I want to claim that we do nothing. I want to give examples of doing nothing. It is very much in my mind due to the fact that I know there is no other solution - anyway, I don't see any other - or perhaps time is the best solution, but I don't even know that there is much time.

Cage :

I think, as far as our lives and behavior are concerned, that we are on the search for clues as to how to proceed and how to behave in this very complicated historical moment of the old structures remaining and new structures becoming either evident or desired. You see it everywhere. And then, we determine our actions by those clues once we're convinced of their usefulness and validity, and try to apply them. The first one I've given you seems so little and so difficult because its so basic - that idea that we're being educated without being educated. Well, let's see if we could add something. If we add something it should be added in the spirit of that basic nothing and not be antagonistic to it. Because, if we got rid of this new basis, we would have gotten into what you spoke of: namely, a new structure which, according to Veblen, might be as bad as the old one eventually. So, we must somehow keep free of replacing, filling up, that emptiness with a new structure. So we're already close to a new principle which we can recognize, coming from many different directions. For instance, a man named Avner Hovna wrote an article in one of the UNESCO publications on the effect on society of automation - the sum of which, as far as I recall, is that we must substitute flexibility values for continuity values. Now, we know immediately when we think now of education that our educational structure, as we know it, is characterized by continuity values: it has always resisted even the most recent aspect of the continuity: namely, the avant-garde. But, we don't want that continuity value - we have no use for it. We need flexibility value. So, our education must be characterized by anything that leads toward change in flexibility. Therefore, coming back to the architecture of the school - a big, empty space in which the students are not obliged to sit in one chair, but are free to move from chair to chair.

Filliou :

And also from time to time, I suppose.

Cage :

From time to time.

Filliou :

One of the big problems now is that we have schedules, hours.....

Cage :

This must be refused. Anything that represents a continuity from one day to the next should be changed to something that represents flexibility from one day to the next. Anything resembling an interruption, a distraction, should be welcomed. Why? Because we will realize that by these interruptions and distractions and flexibilities we enrich the brushing of information against information, etc.

Filliou :

You know, this high school friend of mine, Philip Corner, also does it - he has been asking some of the questions I have written in my postcards to children. One of them is, "Why did you get up this morning?" Practically all of them answered "Because I have to go to school," and many of them add "I didn't want to get up, but what are you going to do - my mother made me get up because I have to go to school." The very idea of school is unpleasant because of this rigidity, this continuity, this schedule you have to meet all the time.

Cage :

We, then, know we want the flexibility. We also want an anarchic situation in which people do what they want - not because they were obliged to do it.

At this point, the transcriber stopped transcribing. I remember, however, that, at the end, I was in the process of telling John how in the past "enlightment" was supposed to come around the age of 30: Buddha, Christ, Hamlet, Zarathustra, Gandhi are cases in point, in real life or in fiction. Now young people want to reach that stage by the time they're 20. And I remember John kept commenting "Beautiful". Then the tape ended.

R.F.69



ALLAN KAPROW

Filliou :

Last time, I remember we spoke of your project that has to do with making artists available in a system of schools - making their experience available when they are actually working in the schools. One particular thing you mentioned was the problem of integration.....

Kaprow :

Well, integration is a problem on two levels. It's a problem, everybody knows, on the level of color. But, pursue that further and the problem of art and life, so far as everybody is concerned, is also an integrational problem. Pursue it one step further yet, and the problem of learning in general and the rest of one's life is an integrational problem. So, the proposal that we begin, at least in the discipline of our qualifications - the arts - by having professional artists introduced on a permanent basis in the schools, might help to solve a little bit of these other echoes..... we can begin to recognize the nature of the arts today as essentially not bound up with an isolated professionalism, but rather as bound up with a social milieu.

In addition to that is the fact that the arts are not only not isolated professionally, but they're not isolated in terms of category anymore. The spill-overs of one medium into another is so consistent nowadays that it is almost pathetic to see the schools educational programs maintaining forty year-old ideas about the arts, and one can speculate it's the same in the other disciplines as well. Therefore, by introducing artists into the schools we might be able to take the arts out of the schools.

I have the idea that the schoolroom, as a concept, is an exact parallel to the alienated intellectual as a concept. As the school is isolated from the community, it is a rational parallel to the fact that, over the past two hundred years, the intellectual has been isolated from the community.

So, the ivory tower concept which was, perhaps, once poignant and necessary, is now

completely artificial. Educational ideas may, in fact - all the way from one discipline to another - find themselves in the position of goldfish in a tank: every innovation, every idea of the educator to modify this technique and that technique, to change the subject this way and that, may be beside the point if it continues to maintain itself in the sanctum sactorum of the classroom, and furthermore, in a system in which classrooms are organized in respect to the totality of the school, which in turn is a bastion or castle separated from the community.

Filliou :

Two things which you have given much work to are happenings and environments. How does this work relate to your thoughts about education? Did these thoughts develop out of your making happenings and environments?

Kaprow :

Absolutely. It's fortunate when one's love can affect the rest of one's life. I simply generalize on this event and make a principle out of it. Therefore, everyone's experience ought to in some way be connected with everyone's love, whatever that is.

Filliou :

I have noticed in your latest work that more and more, in happenings, you always insist your happenings are for performers only. I think that this is very important - I like this idea very much. The point I want to make in this study is this: we're all students all our lives, and teaching and learning is something for performers only - they are performing arts. I know, for instance, that you have worked with children. You have made happenings for children to participate in. Out of this, do you have some practical advice to give teachers who would like to engage in such activity?

Kaprow :

I've thought about this problem. Let me return, for a moment, to the idea of art outside the classroom. The idea derives simply from the practice of artists currently working in the world... Their whole point seems to be to involve the actual environment in which

everyone lives in a completely integrated way, with the subject or content of their work. This means that if we look to see how artists are working - musicians, poets, etc. - we find that they are working in the streets, in their kitchens, in the stores, on the subway: in their ordinary world. When they meet in a car and go for a trip they make a little event out of that. When they sit and talk to each other they make an event out of that. It seems to me a marvelous model for the school idea, because every community around a school has, obviously, a whole world of community interests that do not correspond to the school. The simplest of them, of course, are the developing neighborhood - clubs, the school holidays everyone shares - like Christmas, Thanksgiving, or today, Washington's Birthday. The kids go home and do nothing. These would be marvelous times for the artists to make a fantastic and celebrational situation, instead of all the conventional nonsense that we have. We could have neighborhood parades, for example, in which the children make their costumes, their noise-makers, parade ideas, big constructions to the pulled down the streets. They could make their own rock'n roll bands and take some old empty lot where a broken down building and garbage is and make little parks and playgrounds for themselves.

In fact, in this way we would not only integrate all the arts, instead of making them specialized subjects, but we would also integrate the colors in the neighborhood - the blacks and whites and in-betweens. We would also integrate, finally, the community with the arts. The kids are themselves the authors of these activities, which could be plays, musical contests, little stories they make up..... They could work with the new technology, like tape machines, and listen to their own voices. They could work with loudspeakers, which could be placed on different floors of a building. Kids love to play with gadgets, you know. They could make poems that go from one room to another - just as they now call each other on the telephone. They could make telephone poems without bringing any

new technology into their house.

What I'm doing is simply talking off the top of my head as one thing leads to another, but the important principle behind it is that it's not one of those abstract and forced situations which you get in the classroom, however nice the teacher is.

Filliou :

Do you think, Allan, that normal teachers could be taught to practice these programs, or whether in every school you should have the equivalent of an artist-in-residence at universities - somebody who would, more or less, teach the teachers by having them participate with the children? For instance, if they do a telephone poem, the teacher also would be there making his telephone poem with the children.....

Kaprow :

I think, you've touched upon a very, very problematical area in the whole idea we've discussed. Very simply, there are not enough artists in the world - there never will be. We have in our country, just this one, probably ten thousand schools, maybe more. In any case, you need tens of thousands of artists of all kinds.

It is conceivable, in the way I think, that a training program, something like a parallel to the Peace Corps - it could be called an Arts Corps - and could be developed in the graduate schools that now turn out artists and poets and musicians with nothing to hope for when they graduate. Some of these could be deliberately prepared, groomed, for the job of a prestigious position as artist-in-residence in a school. But even that, added to those who exist now, would be a small number, perhaps one thousand at the most. This is a statistical fact, a reality we have to deal with.

Now, my suggestion here is purely speculative. I don't know how it would work, because we have to try it first in a modest way - to establish regional centers first through a university, which would then arrange to make itself available to the schools as an agency that would provide poets and musicians according to the wishes of the schools. The schools, in

turn, would then establish this particular artist as an artist-in-residence, and he would be there not only to conduct experiments with a class of children - out on the streets or wherever he wants - but also to act as an advisor to the teachers in other schools in that school district. Therefore, this artist would be an example to those who are not professionals, and could very well improve the situation by his live example.

A further part of this scheme is to have a place where the artist - teacher can also learn new things - that is, to bring the university back into the picture, not only as an agency for the lower schools, but also as a center for advanced researches in pure art. So, I have proposed that our university, and in turn, other university centers throughout the United States, should establish experimental institutes in which artists of a very interesting and advanced inclination could come to do whatever they want in a noncategorized way. Their only requirement beyond doing their art work should be to make themselves available in some way to the artist-teachers in the lower schools and also, occasionally, to bring their art to the children of the lower schools. The children would get a chance, just as the teachers, to always be in touch with exciting new possibilities. These might - if we maintain the tree-fold arrangement between the advanced research center, the artist teacher in the lower schools, and the children in the community - bring about a very live situation that immediately, in every case, pours new possibilities into the community. Then, hopefully, as part of the program - if we follow it for ten or twelve years - when these children come to college it would be very interesting to see if their attitudes and capacities to study historical art, more advanced intellectual critical problems about the arts..... to see if all this made them much better qualified than the students who now come to college with nothing but prejudices?

Filliou :

Once, I expressed it to myself this way: that creation becomes very easily for me recrea-

tion. Search - I search for happiness and joy - becomes research. We've talking about the art of living - we've been talking for centuries. We have to turn the world to artists, always.

Kaprow :

Yes, but without giving them the wrong kind of power and responsibility. I think that Plato was worried about artists taking over the world, because he assumed that they would take over in the way that the politicians normally do, whereas nobody ever asked the artists to take over in the way artists usually do - that is, to provide play and nothing else.

Filliou :

So, we can see in Plato, or as Engels put it, a notion of the world as "upside down"..... (Transcriber's note: "The tape is obscured by noise, laughter and both men talking at once.")

Kaprow :

We still have time?

Filliou :

Oh, yes. We can still talk about many things.

Kaprow :

Well, I was just thinking about the telephone event. We could have television events. For instance, everyone in the community, black, white, and in-between, watches certain programs customarily, as all the statistics shows. So, for example, we would arrange a whole event based on clues to certain actions that were given unconsciously by the normal program. So, when a cowboy says: "OK, mister, raise your hands," that means that everyone in the place starts moving furniture around very rapidly. I mean, you can take games like this and imagine that all over the neighborhood children are watching this particular program, and each group of children has a different activity to do when a certain signal is given unconsciously by the program. Or, when a certain commercial comes on, if it recommends that you eat Yoghurt - everybody immediately goes and eats ice cream. If it recommends that you buy aspirins - everybody immediately eats candy.

So, suddenly you tie apparently discrepant activities into a whole game notion. One can look at these things from a scholarly or psy-

chological standpoint as very profound, symbolic activities, but who cares whether they are? The point is that they can be fantastically enjoyable.

Filliou :

A friend of mine in Copenhagen, Knud Petersen, had thought of using television to fight illiteracy in the world. He said there ought to be a television set in every Negro village in Africa. I don't know if it would solve the problem very well. They like to watch, for instance, westerns and things like that. Petersen suggests having them associate the western with a letter in the alphabet.

Kaprow :

I think that's a good idea.

Filliou :

So, everybody would be there and such and such a film is being shown, and they learn the letter A at the same time. It goes on from there.....

Kaprow :

That's marvelous.

Filliou :

Learning the alphabet becomes fun. And then, perhaps afterward they can start writing the name of the star or the name of the film, etc. He wanted to send this proposal to UNESCO.

Have you thought of any application of your own idea in international terms? For instance, have you approached anybody in UNESCO?

Kaprow :

No, I never thought of it, but it's a good idea.

Filliou :

I think of this because that it will be done in the United States first is probable - this country is very active and dynamic - but, how wonderful it would be if it were done in many places at the same time.

Kaprow :

Oh, that would be grand. It fits in perfectly with my idea of the advanced research center at the university level, of which I spoke earlier, because there the people involved would be necessarily international.

Filliou :

You know, it could result in subsidies for your program or, at least, moral support. The

techniques could be used, as you say, for the problems of discrimination, which exists in a ridiculous and absurd way on a world-wide scale. I can conceive of a Youth Festival where people would come from every country and learn things and learn to work together. Not the Boy Scouts - that hasn't worked, because it was born in the area of imperialism.

Kaprow :

Yes, it had "the white man's burden" attached to it.

Filliou :

You realize what would happen if anybody who is officially connected with a government had control over such a thing. It would be disastrous. They would try to push their own scheme of values, but if it is artists themselves who control things it is much more likely that artistic values and motivations will emerge in terms of freedom and respect.

Kaprow :

That would be very beautiful. You could have an international exchange program working in the same way that educational exchange programs have worked very nicely, so that the machinery is established. In addition to that, we have reached, in our technology, a state of such communicability that you can have people in communication with one another all over the world without travelling. So for example, we could imagine an international learning program in which people in Ganda and kids in Iceland, and kids in the United States, and kids in Rio de Janeiro are all, at the same time, involved in a network of television events and telephones and telegraphy, and a sense that at certain times they all are performing certain games - even if they are not talking to one another. They could communicate, in addition to that, with letters, photographs and movies that they make of one another. For example, the whole area of movie-making..... I would like to give the children an artist who knows about filmmaking and let them make their own films with him - about themselves and their new non-classroom situation: their community situation. They could exchange these back and

forth and they could be marvelous forms of international communication and friendship and stimulation. So, I think this idea of asking an international organizing for constructive help is good one. I don't know how to go about it.....Whom do you go to?

Filliou :

Well, the UNESCO center is in Paris. I used to work for the U.N., you know. I may inquire for you.....

For making films, the modern artist with the most childlike spirit is Red Grooms.

Kaprow :

Yes, he's very good for that, extremely good.

Filliou :

He is wonderful. I have thought, as a part of this program, to speak with him. I think he would be interested.

Kaprow :

Oh, that would be grand. You know, Yvonne Falcone has worked with Red. She has a special class near Boston, and her children have made films already, and since she works with Red, it would be natural to have them together.

Filliou :

Yes, good. Now I'm wondering, Allan, as we wind up our conversation, if you could describe to me one happening that you have done with children.

Kaprow :

Well, I did one in Central Park this last summer which I enjoyed very much. It was very simple and direct and rather more concentrated in one spot than my work usually is, but it worked very nicely. It consisted simply of a game which is related to many children's games, where the child wishes to destroy something and proceeds to make a kind of professional activity out of destruction, and in so doing makes a game out of it.

It was the following. I secured about a thousand used automobile tires and found a large hill in the park and made stacks of those tires all around the perimeter of this hill. Down at the bottom it was like an amphitheatre in ancient Greece, because the hill sloped gradually toward a kind of cul-de-sac at the bottom. There, I placed, at random in

the ground, twenty-five-foot wooden poles, and on top of these poles I tied great clusters of tar-paper and tin-foil and plastic film, so that they looked like medieval halburts: they had a kind of flag quality - they blew in the wind and looked very sloppy and crazy, yet very elegant because of the glitter of the black and silver and the plastic film.

Then, at a certain moment, I went around the area where we were having a festival of the arts and was shouting through a bullhorn, which made me very imposing to the crowd - and I just picked up kids all over the place. "Come on, come on. We're going to have a tire-rolling event." So they came in dozens and dozens - only children - and went over to the various piles of tires and took one and got ready. I said: "OK, we're going to begin the countdown, but before we do that we're going to remember what to do next. Each of you will try to roll your tire so you knock down a pole."

And it was a very long distance. They thought this was very exiting. "But afterwards, we're going to clean up the entire mess and make a great big mountain out of all the broken wood and all the tires. When you get the mountain done, we're going to take a big sheet of plastic film and cover the mountain and then I'm going to give you dozens and dozens of rolls of string and you're going to tie this all up and make a big package out of it. Then we're going to line up and I'm going to put a paper bag over my head, so I can't see, and I'm going to pass along the line of all the children and I'm going to touch the heads of eight children. All the horns that you hear when you roll the tires will be given to the eight children who are lucky to be touched by my hand."

BENJAMIN PATTERSON

Filliou :

Benjamin, what I want to talk about is if, out of your own experience as an artist with all the audience participation things you did both in music and performances- and of course together we also did street performances.... - you think there is a kind of future in an idea like "Teaching and Learning as Performing Arts."?

Patterson :

Yes. Do you know what Phil Corner has been doing this year? He's been teaching in a high school, seventh graders and older in music in a school called New Wicken School. One class has just been doing happenings and action music - all sorts of good things. So, that's pretty marvelous.

Filliou :

I know, and Phil is one of the men I intend to talk to. He once invited me there. I went for an hour and I had a very good time with these kids.

Patterson :

Something like that really should be done. He gave grades, but then he gave an exam two weeks after he had already turned in the reports. He used an exam I had written. Its just one question: "Define and elaborate upon the purpose of this exam." Then, you have an hour to do it.

Filliou :

I don't understand very well. How many times has this been performed?

Patterson :

Well, I think, three times, maybe more. It was published in "Method and Processes." So, people may have done it, you know, on their own. Then Phil Corner did it at the Bridge with adults.

Filliou :

Why don't you give some examples?

Patterson :

Then, Phil did it with the class. That was interesting, and for that one I wrote comments on each one - Phil brought them to me and I added my comments to their definitions of

the thing and then he gave it back to them.

Filliou :

That's very good.

Patterson :

Some of them were very interesting, because, you know, I didn't know them at all and they didn't know me and so there's a sort of once-removed authority or, at least, critic. At some of them I sort of slapped my hands and told them: "Now, you're being silly and wasting your time and not really trying to come to grips with what you're being asked to look at in this. It's for your benefit and not mine." I know what I was trying to do.

Filliou :

Do you think normal teachers would be able to do that? What kind of a training should teachers get so that they would be able to do these things?

Patterson :

Hmmmmmm

Filliou :

Phil is a composer and he is a performer, so he applies it automatically in his class.

Patterson :

It's interesting..... Well, the sort of teacher that could apply a technique like this would be freed from coming straight from the text. I guess the best ones are teaching art of some sort now - the people who are teaching composition or painting or something. Then there is another type, a little more structured, I guess..... library schools..... in which they're teaching role-playing and some library administration in a sort of artificial, assimilated library system they've set up and everybody has been assigned a job in that system. The whole course is being taught within the framework. There are various problems that arise within it and you work them out in the role that you have.

Filliou :

Good. For poetry, for instance, I feel that it's much better to teach children to make poems through the technique that you used..... this type of collage with text and picture, and then later on they may catch up with the poetry of the past.....

Patterson :

It doesn't mean really very much until they've made it themselves.

Filliou :

As I see it, what the teacher would do is make material available to young people so that they can teach themselves - they can make games and all kind of things.

Patterson :

Yes, at least the material should be made available. There should be direction from the teacher, not necessarily supervision, but for impetus and stimulation and guidance. Once you see that someone is following this path that you've shown them: "Well, that's good, and did you know this about that, etc".

Filliou :

Kaprow things that what the schools need is an artist-in-residence. The teacher, also, would participate in this system.

Patterson :

An artist-in-residence?

Filliou :

Yes, because he would, I suppose, take the material and conceive of games and toys and other manifestations outside of the school.

Patterson :

From what I know of artist-in-residence, I have the idea that what usually happens is he goes there and works on stuff. He does a lot of good work and talks to a couple of students, perhaps - and that's about as far as it goes and it doesn't get involved in things that would connect him to this particular idea of an artist-in-residence. You know, he comes to the campus and within his contract it should definitely be included that he is there in a teaching capacity. If he wants to create something, then it should be the product of his job.

Filliou :

I think this must start with very young children. You know, in American they speak very much - this is the point Kaprow brought up - of the problem of integration. They have noticed that at times they have conflict, because outside of the school the kids don't have contact. Kaprow had in mind, for instance, to organize all kinds of things outside the school where they are used to working together.

Patterson :

The school shouldn't be so divorced from our viewpoint. The idea now is that the school is a building and you go in there and you have a set of ideas about what you're trying to do when you get there and it's all structured - everything you do in there you do because those are the rules you've been drilled in. So, you have a building with a hall that goes forward, then left, then right, etc. To get to the toilet you always have to go forward and to the right. To get out of the school you have to go in, you have to sit down, you have to keep your mouth shut until the teacher asks a question - you give the right answers and you get out of the school. Everybody wants to get out of the school, because it isn't very pleasant - and that's what happens.

So, you take the set of rules when you get there, but when you get outside you forget them because they don't have anything to do with outside. So, the whole thing might be much more diffused. There should be ways of having schools in the streets, and during different hours of the day and week. A varying schedule. There must be many changes in the system.

Filliou :

Do you think the artist can make a contribution in changing somehow the spirit, so young people don't feel so alienated when they grow up?

Patterson :

I don't think we can really do anything - I mean, the artist these days is an example - a captive animal on the campus. Saying: "We have an artist-in-residence," is about the same as saying: "We have a collection of the letters of Gertrude Stein."

It doesn't mean anything unless he's really participating - more than participating - using what he knows as an artist to get the students to produce or think or get themselves involved in problems or trying to produce or think. Nothing else is going to do that.

Filliou :

I don't know much about the problems of education, but I've seen a few books. The educators all seem to know the importance of art, but most of the time what they teach is

old art. Well, it seems to me that we should start with the most advanced form of art, because children understand it very well. I think they themselves can contribute to modern art, but they cannot contribute to historical art - it's done, finished.

Patterson :

It just occurred to me that in education - the teaching of art in schools - it is probably always assumed that the student was exposed to the contemporary art in his home, so this was more or less filling in the background of what was happening in the same way that the history of the country is taught. They assume that you are reading the papers daily and that you see what is going on around you. They are filling in the background.....

Filliou :

On the part of the teacher it would be good to learn to involve young people. You know, in our performances we all have worked very hard. I know it's easy to do.

Patterson :

The audience participation thing is, I think, gradually creeping into education at all levels to varying degrees. It's more and more recognized that it's the only way learning really does take place in the personal, tribal area. Participation has to take place in all these areas. Everyone has a certain amount of suspicion that when participation takes place at so many levels in the educational process, then we're not sure anymore what we're teaching them. In other words, the degree of control over what we're teaching them is very slight, and they don't know whether they're actually being taught.

Filliou :

Education is based, traditionally, so much on control and discipline.

Patterson :

If you don't teach them: "This is the right way to think about this and you should always obey authority," and there is someone with the final authority - the teacher - and later it's transferred to the President, etc....

Filliou :

It's the world of Kafka. We want to come out of the world of Kafka - we don't even know

who decides the school program.

Patterson :

If, you know, you start giving this participation to the students at levels of deciding what the curriculum should be, then what is this.... what is the point of what happened in Berkeley? We are afraid of what is called anarchy - really a kind of self-determination. Many people get afraid of that.

Filliou :

Well, as performers we have the very same problem.

Patterson :

I'm not afraid of that as a performer or as a composer - that's sort of an ideal, but the thing is that people who are interested in controlling groups of people later are making sure that the workers don't continue to get too many big ideas about what they want to work for. Then, this type of thing graduates right down through the education mills. So, it's a very difficult thing.

Filliou :

I know it's difficult.

Patterson :

It's certainly very necessary and I think it's something that's going to happen in any case. It's interesting that a university should think about something like this, because although other artists may have thought about it fifty years ago, there wouldn't have been any potential or opportunity for it then.

Filliou :

The time is getting ripe for it.

Patterson :

Yes, the time is ripe for it.

GEORGE BRECHT

Dearly beloved,

As Bert Williams used to sing

"If you can't say somethin' good boom boom
Don't say nothin' a' tall---
Don't you know that pride goeth--
before a fall....."

Since you can learn without teachers, and teach without learners.....

- I. The guy hears about this Master, see, so he walks 2000 Km. and finds the master's hut, and sits down in front of it.
A year later the master hands him a broom.
Three years later the master says: "Cut the sweeping, Kid. Ya wanta sit down inside? "
Five years later the master says: " How abouta cuppa tea? "
- II. Koran (by rote)
Indian scriptures (by rote)
Lincoln's Gettysburg and Bill's Caesar (by rote)
Plus 5 x 9, and 6 x 7,
Ich sehe, du siehst, er sieht.
- III. "Bill's Ineffable Automative Rehabilitation".
Small garage in Metuchen, N.J.
Three young guys and a guy who gave up Teacher's College to be an auto mechanic,
Lathe for turning out special parts.
Hot coffee, girly mags, and talk talk about cars.
Learn about cars? I bet - went to him all the time.
- IV. Premise.
If you want to know something spend some time with someone who knows. (See VI)
- V. Practise (spoken of once or twice I think, once I remember in our rusty old blue English Ford).
 - a. Let everyone who is willing to practice something with other (s) around agree to accept a number of apprentices students (another word, to be invented?) conditions to be arranged (See VII)
 - b. For example (each person would choose what he would want to be responsible for, but these are some of my ideas:)

Daniel Spoerri:
 Dick:
 Robert F.:
 Diter Rot:
 Marianne:
 Donna:
 Ben Patterson:
 Joe Jones:
 Claes Oldenburg:
 Jim Dine:
 W. De Maria:
 San Antonio, Frederic
 Dard and Simonin:
 Andre Thomkins and
 Tomas Schmit:
 Nick Cernovich:
 James Waring:
 Ray Johnson:
 Emmett W.:
 Al Hansen:
 Alison K. :
 Me:

Cookery, (?) Glue
 Exotic traditions, Publishing, Politics (?)
 French Love-making
 French love making around the world.
 Sauve (Gard), (?) Economics.
 Vodka and Iceland
 Danish, crêpes, and Scandinavian love-
 making (?)
 Beading, Proof-reading, Editing
 Set Theory, Library Science, and Ne-
 gro Psychology
 Electronics, Mechanical poetry, Poetic
 mechanics
 Monuments
 Drawing
 Drumming, Impossible Machines
 French
 German
 Bisexuality
 Homosexuality
 Asexuality
 Combinations and Permutations, Heart
 Improvising
 Listening, Watching, etc. (laboratory
 course)
 Chemistry (laboratory), Comparative
 literature

ETC.

VI. Basic. I remember seeing someone (I don't remember who) hammer a nail a little into a board so when he went to put the screw in, it would "take". Did it today, in fact.

VII.

- a. Publish a thorough enough invitation and see what happens
- b. Since not all students can travel anywhere, get a grant for the program? (I'm not too keen on this.)
- c. Since I hear music all my waking hours (and am considering my dreams), should I pay John Cage's way to come and visit, so he wouldn't have to put out dough for all that electronic equipment? Or ask him to pay my way so I could go to Stony Point and be convinced that something special is necessary?
- d. My son Eric is 13 and loves sports cars, engines,..... and knows about horsepower.

I think we should do something concrete about this. Please let me know what you think. I would love to have Eric have such possibilities.

Love,

George

**NOCH MEHR SCHREIBRAUM
GEHT'S GUT, JA ?**

**AND MORE SPACE
DOING ALL RIGHT ?**

DITER ROT

Filliou :

We must speak English. You know, you told me, when you read the interview with the children, you told me: "You do the opposite of what people do. They ask people with supposedly much wisdom what to do. But you asked children." And then you added: "But of course you can go further, like ask the trees or ask the pigs." Well, that is where we can kick off. Hahaha. What do we ask the pigs?

Rot :

I always think that animals are much wiser than men, because they take any shit without making much fuss about it. Like pigs sometimes squeal and that's all, they don't really argue with men. When they have to go to the slaughterhouse they go, they squeal a little and then they go. But this is wisdom. They don't want choice, I think.

Filliou :

It would be fantastic if in the book, as part of the artistic proposition, there would be....

Rot :

A squeal, at toot..... hahaha, why don't you do that?

Filliou :

Yea, but it is difficult to transcribe. If it was a record.....

Rot :

But you could have a little record in the book.

Filliou :

Yes, I thought about it, the original thing.

Rot :

I think, it would be, at least for me, it would be important to have a pig, because men use the name of the pig to give each other trouble.

Filliou :

In the original record..... Or a tree. In Villefranche I always used to look at the eucalyptus trees, and the wind blowing through them. There I have asked..... It is very funny, because this thing, the contrast between what children have to say and what people like us

who have an experience about the thing they have to say, is quite strange, you see, and that's why kind of the two chapters follow each other. Like right after Marcelle and your children we come in, you see, and we have a different way to look at it, that's all.

Rot :

Sure, I got the idea about the animals and plants to vote..... In the Academy, have I told you this, there was this big meeting they call Vollversammlung, and everybody who is in the Academy can come and say what they want. And then I found out that, mostly, these people were talking about democracy, and that in democracy you have the right to say this and that. And I thought, and I told some of them, that they think, democracy is, where everybody has the right to speak. Well, I would say o.k. But then, has everybody the right to convince other people? And I would say No, this is not democracy. As soon as you start to convince, it is kind of a dictatorship. You should not even use your intelligence to convince other people, they might be so much different from you. I said then what I think democracy is, it's a field where all can say what they want to do or want to have, not what the others should do, or what everybody should have, what the country should do, or what everybody should do, but what they themselves want. Then maybe one guy says: "I want this", and another guy says: "I want that", and all say what they want. And then they can agree. If they have enough people who want a certain thing done, they can do it, right? Because they have the votes on their side. And then I said, what you should do is, you should consider that there are more beings than just the human beings, and they also want something. And look at the plants or look at the animals. And I think that the plants get almost hundred percent of what they want. They get everything, and therefore I think, they are wise. They go into the forest, and live there and get everything they want and can want, and they are much wiser than human beings like us, who have to go here and there and try, even try to express first what we want.

Most of us even can't express that.

Filliou :

Let's say that this is their genius. Like we all live off plants, anyway, directly or indirectly. Their genius, as I see it, that's what keeps the planet alive, isn't it? It's the genius of plants, because animals eat them, we eat them.....

Rot :

Yes, then you come to the point to ask what do the plants eat?

Filliou :

Well, that's the genius, the air, the thing which is renewable.

Rot :

Although it seems to me they live of stones, like animals.

Filliou :

No. Air and water.

Rot :

I have the impression.... I was going to say, that the wisest are the stones. In any case they get what they want. They don't even die.

Filliou :

But you see, we who live in this type of world, you and I for instance, and we have children at the same time, in other words, we have our life very much in this world, right? Your kids, like mine, they go to school and they have certain reactions. And really, I don't think I would have been concerned so much with all these things, if I hadn't had children, you see, because I always thought..... You know my brother, he maintains that by the age of 10 years old, it's too late. You know, that kids have been so conditioned that it is too late. May be it has something to do with what you were saying yesterday. You know, the core of your character is there, right? Even though on the fringes you can change, you know, you said something like this. But the core of it is always the same. So, what I have in mind, is there a way..... to consider the way we have to teach children, so that they grow-up in a way they will not be fucked up. Your experience, I know, in teaching, is not with children, but you have had this experience with students, with art-students, you see.

Rot :

But you see. there is already quite a difference between, let's say, people of the age of art students, and people of the age of children. Children still have this very great urge to express what they want to have. They say: "Pappi give me this, give me that", they simply express what they want, then they see whether they can get it or not. Whereas, when people get older, they express their wishes under certain conditions. For instance, they would never express wishes, where they have the feeling they would not be allowed to be fulfilled. But I think, what they call the field of art is such a harmless field, there is really no limitation attached to the expression of certain wishes, and fulfilling of certain wishes. I believe, what art has done, or is trying to do, is to establish a field where you can have the fulfillment of your wishes. Like these popsingers, they always say, dreams come true, but in art you can do it. But it is still a very crippled and limited field.

Filliou :

You think you would be a good school teacher for instance? In other words, what you may have tried teaching art students.... Imagine you were a school teacher, what would you do? With children of..... your own children, say.

Rot :

I would say, to children under the age of 10, I would not even want to teach anything, besides, let's say, language or how to put a nail in a piece of wood, or something like this. I wouldn't want to teach them how to fulfill their wishes, or what to wish. What I think I was trying in those artschools, was first and foremost to help the students getting an insight and ideas about what field is free for their wishes and their wish fulfillments, and then teach them how to formulate their wishes, first how to become aware of them, and then how to fulfill them. Like, there is a school, there is a room, and what can you do in this room? It's so high and so wide. Somebody wants..... let's say, you get a student aware of, that he wants to build tremendous things like castles, may be a king-

dom. So you say, well, you see that room, are you aware of it, how big it is, do you see enough people to rule? You cannot be a king, but you can maybe make a castle right within this room. You could make them aware of how big the thing could be, of what material it could be made, what the castle could be like. And then, you could make him aware of what his being a king would consist of, and then maybe you can give him little technical ideas..... that he could build this castle in this and that way. But I think this is already far too much, you should not do this, because as soon as the wishes are very strong, the means are always found. Then I think this is ridiculous, the whole thing is ridiculous. Because, what these people really want is to build a castle, much bigger than that room, or much bigger than that school.....

Filliou :

In fact, I mean, what is your reaction to this for instance..... I know you don't like teaching, but you have had to do it. So, what has been your reaction to this, I mean, in other words, what attitude did you take deliberately, knowing that this is what they want, and maybe this is not what you wanted?

Rot :

See, I started to teach in America, and I came to this school, I had the feeling that these students had already got a certain idea about what they wanted. They wanted to do something which they would be able to call art, and other people would call art, whatever that was at that time and place. And then I found that I could slowly make them aware of their way of thinking that they wanted to do something they called art in beforehand. But I could also make them aware, that they could even do something one wouldn't call art, but which would make them fairly happy, you know what I mean. So, what I had to do was, first and foremost - since I came there as a so-called artist - I had to try to put my image down, so they wouldn't confuse their idea of art with the idea of the stuff I did..... To make it possible for them to run straight to the fulfillment

of their little wishes, which they would formulate within the context of this school. So I always told them, do what you want, just try to find out what you want, and then try to do it. And may be consider, that what you want could make you calm or happy, or whatever it is, and then try to do it, and find out the ways to do it.

Filliou :

Did you find that they put up resistance to it, did they get into it easily, or fought you, or what?

Rot :

I think that most of them never knew what they wanted, before I came there. What they wanted in general was something they didn't really want, they wanted something other people had wanted, or there was a certain drive in the American civilisation, as far as I can see, production and quantity minded. What they always admired, even in the field they called art, was productivity and output, objects, stuff..... And then it is very difficult to get them off this idea, since you yourself, as a teacher, come from a background where you have been producing. You would not become a teacher if you would not be able to show your production, and your drive, and your quantity mindedness.

Filliou :

What you say, it seems to me, has to do with brainwashing. You and I and Dorothy, see, I mean everybody, you have been brainwashed, and I have been brainwashed, let me say personally. It seems to me that what you say is, that you don't want to brainwash these students, and even further, you would like even to unbrainwash them, right?

Rot :

No, as soon as you try to do something to something, let's say, you want to make red green, you want to change it into green. You have to mix it with green, you have to fight the red as you have to deal with green, to make red green. This means, you cannot fight anything, because to fight it would be to embrace it, I think.....

Filliou :

To fight it on its own terms, right?

Rot :

To fight somebody means to embrace him or her.

Filliou :

You for instance, Diter, what did you do yourself, to kind of fight the brainwashing you were submitted to? Well, you went to school, and you have been through many things.

Rot :

I remember when I came up to Providence, this was the first real tough production and quantity minded school I came to in America. I thought, I will try to push the students to see that an object, which is almost the opposite of what they admire..... Let's say, they admire satellites, cars and airplanes, and you know, this kind of things. So, instead of looking admiringly at polished, highly effective objects, which serve you very well, try to get the same admiration or even a better admiration, an easier admiration, for something which is, let's say, the opposite. Which is not polished, which is not big and heavy, which is not useful. So I tried to put their mind on cigarette butts, dust, little stones, pieces of glass, nails, screws..... Once I went to school, on the way, in the gutter, I picked up little objects, pieces of matchboxes, cigarette butts, and things I said before, and I gave to each of the students one of these objects, and asked them to think about it, and then write as much as they would like, as long as they would find it easy and funny to write..... what they thought about it. And I remember how they really laughed when I came with this stuff. But then, two days later, some of them came with something they had written and for some of them it was really difficult, because they thought they would have to put out a piece of literature. But some, may be two or three out of fifty, got the feeling that they just were allowed to do anything. And they wrote huge things, you know, long chains of associations. And then I read these things aloud. I wanted to read them aloud, because I don't speak English correctly - at least at that time it was much worse than for instance now - and I thought, it is even

good for them to hear these stories badly read, because than they loose their respect for good writing or good reading. So I read it to them, and they laughed, and had such a fun, and even the guys who wouldn't do anything just wanted to see what the others had done. They immediately sat down and joined them, and at the end I had about 40 or 50 stories about the little objects.

Filliou :

If you did this with small kids, I suppose it would work. But they can't write, that is the trouble..... Imagine you did it with Marcelle.

Rot :

But you have the tape.

Filliou :

Yes, they could just talk.

Rot :

You see the disadvantage of the whole procedure..... From this on, what one could call the first stage, I went on. I had more stages, but it seemed that they took this as a "devoir", a job I gave them. See, I was never sure they would have done it themselves. Would they really love it, see? Because most of the students do it for you, to please you, and when you are pleased, and everybody is pleased, they are pleased too.

Filliou :

That's the problem of questioning children, you know, asking leading questions.

Rot :

This is the disadvantage, the nonsense of teaching, that you have to tell them what to do.

Filliou :

Me, I want to teach now.

Rot :

Even if you would tell them what they could leave out, what they are allowed not to do, it is just the same thing in reverse.

Filliou :

Do you think, Diter, that some of the things we do, that we speak about - we know each other and we know what we do..... Me, I got the idea - for the book, as it went along, this book - that I could develop a new theory of value, and I am working very much on that. In other words, all these things that we talk about - and I am having it on the cover of the

book, - you know, as long as I have not developed a new theory of value, whatever I say is a lot of bullshit. Because it cannot be applied by anyone.

Rot :

I think I must interrupt you. You want to get rid of the general idea that value is something to value?

Filliou :

Right, right.

Rot :

In my eyes, there should not be a new theory of value, because the value would play a big role again. It should be something which does not concern value at all. May be, like, I don't know - "Just forget it".

Filliou :

What I have in mind, - you know I studied economics, and all these things - I had in mind, that since Marx nobody has tackled the problem of a new theory of value. Because we live in a world where things are made, and things are exchanged, and there is a certain concept about what has value, and what doesn't have value, you see? . And so, I am working a little bit your way. But I want to ask more, may be you are going to tell me. I have not gone very far, you see, I am stuck.

Rot :

..... There is an amazing thing I found out, when I was teaching. I think that teaching taught me more than the students. Therefore I am there again on a very traditional basis, you can't escape it. Talking about these plants and animals, that they have not.....I don't know, but I would say, I cannot see that they have the imagination for anything else but themselves. Their world is a world where they can say..... they would never say: "This is my world", because their world is the world. They have no idea about themselves, they have also no value, because they cannot compare themselves to somebody else. They live such a limited life from all our points of view, from all quantitative and western civilisation points of view. They live their life, they cannot live another live and they will never imagine another life and try to live it, see. Man has what one could

call imagination. But not really imagination, he cannot either imagine anything besides himself. But he believes, or he has this abstract idea, that he could imagine other things than he is, or something else besides himself, and this, I think, is the very problem of the discussion, that's the shit about it, you know. We always behave as we could do something besides what we do.

Filliou :

The whole god damn world, in a way, is something that we kind of dream, I mean, it's millions of people.....

Rot :

I always found - or rather recently, let's say - that anything you can imagine is less to you, has always been less to me, and more difficult for me, than things I don't imagine. Just my little living, like breathing, and fucking, and doing this eating, and you know what I mean, has been better to me, nicer and sweeter, than any imagination or anything else. I could do may be..... Therefore, if you do what we could call teaching, you will implant on these innocent little young beings our manner of imagining something outside ourselves, or of believing that there are better things than we have. How is that?

Filliou :

Well, it's good. It's a very, very big thing, because I got stuck on this thing. Because I..... you know, George, once in a while, when he has been drinking, he shouts, "à bas l'imagination".....

Rot :

You know what he said to me once..... he didn't say, "à bas l'imagination" - may be he says it now - but about a year ago, I met him in London. He said: "fuck imagination", and this is what I told him: "you must love imagination very much if you want to fuck it". But still, if you say "à bas l'imagination", that means you put it under your feet, like building a road.....

Filliou :

I know he has come to say "fuck imagination". Well, I am interested in this thing, this new theory of value. I tell you how far I have gone, it is a kind of dada. I have thought

that people are just meant to be idle, that's what I start with. I want to tell you how far I went. People are just meant to be idle, then work I consider as a sort of reward. People just get bored being idle and....

Rot :

This is the question.....

Filliou :

Let me just finish this thing. So, work is reward, and the value of anything is based upon the enjoyment you have had doing it.

Rot :

I always see a difference between making it or doing it. You see, there is a very nice difference....

Filliou :

I never understood the difference between making and doing. What would you say it is? Because some people in the past have told me: "you have the makers and the doers".

Rot :

I would say, doing something is moving things about, and making is to produce them.

Filliou :

Oh, I see. So would you say we are makers or doers?

Rot :

I would say, I am a maker, or I can both, I can do and I can make. This is, well, I am still very much in the old thing like production and quantity, produce, put them up.....

Filliou :

You are a poet also, like me. Well, let's say, I am a poet like you. I call this the principles of poetical economy. I am working on a hunch, and I know that you don't agree with me on certain points. I am working on the hunch, that all these things that allow us to be like this - for instance, to make a book, something completely unexpected, whether it is mine or yours - that this is the base upon which to build the things, you know.

Rot :

What things?

Filliou :

The relationship between us.

Rot :

Yes, because we are so far from being animals. We are human beings, you know, we are

these people who imagine always, that they always can put something out of themselves. We always believe there is a life outside ourselves. Animals would never believe this. For a pig..... I could imagine, if I were a pig, I couldn't even see a book, everywhere would be pig, pig, pig..... I would not need to read....

A dog :

Wau, wau, wau, wau.

Filliou :

Listen to the dog, he is answering you.....

Rot :

Well, you know what I mean.

Filliou :

Yes, I know what you mean.

Rot :

See, we have this fantastic fun to write a book, where we behave as if we have more words than one. And the animals, they don't even write books. If they would write books, I think, they wouldn't go far. - Each animal would put its name and would tell the publisher how big the book should be..... 1500 pages. So, he writes the word, the pig writes the word "pig" 20 Million times. And they would have the most marvelous book, because this would describe their lives thoroughly, and funnily even.



DOROTHY IANNONE

Here's the contribution, Robert. It may even, in a way, be about education. So. Did I tell you that once Richard Hamilton worked with a German silkscreen printer and he said he was astounded at how many times the German workers said 'So'. They lifted up a pencil, laid it down and said 'So'. They inked a machine, 'So'. They turned a knob, 'So'. A few nights later Diter and I were making love and as he was sort of climbing off me I distinctly heard him say 'So'. The first German word I ever learned was arschloch when Diter put it in the customary place one grand drunken night and asked ist das arschloch?

These days I am interested in ecstasy. That is, I think, I want it all the time. Never mind what they say about the nature of ecstasy, I've got a feeling one could limit oneself to such an extent that it would be possible half the time - and that's like all the time. At 36 I am down to (in a passionate way) eating, drinking, sleeping, smoking, only the greatest friends, love and sex. Work is no longer a constant matter of being alive happily. It's a method of expression waiting for those times when I am not being a beauty in the other ways (today, for example). I was reading an article recently in the Voice and it mentioned a lot of great people like Paul Goodman and I don't know who else, maybe Norman Mailer, and they were all going to do something continuing their wellknown impact on the culture and for the first time I didn't have that just graspable vague feeling of envy at the side of the head. I thought only - mildly and reasonably - well they're making it in their way. Would I for a moment dream that last night they'd better fuck than I'd had or exchanged a deeper look with their lover? Nope. (I'd better admit before it comes out in another way that I still retain some gloomy, lurking ambitions to be the queen of art, but honestly they're getting so dim I just can't miss a heart-beat over them anymore). This paragraph's suggestion was ecstasy through limitation. It's true. No matter what you think of either, did you ever, for example, hear of an athletic harem girl? (Try to think of Paul Bowles' " The Sheltering Sky " rather than Ivonne de Carlo, please).

Education is getting to know what you like, and doing it. So many wrong steers. Did you ever notice the words are Francophile and bibliophile for the accepted pastimes but dypsomaniac and nymphomaniac for those other swell activities. I found out that I sort of like high sex best of all. In his introduction to "Story of O", Jean Paulhan says women have one thing in their mind - sex - but in these days it is not admitted and even perhaps found contemptible. My old shrink (I mean of yore) says that's not quite right. It's also the one thing men have on their minds.

Education is discovering all the people inside yourself, mamas and papas, and men and women, and children and virgins, and gods and freaks, and letting them have their day. And it's also realizing that your lover who is waiting (see how much I like Bob Dylan) has them too.

Education is loving your past and your talents and even your new long raw german appendix scar. But how this is conveyed to young people, I don't know. By example is perhaps a bit too

much to ask. I must admit I don't worry about it because in the end it's selfeducation which is the great adventure. And you and I, for instance, who love and respect each other, have hardly had the ideal formal education. Yes, as it goes, we're pretty good. Right? It's true I am unable to cope with the whole of any subject - politics, education - but could anyone deny that happiness, greatness, satisfaction are, so far, mysteriously achieved.

Once, way under the covers, sucking and caressing the man's cock, I had a hashish vision that I was in the womb and my father was fucking my mother and the sperm which came out would create me and I was manipulating it, assisting at my own creation. I was in there, bright and thoughtful, waiting to be born again. Selfeducation is, I suppose, selfcreation.

Well, finally, some other nice place to go. Right now, the most faraway thing I am closest to is becoming an animal. Diter was going to tell you this when his tape ran out. I don't mean anything brutish or imposing - say rather like an antelope. And mostly I mean that then one makes one's own sounds, neither beautiful nor unbeautiful, simply one's own. Like sniffing and biting and yowling. No selfcriticism for when it's coming from way in and no criticism for other's deepdown sounds. And I think that somehow shame and guilt can't live in that uncritical air. I heard you say it was a dream but that's O.K. It's only going toward it that's all the fun.

Thank you for the five women introduction. My apologies to the other four.

Dorothy Iannone
Düsseldorf, Nov. 1969.

JOSEPH BEUYS

Filliou :

Joseph, when I met you, I knew you as a performer, first. And the type of performances we have been doing have been called many things, but they are always performances that more or less involved the participation of the audience. So one of the things I have in mind is: your own practice and experience as a performer, do you think they can be applied to the field of teaching and learning? I can be more precise. We know certain techniques of performance. Can we apply or consider them for everybody?

Beuys :

Yes, we can consider them for everyone, generally speaking. But you can't expect that they will be understood. My performances and for instance, the one which Robert saw for the first time, as I did it, was doubtlessly so conceived that it couldn't immediately be understood. We could put it this way, someone is performing something which I, perhaps through my ratio, can't understand at that very moment. As a comparison, this could be extended to other forms of artistic expression where to one's ratio it also isn't understood momentarily, and could hold oneself back. So one feels obliged to jolt oneself and say I don't understand it but I really must understand it. This was just the way Robert saw it. At the beginning, my actions, and in fact this has been consequently developed, have never aimed at the ratio, rather surpass it approaching something which isn't to be understood by it. Since my conviction is that the most important things we must realize extend the ratio anyway.

Something will be shown which isn't irrational, rather an endeavour of the consciousness to deal with a subject. This subject because of its position achieved through our culture, that being namely, positivistic, materialistic, divisionistic and so on. Let us for a moment advance these categories one step in order to have a content revealed, or have it performed which through these classifications can't nor-

mally be understood but ought to be understood. Here, I am very insistent and say that they must be understood. Therefore, I put forth this request.

Filliou :

If I understand well, we have this information available and people could use it. But we can't make it available to many people, or can we?

For instance, when I came here to Germany, I found out that you have been doing a great deal of work in social matters, you know, and because I don't speak German, I don't understand very much what it is about. But this is something that I would like to know. How do you go from one thing to the other?

Beuys :

Actually, one can't go from one thing to the other, because as I said, I perform something which the ratio can't understand but which must be understood. However, not with ratio, but another form of consciousness. Actually, this is a demand for an enlarged consciousness. At this point it becomes evident that these things which until now have not been understandable are indicated as experienceable, but this must also be Science and that which hasn't been understood must also be Art, right. We can take that as the expanded concept of Art and indicate it as the expanded concept of Science, that which should be understood. Well, now my representation is naturally an imagination. Therefore, in order to conscientiously develop an educational process to a conclusion, I'm now obliged to return. Not advancing a step in as much as talking to people through words as I now do, rather I regress considering their consciousness in which they live today. I consider a rationalistic consciousness which is greatly impressed upon by the cultural consciousness in we live today. I consider a rationalistic consciousness which is impressed upon by the development of thought in the north of the Western Hemisphere which tends towards materialism, and I consider this. Thus, in this language I attempt to express what I mean in my actions. Actions tread, more or less, as a phenomenon of sculpture or as a painting, so now I try verbally to formulate these terms

and explain what I meant, approximately indicating the direction. Consequently, it is clear that it can't be developed through a term following the action, rather I must step back considering the consciousness of the audience. Therefore, I must strongly differentiate the language depending upon whom I am talking to. When I talk to someone who knows scientific terminology, then I use scientific terminologies. However, when I speak a language to people who don't understand, then I am very much obligated to speak a language which they do understand. But really, even the scientific language can be transformed into a simple language and be made understandable. Each scientific term can be made understandable in completely ordinary language, isn't that right? Once again, I must return and consider, yes, you could say I must consider the history of the audience. For instance, if there's a child sitting in the audience, his consciousness is working with a totally different aspect because of his own particular biography, after all, he has already experienced things, isn't that so. Perhaps he is more advanced than I, and I must after all attempt to learn from the audience. A discussion arises. Through a pedagogical process, we must always try and this must always be tried, to scan what is occurring in the audience, what they are able to understand, and yes, how I can communicate with them.

I must repeat that these actions provoke something: a subject which concerns me and which in my opinion I could objectively represent: in other words, to express something about a world towards which we are moving. That is the content of my actions. Things are occurring whose content has completely no propensity to our consciousness. Yes, we could also say there are things happening where we must allow for the education of man, that for instance, birth is not just a biological fact, possibly let us say, a process of incarnation. That is, man is born as a developing thing, a personality, having gone through things not only from this earth, but from other spheres bringing with him a great amount of experience, a certain impression,

which let us say, at birth naturally struggles with the matter or, for example, material. For the biological substance is the first struggle with the earth material. Because of all this, the child, at first, is in a situation like being in a coffin from which it must gradually be freed. This is an example of one point which plays a certain role in my actions. It naturally exposes a very certain aspect towards education, in so far as also exposing an aspect towards human development as a "total biography". It exposes what happens to a child when in the puberty stage, a twenty-one year old, an adult. That a new consciousness is respectively building up, which tends to go again through the earth coming out elsewhere, that is to say, birth and death. These are two important elements of my performances. Not by accident, the Christian terminology has also emerged on this premise. Because I disagree with many people who believe Christianity is bankrupt, as we have falsely judged it by the external failures in society. Thus, Christianity is regarded as something which hasn't yet manifested. What we today know as Christianity is merely a prelude, one could say, the labour pains of what we know as Christianity. To illuminate the subject is what occurs in these actions and exactly that can't be easily understood, and here an incredible amount of misunderstandings arise.

Filliou :

You have started a thing which is called "The German Student Party". In our own mind I am sure there is no contradiction, you translated your performances in terms of social actions. And now I would like you please to tell me how you went about it?

Beuys :

I would say there is no difference. As I've consistently stated my performances, that is their content, are comparable to the exemplar content of a university academy. The content of a university academy being, at the same time, comparable to that of this student party. However, I see no connection here, rather it is identical, that is, the content is identical. Only in the programme of a student

party when the term party arises, do political categories understandably come into the foreground. All these terms which appear in the performances as pictures, appear in the discussion of a student party as terms which are related, for example, to the concept of society. Therefore, they must be transformed into a political language. Whereby, this again is my interest, one can't stay at what today as politics is understood, but that this term of politics must be expanded in the same sense as we expanded the old term of Art, we've all worked to achieve this, you too Robert. All these actions were important to enlarge the old concept of Art making it as broad and large as possible. According to possibility, making it as large as to include every human activity. When this is true, that the enlarged concept of Art includes every human action, that is to say, that every human action is declared a piece of Art, then it is logical that the same is applied to a scientist, a physicist, a chemist. From this, it also is logical that this is applicable for a man who is concerned with the system of Philosophy or Religion. Yes, here it even follows that every human activity will be included. On the other hand, this again demands that the concept of Science has achieved this expansion itself, otherwise, it wouldn't be logical. There, when I demand an enlarged concept of Art, with it I demand an enlarged concept of Science.

Well, I would like to return to the concept of politics. Therefore, we here deal with it as an expanded concept. Projected concepts are already discussed here with which the politician of today has not as yet concerned himself. That is politics... certain categories are emphasized and also used as judgements, and these again appear in the performances, for example, the human biography. That a functional politics is to be created having value, which also can elucidate that life which is before birth, at the same time grasping the life which is present after death. For instance, what the student movement revealed was instinctively sensed by students as the right way. The rebellion against the present day, so-called culture; the rebellion against civili-

zation, or against our consciousness as it is politically practiced. Yes, it is right, it is instinctively right. However, the rebellion again works with terms which derive from traditional science. This is the discrepancy. I am again forced to take a step backwards. When I am thinking politically, as well as in my performances, I have to take step backwards. I must certainly discuss the realistic matters in politics. But I must, when I say what will be wanted, or into which political direction we are moving, I must have a projected conception. I must, however, surpass that which is existing. This being so, I can't simply idolize a science, for example, Sociology. I must first clarify the origin of Sociology. That Sociology is a science which is always dealing with what has already developed. Therefore, it hardly deals with development, rather with what has developed: what I am trying to say is that Sociology is not fit for a political evolution. Not for evolution.

Kasper König :

Yes, I believe that is exactly the point of Robert's study, to find out the possibilities of how far education can go. Not only to develop a system, to reach certain aimed ideas, but to live inside the process of education so as to experience a real exchange.

Beuys :

Yes, that is also completely true. We were very much scolded because at the beginning we called our party the "Educational Party". Then it was always said, we don't want to be educated. If people have misunderstood it that way, they were naturally right. We don't want to educate people in that way, that they feel they are simply educated. However, we must insist on this term "Educational Party" because pedagogical though stands as the central point since there is no other, except through education.

Filliou :

Can I say something to you Joseph? In France, during the May Revolution last year, I thought: "I know what students want, they all want to live like we do." This is what they want - all young people want to live like artists. This is what they claim, this is what

they wrote on the wall.

Beuys :

Yes, okay.

Filliou :

In other words, I think that our ideas should be the base of all real values, in the world.

Beuys :

Yes. And it is this which can be formulated very precisely and radically because it is my opinion, and it also is attempted in the party, to invest much hope in that a revolution can arise from Art. However, that doesn't mean that my self-estimation believes that it can only come from the artists, rather that it can come from the concept of Art and anti-Art, or from that which we are practicing. Robert is completely right when he says people want to live as we, that is as we artists do. From this, we again find out that they instinctively mean exactly what I mean, that all knowledge ultimately stems from Art. There are no genetics for Human Knowledge, nor for Physics, nor for Sociology, nor for Behavioral Research, not for any branch of knowledge you wish to take. It ultimately stems from Art. Now, we must again consider the human consciousness of today. However, little can be done with this concept of Art without expanding it, for example, Art is creativity. Indeed, this term of creativity is already an attenuation of what I want to say, but anyway, we can go this far. One can say that every human knowledge, be it Mathematics, Chemistry, Politics ultimately stem from Art. It has been fractured by the human evolution. It separated itself, and that is in my opinion the history of Christianity. It is the history of the Occident, that the Occident substituted undertaking cultivation with namely a singular direction radically aiming at materialism, enabling us to construct a civilization. Therefore, something to do, what we call technology, and we cannot produce technology when remaining at the genetical point: everything derives from Art. Had this been perpetually so, one could never have developed. The consciousness could never have developed to be capable, for example, to build a machine. In that way, that it can build a machine, so that

it practically built our world in which we now live, and perhaps even suffer. In this world of so many existing political difficulties something developed, namely a gap to the subject. There are no longer natural connections to the spiritual collective, as we could say there originally were, rather a gap has developed. Man faces his fellow man as a stranger. There is a great cleavage between this man here and that other man there. Here, freedom enters the conversation as when I say a man is separated from another, then the concept of freedom appears, although negative, that is through the term "separated". Very few people realize that through the negative illumination of this subject, that is when we say people are isolated and alienated, these terms meaning nothing more than that they are free. Of course, this is a completely negative formulation, that is they are mutually separated no longer being forced together in the collective system by blood relationship, or an inspiration culture, or led by a caste of priests, rather they are really independent beings. This nears something which people sense as alienation. But they don't sense this as the negative form of freedom. It means that the umbilical cords really have been cut off. They really have been freed. They are freed from the original total. Perhaps it is much easier to continue that everything depends on the understanding of freedom, whether people see a possibility in future of making a political concept. Today, there are the most various opinions about a political evolution. There is even the opinion today, that it would be possible with a collective. For me, this is totally fatal as, merely through the term collective something arises which is no longer possible because man really is totally isolated and, as such he is absolutely free, but he must overcome the enormous gap with a great amount of energy, he must work together with other people. But this is not collective, for me it is something entirely different. Human collaboration and brotherhood are for me, basically other than collective. Today, a great confusion governs concerning this.

Kasper König :

Yes, Robert does not only formulate, in his book the demand for a social or sexual revolution, but also he is asking for a poetical revolution.

What you formulate, does this cover up everything ideally in relation to the student party or the performances you do?

Beuys :

No, the party does not cover anything.

Kasper König :

Yes, but we can understand the party as a sculpture.

Beuys :

Yes, that is the way I have often put it. Absolutely these terms are interchangeable. Sculpture is especially suited because for me in it is linked the concept of freedom. Because today most people lack confidence in their own potential. As socialists, they formulate something which for me has become totally obsolete. They convene themselves on a Marxist theory or grasp at something from Sociology, which basically is practical Marxism, one could say, Marx being the inventor of Sociology, or the first who provided Sociology with a basis for a science. They single something out and define, for example, from the whole world they see man as a dependent. But really, they always see him as a dependent.

Kasper König :

But the tendencies of the possibilities which are offered here in this book, from the various people and in particular from Filliou himself, are in my opinion strongly political. They have anarchistic tendencies.

Filliou :

I believe that the way we live has a revolutionary potential. Would you agree with me? In other words, I believe if everybody would be an artist, we would be all free.

Beuys :

Yes, that's right, only it seems to me something is reversed here. I would say, with man a consciousness must first be presented, allowing him to conscientiously formulate that he is an artist. But today, people will not admit that they could become artists. The most urgent question which we must cope with here, and which at the Academy is daily repeated,

constantly back and forth with a thousand misunderstandings, is that people say: Art has no relevance. What Robert meant is too optimistically seen. Indeed, the people want to live like this, but on the other hand they are too conscientious simply to be able to live like this. They ask themselves, is it justified? Can Art contribute to the revolutionizing of society. Isn't Art and the complete vocabulary which we've heard enough of to regurgitate, which as such, could be boring for me, merely an alibi for the ruling class. But anyway, I know that it basically comes from a conscientiousness. People have grown up in our rationalistic world where Art is practically no longer of any value. If we look at the world rationalistically, we really must say: Art has no meaning in a rationalistic world. Art is only like an underground movement maintaining a thin blood line which basically stems from prehistoric times. Therefore, was also connected with the spiritual, also mythical, and also the magical. Now, from here it must certainly develop and must actually deal with human freedom. But very few people realize that they can have this freedom, and actually that they already personify this freedom. This is completely obstructed for them. Actually, I talk from morning to night only about freedom. I also try again and again to prove freedom. I try to take into consideration what possibilities there are in Science to comment on freedom. I talk about the information theory because I believe that the information model, when you consequently follow it through by applying the theories of cognition, is the proof that man is a being which reaches beyond himself, that is, he isn't really an earth being. He isn't made for the conditions of earth at all, partout. Only in part is he on this earth to achieve something very certain and this will be extended at a further stage of evolution. He also won't eternally live on this earth. He will perhaps some day live on another planet with other conditions and no longer with this type of body. These are all things related to the concept of sculpture, as such, because sculpture defines the genetic point of all ori-

gin. Here, where man is really not dependent on his external world of objects or his environment, rather he is completely independent based on his concepts of thought and freedom. This therefore, in my opinion designates thought as sculpture. Because thought can't be reduced to anything further as it isn't dependent on the object world. Here, where thought arises there isn't a single object of the outside world present to men. Here, where thought acts, I am not confronted with a subject which externally influences me. For where thought exists nothing can replace it. This can only occur within me. That is to say, it can only enter the world completely new from one point of creation. Therefore, this means that through the thought of man something totally new is introduced into the world. Something free. That is the concept of sculpture, as far as it already occupies itself with thought as sculpture as it already materializes thought, namely, it is already materialized in speech. Here the larynx is already vibrating, material already participates. Therefore, here the creations process is already with the material which, though being in the human body, is also environment. Most people ignore the fact that their own bodies also belong to the environment. They think only what which surrounds them is their environments. My knee is already environment as opposed to human thought. Even my senses, feeling, and my will are environment as opposed to thought. First, nothing is left but thought. Thought must be reduced until it is standing outside the body, until man sees himself from the outside, or sees himself as a stranger. That he sees, there I am, and in fact, I am over there in my thought. But now I must occupy myself with my body. Therefore, I must disassociate myself from my environment which begins in my body. I can also say in my coffin, or in my corpse which I must move based on my thought. That is, I already personify the material which is nothing other than earth. For, when I die, I throw this carcass away again and it remains lying there. I myself move on with my thought, right. Thought is therefore something which

enters the earth now in a child, in this body which develops and which later will be discarded. It deals with this body through language. You can already see thought as environment. I can see through thought that I intervene in the environment when I'm speaking. It is totally natural when my speech is transmitted by sound waves and reaches a counterpart. So to another man who lives under the same conditions as I, it is physically given. This way, a means of information. This is now air, our sound waves, or stones which I throw, or signals which I give and which reach the other person. Here, speech is also plastic. The speech especially is totally plastic because it already has movement. What the mouth does with speech, the blubber it releases, these are also real sculptures, although they can't physically be seen, the air is worked on, the larynx is worked on, the inside of the mouth articulates, the bite, the teeth, etc. On the receiver's end, the sculpture drills itself into the ear. And the cochlea of the inner ear isn't accidental, they accentuate this interlocking of the sculptural process stronger, for example, than sight. One immediately continues by saying today Physiology is regarded as superficial. We regard it as a result of some chemical or physical processes. We must see the ear as a plastic organ of reception. I then logically conclude that the ear is in a better position than the eye to receive sculpture. The eye is a scanning organ. In my opinion it has many more abstract tendencies. It scans form. But the actual plastic is received much more by the ear. To return: thought is to me sculpture. Most of all I am interested in the process of origin, where man is really free, where he isn't dependent on the external object world, but where he can create things himself. Then of course, action is sculpture. Thought doesn't just extend into speech, but thought also becomes writing in certain circumstances. To make letters I must act, at least I must pick up a fountain pen. Thus, writing is sculpture through the characteristic of action. Naturally, I can also take clay, fat, or earth and form it. This is what sculpture is conventionally de-

filled as. We arrive at where people can understand that it is a matter of sculpture. They say, yes, now I understand. But, only with a conventional understanding do they say yes, I understand that is a sculpture. In a way, the point of origin of a sculpture is more interesting than the sculpture itself.

Filliou :

I really think, that what we feel is the base of everything. Do you think, Joseph, that we are condemned to be a small group, minority..

Kasper König :

You see, this is what Beuys has answered before. Saying, and this is very much an interpretation of how I understood it, the way he doesn't look upon this as optimistically as you.....

Beuys :

I was wrong, that wasn't optimism. What Robert saw were rather the desire of many people. He bases this on the characteristics of these desires. He saw things external to the phenomenon, he saw many young people who have the desire to live like this. But perhaps he overlooked that young people can only apply their desire when they get a conscientious answer to "what is human freedom?" or an answer to am I "dependent or am I free?" or at least an exact general view. For they are basically more moralistic than other generations because they pursue social questions. My grandfather and my father have never considered the social question in such a way. They have lived in another phase of history. But we must ask ourselves how this generation arrives at bringing forth the social question. A social question is a moral question and most people cannot clearly extend themselves to Art without receiving the answer to, what is my responsibility in this case? What is in this case my social responsibility? What must I do for society? For I'm sure Robert hasn't overlooked that most people practise criticism on Art, namely asking "does Art render anything to society?" For this question is presented as forcefully as the need to live like an artist. And consequently follows a perpetual discussion reducing our whole political sy-

stem, where, for example, the individual is declared as a social being by the majority. He will be seen as one simply dependent on others. He will not be seen as being free. One also tends to forget that on the basis of the interdependency and the actual economic processes, as Marx said it, or through the process of nature, simply nothing original could be achieved. For when one is perpetually dependent, one can't be creative. This logical mistake is often committed, but anyway I just wanted to say they must now realize it.

Emil Schult:

Robert has already described this point, that young people shouldn't learn, rather to try not to forget what they want. This way every kind of work in society will turn into leisure and freedom.

Beuys :

Yes, that's right, but I know from experience that the majority can't do it before having the uncertainties of their questions illuminated. They simply want to know how something can be accomplished from Art, for the human society, for the communal living. This doesn't ultimately encompass all the questions situated in the artistic field, it merely asks is education at all possible. For there are people who believe everything must be anti-authority, which consequently means that people don't need a teacher. The anti-authority principal consequently contains nothing other than that man is left to himself. That there is also no need for education. We know that there are anti-authoritarian kindergartens. It follows that parents are the most detrimental for children. On the other hand, the question in discussion now is do they need the mother - father principal, or not. This is a question of eminent importance. The question of freedom arises already with a baby. That is, we really can't leave a baby to itself, in other words, the baby doesn't now need an authoritative human being, but authority. This is very often confused, the authoritarian principal and authority. These are actually two things. The authoritarian principal is something negative: authority is also a tree or

a cat running through the room and is reality for the child with which it disassociates itself. Though the question here is if the education of a baby can be left to itself. The question here is can we leave the education of a child to itself. It must be manipulated, lured from one side to the other so as not to get a flat head. Perhaps it needs braces for its teeth so that it won't get a jaw like a donkey etc. Therefore, the intervention of man is very important. So something is already presented here which is often completely rejected. Man must grow up completely free they say. Here freedom is misused, that is not freedom. Because then man doesn't disassociate himself with anything. The world isn't simply a void. He's got on the right earth, and man belongs to earth. The question is, and I won't make any decisions on it, if children require a mother or a father; this is too great a problem, and people want an answer for it. It must therefore be tried from all aspects. Is it right when we say that there must be an antiauthoritarian kindergarten? The children are more or less left to themselves and may do what they want. This is the question, if a person can simply do what he wants, if, for example, he then is able to develop a strong will? Whether from this something arises, whether through education, through man, that is, teacher, nurses, doctors, etc., whether something can be contributed being necessary for a free man of the future. The eminent question is how people today can learn anything at all?

Kasper König :

Are they able to learn more from certain things than from others?

Beuys :

Yes, that is the question.

Kasper König :

..... and the strict systems of education which are still practiced today.

Beuys :

Yes, when one deals with education we come to the conclusion that we live in a non-world. That all our politics don't educate people, but actually misform them. Following this, is that one must involve oneself politically. That one

must submit information to the largest audience. That this information must reach everyone and gradually enlighten them. This again demands a very long breath being always active again explaining to people that they live in a non-world. That it simply cannot be conceded, for example, that the state determines the system of education. The system of education can only be determined by criteria and thoughts of the educators who are really living with these ideas, as we live with them and then, perhaps after a long discussion, have to reach a decision. Even when, point by point, this is only temporarily the best. For already today, we have to deal with human beings and again tomorrow. We can't wait until we have the ideal solution, but we must already decide today. But the solution must be as good as possible and can't be determined by some power - structure, that is, not by politics. Here the revolutionary can work constructively, for example, for the autonomy of the "Hochschulen". To break away from the tutelage of the state.

Filliou :

Joseph, you know this box you have made, this cookbook. You just wrote "intuition" in it. Now would you consider the world as an enormous cookbook, so I should think all you need is intuition - if you have intuition you would make sense out of all this cooking?

Beuys :

Yes, but this term intuition isn't anything else than that which we understood as thought. Its superior form. Intuition is when we consequently consider it, also experiencing it by dealing intensively, again and again, with the thought itself. This is nothing more than the superior form of thinking. That which people today are always shouting as a slogan: enlarged consciousness. The expanded consciousness is the intuition. It's the thought which recognizes itself. The point of creation. Intuition is that which realizes man is free. In fact, this is only possible by the means of thought, as thought realizes itself as thought.

Lieber Co-Autor, wie wärs, Sie schickten Kopien Ihrer Ansichten zum

Lehren und Lernen als Aufführungskünste
c/o Verlag Gebr. König
5 Köln
Breitestrasse 93

Ob und wann wir sie in einer anderen Ausgabe verwenden; wir werden mit Ihnen Kontakt aufnehmen.

Dear co-author, how about sending copies of your views to

Teaching and Learning as Performing Arts
c/o Verlag Gebr. König
5 Köln- Westgermany
Breitestrasse 93

If and when we use them in another edition; we'll get in touch with you.