

[00:00:01.740] - **Mariano López Seoane**

Welcome everybody. We're going to start in a few minutes. I'm very, very pleased personally, and we should be pleased as a group to welcome Inés, who is, as you probably know, Director of Latin American Art and Director of the Cisneros Institute at MoMA in New York and a great friend. I'm really happy that she's here. Very honored as well. It's a privilege and a joy to have you here. For those of you who don't know, this is part of a seminar that I'm teaching here at CCS Bard that is basically focused in Latin American practices in the mid and end of the '60s, and this is a period that Inés knows very well, that she's going to center in her talk today as well. So in a sense having that context is important, that it's a talk that was thought of in connection to what we are doing in the course. But anyway, of course, you are all welcome to be here and you will as well understand. So she's gonna present, there's some slides as you can see, and then we're gonna have a talk about this and questions, a Q&A.

[00:01:08.280] - **Inés Katzenstein**

Okay? Thank you.

[00:01:09.460] - **Mariano López Seoane**

Yes.

[00:01:10.020] - **Inés Katzenstein**

Thank you, Mariano, for the invitation. It's a pleasure to be here. Very nice to meet you all, all of you. I'm gonna make this presentation, which I think is around 20 minutes, 25 minutes perhaps, and then we can have a discussion or a conversation. If you feel you want to interrupt for some reason, that's fine. Or if there's something you don't understand and you want me to repeat, I can do it also. So I'm going to start. My presentation today has two goals. First, I want to break through what became the main narrative of the '60s in Argentina, highlighting the lives and the work of three artists that for many reasons were anomalies and at the same time, I will argue, key to understanding the stakes and challenges of this period. Secondly, I have another goal which is less historiographic and that addresses, hopefully, our present today.

Considering the context of hyper-professionalization of our contemporary art system, I decided to present to you a series of artists who, within the terms of their own time, propose themselves as counter-models for whom not quite fitting the normativities of mental health or gender became a challenge to their legitimacy as artists and even to their own survival.

[00:02:52.810] - **Inés Katzenstein**

And by doing it, I want to bring to you some questions that I won't attempt to answer, but I hope are useful to engage in your dialogs with artists. How do we listen to the peculiarity of an artist's voice? And also, how could we recuperate as a critical model the value of rebelliousness and nonsense vis-à-vis the dominance of the figure of the artist as a rational professional intellectual? Hopefully by the end of the talk you will understand these questions better. Before entering into the fascinating lives of these three artists, let me share with you a quick introduction to their context. During the '60s in Latin America, politics became the most important parameters in establishing the legitimacy of the production of writers and artists, and many visual artists transformed themselves into so-called committed intellectuals, agents working to bring about radical change in society. The main catalyst of this conversion was the Cuban Revolution, which while happening far away from Argentina, rapidly spread throughout the region as a model for political action and as ideal where to project solidarity. And here I want to show you this fantastic poster by the Argentine artist Roberto Jacoby that says, "A guerrilla doesn't die to be hung on a wall." And of course, the guerrilla is Che Guevara, who was in '69 already an icon, dead.

[00:04:42.720] - **Inés Katzenstein**

And you know, here [PICTURE] is like a pop icon, and so this is a critique of art in a way from the point of view of Jacoby. But you can see here the kind of shift from art to politics. In Argentina, this process of politicization became especially confrontational, and different groups of artists working in the main cities found their relationship with institutions growing increasingly tense. As you have probably seen in Mariano's class, the situation almost exploded in 1968 when there was an escalation of ideological debates

that marked a somewhat dramatic culmination of a decade characterized by an unprecedented cultural and artistic experimentation. As the students of Mariano probably know, at this point, the scene in Argentina features a wide spectrum of artistic vocabularies and conceptual explorations, ranging from artists such as Marta Minujín, with her massive happenings and her very particular way of embodying the transformation of the figure of the artist into a celebrity, through artists such as David Lamelas, who used communication theory as a platform for the postulation of a media-based art. And here, this work is very interesting because it's an office of information in which there is a telex machine at the right that brings information about the Vietnam War live, something that for us today is, you know, old-fashioned news, but at that point was a very kind of contemporary technology.

[00:06:31.860] - Inés Katzenstein

So from Marta Minujín, passing through David Lamelas, to Luis Felipe Noé, who after revolutionizing painting for nearly a decade, decided to abandon artistic practice in favor of a political commitment more coherent with his ideals. This amazingly energetic moment found its main space in the celebrated Instituto Torcuato di Tella, a private center dedicated to visual, performing, and musical arts, where you could see different expressions of informalism, primary structures, pop, and the works of some of the pioneers of happening and conceptual art. And here we see works by Edgardo Gimenez, these like black beautiful stars that are for me a very brilliant kind of intersection between pop and like primary structures, and David Lamelas' Situation of Time with seventeen TVs connected in this kind of snow effect in a specific gallery. As the '60s progressed and different forms of cultural and political repression unfolded, commitment to the revolutionary grew more explicit and more intense. In 1965, for example, the work The Christian and Western Civilization by León Ferrari was censored by the director of the Di Tella Institute. So this is a key piece in the 1960s Argentina, this kind of collage between a Christ and an American I don't know, F-something.

[00:08:16.110] - Inés Katzenstein

It's a very famous airplane used in the Vietnam War. It's like an anti-colonial monument,

this piece. Police detentions started being very common at that time, and in this context, the political positions of writers and artists tended to harden and grow more radical, in many cases adopting what the historian Claudia Gilman describes as a, quote unquote, "marked regulatory and disciplinary left-wing wheel." By this she means a social condemnation of artists that did not join the leftist movement. The following quote from León Ferrari, written in 1968, summarized the ideology and eloquence that dominated the moment. I quote: "Art will not be beauty or novelty. Art will be efficacy and unease. A successful work of art will be that in which, within their medium, the artist had an impact in some way equivalent to a terrorist attack on a country struggling to liberate itself." Here, these two pictures show some of the increasing violence of the moment and how it translated into the art world. At the left, Graciela Carnevale's performance in which she locked the audience in her opening until they finally broke the glass door. And at the right, the closure of the exhibition *Experiencias 68* at the Di Tella Institute by the police, which resulted in the artists destroying their own works in the sidewalks.

[00:10:08.070] - **Inés Katzenstein**

It is bearing in mind this backdrop of ideological exaltation, and considering that precisely the artists who participated in this process are the ones that have been highlighted internationally in the recent decades, that I have decided to concentrate today in what I see as an adjacent but different side of the '60s, also political, rebel, and counter-institutional, but definitively individual and non-programmatic. I will make an account of this other side of the '60s by focusing in three incredible lives, three male artists, Alberto Greco, Jorge Bonino, and Federico Manuel Peralta Ramos, exceptional figures who, like clowns of sorts, not only avoided but opposed the rational and programmatic discourse of their colleagues and— this is very important— ended up sacrificing themselves by surrendering to the classic avant-garde motto of dissolving the barriers between between art and life. Two of them committed suicide, and the third, according to rumors, may have died young by suicide too. Not confirmed. As we will see, they were three performers who, due to a particular condition in common, set somewhere between insanity, stupidity, and genius, were marginalized, forgotten, died,

or were excluded from the historical left-wing canon because they were considered apolitical and not having the integrity and resilience of the more professional artists.

[00:11:56.900] - **Inés Katzenstein**

The question of failure is key here. In a way, as we will see, they are antiheroes. Either they renounced arts and life like Greco, who were isolated like Bonino, who was condemned to wander through the parks of a psychiatric asylum until he committed suicide in 1990, or declined into mass media ridicule like Peralta Ramos on TV. We'll see this soon. Are we going well? Yeah? See? Okay, cool. We continue. So we're going to go one by one. I think they are fascinating. Also try to think about their lives as a kind of almost like fiction. They are not fictional, but think about it like that. So let's start. Jorge Bonino was born in 1935 and is of the three artists the less well-known. The son of a Protestant evangelist, he was an architect by training, but immediately after graduation began to produce performances and distance himself from architecture. He soon found his way to the Instituto Di Tella, where he produced *Bonino Clears Up Certain Doubts*, in 1966, and two years later, *Interest or Statements*, both of which were enormously successful. He then took his shows on tour to café theaters in Paris, Spain, Germany, and the Netherlands between 1969 and 1973.

[00:13:44.110] - *Inés Katzenstein*

We don't know where exactly they were shown. No records of these performances remain. All there is is an audio recording of two shows in Buenos Aires and the script for one of them. In Paris, tormented by the sensation that, quote, everyone in Europe seems dead, he joined a group of homeless people in the Place de Montesquieu where he plotted his movement through the city on a paranoid map that showed the bridges he felt safe using to cross the Seine that day and the ones he couldn't, until the moment came when he couldn't envision a safe path and swam across instead. After this, he was committed to a psychiatric hospital, and in 1974, he was returned to Argentina where he took refuge in the city of his birth, Córdoba. In 1975, now recovered, he presented *Bonino Tries to Perform but Not Very Hard*. Later, he would disappear back to the psychiatric asylum where he could remain until he commits suicide in 1990. Like the

data shows, like [James] Joyce's *Finnegans Wake* or the two plays Marguerite Duras wrote in the late '60s in a language of her own invention. Bonino's performances were spoken in an invented language that sounded, according to the press of the time, like a mixture of Romanian and Spanish, also described as a storm of nonsense which nobody speaks but nevertheless lets loose a flood of meaning.

[00:15:35.200] - **Inés Katzenstein**

The use of these non-words was based on a willingness to destroy language, to find an escape from the limits of language, in order to engage in what Bonino described, quote, as a critique of the world from no particular point of view. To give a better idea of his performances, it is important to say that they were structured as part conference, part masterclass, class, part political ceremony. Bonino acted from a stage with a table, blackboard, and a map of the world in which he could teach something that sounded as geopolitics or mathematics. A lecture performance, we could say today. In *A Ficciones y Enunciados*, the idea in the pedagogical sense was radical. The show began with the audience learning to pronounce every vowel again from scratch. Then Bonino would portray an everyday situation such as eating or waking up and slowly teach his audience to look at certain objects in a new way in the best tradition of Brechtian strange men. But everything he said was always incomprehensible. The writer Tamara Kamenszain describes Bonino as, quote, "An unhinged Zen master, a second-rate Wittgenstein." And she wrote that quote, "The comic brilliance of his shows and life shouldn't distract us from how radical his message was.

[00:17:10.040] - **Inés Katzenstein**

You know nothing. You must be forever learning everything all over again." Using the plasticity, pathos, and idiosyncrasy typical of clowns, Bonino was attacking the idea of art as a system for the circulation of meaning. Along these lines, we can connect him to the drawings that Leon Ferrari began to produce at the time, a series of distorted pieces of handwriting including his celebrated letter to a general from 1963 written in illegible roughness. Like Bonino's Glossolalia, these writings— and here I'm showing you more— are closer to mute experimental drawings than to the instrumentality of the

word, more encrypted than legible. In the case of Ferrari, because of his particular political activism against religious and political oppression, they have been interpreted as the resilience of critique under a growing climate of censorship. The work of Mirtha Dermisache, another Argentine, and her amazing series of letters were produced a couple of years later in Buenos Aires. And if we think that within Revolutionary moments like the '60s in Latin America, a new language needs to emerge. Let me connect these works also with Cecilia Vicuña's Palabras that were like— were trying to somehow break words and find other meanings through drawing.

[00:19:01.770] - **Inés Katzenstein**

It's not at all easy to introduce the second artist in this series, Federico Manuel Peralta Ramos, for two reasons. First, because he was an artist who produced more situations and anecdotes than actual works or projects, although we will see some. And second, because he was an artist whose stage, whose audience and context was almost exclusively the city of Buenos Aires. He was a wanderer who used newspaper kiosks, cafes, and clubs as his favorite venues and produced aphorisms that are hard to translate in the sense that they are intrinsically linked to the linguistic and cultural codes of a specific city and period. I like it here, was his motto. By political choice, he was hyper-local. So let me give you some background. Are we going well? Yeah?

[00:20:02.330] - **Mariano López Seoane**

Yes. Good.

[00:20:07.080] - **Inés Katzenstein**

Born into an upper-class family, Federico Manuel Peralta Ramos received formal training as an artist, but little by little began to reject the notion of art as work in order to embrace a total identification between life and specifically leisure and art.

[00:20:31.648] - **Inés Katzenstein**

What he produced then, was a diffuse and provocative activity that he described as metaplastic, which included situations, jokes, statements, public actions, aphorisms,

and myths about himself. But one of the interesting aspects is that although he might have been a little lunatic, Peralta Ramos was in no way an outsider and his practice was tremendously productive in the artistic field of Buenos Aires in the '60s and '70s, assimilating all the important themes of the avant-garde of the time and using them as a conceptual model for work avoidance. The idea of the dematerialization of the work of art, for example, so important during that time, was for Quino's a strategy to transform his poetic ordinary wisdom into art, as we can see here in this painting by him, in English originally, that says, "My life is my best work of art." As we shall see, in Peralta Ramos, personality, lifestyle, and artwork became one and the same, impossible to separate. A perfect example of this is the work he made when he was awarded a generous Guggenheim grant in 1968 in the painting section. With the funds of the grant, he held a banquet in the restaurant of the fancy Alvear Palace Hotel for a group of 25 friends, inviting them to come dance in the Africa Club later on, he had three suits made.

[00:22:30.520] - **Inés Katzenstein**

He paid all his debts from an exhibition he had put on the year before, invested \$300,000 in stocks, and because the grant was meant for painting, he bought three paintings by contemporary Argentine artists, one for him and the other two to give to each of his parents. He also made a record called I Am a Piece of Atmosphere. After he has spent the money, he sent a letter detailing the use of the funds to the Guggenheim Foundation in which he stated that these demonstrations were driven by, quote, "my conviction that life is a work of art. My philosophy consists of the phrase 'being in the world.'" The Guggenheim Foundation wasn't happy with the use of the funds and sent the artist a letter requesting that he return \$3,000, to which Federico answered, quote, "amazed and upset that he couldn't return the sum" because to do so would be quote, "To express disbelief in my attitude, which is an homage to freedom." So this is the letter that he sends to The Guggenheim. To consider this work, which represents a watershed in his perception of the possibilities of art, and understand some aspects of his practice, which we shall examine later on, it is useful to recall once again, Georges Bataille's reading of The Gift by the French anthropologist Marcel

Mauss.

[00:24:14.380] - **Inés Katzenstein**

I don't know if you know about this, but studying the Aztecs and also some North American societies, the anthropologist Mauss analyzed the practice of the gift and the counter-gift as an exchange in which power and prestige are achieved. Not through accumulation of resources, but through the distribution or the squandering of wealth. Simplifying greatly, the person who gets rid of, destroys, gives away, or loses the most wins the most in terms of power and rank. So when Peralta Ramos receives the grant, he spends it on fun, on meals and gifts, with his friends and family. As an unruly descendant of an agricultural-based aristocracy, decadently accustomed to unproductive expense, Peralta Ramos uses his grant on the goal of achieving the hedonistic ideal consisting of taking and giving pleasure. In addition to hedonism, the situation, or should we say the project, is also obviously a transgression of the conventions of the art system. Would institutional critique be a good frame to understand it? Let's see his show in Galleria Arte Nuevo in 1967, in which, in a kind of kitsch synthesis, he used the key elements of the avant-garde repertoire of the '60s primary structures, neon lights, readymades to frame his objects of personal consumption and pleasure.

[00:26:01.420] - **Inés Katzenstein**

A box of— here we see a cheese, a box of marrón glacés, the mate. Do you know the mate drink? A mate drink, coffee, and a telephone. And all exhibited in these eccentric color pedestals lit with neon lighting as if they were part of a futurist prop closet. These small monuments paid homage to cheese, mate, and sweets, all objects that we could define as dialogical or relational pleasures, objects of affect, as we can see. As you can see, they share the specific space with neon signs that says hello and goodbye, completely ingenious and hospitable signs from a very unique artist. I love these pieces. I don't know if you love them too. Look at them [PICTURE]. It's like Dan Flavin's. From this moment on, Peralta Ramos used words as one of his main forms of expression, becoming a self-defined guru, a quote-on-quote “metaphysical cosmologue”, as he

would say. He wrote poems, aphorisms, jokes, and lyrics, gave hundreds of interviews to the press in which he shared his philosophy, and in many cases transformed his phrases into paintings. He preached that we were entering a new phase of the world in which, quote, "The ugly ducklings, the psychotic ones, the scapegoats are going to enter society.

[00:27:48.110] - **Inés Katzenstein**

They are starting to be the most important beings in the family." And he transferred his aphorisms into canvas in a very straightforward way, and I'm going to show you Mystery of Economy, which is like a joke with the— how do you say?

[00:28:07.620] - **Mariano López Seoane**

Ministry.

[00:28:08.330] - **Inés Katzenstein**

Ministry of Economics. So Mystery of Economy [PICTURE]. This one, which I love, that says how beautiful— it's lovely to lie in bed looking at you. And this other saying, "God is very, very strange." He also exhibited an old wooden gun next to a sign that said, "Be careful," or "Beware of painting." His interest in connecting with a wide audience beyond the elite of the art world, combined with his belief in the importance of the artist's presence, took shape in many works of which I will mention The Fat Man's Little Gallery from 1986, which consisted in the creation of a waiting room-like space in a city-run cultural center where Peralta Ramos spent hours hanging out, waiting for people to come over to chat. This kind of work, in which the borders of the artistic situation disappear, and where dialog, or its possibility, occupies a central space, clearly places Peralta Ramos as a precedent for many artists working in the '90s around so-called relational esthetics. To conclude with Federico, his humorous and yet critically tense relationship with the art system and his willingness to reach an audience beyond its borders led him to participate as a regular guest in one of the most successful and brilliant coming political TV shows of the time, presented by Tato Bores.

[00:29:53.770] - **Inés Katzenstein**

His performance consisted of acting like himself, Federico, in a kind of trance or delirium. This TV appearance, half ridiculous, half surreal, were perhaps one of the reasons behind Peralta Ramos' erasure from the canonical art history of the '60s until very recently. But at the same time, they were an accomplishment of sorts for someone obsessed on the one hand with visibility and ego, and on the other with the possibility of introducing himself to a broad audience talking from the perspective of someone who defined himself as psycho-different. Peralta Ramos, who struggled with obesity all his life, would die young on his own terms, presumably after eating thirty six croissants. This is what they say.

[00:30:53.040] - **Inés Katzenstein**

Well, this is our last character of the night. Perhaps I should have started this talk with the figure of Alberto Greco, because chronologically speaking, he was the one of the three artists discussed— he's the first of the three artists discussed, and because he's an artist who produced a more formal and well-known body of work. But I leave him until last because he's the one who, in terms of discourse, created the most extreme movement ranging from a maximum contraction of language to the exhaustion of language as professional verbiage.

[00:31:36.860] - **Inés Katzenstein**

Poor to the point of homelessness, gossipy, clairvoyant, if we compare it with Peralta Ramos, more of a witch than a guru, with an extremely intense social life, Greco lived in a frenetic state of transit between 1950 1954, when he left Buenos Aires on his way to Europe, and his death in Barcelona in 1965. During those years, he lives in São Paulo, Madrid, Paris, Rome, Buenos Aires, Ibiza, and New York, staying in each city until his economic or emotional situation became intolerable. His tendency towards public scandal made his path a litany of incredible anecdotes, which include being deported from Italy for his heretical involvement in the play Cristo '63, releasing live mice at the feet of the Italian president Antonio Segni during the opening ceremony of the Venice Biennial in 1962, and covering Rome with posters saying, "Greco puto," Greco the

Fagot, and also *La Pintura e Finita, Viva el Arte Vivodito*, [translating] *Painting is Dead, Long Live to the Vivodito Art--Greco*. But it was the invention in 1962 of a form of art called the *Vivo-Dito* that entered Greco into the canon of Latin American art history as one of the pioneers of conceptual art, being 'De Vivo-Dito' the strongest response to the Duchampian ready-made from the South.

[00:33:21.470] - **Inés Katzenstein**

In 'De Vivo Dito,' the Duchampian gesture of appropriation of everyday objects becomes literal, a performative gesture and a political one. 'Dito' refers in Italian to the pointed finger of the artist indicating people on the street. *Vivo-Dito* presented the encounter between the artist and an anonymous person, an instant during which the artist's only intervention is pointing at the chosen subject, drawing a circle around them, signing, and getting someone to take a picture of the action. These performances represent the maximum possible concentration of discourse and image. There's nothing to say, nothing to touch, only a demonstrative gesture with the tip of a finger and an ephemeral chalk line capturing the subject in an ordinary moment of their life. The signature, conceptual art's fetish, is the only word involved. *Vivo-Dito* explored two fundamental questions. First, it was a as I just said, an incisive, human-focused version of the Duchampian readymade. Nothing to do but a choice and a selfie. In this respect, Greco wrote, quote, "living art is a contemplation and direct communication. It strives to break with the premeditation of the gallery and exhibit. We need to get into direct contact with the living elements of our reality."

[00:34:58.330] - **Inés Katzenstein**

End of quote. Secondly, Greco's favorite subjects for the *Vivo-Dito* share a particular sociological dimension. The majority of the photos that document *Vivo-Dito* actions show poor people. An old man that you see there, an old woman, a worker, a peasant, a pipe seller, a shoeshine man. These choices place Greco at the forefront of a series of Latin American artists who work with poverty as a central topic, including in Argentina Oscar Boni and his *Familia Obrera* on the left [PICTURE], which consisted— that is a worker family that was exhibited on a pedestal in the halls of the Di Tella Institute during

the duration of the exhibition *Experiencias 68*. And on the right, Oscar Masotta with his controversial happening during which he harassed a group of poor people, old people, specially hired for the purpose with bright lights and loud noises. Masotta would define this type of artist as monsters of sincerity. So Greco's chalk circles drawn on the streets and the outlines of subjects painted on white canvases had the goal of showing through this ritual the existence of those poor old people whose mere presence constituted an offense against the pop ideals of youth and enthusiasm.

[00:36:40.240] - **Inés Katzenstein**

That were prevalent at that time. And here you can see a comparison between Greco's choice of this old woman and Yves Klein's famous anthropometries, you know, with young beautiful women. So the *Vivo-Dito* is the first symbol of Greco's rebelliousness, an attack on the viewer's comfort regarding his or her social position. After producing this extreme silence, Greco started writing prolifically, compulsively. Faced with the stormy intensity of a life of queer drama, the written word played a fundamental role for Greco in his search for communication and inscription of his ever-conflicting self onto the public sphere. This explains the fact that throughout his life, Greco produced messages, confessions, stories, and novels in drawings, notebooks, and letters, which functioned as an ongoing and omnipresent diary of his cultural consumptions and his despair. So little by little, writing invaded the surface of his drawings and paintings until it almost took them over. As the years went by, the verbiage increased and it is actually possible to argue that even though Greco is considered to be a visual artist, he ended up his life as a writer. But as Bonino— as in Bonino, his relationship with language was not at all terse.

[00:38:23.680] - **Inés Katzenstein**

I quote, "Sometimes I think," he wrote, and here is surprising coincidence with Bonino. I continue, "that we should write a different kind of dictionary because these dictionaries don't have enough words. I'm not happy with their definitions of wit and heart. And why is the word magic separated from the word ward?" and the word beauty from the word man, and the words everything and sad from the word wonder. With the passing of

time, this innocence would disappear, giving way to more carefree and even abject queer writing, including obscenities, laments, notations, onomatopoeia, fiction, and quotes, all cut up, juxtaposed, and confused, occupying the page or the canvas with no composition at all. I'm finishing, be patient. But the immediacy of registering his feelings and the possibility of using language to exercise his suffering did not seem to be enough for Greco to express or contain his desperation. He was thus the first of a series of entropic the three clowns I present today, followed by Bonino and Peralta Ramos. They all experienced a parallel radicalization of feeling, marginalization, and work, going down a path that would eventually become irreversible. Neither art nor life would be enough.

[00:39:59.210] - **Inés Katzenstein**

In this regard, Greco was perhaps the most extreme of the three. He commits suicide in 1960, in 1965 at 35 years old due to a romantic obsession after writing the word "the end" in one of his hands and after completing in one tragic summer in Ibiza his novel *Besos Brujos*, "The Witching Kisses", which the press of the time called the first artwork that pop art gave to Argentine literature. And perhaps one of the most daring gay novels of the period. The irreversibility of life and artistic experience together is a fundamental fact in understanding these three artists and represents a unique contribution to the humanist philosophy which still typifies this period. What these artists show us is that art and life are not easy to reconcile, and that at the end art may not save us. These artists reach beyond art but also beyond life. The dissolution of borders became in the end self-annihilation. So let me repeat the questions I presented to you at the beginning. How do we listen to the peculiarity of an artist voice. How could we recuperate as a critical model the value of rebelliousness and nonsense vis-à-vis the dominance of the discourse of an intellectual constructed rationally?

[00:41:36.800] - **Inés Katzenstein**

So this is all what I wanted to read to you, you know, and with the idea of opening up the discussion, very especially for those of you who are like doing the '60s class.



Speakers Series :Inés Katzenstein  
Thursday, October 17th, 2024  
Center for Curatorial Studies at Bard College  
Annandale on Hudson, N.Y.