

Questionnaire

1. In what ways have artists, academics (faculty, staff, and students), and cultural institutions (including collectors, dealers, and magazines) responded to the U.S.-led invasion and occupation of Iraq? Can you offer examples of significant oppositional practices? How would you assess the forms, visibility, and efficacy (or lack thereof) of opposition?

2. Are there examples of an active counter-public sphere in which protest against the war in Iraq is conducted with an intensity comparable to the protests organized during the era of the Vietnam War? What, if anything, demotivates the current generation of academics and artists from assuming positions of public critique and opposition against the barbarous acts committed by the government of the United States against a foreign country? Do you consider the absence of the draft the sole significant factor?

3. Can we speak of the “professionalization” of the artist (as a highly paid and market-dependent provider of infotainment) as having reduced or eliminated political consciousness from cultural production? Have academics and those working in cultural institutions been subject to similar processes of professionalization, and if so, what have been the effects of this professionalization? What have been the political effects of the increasing marginalization of the humanities in American academic institutions? Do artists and academics still regard cultural production as a socially and politically communicative, transgressive, or critical activity?

4. Antiwar opposition seems most visible on the Internet, where information is distributed, money is raised, and demonstrations are organized. How does this electronic-technological public sphere compare to the public protests of the Vietnam era, during which agitprop cultural activities were organized through word of mouth, flyers, and planning meetings, and demonstrations were staged in

the streets, in museums (for example, by Guerrilla Art Action Group), in theaters (Bread and Puppet Theater, The Living Theatre), and in a variety of print media (from pamphlets to weekly magazines)?

5. Does this condition imply a fundamental transformation of the sense of a public political subject? Do advanced technologies (and more specifically, the ease with which we consume them) serve simultaneously as universally accessible tools of communication and as spaces of social confinement and depoliticization?

6. What, if anything, do you think can be done to make intellectual and artistic opposition to the war more active and effective?

16BEAVER

Ayreen Anastas
Rene Gabri
Benj Gerdes
Jesal Kapadia
Pedro Lasch
Naeem Mohaiemen
Paige Sarlin

1. a. It is good to talk about the war on Iraq, but why only focus on Iraq? Where do we place Afghanistan? Guantanamo Bay? The Patriot Act? The occupation of Palestine? Or last year's war on Lebanon? Why not at least refer to the inane "war on terror," which preserves the infinite and all-encompassing dimension of what we are confronting? How to begin to discuss Darfur and our impending ecological crisis within this same conversation? How do we discuss the large-scale dispossession being carried out in the name of development and "free markets" across the globe? How to connect these global issues to what is happening in American towns and cities or just on or across our borders? And the struggles last year in Oaxaca? You ask, how are artists and academics and cultural institutions responding to Iraq? It seems that your question is designed to produce only one answer, too often isolating it and removing it from a much larger picture. We need to try and connect the dots, which does not mean not resisting the war in Iraq. It just means that our activism and our daily activities need to connect. Our resistance needs to begin to be lifelong and embedded in our everyday activities. As cultural workers, if we are ignorant about the connections and we are not actively seeking to discover them, we are part of the problem.

P.S. Since when did magazines, dealers, and collectors become cultural institutions?

(Rene Gabri)

b. A war is a war is a war with only certain tongues spoken in *October*. Breaking News: "the mainstream media has also claimed responsibility."

The most inspiring examples are found in small circles and unpredictable forms among the multitudes, not among the anointed or representative few. Search through the 16Beaver Mondays or Articles archive (www.16beavergroup.org/monday/) or the projects/events pages (www.16beavergroup.org/). There isn't a month since 1999 without a mention, or discussion, or reading, or screening, or action, or project, or protest about Iraq Sanctions, the Afghanistan War, the Iraq War(s), Guantanamo, Palestine and the Occupied Territories, Sudan, the WTO,

Electoral Scams, Corporate Fraud, Global Wealth Accumulation, etc. One has to sift through the piles of traces left by actions that might seem insignificant but have in a few years made the large majority of the U.S.'s population oppose the current war. This major change of popular opinion was certainly not aided or produced by the various years of post-9/11 silence and the lack of dissent in the mainstream media or the two-party system (or the art market and its associated criticism).

(Pedro Lasch)

We also have to ask ourselves, what determines significance? Maybe the greatest significance emerges in the collective (sometimes unintended) consequences of all of our actions. And what appears as significant or singular is only a moment of visible coagulation, a moment that is only a trace of all that came before it. An example found or produced may lead to many others, creating a map of creation and resistance that is unique to our experience.

(Lasch and Gabri)

Our work at 16Beaver attempts to create a public conversation about these connections and to do so in a continuous and steady way. It has been an unending conference with many efforts to connect to things going on in the world and in the city of New York. Its significance is more meaningful when it is used, emulated, taken, and transformed by others into other ways of thinking and doing. Some of its significance is lost when that collectivity and self-organized aspect is fetishized (in the cultural sphere) and robbed of its political dimension, robbed of what motivates or underpins it, which is a sincere desire to understand, analyze, and change the world. Our activity is not THE answer or solution, it is a way of figuring out the right questions, sharing those with one another, learning from each other. By connecting with others, remaining open, we are also constantly rethinking what and how we do. We don't need manifestos; we need sustainable and ongoing opposition to the different mechanisms that fuel the war and the other situations named in the first part of this response.

(Gabri)

c. as*ssess: to sit beside, assist in the office of a judge . . . 1: to determine the rate or amount of (as a tax); 2.a: to impose (as a tax) according to an established rate, b: to subject to a tax, charge, or levy; 3: to make an official valuation (of property) for the purposes of taxation; 4: to determine the importance, size, or value of; 5: to charge (a player or team) with a foul or penalty.

Ass ess S S? I would not assess or quantify anything of the sort. We will not get grants, credits, or a tax break to fight this or any other war. The State will assess. I hope we may break its numbers or at least resignify them. We need irresponsible (or can randomness ever be responsible?), passionate, and intelligent multiplications, not a careful and quantitative evaluation.

(Lasch)

2. a. There are two common yet troubling implications in this question that seem worth addressing. First, it is implied that the intensity of the Vietnam-era protests succeeded in creating a true counter-public sphere, which we need to compare ourselves to. While we can agree that the protests helped end the war, and the end of the war was better than the war itself, we may say that the Vietnam-era resistance and the people involved in it were not able to bring accountability to the genocidal state criminals of that period. Neither were they able to systematically transform what they were fighting against. We might have great respect for many of the people in that generation and their efforts, but this is far from saying that they created a great model for us to follow or look up to. Calling the end of the war a success seems especially crude if you try to explain what you mean to a Vietnamese survivor. Second, it is implied by analogy that the goal of our movement should be to END the war, just like they did with Vietnam. The question I would ask here is: if all had “gone well,” the occupation had “ended swiftly,” and “no more American lives were being lost” after the infamous Mission Accomplished, would you/we be talking about an opposition to anything?

I hope we would, but in that case our opposition would be one against a system that needs to be changed, even if a war had already ended. Shouldn't we also bring to justice the people responsible for so much death, suffering, and destruction, even if only so future leaders might think twice before they follow in their footsteps?

In terms of the present counter-public sphere, there are many examples of active opposition wherever you look. However, our contemporary forms of censorship and self-censorship have become so sophisticated and powerful that one of their largest dangers seems to be the way in which they make us unable to see the very movements we are a part of . . . very much in the way that classic factory alienation breaks the connection between the worker and the fruits of his or her labor. It is precisely the existing connections that are the most threatening to militaristic, greedy, and territorial minds. They go straight for the destruction, criticism, or obscurement of these links across boundaries, and they have shown all willingness to use any means and resources necessary to do it. If we simply rebuild the links or point at them, the picture of a massive and brave creative production (and opposition) emerges.

(Lasch)

This question of visibility “now” as compared to “then” always comes up, but precisely because the resistance today is far-flung and transnational in a way that was not possible during Vietnam. Much of the pan-nation solidarity organizing of that era was between the United States and Europe—the iconic images of student action at Columbia, Berkeley, etc., ended up inspiring other direct actions in Germany and France (often with different methods and intensity), and vice versa. In Tariq Ali and Susan Watkins's book *1968: Marching in the Streets* (1998), juxtaposed press images construct a story of parallel, perpetually interconnected movements.

But just looking at the riots in East Pakistan (today's Bangladesh), most of that sound and fury unfolded in isolation from, and independent of, the Vietnam antiwar movement. Fast forward to now: the Iraq invasion has produced much larger, sprawling, transborder organizing, counternarratives, and oppositional forces. So instead of being concentrated in the U.S. and E.U., it spreads over a much wider network. There's a Euro-American navel-gazer who thinks that because the streets of New York and London are not perpetually choked with protesters, nothing is happening.

Paradoxically, the imaginary of a hegemonic America is so solid, even stories of resistance inside American borders can get lost—because of global fears that the U.S. population is “united” behind permanent war. In the 1960s, there was a global perception that the Empire was under critique from inside and outside. By contrast, consider a recent American antiwar icon like Cindy Sheehan: she seems to be virtually unknown in Asia and Africa. This is either because South nation activists discount the possibility that such people could exist inside American borders, or because American activists fail to reach out to much wider networks. Or both?

(Naeem Mohaiemen)

One clear arena has been the large groupings of social forums and smaller-scale international and regional gatherings taking place throughout the world. The impact of these meetings may not be immediately visible, but they will alter global politics significantly in the coming decades. Artists and cultural workers are finding their way into these networks, but they need to be integrated as a part of the discussion, not as a side show or decoration.

(Gabri)

b. I do not see less motivation in the current generations as related to previous ones. I'm afraid we tend to romanticize past struggles and in so doing fail to see the power of our common present and the ways we challenge it. How long did it take to end the Vietnam War? How many years, how many dead on all sides? What might possibly help us now is if we stop looking for the center. The center will find itself, if it is needed. A large part of the damage caused by corporate media and party politics is justified by the notion that they are creating a middle ground. On the one hand, this is simply false. Rupert Murdoch is not a figure in the center, and there is clearly no equivalent to him on the Left. But even if it were true, we should ask ourselves: a center for what? There is too much focus on negotiation and polling of “public opinion” these days. Majorities can be wrong and have been shown so repeatedly and violently. By insisting that we are connected to people who disagree, but that we are voicing a viewpoint (a minority one) and will continue to act in a particular way regardless of what a “majority” reportedly thinks (or how they censor us), we are NOT being elitist, intolerant, or undemocratic. Within the U.S. this set of implications is one of the most successful concoctions of the Republican movement against the status of culture, education, and dissent.

It is also what keeps Democrats in existence, in spite of their party's utter lack of integrity and respect for their constituency. This does not mean that WE are right, but that we think we have something crucial to say and do and are not afraid of the repercussions. It is also an important way to create truly transformative movements that dare stand against convention and do not rush to negotiate everything away at first chance. Let's join and follow the Other Campaign (Otra Campaña), the various "parallel governments" established in the aftermath of fraudulent elections, the governing structures of refugees and migrants who defy national borders and corporate hierarchies. This is especially crucial as we experience a deep global crisis of the structures of electoral democracy. We must experiment with alternative forms of transnational popular governance, and we will hardly find these in "the center."

(Lasch)

The critique and "opposition" to the war on terror is building around more than just the "barbarous acts" perpetrated by this government against a foreign country. That this could be a formulation or apposite for the war indicates an oversimplification of the very nature of what it is that one would be "opposing." It's also terribly symptomatic and illustrative of one of the central dynamics from which activism and discourse around Iraq has suffered. Namely, the absence of a political critique of how the war is in fact an articulation and intensification of business as usual for the system we are operating under. The absence of a more nuanced and varied analysis of both the war and its opposition and the forms that "protest" and "critique" can and do take lead to this apparent "de-motivation" your question points to. For me, and for many others who collected on the streets of Chicago, New York, Rome, Paris, London . . . on February 15, 2003, we were participating in an international protest that was larger than any other protest against a war, ever. That many of the people collected there believed that if we had a large enough number and loud enough voice we could prevent the war from happening led to tremendous demoralization when the bombing began. Protest and opposition appeared futile. For me, the absence of an analysis that went beyond simple opposition and moral conviction was palpable and the cause of the political depression that ensued. We've forgotten that the movement to end Vietnam was just that, a movement with many factions and groups with a whole range of reasons for opposing the war.

(Paige Sarlin)

Much has been written and said about the coordinated global protests that have taken place against the war, including the ones on February 15. And I recall a point made by C. Clark Kissinger at a panel discussion we organized shortly after "victory" was proclaimed in April 2003. Clark was one of the principal organizers of the first march on Washington against the Vietnam War. He emphasized that we should not forget that without those worldwide protests in 2003, this war could

have involved NATO, could have involved France and Germany. Those protests were “significant” and “successful,” but left alone, they were insufficient. Even then in the '60s, the protests were not alone. They were part of a much larger critique being waged on many levels, including what the Black Panthers were doing, the civil rights struggle, the struggles for a different kind of education in universities, the struggles for access to culture by the poor, the struggle for women’s rights, the struggle for different forms of life, the struggle for a different sexual politics, and an underlying critique of upper/middle-class values. The failures of that era are in fact also worth learning from. And that is possibly the more important task in considering that period. David Harvey argues in his *Brief History of Neoliberalism* (2005) that those critiques made a very unfortunate pact with the governing elites. In exchange for being granted certain claims for specific identities, specific social rights, and freedoms, they gave up their claim for collective social justice. Seeing this same issue from a French Arab perspective, from some meetings with folks in Paris this year, we can see almost the opposite. The Leftist establishment there was so focused on their claim for collective social economic justice, they abandoned and ignored the necessary analysis of racism and Americo-Euro-centrism within their own parties, society, and culture—an analysis of their own paternalistic attitudes. They abandoned certain struggles, because they did not see them fitting into their overall plan. The latter two examples are just the beginning of a very long and necessary discussion if we are to begin rethinking and reconstructing a formidable Leftist politics.

(Gabri)

c. The significance of the draft is often overstated. But I believe the fact that the U.S. public saw images of Vietnam every night on television cannot be underestimated. The facts are now that the American public associates the war with the discourse of talking heads, not maimed bodies, and the situation in the United States is actually that of a kind of draft in the form of mandatory service for reservists and what is referred to as the poverty draft. There is an old political adage that people “move” when they think they can win OR they have nothing left to lose. Within the framework of daily life in the United States, the cost of continuing the war “appears” negligible. Where the cost is the highest is where you see the most activity, and the most activity is precisely around counterrecruitment and the work done by the men and women in the Iraq Veterans Against the War and the Gold Star Families, the growing number of people with the most to lose.

(Sarlin)

Conventional wisdom says that there are no bad questions. But let’s say that better questions are able to generate thought, are thought-provoking. This kind of question is what fills most of our airwaves and television sets. It only serves to break people into camps. Yes, no, for, against.

Do we actually think that we are going to convince the majority of Americans

to reintroduce a draft? Or is this question just asked to bring out the economic dimension of this war? If the latter, then why not be straight and ask about that directly? We need better questions if we are going to stop only entertaining different opinions and start thinking about how to get ourselves out of the political and ecological catastrophe we are in.

(Gabri)

3. a. One should speak of professionalization and specialization in general and not only in relation to the artist. Somehow, it seems that if one can understand the artist as the nonprofessional by definition, then there is a misunderstanding that has to be cleared up first: the whole society, including academics and highly specialized magazines—like this one—are the ones who are professionalized, meaning: when it comes to other spheres, problems, questions, beyond their range or the arena of their specialized field, they will often claim that this has nothing to do with what they are doing. This happens in art, medicine, architecture, and so on. We can think, for example, about the so-called Israeli Leftist architect who is able to separate his political desires for justice and his profession as a planner for a settlement in occupied Palestine that will undermine any possibility for justice.

It should also be noted that the majority of artists are not highly paid and market dependent. Sadly, many wish to be, but this is another problem that needs to be addressed in another forum. And the artists who are highly paid and market dependent may not really be the most interesting artists for this discussion. But given the fact that the main supporters of art journals like *Artforum* are galleries, it's easy to get confused.

Resistance to professionalization is at the core of the political activity of an artist. A professional artist is someone who accepts the definition of the world imposed onto her/his being as an artist, who accepts a proscribed competence, and thus misses the opportunity of the openness of the unnamed artist and artist to come.

(Ayreen Anastas)

To describe “professionalization” within cultural production as beginning with the artists indicates a lack of structural analysis. Rather, the circuit of gallery, art fair, biennial, and museum—which seems to provide a valid field from which many critics select “viable” models for art practices, politicized or not—speaks to a certain across-the-board consent toward professionalization. This agreement reveals a lack of scope and an unwillingness to set the bar any higher. If these are your options, yes, a certain apolitical trend will likely emerge.

There exists a too-prevalent critical trope where artists first rewarded by the market are doubly valorized as the most important political practitioners of their moment. Often praising their savvy or cynicism, critics affirm these artists over the heuristic fallacies in which political practitioners who more frequently self-identify as activists are said to participate.

It may be imprecise to understand that politicized cultural practices are irreconcilable with a commercial art market. In art, as it is at large, the market is capable of supporting a breadth of practices. A certain number of overtly politicized practices can be sustained, as well as collected (by those the work might seem to critique), as a set of welcome supplements to prove the diversity of the market. The performance of this form of tolerance argues against the necessity of an alternative. It attempts to abolish the need for it.

(Benj Gerdes)

b. Professionalization is a sickness of the Western world, thus it has affected a wide range of its population. It separates and parcels life into compartments that are alien to how life is or could be: one issue always connected to the other, one idea to the other, one notion to another, and so on. There is hardly any separation possible.

Unfortunately, professionalization is a part of the logic of the market. So those who argue that we must accept the market miss this point. The logic of the businessman rules; profit and self-interest are the priority, if not the only logic, that moves a professional. If someone is aware of this, then they are ready to see the world as it is and act in a way that does not separate what they do, how they think, and how they live.

(Anastas)

c. The American academic institution is not only home to some of the brightest students and professors but a nest of countless corporations. What do we expect? Is it not strange that one has to pay a huge sum of money to be able to study in such a “rich” country? We can also speak of examples of how harmful these institutions can be to the (poorer) communities of cities they are in, such as Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, which has displaced a largely African-American community for the sake of building a Bio Tech Park and homes for its professors.

(Anastas)

Professionalization can be seen as a result of trends such as rising student and consumer debt, lack of job security, prohibitively expensive cost of medical coverage and care, but overall it points toward the increasingly neoliberal agenda espoused by universities and museums—both institutions figuring again in this process as deeply entrenched partners in aggressive urban redevelopment schemes. If professionalization is now taken to be almost a prerequisite for an artist living in a Western metropolis—what are the conditions of survival for people at large? Universities, now run as mercenary real estate ventures (and the students treated as customers to be placated), contradict their avowed purposes.

(Gerdes)

d. It all depends on which artists and which academics are in question: the ones

that have accepted the systems of exchange they are participating in OR the ones that are able to find their way, and resist or change those systems, despite the huge pressure for normalization. Since professionalization is also normalization.

(Anastas)

4. While the differences are significant, I would like to add the following question: what are we doing to bridge several generations of antiwar culture and politics so that it is understood as a continuous struggle not just against the growing globalization of a European/U.S./Russian military-industrial complex, but for the creation of an international order with a more fair and sustainable distribution of wealth, as well as productive systems that do not threaten our lives and the very existence of the planet?

(Lasch)

What is at stake in such a comparison? We could point to many differing technological regimes at play in the present, as well as shifts in not only the way warfare is waged but also the means through which it has been allowed to be made visible. Network television news programming plays a role in the popular history of the turning of public sentiment against the Vietnam War, if balanced by alternative or self-distributed print journalism. What agitprop performance, to take your examples, could be said to share with various online journalisms is an attempt to make visible failures of the state. Beyond that, different tactics carry with them different aims and divergent notions of efficacy, as well as temporal and geographic specificities. These are not new questions.

If, as I read the above, we characterize the past as primarily a set of physically situated actions geared toward building affective affinities against the war, and the present as an online information and networking hub, we misunderstand the necessity of a range of tactics and practices in any successful oppositional movement. Certain economic and organizational capabilities have become widely available, but it's interesting to note that much of the work has been done through fairly low-tech means, especially e-mail lists—this is consistent with many social movements globally. If the question implies a kind of migration toward networked activism and analysis, the privatization and militarization of what was once deemed public space—welcoming across class, racial, and ethnic lines—has clearly led people to seek out inhabitable spaces online. Emergent technologies, wherever they come from, offer new tools and, potentially, new possibilities, but it's ultimately a question of implementing them tactically.

In the same way that something like 16Beaver can be a group of people, a physical meeting space, and a Web site, the import of real social relations made in physical proximity can be enabled by online communication and enhanced by broader geographic alliances and ongoing dialogue. If there is a contemporary danger of the interface or possibility of communication becoming fetishized over the strategy at large, the broader danger is an occlusion of sustained organizing

campaigns—physical and virtual—that have often achieved legitimate gains, via an emphasis on the most seductive street actions alone. Clearly and urgently, we need both the unsexy work of organizing over an unforeseen duration, as well as the political imagination to intervene and articulate demands from within whatever spaces we may have access to, even temporarily.

(Gerdes)

5. Interestingly, “public political subject” yields only one result in Google, and that is as “public/political subject.” Each of the three terms—public, political, and subject—have been under heavy scrutiny in this last century. And somehow any response to this question would need to settle on an understanding of what you mean with this term.

But we could simply ask, what constitutes being political or a truly political activity today? This critical question is bypassed by assuming we understand what being political means or thinking that politics is simply about manifesting on the streets like people did during the Vietnam War (not to mention Seattle, Genoa, or F15).

To relate to the public part of your question. We are political subjects or the subject of politics and a necessary part of that subjectivity and subjectivation depends upon a lively public space. Spaces in which debate, disagreement, and dissensus can be manifested. Spaces that are common, where information and ideas can also be shared freely. These spaces are under the threat of privatization and corporate control today, and this is arguably a far more pressing question, than whether the Internet has withered or altered our political public subjectivity.

(Gabri)

Sure, the Internet and other emergent technologies have changed the way people organize, debate, and share information. And this has transformed the way things manifest in public space. And this will inevitably change our understanding of the public, since there is an emergent space of knowledge, information, contestation, and, yes, also “activism.” It requires our vigilance to keep it public, like other public spheres. But we have to consider the multiple dimensions of what we consider to be public in the first place. Moreover, to acknowledge that the very notion of what is and remains public is under threat today. And one can argue that this poses the biggest threat to what in fact is a “public political subject.” Everything we have known to be public is being territorialized to greater or lesser degree by a proprietary logic. There are the technologies your question refers to, old and new: radio, Internet, public television, cable television, satellite television. There are universities and libraries and other social and government institutions and organizations. There are spaces of the city, the commons, parks, forests, sidewalks, plazas, waterfronts, beaches, streets, etc. And there is a less material but nevertheless critical public sphere; that is, all the accumulated knowledge, research findings, traditional forms of understanding, stories, words, names, characters, ideas, etc. . . .

The fact that I can search for “public political subject” on Google, but have to pay nineteen dollars to access it from the *Journal of American History*, is simply absurd. We need to keep an expanded notion of the public sphere and prioritize our struggle. Within this context, our struggle is not against any particular technology: our struggle is against the privatization of the commons, against the privatization of our public sphere(s).

(Gabri)

6. I think we should all become plants.

“Common suddenly felt the firm tug of gravity. He felt glued to the spot, as if attached there. He was attached. Looking down, he was dismayed to find his feet lodged firmly in the ground—and himself a plant! Transformed into something soft and thin, greenish brown, neither tree nor grass” (Kobo Abe, excerpted from <http://193.171.60.44/dspace/bitstream/10002/302/1/Nadarajan.pdf>).

To address action and measure effectivity, I would like to direct this question to a place of non-solutions and non-actions, of being rooted to the gravity of the situation, like a plant that is fixed to its environment (and by this I certainly don’t mean any neutrality or inertia, set boundaries or categorized notions of place, home or nationalism, or any isms for that matter), but to a state of understanding the conditions as they are and thereby to develop a complicated system of responses stimulated by one’s immediate as well as interconnected surroundings. Exercising the relatively easier option of escaping and migrating away from any responsibility, be it political, personal, artistic, or intellectual, is a choice available only to the more mobile beings. I remember Eqbal Ahmad saying, “Fight your battles organically, wherever you find yourself to be.”

1. The trouble is that we are too caught up with words like *opposition* and *effectivity*.

Art must be made with the right intention and need not be limited to mere opposition.

2. Dream. Have we seen any work that shows us a picture of war-endings? If we cannot even see the war ending in our imagination, in our dreams, then how can the war end in our reality? It doesn’t work just as a utopian idea.

3. The point in making art (or one of the points), whether politically charged work or not, is not to solve problems or offer solutions, but is first to deal with the issue creatively. To engage in a creative act, be it spontaneous, tactical, experimental, etc. We all as an intellectual artistic community here and the world over are doing many things, and we will continue to respond and make creative interventions in myriad ways. This page will not contain examples of what everyone has done and will do. So many artists, art practices, and art works all over the world have gone unnoticed, though all have made their contributions in their own way. We need absolutely ALL their efforts, not only the ones who are visible and known to a few of us.

(Jesal Kapadia)

1. Begin by shaking off comfortable, distant, ironic, or knowledgeable attitude without sacrificing your sense of play.
2. Choose the wars you're opposing or the ones you are fighting.
3. Make a mess in a theater of war near you.
4. Join the movement of those who do not pay taxes for the war(s), those who migrate because they must, or those who oppose nationalism and the state in its always dangerous affairs. Do so in ways that disrupt your comfort or even scare you. You may lose some friends, but you will also make better ones.
5. Unless you live in Utopia and don't care about those who don't, challenge whatever institutions you belong to, be they for or against this war.

(Lasch)

By Many Means Necessary. Connect the dots. Connect to other struggles. Connect the global to the regional, local, and personal. Connect to the vibrant social movements that are taking place every day in every part of the world. Resist social isolation and professional separation. You may not be ready to abandon the big institutions (state, corporation, university), but at least use their resources to construct the scaffolding for more autonomous and horizontal structures for thinking, sharing, acting, and cooperating (freely).

(Anastas and Gabri)

16BEAVER is the address of a space initiated/run by artists to create and maintain an ongoing platform for the presentation, production, and discussion of a variety of artistic/cultural/economic/political projects. It is the point of many departures/arrivals.

AYREEN ANASTAS thinks of you, dear reader, of what more you may want to know about her.

RENE GABRI is thinking about what illuminates the night.

BENJ GERDES recounts that "what one cannot survive is allowing other people to make your errors for you."

JESAL KAPADIA quotes Eqbal Ahmed: "Fight your battles organically."

PEDRO LASCH has been asked to look where the finger points, instead he sees blood on the finger tip.

NAEEM MOHAEMEN is dreaming of the days when "there was milk and toast and honey and a bowl of oranges, too."

PAIGE SARLIN believes that the tasks set for us to solve require much more than the unique momentum borne of relentless erudition.