

"The Oakland Table" Conversations Between Ivan Illich and Friends,
notes by Debbie Moore

Table of Contents

09/02/00 Ivan Illich: Opening lecture of the Oakland Table
 09/05/00 David Cayley: "The War on Subsistence: the thoughts of Illich"
 09/10/00 Douglas Lummis: Democracy and Place
 09/11/00 Jerry Brown, Ivan Illich, and Douglas Lummis in conversation
 09/12/00 Raphaela Lamberti, lecture on: Political Place of Friendship Among Women"
 09/13/00 & 09/14/00 Lee Hoinacki: "The Experience of Place, pt1 & 2"
 09/18/00 Jean Robert: "Space"
 09/19/00 Jean Robert, pt. 2, "Place"
 09/21/00 Professor Antje Menk: Language Policy in Multilingual Settings
 09/22/00 Joseph Rykwert: "The City in the 20th Century", book signing at Cody's Bookstore, Berkeley
 09/23/00 Joseph Rykwert: Lecture: The City in the 20th Century
 09/24/00 Joseph Rykwert: in Colloquy with Ivan Illich, Jean Robert, and Terry Galvin
 09/28/00 Terrance Galvin and Bill Braham: Prologue to Proportionality in Architecture
 10/01/00 Building Communities from the Inside Out: with Terrance Galvin and John McKnight
 10/02/00 John McKnight
 10/07/00 Gustavo Esteva: "People Regenerating Places"

Opening lecture of the Oakland Table: Ivan Illich 9/2/00

Ivan begins by speaking to us about how we "touch with the eyes". Describing the history of gaze, he says that until the late 18th century, the pupil was considered to be an erectile organ which effected "eye taste". Over time we lost the idea that our eyes reached out in this way, and have the modern certainty that we see by taking in, not projecting out.

Ivan talks of a sense of place resulting from people's interaction. Place is measured with physical activity. For example, the walk of the sacred measures the distance within which you can lead a cow during the day and return by night fall.

Ivan describes people living in places, ours and neighboring places that we measure in the four quadrants stemming from the center of a cross. In Jerusalem the center was a place surrounded by seven bowls. By the twelfth century we had maps to describe place as "diapod", within a radius around us.

The womb is a "place" where people come into being. When we are born, we move from the womb to another "place". In 1827 the fetus could not be seen. Pregnancy was a hope. The dead are in a "place", a certainty oriented above.

Becoming a loudspeaker is something Ivan fears because the most important "place" that exists is that which is between you and me. He feels the voice to be an extension of our body! The loudspeaker is therefore an aggression against common sense. It destroys the sense of place that is a spatial sense around our bodies.

Ivan speaks about the goodness of dealing with another person, of listening, noticing and touching! In speaking about "edification", he describes the loss of that organ of sharing called "common sense". It was believed that this organ was the pituitary gland. Common sense is that knowing of "what fits together".

In modernity, Ivan believes that people have forgotten the ability to synthesize. He recalls the harmonies of columns, of spaces functioning in proportion. A sense of these things, our common sense has been replaced by "values".

We go with Ivan into a history of our certainties, into that which is taken for granted. Take for example the well accepted term "under developed". It was a term created by Truman in 1949. A newer certainty is that of "services" which are a given, and a response to the creation of modern "needs".

We study the history of proportionality by considering the existence of space vs. place. In late English, Shakespeare described "space" as that time that we are given just before death. Wanting more space was wanting more of that bit of time. Ivan's hypothesizes that our addiction to thinking in spatial terms destroys our sense of place.

When we consider space, the term to "dwell" is not used. To dwell is a human activity, an art, a part of living. Ivan asks how a city can encourage the practice, the art of dwelling? He says that living means to dwell and asks where have the imprints of dwelling formed you?

The words "ethos, and ethnos" come from "gait". It is the way we are shaped in a place, the way we know someone to be from elsewhere. "Good" is to be related in a good way to each other; it relies on place. Ivan recollects a boyhood memory of his mother's situation in the kitchen of in-laws in a foreign place. His mother is kicked out of the kitchen because she is said to move through the place like a "German", an outsider in terms of gait.

When we look at people on the street we find we can create these mini-places, we can create atmosphere in Oakland. "A trace of a presence" is that which gives an intensity of here-ness.

"Conspiraci" is breathing into each other. It was a custom of early Christian church leaders engaged in sharing the breath of God. One must not engage in indifference, but must act in a good way. Most institutions dispense with loving human beings and act in a cold harsh way. Getting too used to space will render us incompetent in judging place.

Ivan believes that friendship can recover common sense. When someone in the audience asks Ivan about the writings of Rumi on the situation of place, he answers that Rumi described very acutely the inner and outer orientation to being. Ivan warns that one must arrive inside first, under the skin, in order to then have a sense of outer place.

In closing, Ivan mentions "contemplate", which like constellation, is the putting together of sky and ground, that which orients a town. To plow the borders of a place can be compared to the original place of vagina. He concludes with "liminal space" and talks of that transition between places which is birth.

"The War on Subsistence: the thoughts of Illich"
by David Cayley 9/5/00

David Cayley quotes Illich when he says "corruption of the best is the worst!" This was Illich's title for the series of works that have been re-titled "The Corruption of Christianity." According to Illich, the Old Testament was mostly prophetic, a "pregnancy", in which nature and history foreshadow things to come. The Hebrews looked back not forward.

The New Testament could be seen as marking the beginning of the modern world. Illich sees the story of the good Samaritan as a revelation of freedom!

The Samaritan makes a radical departure from the ethnic boundary (ethnos: the ways appropriate inside a boundary) to aid someone. The good Samaritan does not act out of duty as described by the institution of the church. Rather he responds in a personal way to a specific individual and makes a radical departure from social patterns, even established requirements of duty.

The flying fish is a symbol of being in the world, but also being not of the world. Illich describes the years 1077 through the twelfth century when the church removed itself from the confines of the world in order to rule over it.

This was a time when sin was defined and the duty of annual confession was proclaimed. The church creates a legal structure, and inner court, a conscience. Sin is criminalized by the church which establishes the conscience of citizens. Rules are established that are broken when citizens act from their own sense of freedom.

The twelfth century was also a time when the marriage was created as a contract with oath taking that was remote from the couple. Conspiratio was breathing into each other, whereby anyone can join in. But, the church established it as a sacrament, turning it into a tool.

Every town had a prophet. With the coming of Christ came a vision of evil. With the revelation came disembodiment, a state of immunity to our own salvation. Good and evil grow up together.

Douglas Lummis: Democracy and Place 9/10/00

Douglas Lummis begins with a definition of slavery as those who work all the time. We are like this in our modern society. He directs our attention toward Jerry Riflein's "End of Work" when planning civic projects.

Lummis points to St Francis of Assisi as a model of poverty, a weaver, who becomes "earthwise". Lummis looks for our playtime, for living in simplicity.

Illich describes walking through a garden, emptying oneself. Lummis raises the question "what is leisure?" What is the goal of the rich in a community broken apart? Is it to travel to exotic places and be serviced by slaves? Do people wish to assume the power of kings, which involves removing power from others?

He believes that leisure is really within reach. It is growing into a fit within the commons, finding a place beyond competition. He points to manifesting an attitude, and finding readily available sites nearby for expanding family and celebration. Finding places to grow plants, cook out, create festivals and not struggle within wage earning.

He mentions the misunderstanding that idleness is evil, and reason for guilt. He looks to a "natural capitalism" in which environments are created where everyone can give. Commons is a place to document and bare witness.

Lummis ends with a question for us to consider. What if Oakland held an annual Congress of people's organizations made up of community groups that would consider relative issues? What if this Congress was chosen by lot instead of election?

A conversation ensued in which folks spoke of fears about the lottery process. Some feared who would be chosen. Others stressed the importance of jury systems in keeping our rights and freedoms alive. Marty Kent spoke about the intentional dismissal of juries by a City Council ruling, followed by a court case in which a judge reversed a decision that many jurors in many trials had previously supported. The jury system and choice by lot can save citizens from political corruption.

Jerry Brown, Ivan Illich, and Douglas Lummis
in conversation

9/11/00

Jerry Brown begins by describing the political process that brought Measure X into being. This was a vote which brought additional powers to the Oakland Mayor. It began with a petition signed by 50,000, in what Jerry describes as "an out-pouring of spirit, of people's power". He sites these as "true democratic moments", that is moments when people take power into their own hands, when pure forces of community come together to get something done.

He sees the Oakland table in this way as well, as hospitality and friendliness in action, a talking House of Representatives, a people's body.

Ivan describes "place as that which is created by people's presence". He suggests that clear and special acts by people can have impact. Quoting Havel, he speaks about "automaticity" as institutions that run on their own.

Douglas says that democracy is "something that people do" in the terms of Abby Hoffman. Democracy is performance art that exists only when people do it.

Douglas describes moments on Sproul Plaza in 1969 when Mario Savio climbed atop a police car and addressed a small circle of friends who sat around the car, blocking it from leaving with a man who was arrested for passing out leaflets. This began the Free Speech Movement which grew over a period of days in which Berkeley citizens grew in number and "sat in" on the plaza in greater numbers.

Savio speaks of the desperate act of throwing oneself on the gears of the machine to draw it to a halt. The few folks were acting purely democratically and their numbers grew into the thousands. The right to leaflet on the plaza and the power of the sit-in was established.

Ivan says that something is "born" in a democratic outbreak, born to an unforeseen "we". He goes on to eloquently describe the occurrences of many different kinds of "we" throughout history. He talks of people who do not have a "we" in their language and speak only of you and you and I. Does this save their thinking of a personalized self and other?

"Self" has become "automaticity", an object of management, according to Ivan. Democratic outbreaks are awesome and intolerable to government. "Conspiraci", the intimate breath exchange stands in contrast to "conjugation", the taking of oath in the growing government of the church.

Raphaella Lamberti, lecture on: 9/12/00
 Political Place of Friendship Among Women"

In the 1970s Rafaela worked on a project (Orlando) that considered the restriction or inclusion of women in politics. When confined to the private sphere, women found that personal life matters as much as politics. The personal is political. Rafaela deeply believes that relationship among women is crucial.

The Bologna, a German women's group formed around the times and ideas of the Women's Liberation movement and has continued to this day. Their first research was supported by private donors. They convinced other women's groups to give resources.

On "individuality and plurality", Raphaella says that we are born separate and yet to be is to be with others. Being "among" women and also supporting each woman's singular initiative has been of major importance in their group, certainly in light of the knowledge that individual support has been traditionally denied to women. She believes that they are returning "I" to women.

During the Gulf War the group put special focus on breaking down the idea that war is a "normal" state. They went to other countries where women were in deep need and lived out personal hospitality there and at home. Raphaella described how historically all buildings in Bologna are civic places.

Now that aspect is breaking down. Now even their center is being co-opted by a group of divorced male professionals who claim that their educational credentials give them a better status as healers of women. Raphaella described the extremely personal and confidential nature of comforting rape victims and nurturing very young hurt women from many cultures who take refuge in her center. The building always keeps an open door and a bed for a woman in need of refuge.

Many attendees to the lecture made comments describing their support for Raphaella's kind of women's center. Silia Saureski said that she stayed there and was struck by the homey feeling and her gratitude for the way in which intellectual formality was replaced by real human aesthetics. One woman asked how such an atmosphere could be maintained in an institution and Raphaella accredited it to the depth of involvement that women have had there on an on-going basis, and involvement that is based on real caring, not status seeking. Someone spoke about the rushing around, and time consuming activities of American women, making such getting together and devotion impossible.

Debbie described the kind of group actions that she and groups of her friends have taken up when war and crisis have been at their door. Actions such as "embracing trees and walking in nude embrace when our bodies and trees are threatened". Debbie wonders if the strong women from Raphaella's center could enact a physically visible action of embracing the building or forming a procession in town if it came to the point where their building was taken away from them. Raphael seemed to enjoy and relate to these passionate means of protest in Berkeley, however she hoped that her group could have an effect through verbal communication and perhaps the introduction of other recognized means of support.

Whatever the means of expression utilized to keep the center open and functioning with women at the lead, all of us wished luck and well-being to Raphaella and her group. Ivan spoke about disembodiment, and said in closing that "love cannot be present when grief is undermined".

Jerry spoke about the very strong connection between action and hospitality.

Lee Hoinacki: 9/13 & 14/00
 "The Experience of Place, pt1 & 2"

Lee Hoinacki tells of his walk to Compostella, a place that during the Middle Ages was known as "the end of the earth". It was a pilgrimage place for more people than any other place.

Lee sets out wearing Ivan's shoes. He makes a few rules for himself. Deciding to travel without reading anything is one rule that will give Lee a true break from the life of reading that is his norm. He also decides to walk alone, in order to give himself an opportunity to focus deeply on place instead of social involvements.

During the pilgrimage, Lee began "seeing the world as creation". He reads from his book, "I become immersed in more and more beauty, and experiences of the dead who accompany me." He exists only within the practices of ancestors of that place. Knowing from experience occurs less in our modern world, and occurs more from hearsay. But, Lee has found that direct experience of exemplar place has given him a way to experience other places.

Exemplar experience of a tradition allows knowledge and vision. Lee points to authors who have deep experience of a tradition.... To Flannery O'connor the dead are real. To Emily Dickinson love can be passionately described. William Shakespeare can clearly describe human passion.

Lee suggests that we turn to Thoreau to find out about an American tradition of being in "place". Other reading he suggests on place is Wendell Berry's "The Hidden Wound", and Brian Donahue's "Reclaiming the Commons". He mentions that Ivan Illich describes bike speed as the fastest possible for retaining a sense of place. Lee also suggests "Wanderlust" for reading on pilgrimage. Other great reading is "Habit of Being" by O'Conner and "Wendell Barry/Brand in Conversation".

The only reading Lee could find on walks through places in California was in "Let's Go". However, he mentions that pilgrimage is not the same as hiking.

Pilgrimage is to find one's soul. Ghandi walked to affect social change. Chavez walked on Sept. 8, '65 carrying the banner of Our Lady of Guadeloupe with a group of 350 people that grew to 10,000. Martin Luther King Jr. walked in the south for freedom. Walkathons occur for money which seems like a corruption to Lee.

He believes that space must be integrated with tradition to become a place. He encourages us to find the place where you can do something "fitting" on earth.

Lee begins part two of his talk with the proposition that, "I can know place." He says that this is rare. Aristotle considered experience to be the ultimate principle of rational thought. Thomas Aquinas described 13th century virtue of justice to be objective give and take.

Lee wishes to be closely and lovingly rooted in place, to be only in place, to know intimately the soil beneath his feet. He sees "a vine and branches" as a metaphor for living stories that people can know. He believes that people must experience real place as only a self can. Self can be destroyed by conformity and role.

Lee talks about Aries writings on the invention of "childhood" as a state that some adults have never escaped from, having never embraced adulthood. He takes from Simone Vais the idea that we must use hands during physical work and free the mind. Benedict combines prayer and labor.

The time in Lee's life when he most experienced a sense of place was when he labored cleaning toilets in a small town where his sense of community was strong. He felt great respect for the people he communed with. They cherished family, church and work.

Oakland Table: **Jean Robert**, "Space," 9/18/00

Jean is interested in contrasting place and space; he began by connecting the word place with "perception" and the word space with "concept."

Tonight's talk falls very much into the category Jean calls the "esoteric", which he defines as that which is made un-understandable to the common people and which is only inside of the scientific community. The migration of the scientific idea occurs, the reflection of ideas coming from the esoteric and becoming understood by all, becoming fact, the exoteric. Space is "esoteric", while place is "exoteric."

Jean describes how ideas can stay within the esoteric, referring to "Koon" (sp?) or become reflections of ideas in the understandings of common folks, referring to Robert Murton, or go so far as entering into pop-science, referring to Fleck.

Now Jean discusses the genesis of space as a concept in science. There was no concept of space at all before Euclidean geometry. SOMETHING migrated from the realm of painting into that of math and geometry. This "something" was single point perspective, that is, elements of a painted scene seeming to occur within an enormous cube in which there is a point of view from within a large, close-up frontal area and a smaller, background area.

There have been many great changes in the genesis of space as a concept. Think about the panoramic gaze of the new railroad in which the great span of landscape whips around the square opening of a small window frame, moving at great speed. Consider the view through a windshield, or that which is viewed on a movie screen.

Showing a drawing of a man seated before a frame, viewing a vase which stands behind the frame, Jean draws to our attention a small measuring device the man uses to bridge his eye to the vase. This was Durher's depiction of the step by step means of turning seeing into painting. Common folks accept this process because the erectile instrument brings continuity into the act of seeing a real object that is painted on the screen.

But ultimately, the object, the vase itself, will be replaced by an image of a vase, and an image is painted from an image. We are in a world in which spatial representation is called into question.

We look at the experimental relationship between a three dimensional bowl with a graph drawn on it and a piece of paper with a graph drawn on it. If both are superimposed at a great distance from our eye, they look the same. Does this bring us closer to a way of seeing space?

When curved space was introduced, it was not believed, perhaps because it could not be seen with the eye. Galileo thought in terms of space divided by time (mph), but most were unwilling to think of space in a relative way.

Ivan describes research by Barbara Duden in bodies that were truly different bodies than those we have now, and in the evolution of the spatial representation of the fetus. The first view of a fetus came during the same year that Columbus sailed to America, in 1492. This early view was greatly changed by 1799 when women's innards were made clear by a series of drawings that graphed the changing fetus as it grew through time.

By 1799 we had "God's view" of a fetus by way of parallel lines that were drawn, like an architect would from in front and behind, in order to give perspective to the fetus in space. And now a woman "sees" the

space of their womb and fetus by way of a scanner and screen. Now we live within the "distorting mirrors of virtual space", with a perspective of the world that is schizoid.

Jean gives us a list of the many contrasting aspects of place vs. space:

PLACE:

perception, autoception
 exoteric
 dwelling, inhabit
 home
 tree, truth, (firmness)
 bodily emersion
 synaesthesia
 relation w/community
 orality
 pedestrian
 now, present

SPACE:

concept, teratoception
 esoteric
 resident
 house
 plastic trees
 visual trick
 anesthesia
 individual
 literacy
 vehicular
 fleeting past into future

Jean Robert, pt. 2, "Place", 9/19/00

Tonight Jean will focus on a definition of "place". Whereas "space" could be defined through analogy, place cannot rely on analogy for definition. We will become involved with "phenomenology" and the words of Bachelard.

We begin with projection, that way of seeing that involves the overlap of two objects. Of course, any single object can be seen from many many vantage points. But, once you place two objects in relationship with one another, in a fixed overlap, you have a frozen image, a projection like that of painting.

A ground breaking painting was Velasquez's "Las Meninas". This broke from the tradition of painting of that day because it was a metaphor, it had meaning, it was edited. In those days, folks were unused to editing. Each object had its own unique aura. There were no reproductions, even paintings had their own unique presence. Paintings could be entered by way of a foreground that came forward and bound you to the painting, with a background that receded.

At the center of the projection is "I", and is the artist's "eye", where everything in the painting surrounds at a distance. If you would sit in the painter's place everything you would see would be as he saw it. There was no "representation", only measurement. Similarly, Durrer and his projectile measures the vase behind the screen, and sketches it from his viewpoint precisely.

In 1799, however, Soemmening did not use central perspective to draw the fetus. He used axonometric, or isometric drawing, with an x and y axis, as in an architectural mold of an object. You could take measurements and reconstitute the object. The mode is a blueprint, not representational.

But, changes occurred by 1830. Projective geometry had stepped behind the screen and replaced the vase with an image, thus painting an image of an image, etc, while photography changed seeing. Ivan notes that photography was a return to central perspective. You could enter a photograph, just like a painting with central perspective. And the acceptance of this kind of painting had opened the door of acceptance for Descartes' 16th century projective geometry.

After this, according to Ivan, seeing went schizoid. Images of images of images were made without end. The fourth dimensional hyper-cube is placed on another fourth dimensional object because in that overlap, that intersection, one has the opportunity to see relationship in the fourth dimension. Seeing comes out of sets of inter-relatedness, from metaphor, not from the reality of presence with a measured object.

Rembrandt paints a boy racing behind a moving coach in order to paint speed. Turner paints a hare escaping a train in order to show just how fast trains are. Durher steps behind the screen to paint many different vantage points on the vase, to give you the sense of being in the middle of the painting, of being in reality. However, viewpoint from within a real moving train causes the foreground of our vision to blur, the reality of that which is closest to us disappears.

Bellini paints a portrait of Lorenzo de Medici after the murder of a number of his brothers. The painting must inspire fear and does so by placing its subject on a balcony from within a floating frame, strangely out of continuity with surrounding space.

Consider vehicular vision; that train window that frames a moving picture, like a projection on a screen. What do all of these forms of vision have in common? They have framing, they are additive, and they are edited. These images are edited, and they are not reality. They are hyper-real, outwitting reality, some say, "better than reality". Is reality just a support for the hologram, for moving images?

Edison came along and simulated the motion of photos projected over time. Leni Riefenstahl borrowed the technique of placing cameras at many vantage points that the eye could assume. (Cayley said that we live in a "parody of salvation.")

What does reality have that these projections lack? In a historical study of words for space, we find a variety of concepts. Space can be a projection. "Rus" means the countryside, open space. Greeks have no word for space. Plato used "chora" (phonetic) which is the field once cleared to give a dream-like sense of space. "Aperon" is that which has no limit. "Makkom," in Hebrew, is where God pronounced his word. "Oikos" is house in Greek, "vicus".

In contrast, place is described by Bachelard, in "Water and Dreams", as nature revealing itself to a subject through bodily motion. Motion reveals depth; walking defines placeness.

Through walking we find the intimate distance between moments in place, while speed abolishes a sense of distance, and the aura of uniqueness of places is gone. Along with speed there comes a concept of interchangeableness. Bachelard says body motion is that which brings forth the potential of things. It is a principal of nature. Water surging from the depth of the lake is an actualization of body motion.

This sense of place stands in sharp contrast with the vague appearance of visual images. Place is the bringing of things into the presence of one's body. Bodyless motion is a dream. Body motion is a seizing; it is that projectile kind of seeing that is "gaze." Body motion is seizing reality, seizing nature.

Walking imprints nature in your body. Walking is a synesthesia. After climbing the mountain, you feel the ache in your calf. When contemplating the second climb the distance is felt in the memory of that calf ache. Motion is an epiphany of the reality of the world. We must be bodily aggressive to retain the world.

Bachelard find water to be the depths of remembrance, and home. Our dream seizes upon its true substance, by water we find our reverie. Water makes nature weightless, makes me bodiless.

The body is an inter-twining of motion and nature. A "chiasm", meaning crossover. Vision is emanation overlapping with what the eye can see. A friend of Gallileo rejected the telescope because the illusion it offered of the nearness of the places of planets and stars upset his sense that places are where you can go with your body. "Everything I see, I can walk to."

Gallileo explained that surfaces of stellar places had mounds and caverns like our own countryside. However, his friend would rather let the night sky remain forever somewhere that exists only to orient his relationship to places on land. Thus letting real places remain those that he could move through with his body.

Ivan describes twelfth century "homes" as the places that could be shared by certain folks within one day's travels. In India the sacred cow still moves around home in this slow way. When horseback riding increased the number of folks that could pass through one's home in each day, this changed their measurement of reality, of home. Similarly, the relationship measuring the leap from a third to a fifth in music is a proportion that you can only experience if you have a sense of it.

A feel for the right proportion is common sense. Place is made by bodies and touch. Place is made by walking, by breathing in.

Professor Antje Menk: 9/21/00
 Language Policy in Multilingual Settings

Antje hopes to deal with three topics in her talk. First, the native languages and the role of English as an International language. Second, language policy in multi-lingual settings. Third, experiments in Bremen.

Beginning with a brief summary of today's conditions with regard to languages, Antje reports that there were ten to fifteen thousand languages before Christ; now there are three to five thousand languages. Ninety percent of the existing languages today are believed to die off by the end of this century.

Regarding the topic "language teaching and Imperialism", Antje will discuss the world wide teaching of language. There has been a language shift in third world countries in which folks must change languages or die. Is this forced assimilation that people are immersed in a good thing?

When "language is independent of region" we find people separated from a sense of "place". The forced learning of English connects to the concept of being in "space, not place". The "home language" of a people is often different from the standard language of their country. Notice the regional differences in English as it is spoken from Manhattan to Louisiana. In Oakland there is also connection of language to place, as in Chinatown.

When subsistence is lost, large numbers of people move to the cities and must undergo language change. Ivan speaks of the "language of commodity" as the most expensive language of all. "Language is the companion of empire and power."

Planning the language of a people is planning inequality, as some are put at a disadvantage. When the "Academy Francais" imposed the standard of the written language, they got rid of many words. Terry points out that the timing of this imposition coincides with the invention of the new measurement system of meters, and a new system of grammar. Webster's dictionary became part of the standardization of Massachusetts in the nineteenth century, working against US. regionalism.

During the "anglofication" of the world, we had "splinglish". Ivan's book "Shadow Work" was stopped during publication when the word "work" was ruled out and replaced by a systematized word. Ivan says that "monolingual habitos" is an epidemic, a language of space. There was a young boy in India who had an attitude of multi-lingual life by way of his daily talks in the language of four different people, household servants, teachers, friends, parents, neighbors, etc. who all spoke differently. Reducing him to one, supposedly original language crippled his multi-lingual abilities.

During the experiment in Bremen in the beginning of the '90s, in which Antje played a part, we look at the development of immigrant children. North Germany is a harbor town, similar to Oakland, the same size and includes multi-lingual people. Oakland is more diverse and has more immigration, however.

During this time, the mayor was also the governor, freeing Bremen's educational process from Federal rule; it was considered to be a "free town". Turkish and Kurdish were the main languages in Bremen. Polish and Russian was the language of the "ethnic Germans". Their law of common blood was ancestry traced by descent, rooted in Fascism.

In the sixties immigrant ancestors had their citizenship put into question because of bloodlines. Therefore their language was an indication that they were immigrants and they were discriminated against. During the sixties through the mid-eighties, the language of schools was German only. But during the experiment of the nineties, Turkish was introduced.

Antje describes three different principles of language in school. The first principle is that of "Nation State". When the senator promotes "German only in Germany". This has to do with control. The senator has the job of being secretary of state for education and says, "We're not a translation bureau".

The second principle of language education is to teach all of the languages and contrast one against the other. It involves a time of transitory use of the children's original language to help them get into German. This principle was supported by Antje and the Mayor and utilized in the Bremen experiments.

The third principle was the bi-lingual schooling which taught Italian and German both. Oakland blames bi-lingual teaching for failures in learning. "Eurocrats" are folks who move a lot and need special schools, for example the multi-lingual middle class school in Amsterdam.

Utilizing the first principle of Nation State, the senator says "Turk speakers should go back to Turkey". This is similar to the concept in the US. that "the English language needs protection and this should be put into the constitution. Following this principle, Polish schools were all closed in the 1940s and German schools minimally taught just German commands, not German grammar and reading.

Utilizing the second principle of transitory involves use of the "home" language, and there were special classes in German languages. The mayor helped the immigrants. It was much more efficient for the teachers to know some of the home language and share more acceptance with the parents. In the nineties most of the immigrants reflected this program by graduating to college.

The teachers learned Turk just enough to be able to transition children to German. Knowing the home language changed teacher's attitudes toward immigrant children, thinking of them as offering variety to the classroom, not just mistakes. They taught an appreciation for this variety when talking and insisted on the transition occurring when dealing with writing and reading.

In Oakland Antje visited the Prescott School and observed the third grade program of Ebonics. They transitioned the children in terms of spelling and pronunciation in standard English but gave appreciation of Ebonics as a dialect of English, originating from Creole.

An attendee to the talks speaks about teaching in an Oakland high school. He says, "language is a way of knowing and being." Ebonics has been described by the media as standardizing a view of African Americans to downgrade a people. Ebonics has been given the connotation of being a virus, (Economist Magazine). He considers Ebonics to be "soul speak" and thinks it can be a means of fighting the white supremacy of standardized testing.

Mr. Riley sees Ebonics as elevating Black English to the status of a language. The question has arisen whether it is "broken English", slang, or signs of a people who don't know any better. No one has talked about the need to bridge the gap between a home language and standardized English in the interest of truly educating people.

The book "The Language War" deals with the Ebonics debate, saying that no experts in linguistics have been consulted. From 1790-92, during the French Revolution, there was endless debate about replacing all languages with "decent French". Calling it the "language of freedom" it would eliminate German and Italian, etc.

There is no nation state where multi-language is considered and efforts made to bridge between many dialects. There is an argument between "high German" and "low German". Low German is not a written lan-

guage and questioned to be a language or a dialect. But, during the time of Hunsaka it was a language. Perhaps a "dialect" is "a language without an Army and a Navy".

Antje mentions that hidden racism can be voiced around the language issue. If it is not politically correct to voice outright, it can be a substitute battle for racists. It opens a very emotional debate, and usually involves big press coverage. She mentions that the first language spoken on the moon was English which commanded big dollars, and it promoted English. Home language is the language of slaves.

Jerry says that if economy rules language, then talk is for power and money. He described the time when there was a program to drain all gender words out of the law books. When it came to laws related to marriage, the law books standardized vows for people and it became briefly legal for like-gender folks to marry. He raises the question, what if Ebonics was adopted in Oakland as a real language class? He believes that would probably fail most African American students because of the ways of standardized testing in the educational system.

If the school system could appropriate Ebonics as a school language, this would greatly destroy the language itself. Keep it vernacular, a language of place. Ebonics was a program introduced to help folks learn English, not as a way to standardize Ebonics as a language, as the press would have you think.

Joseph Rykwert: 9/22/00

"The City in the 20th Century", book signing at Cody's Bookstore, Berkeley

Joseph begins by saying a city is like a dream; it is willed and unwilled imaging. Dreams and cities can't be controlled, but we can talk to them.

Cities are ruled by free will; they are the product of what we want. Cities are not created by an anonymous force. If we want change in cities we must contribute. Everyday ethics contribute to the way of the city.

Joseph read from the chapter, "Concentration of city as Physical Entity", from his new book, "The Seduction of Place". He describes institutional buildings as those that have shared areas for drivers and pedestrians which are buffered by surrounding traffic. The modern city has many faces, fractured, and incoherent in image, which is good, because many different people inhabit it.

He points out that a city cannot change without change in society. Society and cities change constantly. He encourages tinkering with society, and then cities change because they are malleable. Debbie mentions the growing custom of outdoor procession in her community. Joseph believes that the procession is a useful activity. He strongly encourages advancing "puny and fragmentary ideas", saying that they have an effect beyond their immediate circle.

"City as a Game" is the next chapter that Joseph reads from. It describes the game Monopoly, created in 1935, and compares it with Sim City, a new game. Both have a hypothetical place as the setting, with buildings which cannot be modified, and the strategy of both games are economic. Joseph describes the dystopia of the city, the city as an image of social inequity. Once porous skyscrapers which could be entered by anyone are now heavily guarded, thin pencil points. The Trump building dominates the UN buildings.

When addressing the government organizations that control buildings, Joseph says that protest must become project. We must have positive thinking. For example pedestrians have ways of affecting the city, parades are on the increase. Computer "campuses" consume large areas. They are like remote gated villages. They no longer mesh with the city, leaving an atmosphere that something is missing. The work place is then alienating. Group activity no longer happens.

Audience folks ask about the confusion of attemptation to call cities "sustainable cities". Joseph suggests keeping the idea of city as ecosystem, as a utopian aspiration, but at the same time, realizing it cannot be reached. Still it is good to work toward and to think about. The problem blocking it is a problem of political will, which is dishonest.

Joseph Rykwert: 9/23/00
Lecture: The City in the 20th Century

Joseph begins his talk with some political background on the Green Party's beginning in England and strong growth in Germany. Environment once began "oe", as in the Greek "oecois", meaning dwelling, home. The notion of environment as an ecologically successful place is one hundred years old. Synergy has the Greek meaning the collaboration of human will with God's will. This idea of synergy became food for a 16th century debate.

Mumford's guru, Gehed, put synergy into operation in biology. In 1955 there existed already, a lot of cheap housing which architects noticed. The place, family, and work were on trial to sustain some ecological balance. It was synergy that brought these three elements together.

In 1917 there was the presence of green growing in buildings. Trees grow through a house, are planted in a house and cut-outs are featured in '50's style architecture. During the post-war years there was a great pressure to reconstruct war torn areas. New structures allowed a little green.

Solari's impact was to build mega-structures but more in desert areas, not urban areas. Solari's work lacked an economic strategy.

Houses built to be self-sufficient in the 70's had green within them, but were not truly self-sufficient. Joseph describes an underground chapel in which folks would carry a shovel of earth across the chapel to the other side. There was a house of friendship in Istanbul that was built into a hillside. It had many green spaces. In Japan the government building had many outer, layered balconies with plants on them.

In 1973 energy saving became very important. Public transportation was more subsidized and developed an interest in reducing cars. However, tall buildings continued to be built and the idea of synergy and ecology was not dealt with. The atmosphere of buildings changed in the '80s. Solar energy was 45% cut off from real use and became stylistic instead.

Joseph believes that a tokenism took hold in which there was a claim to be a green related building when there was really very little real reason to make this claim. One must consider the fabric of the city, and the way it is occupied to find ecological balance. The strong banishment of retail trade in residential areas caused much imbalance in the energies required to fulfill basic daily functions. It has become very difficult to homogenize existing city functions when private ownership rules decisions.

The tokenism of green building is, however a good thing in that it proves that there is a pressure in the direction of continuing to increase the presence of green. But Joseph asks us to realize that there is much tokenism which exists to satisfy protesters.

There are always technocratic solutions, so make plans beyond what can be done, beyond culture. Joseph ends his lecture with a plea that we must be small, and make small plans.

Joseph Rykwerk: in Colloquy 9/24/00
with Ivan Illich, Jean Robert, and Terry Galvin

Joseph opens with the question of height and density. He believes that one must realize that height and density are not cause and effect.

Jean Robert finds that there are three types of density without tallness. The tall building is like a pump that sucks people in and pushes them out from a wide radius surrounding a city.

Jean says it is a fallacy to believe that increasing the volume of a building will increase the land value when the issue of shadow casting is ignored. When there is respect for the distance placed between high rise buildings, then the shadow problem is minimized. But, the optimum plan is to limit buildings to five or six stories.

Jean points out the relationship between static tall buildings that manifest motion upward. Pulling people and ejecting people seldom phenomenologically relates to people's motion around the buildings and land values. Gaffney relates the process of land value to pulling people in. Once raising accessibility (choices), many folks suggest other potential uses of land masses.

Jean believes that high rise buildings are to land value as land value is to people's habits. Building high means that people must come from farther away. High rise buildings are often built to offset urban sprawl, but in between these two options are many other choices. One choice is to build high density smaller buildings.

Joseph Rykwerk describes an anthropological issue of 1934. "We built high because we wanted to!" The early phallic character of the first high rises gave buildings an impression they no longer have with such intensity. Now the high rise is built as an income producer or a show of business size and success.

Joseph goes on to describe people's emotional prejudices when it comes to housing. Most people would rather live in detached houses with gardens and flowers in the front. Even though this may be the most desirable, it is not possible in most countries. This emotion stands in direct conflict with the people who want high rise buildings.

Jean speaks of Plas Voisin, the plane engineer who could have called his work the "model-T city" if he had known the effect of the model-T. Plas Voisin means neighbor. For thousands of years cities were built around the feet. When planners suddenly tried to plan a city built around the car they believed that this would take everyone "back to nature". They believed that they were rescuing people from the erratic animal motion, the whip sound of the animal driver and bringing into being the quiet of the car. The car was thought to move quietly through a city park and to bring the beauty of the surroundings into the senses.

Joseph adds that cars were thought to save people from the manure pollution that plagued the streets. Cars would serve to clear the streets of droppings. It was never expected that cars would become present in such volume.

Ivan tells about how Paris achieved such a valuable amount of horse droppings that it became the greatest cultivator of crops of fruits and vegetables to export to London.

Richard Register asks what can be done for a city of pedestrians that makes sense? He views the medium rise building as an answer that would create pedestrian places without having to increase the freeway commuters. However, he believes that in order for people to accept the creation of medium rise groups of

buildings they would have to shift their sense of scale. The vision would have to be one of many different kinds of uses of land, many different kinds and sizes of buildings, partly pedestrian.

Jean Robert speaks about the variety of issues of the tall building. There is the issue of parking for all of the drivers that arrive there, but also a less obvious issue, that of the shadows cast. Instead of building tall structures that will cast shadows on every place around it, taking away the sun on the streets below, there could be several lower buildings, five stories or less.

Jean Robert describes a "back to nature" approach to building. He says that city planning really has to do with traffic planning. A common variable of the city is what transportation allows it to be. Transportation theory is wrong when it tries to place the autonomous vs. transportation. The difference is never made. Walking is not "transportation", because you move yourself.

Jean says that in Energy and Equity, Ivan asks us to consider the right terms in the mixture of synergy, combining two very different beings to create another. Instead of thinking of transportation, why not include "traffic"? Consider autonomous transportation and heteronomous transportation to equal synergetic options.

Joseph responds that developers are most concerned with drainage. Drainage is the unconscious of the city. Over top of drainage is traffic, which is considered a mesh of two things.

Terry says that we therefore must think of the city in 3D terms.

Ivan speaks of the house of Babel. Why is it a certainty that excrement must be put into water and then drained? It is seven times more expensive to get water out and clean it of excrement before getting it back into use. Could architects in a world of absolute mythology do something about dissolution of shit for the future?

Joseph responds that we must talk in terms of "nongeos", organizations outside of the government. The question of group transport, the question of the elite who grab land for high-rises with their name on it... these are questions that must be taken up outside of government.

He mentions that in 1930 Stalin disliked common music, so he made up a new kind of music and created a song that was very bad. Government officials step into action in areas that they may have strong emotion about and the result is like Stalin's music creation.

Marty Kent describes the place of planning in the evolution of the city. Large structures require great engineering. This makes people feel like they're in someone else's house. Personal building within places like Mexico city, where many have made their own house brings about a sense of being home. What about folks planting one tree in front of their house, and it coming from people themselves, not from an authoritarian. What if many folks decided on their own to step out and tear up a small piece of concrete and plant a tree?

Joseph replies that graffiti is considered criminal, but he sees it as a mark of a people taking possession of their places. Statistical surveys on criminals overwhelms contact that can be made on a personal basis.

Marty asks if there is a history of folks tearing down construction?

Terry encourages building up from the ground up with groups of people getting together.

Joseph he looks forward to less advertisements from large corporations and more graffiti. He describes the gated communities in China, with many different styles of architecture. There is elaborate surveillance in the corporate campuses that have their own huge supermarket. He does not consider these places to even be "public". They have plainclothes police to extract the boisterous, or any behaviors that are not invited. Gated communities are "Disneyland".

In answer to a question posed about the history of the separation between residential and retail, Joseph mentions some low key protests that go on when retail is closed. The imposed zoning laws of 1937 also imposed zoning principles on architects.

In responds to a question about lay architecture, Joseph brings up urban farming. Ivan mentions street vendors, saying they are repressed everywhere. Street vendors are replace by large supermarket chains.

Ayeesha has just returned from Ghana and describes the whole city there as an open air marketplace which enlivens the city and adds a joy and energy dearly missed here in Oakland.

Ivan says that it is not a "need" to have professionals supervise our markets, but many folks have been convinced that it is their "need".

In answer to a question posed by Lenny about how we can build from the ground up, and how our groups can make decisions if not "lead" by official government leaders, Debbie Moore describes her experience with such a group. In 1998 the Berkeley City Council was stopped in their progress toward clearcutting the downtown trees.

Just three friends challenged the citizens to save two hundred trees destined for the city planners' axe, by holding a series of meetings that led to a public demonstration. Even though Debbie was arrested for performing a nude tree-embrace in tree branches, the protesters alerted enough citizen support to stop the cutting of over a hundred healthy mature downtown trees. However, she points out that the creation of the ritual demonstration took many serious meetings in which leadership came about by folk's willingness to listen deeply to one another.

Dean describes such systems of reciprocity and feedback. He says that there are some kinds of systems in which the public is invited in to participate in pre-existing systems. However, there are other systems which are reciprocal, like Debbie's situation, which build up organically. The scale may be different, in that one may be an individual scale while another is a planetary scale. It is important to distinguish between the different scales.

In answer to a question posed about how to cut down on massive gentrification, Joseph describes work that he did in Cortibon, Argentina. He worked to subdivide large suburban areas in many sections of the growing area to create several urban centers. They did so with the knowledge that directly surrounding each section the land would become slightly more valuable. However, this method was still better than the absorption of the entire region in urbanization that caused all the land values to skyrocket.

Richard Register describes information he found at the International Eco-village Conference. In Vindhorn there are two and three story buildings with commons nearby, and villages around that area. There was so much diversity in the ways that building was combined with open land and small village life. He asks why we all need to be surrounded by so much stuff? If we were to clear large land sites surrounding large buildings we could model our city on villages that have a sense of needing less stuff.

Aeesha asks about the Oakland gentrification problem. Will bringing 10,000 people into the downtown area bring gentrification into the housing areas? How can we keep Oakland diverse?

Karl answers with mention of the "Urban Habitat Program" which develops strategies that insure low income housing.

Leonardo Puyol describes the purpose of a mediator in self-help situations vs. government ruling. He believes there is a need to increase the dialogue. It is important to deal with people from the heart as well as the mind.

Another problem opened up for consideration is the bringing of non-handicrafts into the Berkeley street vending areas. One attendee finds the street vendor scene on Telegraph Avenue to be consumed in commercially manufactured goods. John Quintero suggests that by opening up more and larger areas of the city to be utilized by street vendors of all kinds, then there would be more chance for handicrafts to find a place along with other items. He believes that the lack of street vending areas and the low quality of items for sale is a result of the limited marketplace.

John, who has observed the decline in quality of the Berkeley street vendor's market believes that stronger restrictions could solve the problem as in the outdoor food market in Santa Cruz where the only food allowed there is that which is grown within a five mile radius.

Terrance Galvin and Bill Braham: 9/28/00
 Prologue to Proportionality in Architecture

Terry and Bill will give an introduction to both of their upcoming lectures on proportionality in architecture. Terry begins by describing some of the findings of the "Circle for Research on Proportionality". Firstly, Terry describes "place" as somewhere that is differentiated from "space" by way of what people make there. For example, he reminds us of Rafaela's work in Bologna with a small group of women who created a feminine presence in space, making it a true place. Also, Phil Loetti says that when Adam was ejected from Eden, he raised his arms to create place and Eve raised her arms mirroring him but relates that place to her own shape, and this is "proportionality".

Terry sees proportionality and analogy as a set of relations with two things compared with two other things. For example the thumb is to the hand as compared to how the hand is to the arm, even compared to how the arm is to the body. This sort of analogy of the relationship of a part to the whole is mirrored in the column's relationship with the building, (from Rykwert's "The Dancing Column".)

The columns were called "the orders" because their proportionality has to do with order. It was from a time when the sense of order came from analogy and had to do with comparing, as in two sets of things seen in relation to two other sets. This is very different than a "ratio" which is just one thing compared to one.

Proportion is the "way we see things", but in antiquity they saw things with order. Consider that "creation" was known as order created out of disorder. The creation of the body of the world was fire to air, air to water, water to earth, a set of relations! Even the Pythagorean number one, two, three, four, was seen as a set of relationships between this variety of items that keeps growing by one integer, (Terry shows us a small picture of dots ranging from one to four in succession.)

In Euclidean geometry, medieval masons recognized solid parallel lines reaching infinity. Medieval proportions involve a symmetry of parts; a world dealt with in an overall way, not in parts. During the Renaissance proportion was found in an overall way. Measurement was derived from the human body, from divine order. The wrist to the elbow measurement of the ruler of a town became the unit of measure for that place. Recognition of the measurement of their leader's body became one way of belonging to place.

Proportion that is inherent in realization, or adjustment of perception, is the "orders"; the columns cannot be removed without destroying the whole analogy. Buildings dealt with the "good" and necessary when the "orders" were invoked. But then there was a great shift away from orders as a basis for proportionality, to beauty and ugliness. Aesthetics become more and more independent from order.

Order had once meant harmony, arrangement, adjustment. But when proportionality shifted orders became judgement, not that which encompassed divine order. The decision to change orders and think of proportionality as aesthetics was defined in the seventeenth century with the "treaties on orders". This left behind a view of columns as mirroring the human body shapes, as having gender. The treaties described the shift that made order subjective.

By 1780 the break in perception of proportionality is significant, a change in meaning to meet your own personal viewpoint. Phrases describing orders that are "pleasing in nature, are parts in harmony" are considered with regard to "our sensations". Perception is an occurrence based more "by chance", thought to be based on the pineal gland according to Descartes. The composite image is now thought to be created from inner projections, as in paintings.

This is the era referred to as the picturesque movement. The English garden was created so that one would pass through successive vignettes and add up the scenes inwardly to gain an internal response afterward, as you would a painting. During this time geometry and "the golden section" were numerical systems that defined a principle of order. The relationship of the square to the circle to the rectangle were depicted in the golden section and proportion became something that could be numerically translated. In 1791 the meter was invented.

Bill Braham steps in here and takes the lecture onward from the involvement of numerical systems in proportionality through to issues of recent architects. He shows us a book, "Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism", which clearly describes the systems of proportionality as used in Medieval times, answering modern day architect's search for meaning that has since been lost.

Bill sketches a rectangle with cross sections that mathematically create dimensions for a perfect doorway within the rectangle. This system utilizes geometric proportions to measure the door. Another system of proportion was the "arithmetic system", that was taken from music which harmonically progressed from thirds to fifths, from twelve to thirty six, etc. A third system is the modular system that modulates between two mathematics scales along one measuring tape.

These mathematics systems emphasize the break that Terry described, away from the room size that is "good" in a divine sense toward that which fits a ratio of numeric lengths considered "good" in music or math.

Bill tells us that architects were very aware of a loss of historical grace and order that existed only in antiquity. They tried to turn to internal personal aesthetics out of a willingness to discover order. In the twentieth century, the image of the body has changed such that shifts in models of the body also shift models of nature and models of health.

Emily Martin studied four different places where women proclaimed "I am an immune system". The view that we are a system has taken hold. Even a model as complex as a bus station is modeled after supposed systems in nature and ecology. How absurd to model bus station proportionality after natural "systems" that are thought to be stable when no system is perfect or stable.

Ivan says "are there no limits to the disproportion of incomparable size and stuffiness?" He says that it amazed him to be surrounded by 25 scholars who had been architects for a lifetime. He "taught" architecture at Kent State University during the late 80s at the doctoral level, feeling as an outsider. He was shocked to discover that architects don't build. He was shocked that the things they built came from no specific school of thought but resulted from modern zoning laws and the need for an architects stamp.

Ivan says that when he studied history and thinking about proportionality, he said that for proportionality you must think about a scale in which human proportions can be applied. But cement and steel are not the milieu of bodies, but that of cars. Even so, architects still strive for some kind of proportionality that so often works in disproportion to the materials, location and size of human beings. Similarly, the programs of genetics work in ways that have nothing to do with a perception of human beings. Except in a symbolic sense, how does modern architecture relate to the real world of people?

Terry says that in 1485 the word edifice was related to edification. Architects today feel the loss of proportionality and must work with art and their hearts.

Jean Robert says that proportion is intimately related to pedestrian experience, and comes from the heart. Speed destroys the organ (the heart) which architecture comes from. He finds proportion that comes from

the feet and has been transferred to the wheel. Jean believes that from these modern flows comes disembodiment and disproportionality.

Ivan says it is the task of architects of today to not destroy our ability to have a place. They must humbly accept the situation, like that of our mayor, that we can't make any places more beautiful than they are already. But, we can suggest that buildings don't destroy place, the place to pitch a tent. Don't hinder folks from doing that!

Terry looks to the phenomenality of Jean Robert, to Turner who let's things grow. He tries to come from notions like these, not from measuring for success.

Jean says architects try not to hinder people from having place. He agrees with Ivan that we cannot improve place. Architects must not destroy proscriptive ways to operate in space.

Terry finds it amazing that architects have many realms within which to expand and work, they "design everything from the cushion to the city."

Ivan says there should be a Hippocratic oath for architects that is similar to a doctor who gets out of the way of the dying. Just as a doctor must not keep a human being from dying, the architect must not try to make a place!

Building Communities from the Inside Out: 10/01/00
with Terrance Galvin and John McKnight

Ivan introduces John McKnight, a friend who he has known since 1971. John brought the concept of "service as a veil for love" into Ivan's life.

Terry begins today's talk about building communities with a summary of his previous history of proportionality in architecture. He says there is a profound tradition between the body and building. There is a double metaphor: the body is to building, as buildings are to the world.

During the Middle Ages the proportions of the body are mirrored in buildings in a proportional "order". But by the end of the nineteenth century there are "systems" of proportion, ratios that are applied abstractly. There is a loss of the connection of proportion to nature and instead instruments like the "golden section" is overlaid and applied.

An attendee of the talks reads from his notes about a view of Oakland as a city in the midst of change through many variations of place making. He views folks as healthy nodes in a cubicle as a part of becoming a modern place full of possibilities.

However, Terry warns that we must not view all ways of being in spaces as equal in impact. Some ways of building can reduce people into feeling like nodes in a system. Whereas, looking toward the history of proportionality, other ways of building are a "devolution of authority that brings us face to face, where commonsense can be recovered" (quoted from the introduction to the Oakland Table). In this recovery of face to face interaction we find a beauty that is subjective instead of objectively applied. In community work, beauty becomes clear.

Debbie Moore speaks about the feeling of not being a node in a system. To live with others in closely knit traditions of procession through places that are near to our homes and dear to us can maintain our sense of place. She suggests that Lee's talk on pilgrimage reminds us of the deep sense of place that one gets by moving on foot through places in search of soul.

She goes on to suggest that Rykwerk encourages us to have a small plan, which is something that we, at the Oakland Table can create. These small plans are perhaps the answer that Jerry was seeking when he asked Terry for a "theory". Rather than finding overarching theories to guide many situations, we can think of Lummis's radical democracy, which described the Free Speech Movement's beginnings with a small action in which people took government into their own hands. Jerry's Measure X was a "democratic moment" in which Jerry recognized the recovery of true democracy in a small progressive action. We can find face to face some actions that we can create together to make a small change now.

John McKnight has come to us directly from the top of Black Mesa where he stayed with twelve Hopi villages. He described a hole in the ground with a ladder down into it that each villager spent some time within. The Hopi say that people came from the earth and found a way to be a part of it. They have survived as people with a faith through 600 years of colonizers. They have survived because everyone goes down into the hole, a place where outsiders are not allowed to go.

Ivan describes the citizens of Athens who are born there and called "xeno". They have a place in the inner sanctum which is only for them. Foreigners, the "helenes" are guests who are not invited into these inner rooms.

John McKnight goes on to discuss the idea of they who come from a place, a hole in the ground. One of these Hopi villages is the longest inhabited place in North America. John does not know how they have preserved their ways. But he looks at how they suggest every day, every week that the hole is "where we came from". Place creates people.

Ivan talks about this very funny shape that appears in lots of places, the belly button, "umphalos". It is this place through which the axis goes up into the heavens, another common symbol. The Hebrew word, from the ancient Semitic language, "macom" is belly button, but not Debbie's belly button! (Perhaps Debbie disagrees!) It is that hole, and it is the Yoni. Can anything like that be recovered?

Terry refers to the Shiva lingam, as similar to the axis mundi. He points to the relationship of between the lingam and the yoni and he passes around a sketch.

Ivan talks about a friend (Magitte, the undersecretary of the UN) who returns from India. He is overwhelmed with the sense of six million people in communities, calling them Pagans, who "have the Elephant, the donkey, the penis."

Terry asks us what happened when spaces became defined as the "void"? "Macom" means place. When an attraction between objects of the pre-Renaissance occurs in a space between them, the space is full, not empty space. Now empty space is concretized and invested with sales value. When Lee was walking "in the path" of Santiago, his path was solid, filled with meaning from every step. Now, the invented void of space enables the concept of commodity.

Ivan says that there was a great scientific discovery of the "void". This void is a vacuum that inspires horror. Nature abhors the void. Ivan asks us again if there is any possibility that we can feel the "Hopi hole"?

Fernando speaks to us about the womb, that container which gives way to the psychology of Yang, that is, penis culture. He points to a shift from the womb culture as the center of the community, that which has a centrifugal force, drawing into the center. The culture of the Incas, connects with GAO, having the "arena popo", the belly button. These cultures had a high density of people and still ritualized the burying of the umbilical chord, around fifteen days after birth. The reason it was buried was to connect the child to that specific place of birth. When the child is grown, they bring him there to show him his place.

Also, the formation caused by the marrying of the circle with the vector is the spiral, forming a double helix, a place where real evolution takes place.

John Robert mentions an omission in Fernando's talk on phallic places. Tibon discovered through much research that the name "Mexico" is defined as the place where the navel and the moon relate.

John Quintero speaks about Justice Douglas as a hobo, who wished to protect vagrants with constitutional law, pointing to the right of dissent and non-conformity, the encouragement of the high spirits.

Terry tells about the change of the word "order" into "ordinance". He harkens back to the symbolic columns that had soul and gender, called the "orders".

John Quintero replies with a mention of campfires, as the place where cultures exist, which becomes obliterated by the onset of the world of cars.

The attendee who spoke earlier about being a "healthy node" in a changing Oakland, now suggests that the landscapes of childhood could be a key to man's connection with place. He asks about the significance of the old sites in city places which are perhaps the center of the humanity of the city.

But our moderator, Sarjet, repeats the question that Ivan keeps raising about the possibility of recovering "that hole", in today's world and for us.

Debbie describes the recent experience of the "9th Annual Nude Parade". It took place each year in People's Park, which is a place that citizens created by hand, thirty years ago by carrying out backpacks of concrete and bringing in plants. A sense the ancestors there was recovered when a circle of friends gathered nude to merge with the place and each other. Debbie lay underneath a canopy of standing nudes who raised arms and spirits into the canopy of trees and birds. They put her in touch with the deep reaches of the earth below and the sky of spirits above. Her fleshly belly button did indeed become a means of joining with place. Then the round circle of nudes transformed into standing lines of pairs who made archways with their arms to enable folks to pass through their center to exit the park.

Then last week the same group of people formed arches as one part of a larger procession that was called "the How Berkeley Can You Be? Parade". Human beings passed on a sense of refuge, an experience of the earth, to hundreds of parade attendees who moved bodily through their arches and embraces. This suggests that we humans, joining together in small groups in procession and at festivals can recover and pass on a deep sense of place.

Debbie suggests that one of our objectives be to invite more and more outdoor gatherings throughout the parks and streets of the city. These gatherings can suggest to people that we are tenderizing places by bringing outdoors our many different ways of communing. These festivals and gatherings could invite rituals to occur side by side, with groups that usually convene indoors, with groups small and large, who are perhaps very different from one another.

A woman attendee suggests that movie theaters are places where metaphors of connection can be experienced. The theater is a metaphor for the commons, where people can gather and eat corn, (popped). But Terri warns that we must not assume that any gathering situation is a commons. He directs our attention to the occurrence of transformation, and the retrieval of a language when we consider place. He suggests that we consider geomantic practices, such as the water diviner and look for comparable kinds of energies to be encountered. There is an issue of scale, because we now have cities like Mexico city with twenty million. And yet within that large scale are small neighborhoods where we can build on and understand an energy exchange like the ancient water diviner.

Manhattan may have many belly buttons.

Karl describes the importance of the opening to his public gardens, where the doorway is a focus of experience. The door of the movie theater should be a vestibule, and a sanctum. The ambiance of the place is important and has been lost in the mega-theaters. Look to the Islamic entrances which are build in shapes that respect the human aura.

Ivan has much to say to us about the threshold. He met Karl twenty-five years ago in Mexico dealing with threshold habits, and taught about it in Bremen. He brings the word, "ipsimos", stemming from "ipso", the self, that which is reinforced by leading over the threshold. To take a person over the threshold is to bring from the table which is within to that which is outside. How difficult it is to "lead" a German over the threshold when they rush through themselves. He compares the waking up a people in Bremen to the sound of the bell ringing in the tower as a threshold crossing.

Ivan asks us to consider a place like this one, Jerry's house, where a circle is made around the round table. It is a place of rebirth and a place that remains umbilically, springing from where we have faced each other. Ivan believes that the only way to spread a sense of coming from a place is to meet face to face.

John McKnight describes the work of the "National Association of Neighborhoods" in their assessment of issues important to land owners. The most uniting issue for land owners was the threat to their personal household. Most land owners believe that their place of residence is considered a "commodity" and thereby threatened. John suggested the book, "Neighborhood Gatherings."

Terry thanks Louis Kohn and Ivan Illich who spoke about threshold and brought him out of a "planning and development" mentality and into a notion of complementarity of place making.

Lonnie asks if there is a thought on the part of developers that a neighborhood is a "blight" instead of thinking of neighborhood as "home". He addresses the situation of elderly folks who are struggling with large house payments and upkeep in a time when developers prey on them. He also comments that the belly button vision went back far into early Egyptian history.

Terry looks at what is necessary in a participatory process. Creating a circle creates community. A sense of place is sustained by occasions, celebrations, rituals, which must go on to overcome the "systems" mentality.

Karen asks how we can find common ground when Oakland has such diverse peoples with such a variety of traditions. She describes the intense fear that some neighbors have that causes them to hide in their separate languages.

Fernando calls today the tower of Babel. He searches for process that will cause us to make space for another, saying we are "often filled up". He thinks we have little place to heal the other when there's no empty space. He says we must create place to bring others into self.

Ivan describes "empty" as being a place, and "void" as being horror. Emptying is different than creating a void. The door, the threshold is hypothetically outside the door, it was commons. Inside has proportionality, it is complementary to outside. One supports the other, making place possible.

Place is possible with two "heteronomies", the following of different ways. "Heterogene" is born from something else. In the hospitable milieu, that of having guests, a threshold is going "out there", which cannot be without the proportionality of "in here".

Ivan refers to Musi, an Australian novelist, who writes in his diary about the door. Musi says it is a place one could once listen into by placing one's ear to it to listen into sounds from across the private threshold. But, now the walls are thinner than the door and hearing can go on everywhere; the door has lost some of its place in life. Ivan asks us again for a concrete practical thing to come out of our meetings and offers his massive data base of works dealing with threshold and place.

He speaks about that which is not proportionate, "heterogamous". Lee can walk to Santiago but most "go by plane" and what kind of going is vehicular going? In a world of heteronymy, can the home be "a there" in which a sense of place can be made? Ivan says that "people happen to me", which he believes can be quite burdensome outside in our frontier of "nowhere". Still, inside the threshold, let us imagine if...."

Terry speaks about common sense in terms of it's beginning in the house. He experienced the work of Rafaela as bringing the feminine presence, from within the house out into the town, which he felt when he stepped foot in her town. In an ancient city, a stranger steps into a place that is strange. Yet, Rafaela creates a conception of place where a stranger in town is not strange.

Becky mentions that buses that take City Council members into other people's neighborhoods to examine them from the bus are stepping over the threshold without being invited.

Jackie says that what she does is to start with saying "hello" to different kinds of people. She promotes talking; she has discovered that talking can unearth secret histories and talents that are not visible when we meet. She gives the example of a man who she had assumed was Chinese, revealing through talking that he was Laotian and that he had the talent of finding plants. One on one coming together and going out into a park together can give forth something that Jerry asks for, something clear to grab hold of for us to do politically. Jackie asks us for the personal courage to say "hello" and to start talking.

A new attendee to the talks tells of his seven year imprisonment and the years he worked to overcome the sense of being flawed. "We're all flawed" he announces vibrantly. Concentration on hidden likenesses can give way to realizing that we all have "being flawed" in common. This recognition freed him from a tremendous fear of stigmatization, released him to speak to people, even us.

He believes the history of burying the umbilical chord is a "hidden likeness", but another likeness is that we all die. He urged us to thrive on the organic, to get into community and "sit and smell each other", smell each other decaying.

In prison he found that his cellmates and he had to smell each other's "funk". This was a kind of intimacy, a "vile connection". Now, in his neighborhood the strongest time of connection is on garbage day when folks congregate around bringing out the garbage and helping the garbage man. He reminds us of the ancient saying that we are all born "between piss and shit".

Carl looks back on Jerry's statement that after two years of "We the People" there is only "dot coms" and gentrification. On two levels, we must meet to first be face to face and second we must meet to organize. Carl feels there is a sense of impotence here and that we must create strategy and create revolutionary forces. The definition of revolution is "the root". Carl sees that the future is more uncertain than ever and there is gentrification in the overwhelming marketplace of Oakland. He urges us to present alternatives to Jerry.

Elaine Respass wishes that there would come a hole in the schedule in which to discuss what will happen after the Oakland Table is concluded. She has experienced a powerful process at the table which is to "have to listen". Now she feels we should talk about resolution of how we can be here afterward.

Fernando also wants to follow up for those who will stay behind. He asks for an attitude like Rumi's, to be in a field with all listening. Sacred space is to listen and be listened to. He hopes to use the tools we have been given to move from ideas and listening to concreteness and action like Terry does in Peru.

John Quintero speaks of how Samuel Adams would not get on horseback.

Ivan points out that Jackie has given him something very valuable. He likes to admit outright when he is wrong. He found out through her description about talking that he himself has a nasty behavior. He has been looking for places where there are empty seats because he believes that people have an aversion to sitting next to a guy "who looks like me". From now on instead of finding an empty seat, he will talk to people to erase fear.

Adam has come from Washington State to attend, after the chance newspaper fell into his lap describing the Oakland Table. Before this experience, he didn't know how to carry on conversation and friendship on such a rigorous level. The goodwill here has given him an answer about how to carry on the goodwill, which is to begin his own "Sunday table". He will bring people over the threshold of his home. He closed with an apologetic story of how he invaded the proportionality of the place in Jerry's kitchen when he floated into the private gathering after the lecture to speak to Lee.

Ivan talks about geometrical spaces as an empty container and a frontier. During a meeting on limits and Social Science in Germany he heard from Gueramista. Frontier is "from here to there", the line where some kind of proportionality happens. He writes dx/dy tending toward zero, an integral ever becoming smaller toward reaching the void. The attempt to construe a notion of motion toward void, includes the thought that the arrow moves always closer to the void, and never reaches it.

The fellow who described our flaws describes how he observed two neighbors who had a good relationship. Their love for each other caused one to give the other keys to his home when he went away. Upon his return there were things missing from the house. But the relationship went on anyway in depth because they had found a way to recognize each other's flaws and accommodate for them.

John McKnight closes tonight's talks by describing the practical reality of a neighborhood. He says there are two intentional ways that neighborhoods are challenged. Much organizing happens as a result of fear that homes are being threatened. This brings people out of their homes to get together and deal with the fear. But the second way is the fear of those who would "come into my home". The greatest insult to a neighborhood is that "we are not hospitable here". He encourages us to be lured out of our homes, but also to invite folks in.

John McKnight, 10/2/00

Ivan introduces his friend John McKnight, saying that few people can summarize traditional proportionality as John McKnight and Rykwerk can. Living with respect to proportionality, Ivan whispers in such a way that he can be heard, as in a Baroque cathedral. Now, the microphone destroys "place", Ivan says, as he positions himself so that "you can hear me. I touch you with my voice, it is an expansion of me." Just as the eye is a projectile, so is the voice.

John McKnight has another uniqueness, according to Ivan. John looks at the contemporary world (1972) seeing many things which open Ivan's eyes, things which no one else have opened his eyes to. "He'll tell you I am his pupil. He showed me how service is a mask for love."

John tells us that Ivan is an old friend. "Opening eyes" is most about the senses. We go into a home and we can smell it's their home. We see, talk and feel together. The world is about a systematic effort to make us "senseless", to surround our world with "non-sense". How many people I no longer see; they're looking at the screen. They can't see each other. There are new forms of nonsense each day, management, technology, facilitating ways to kill a citizen. Ivan has helped me understand the struggle to be 'sensible'.

John describes a series of wonderful happenstance's. "I've gone all over the U.S. and Canada visiting neighborhoods, asking "what do you celebrate?" "What satisfies you most? What brings you good cheer? What are you proud of?" John asks us to guess what their stories tell us? What is their source of pride, their hidden magic?

Before divulging the answer, he mentions that most neighborhood people call their problem "underdevelopment", seeking to match their lives with the very rich. He also points out that the answers he collected from 3,000 conversations are called "stories" everywhere except inside the university gate. Within the university these stories are called "case studies", degrading them to meaningless data considered "anecdotal".

The source of 80% of the stories are the same. A historian in 1892 wrote about this source of pride, cheer and celebration. Alexis Tokvell, a French count came to North America in 1831 at age 23. His voyage was sponsored for the purpose of studying something that occurred only in North America at that time, the penitentiary. The Quakers invented a place to be penitent, in a cell, with a rule of silence. Tokvell wrote "Democracy in America" after studying Syracuse, Cleveland, Detroit, Wisconsin, Quebec, French America, what was considered Native America.

Then he found a new kind of community, different than what was defined in England and France by the nobility and professionals, by the elite. He discovered that in America, decisions were made by the common people. The way that decisions were made was in little groups. Groups that are and were as numerous as families, formed in huge number. These little groups are the source greatly appreciated by the 80% that McKnight had found in modern times. He creates a name for these groups, which is "associations". They approach the world in three ways.

Firstly, these associations take the initiative to decide what to do. Since that time, Universities do research in neighborhoods and tell people what their problems are. Folks are told that they are "un-American" and "need" analysis. The second thing associations do is to take the initiative to decide how to solve problems. They take away the power of the expert to know how to solve problems. The third thing associations do is to get help to do the work that they cannot do.

Many folks belong to many associations named and unnamed. Associations and families are not about individualism, but common knowledge. McKnight believes that most people think that democracy means that we vote. But really, democracy is "the power to give power away". Tokvelli writes that association is taking power; it is a new form of democracy. It is creating power at home and delegating power.

Association is really a "place". Looking at local place, we find many associations. A newcomer to a small town can find a local newsletter. In a small town there are 1700 associations listed. He discovers that the "American Businesswomen's Association" has three longstanding members. Three women make it their focus to bring young girls into business contexts, fund raise to further their education and share research on women in business.

McKnight visits a Chicago neighborhood that is considered "underprivileged". It has 40,000 people left after many have evacuated. He documents the occurrence of 1,000 associations, that is at least one for every forty people! The members are unpaid, except for perhaps one paid pastor, director, etc. He discovered the existence of almost one church per block.

Associations are invisible. Is that good? Institutional abandonment has brought about the capacity to re-create, re-define, come to terms with self. Neighborhoods survival often depends on its associations. In the Chicago neighborhood, institutional abandonment occurred when hospitals, universities, banks, all disappeared. However, associations became strongly the source of much neighborhood survival, pride and celebration.

Robert Putnam measures the decline of associational life in our communities in the book "Bowling Alone". He shows that more people are bowling, but there are fewer leagues. Harvard promotes a number collection mentality in which many associations do not show up because they are unnamable. Many associations are not visible to a Harvard man. Putnam believes that fewer people under 30 are involved in associations, fewer are going on picnics, mingling with each other. McKnight asks the audience if we are attending fewer picnics.

Jerry asks McKnight about the implications of various economic policies for an urban city like Oakland. He questions the reduction of dollars going to professionals and putting money directly into the hands of poor people. McKnight replies that in programs sponsored for low income people, four billion was spent on services and subsidies and 37% of that was handed out in cash directly to people. He does not agree with the provision of services, nor the giving of cash. He suggests thinking economically, creating a decent economy. Provide money for people to create their own small associations that would, for example, maintain the small food store rather than the chain stores.

Marty notices how often the word "power" arises. He says, "I'm into small scale groups. Power is utterly irrelevant. I don't need power." He makes a request that institutions renounce their power and "get off my back."

John Storch on the other hand, wants a dump truck from the city powers that be. He is working with a pick and axe to clear his driveway of dirt, and wants city help.

McKnight says that Robert Putnam speaks about losing "social capital" in the large foundation initiatives that "shape us." When you see something that engages a whole neighborhood in celebration of place, they've recognized the associations and brought them together. A classic model was Celinski's era which developed an ability to focus on keeping institutions outside neighborhoods, on commonality outside neighborhoods. McKnight suggests mobilizing people internally to discover how they can get together and focus outside neighborhoods. He strongly recommends causing "the association of associations".

Then, for example, there can be some reciprocity with cities paying half to fix the driveway with a city dump truck. McKnight questions the concept of service providers, of getting folks under thirty here, of "problems with the youth". Folks who are drawn into themselves do not notice others. Professionals receive people as "less than" themselves. Perhaps they must be re-educated about what it is to be human.

Folks describe life in West Oakland where people are building up land values, where welfare services have broken down, where they live amidst small town attitudes of fearing others, fearing professionals. McKnight agrees with Jerry about the question of economic policy in a city where people are afraid of those they work for. Corporations get a welfare check intending to fix someone, putting those people into a little box.

Folks describe the associations in the Lake Merritt area, where a few people gather to discover something, to discover the person amidst the abandonment. A local citizen describes her sense of disconnection from the 80 events going on every month. There are no monies available for the discovery of self.

Debbie invites others to look to each other here within our Oakland Table "association" to create actions in each others' neighborhoods. She recognizes the great value in gathering together, in associating with each other. She values the familiarity already present in the gatherings of the Oakland Table attendees and encourages continued meetings beyond the end of the symposium.

An artist describes the need to find the community leaders that are already here and bring them into play with others who are unique to that neighborhood, to develop the character of that place.

Putnam's article traces anonymity in villages and small towns. Agreement to come to each other's defense occurs in an atmosphere where people make decisions themselves. This goes on all over the world. Associations are the place of relationships. "Development" as a field of study does not consider relationships. True development is an on-going process of unfolding. Walls stop energy and stop anonymity.

Jerry reflects back on 1964 when the sense was strong that automation made people unnecessary. The Income Maintenance Commission, Nixon's Farm Assistance Plan, and Humphrey's programs stigmatized the idea of giving away money. Mr. Jinks says that we can't talk about the undeserving poor, but can take worthy poor above the poverty level. The micro-lending program in Oakland assists families who are recommended by their church to receive grants that match their own investments. Jerry sees this as a way to climb out of poverty, build neighborhoods and trust.

"Surplus Powerlessness" says that voluntary associations and Nixon's livable wage are not mutually exclusive means. It describes the making of "every man a king", with monetary distributions from annual citizen's trust funds, monetary disbursements.

The evening's talks ends with a testimonial from a young man who described associations that brought families together when youths got outta jail and worked in the mayor's office. He told how his mother would not leave her neighborhood for a large financial gain, but chose to stay within the friendships she had there. He advocated putting money back into "families, youth and kids".

"People Regenerating Places" by Gustavo Esteva, 10/7/00

Lee Hoinaski introduces Gustavo Esteva by saying that a list of credentials would be too many to mention and would take up valuable time. Lee exclaims, "You'd miss the time to hear him; he has something to say!"

Gustavo begins by questioning who's story is being told. Who is the teller? Where does his story stop and his friend's begin? His story begins fifteen years ago when he was in Japan, where Ivan Illich was introduced. Ivan impacted him greatly. Now he can no longer think of himself as an individual with self-interests, speaking to individuals, or acting only on his own behalf. He is not speaking from "nowhere", not impersonal when he speaks. He shares with us the background of a place, and wants our conversation.

In '29 when Truman took office he coined the word "underdevelopment", and Gustavo became one of two billion who began to think of themselves for the first time as "underdeveloped". This fascination with development made folks strive to be a part of that epoch. Gustavo became employed in "business administration" work because it was attractive to him to be serving community.

He became part of contracts that brought great riches, but he found he disliked bringing monies into large corporations. He became a leftist, then a Marxist, then a revolutionary supporter of Che Guevara. During the early sixties, Gustavo became part of an urban movement, "the Sabatistas". He became disheartened with his fellow revolutionaries and left when a friend killed a woman over jealousy.

Gustavo went to work with the Mexican government in a progressive movement that performed services for millions. He almost became a Minister, (a high post in the government). Again, he quit because he observed damages made against people. He experienced a "taking off of the lenses", a great clarity of sight in which reality became perceived. He stopped studying professional subjects like anthropology, sociology, psychology.

Gustavo started to remember many things about his Grandmother who was an Indian. He remembered ways that she celebrated holidays and how she treated him. He was "re-membering" ways of the grass-roots people. When Gustavo met Ivan Illich, a reactionary priest who folks distanced themselves from, Ivan was using words from the local villages. Gustavo heard words like "vernacular", "conviviality", words that struck him like lightning, freed him from the language of "development" and "services".

In the sixties the planners of "development" promised to complete the process within twenty-five to fifty years. Their estimate in the eighties changed to three thousand years. "Development" was a process that made rich countries richer by far than developing countries. The result was tremendous frustration and rage. It was a revelation for rich countries that their "universal definition of the good life" was a delusion, and that everyone has their own definition. Hospitality also cannot be universally defined. The "developers" were just tolerant of the village ways, they put up with people blandly, a sentiment no one needs.

"Globalization" became the substitute for development. In each village is local gossip and varying states of introspection, therefore global village is unthinkable. How can one gossip about the sexual escapades of global leaders of 300 million people in India, or 30 million in Mexico? Global village news can only be a soap opera.

Gustavo suggests "localization", not localism, not globalization. Localism is entrenchment in local place that is as dangerous as fundamentalism. We can affirm ourselves in the local, but must also be open to others. We must go from resistance to liberation. A common future for all people on earth is absurd. We are shaped by tradition bounded by place and this is good within a shared place.

But, we are no longer traditional people. We are not returning to the past. "Tradition" now is to change tradition in a traditional way. We can change in an autonomous way. We must bring about a new definition of hospitality. Using the hammock as a metaphor for cultural change, Gustavo describes rules of access to a group that shapes you while the group access accommodates its shape to you. Everyone and everything is shaped to each user; there are no set rules of access.

He describes an example when a villager tries to cash a check. The fellow needed money for medical treatment of a burned hand but could not sign the check with the hand that needed the treatment. Access to the cash was not shaped to his need.

The North American Free Trade Agreements marked the end to "development". Rebels appealed to the authoritarian regime to end development programs. They wanted a new regime to allow a return to land and the sense that self organization was enough. Millions supported the rebels, the Sabatistas.

In questioning why people supported violence, Gustavo mentions a story of Ghandi's son who asks, "What if a man is trying to kill me?" Ghandi says "violence is the weapon of the weak." The Sabatistas were weak, thirty thousand died. There was no response from the government or the people when they died. They did not provoke peoples' response, but instead there was a peculiar reaction. Millions of people took to the streets until individuals throughout the world got their ideas. More changes came from the Sabatistas regime than any other era.

Globalization programs view two thirds of the world as useless and disposable to the global market. They are ever interested in creating opportunities to produce their own food, to get free of controls on a local level. However, local practices may require a break at 2:00pm. for food and siesta. On a village level, life is defined by family and food. "Comida" is eating that is central to culture and conditions of life.

Gustavo turns to these local ways in recovering common sense. For example, their children are named nine months after birth when the name can evolve out of direct interaction with that child. In contrast, Gustavo received a card from a modern pregnant woman who had "ultra sound". The card announced the date and time that "Johnny" would be born with a C-section scheduled at the convenience of the doctor.

Gustavo asks us to define what it is to feel well by our own enjoyment of our present life, not dependant on a system of health care and schools. He believes that we are consuming the commodity of "knowledge". The main outcome of education is to create two classes of people, the educated and uneducated, in order to distribute privileges.

We can recover learning when we notice that every baby is an expert, and when we learn from the world, not from information about the world. Gustavo describes learning with apprenticeship as a better method. He tried to introduce legislation that would assign a ten year jail term to anyone asking for or having, or showing a diploma. He wanted to make folks aware that a diploma is only a certification of hours spent in the school system.

He argues that students should abandon school and learn elsewhere. Imposed education was a "need", then a right, then a social addiction. Therefore, it must be treated like a drug or alcohol addiction. There is a five day class on how to install and repair dry toilets whereby a diploma will get you an immediate job. However, there are no jobs for architects.

In Mexico city people resisted the space problems. One half of the space there is occupied illegally. Sixty five percent of the houses are built by folks themselves. The "developers'" sewage system created a

nightmare in the urban landscape. The promise of flush toilets required water to first become contaminated by solid waste and then require five times as much expense to clean it.

Jean Robert invented a model of a latrine utilizing dry disposal of solid waste which became an expression of political autonomy. It saved the precious water and created needed manure. Gustavo describes it as disconnecting the stomach from the centralized bureaucracy. Water toilets were polluting the world. Two billion people depend on the toilet. On Oacca alone, there are now one hundred thousand dry latrines.

Supporters of globalization maintain that the global market is a cheaper market, one shared market. Rebels to the world market claim that eighty percent of the market products can be produced in Oacca. Oacca has three hundred thousand small producers of coffee, speaking six different languages. They were not recognized in the global market. Instead they became their own local organization and represented themselves in the various marketplaces.

However, the very year that the local salesmen came from Oacca to the New York marketplace, the stock market crashed. Coffee dropped in value so greatly that the new sales men were at a loss to reap any profits. Luckily, they listened to a drunk who told them that they are "organic" growers because they use no chemicals. They were able to use this advice to secure a valuable place in the market.

In Oacca they are using one half of the land to produce local food. Therefore, there is a cohesion in their market so that some can give food while others give coffee. They study the market and they study themselves.

A local group called themselves "Hammocks" to describe trust and friendship in the arena of local politics. This opposed the new army of globalizers who came in with a new government called democracy, that they claimed would cure all. But this democracy was a tool to concentrate power in the hands of few. The only power that people kept was the means to give power away to others, to corrupt themselves.

The Sabatistas are creating political bodies at a small scale level. They invite the creation of local communities which reflect on what "we can do for ourselves; we can do everything from the bottom up". They found that the only governmental need they could not fulfill was to create ambassadors that could represent the entire country elsewhere. Every other responsibility of government was taken up by local people reconstructing from the bottom up.

In 1988, Gustavo was part of an "alternative parliament" that gathered in Mexico city, bringing together leaders from far and wide. They fostered the process of destroying "the idea of the city" and abandoning one government for twenty million people. They agreed that in every barrio, groups could create ministers that would discover the specific needs of that barrio and inter-relate with other barrios. They started a dialogue transcending the specific rationale that standing on soil was not a place but an abstract space. They put into question the mode of public transportation systems, whose planners were destroying their city.

They proved that a far better public transportation network could be created from the bottom up by way of each barrio diagramming where they needed bus lines. Then a larger network would connect these smaller local requirements into a larger plan. For the first time this would utilize the true needs of local people rather than destroying local strengths by trampling through villages with destructive master plans.

The vision is a practical one, of creating a whole new world, and abandoning the attempt to have one united world. The dream is to have a world in which many different worlds can fit side by side.

Gustavo describes himself as a person in a net of relations. He says, "you see the mask of the net, and you can only imagine who I am. You cannot see the net." There is the village "we", the cultural "we", the race "we", all coming through the loudspeaker. He goes on to describe himself, saying, "I am a loudspeaker, not for producing sounds of any one individual and distorting personal self, but a loudspeaker that allows all the other people who are in the net to be heard. I cannot bring through the exact words of others, so your imagination must do the rest."

Gustavo believes in trust, friendship and hope, radical hope, as the essence of popular movements. He encourages us to differentiate hope from expectation. A pregnant woman is not expectant, but nourishing the hope of having a baby. "Abrigo esperanzas" is to nourish hope. The idea of the Sabatistas is the "international organization of hope." It furthers hope without the conviction that something will turn out well, but keeps up the sense that however it turns out will make sense.

Marty Kent describes the past five weeks of talks on themes of proportionality and recovery. He says that addiction was spoken about at first, addiction to education, to headphones, programmed material, TV. He reasserts that "bushmen are laughing at the coyote's tricks that turned us into thinking machines. Laughter saves us, makes place possible."

In closing Sajai thanks Ivan Illich and his many friends who made it possible to create the Oakland Table, the five week "work in process." He thanks Debbie Moore and Elaine for starting mini-tables, and Debbie for writing up notes on these talks with perseverance. The next lecture series will explore hospitality, the art of being in place, the history of services and how they pervert or corrupt, and how to re-discover hospitality in practices of today. Thanks to Jerry Brown for housing the household of speakers in his home, and thanks to all who attended the Oakland Table, because "we got a sense of Oakland through you!"

Afterwards:

The "Oakland Table Leaf", or what became known as "The Hospitality Table Folks" is an association of the Oakland Table attendees. We meet once monthly at each other's homes and discuss the recent symposium and what it has inspired us to do. Sometimes our interests gel, and we do things together that express our appreciation for Ivan and his great family of friends.