

people could get the video works and see them on small monitors or on a large LED screen in a coffee shop. I saw the possibility of using the virtual space as public space. Today many artists share using internet to show their works and the commercial distribution of video has begun would like to develop the virtual space as a public space in which to show art works it will be interesting to use internet through mobile phone as a public space.

ART AND THE CITY. POLITICS FOR PUBLIC ART
Alejandro Hernandez.

Evidently, the various roundtable discussions in this symposium have dealt with the issue of the relation or relations that exist between the City. Today we have listened to panelists speak of politics for public art in a first instance, of politics in first instance. Of politics in the strict, perhaps narrow sense of the word as management and administration as the strategies that allow for and foster art practice as something "public".

But maybe we should take a step backwards and ask ourselves rather whether or not every relationship from the outset. And also ask ourselves whether the relationship between art and the city is not a political relationship from the outset. And also ask ourselves whether the relationship itself between artists and their art and we must underscore the possessive their art is not also inevitably a political one.

The topic at hand is indeed art and the city rather than the artist and the city. But if it had needed the later, it would be impossible to overlook. Plato's exclusion of artists (of poets that is to say the creators of works from the city banned both from civic. Space and from the urban real (which are not necessarily one and the same).

In a series of essays whose title happens to be The Artist and the City. philosopher

Eugenio Trias explains the need for this ban in a space (civic space) where everyone is interdependent and governed by pre-established rules that transcend individuality established rules that transcend individuality -and where each thing is what it is says Trias-, there is one individual (the artist being aware of all the terms implications) who rises above the rest and shows us or gives us a "work" that is the result of his or her poetic- erotic impulse- a work that, now following Heidegger, creates a world for itself and is a self - sufficient entity . This action s disruptive nature and the confusion generated by the artists actions in the eyes of the philosopher- politician justifies his or her expulsion.

At least since the dawn of modernity- the modernity that began, shall we say, around the time of the Renaissance and especially since the outset of Romanticism- the artist has been viewed as someone who distances him or herself from his or her own cultural milieu (in a dialectic gesture that negates tradition in order to achieve a new synthesis that reaches beyond it) As Deleuze states concerning the writer an artist becomes what he or she is by becoming a stranger to his or her own language and culture. The artist today is a critic a dissident a radical and thus sows dissolutions in any pre-established social or cultural order.

Here over the last few days, we have talked about the issue of consensus, of *sensus communis*: common sense. This leads us to many questions has consensus, outside of literary works ever been the result of an agreement among free willed equals? Are not culture and tradition- necessarily public- ways of assuring consensus a hence, political forms of control (which does not imply that they are evil perse)? Should a breakdown in consensus be seen as a loss? Is modern art- like modern thinking- a cause or effect of this breakdown in consensus, of common sense?

German philosopher Peter Sloterdijk states that -politics, in its classic conception, referred to the art of co ownership in cities- the art. He also quotes a statistic from 1993 in which "one out every five.

German youths feels like an artist they no longer mean the artist as creator, but rather the last human being whose aura is defined by a permanent flow of experiences". Breakdown n consensus makes us wonder about the possibilities of politics in a society of artists where personal experience prevails. Do not ask yourself what the city can do for the artist. Ask the artist what he or she can do for the city. But let us view broadly this power of the artist what the artist is able to do. Let us of course question authority, but maybe beginning with the authoritarianism implicit in the very notion of the "creator" he or she who has control over what he or she can do. Let us assume the political power of art and the art of politics beyond such issues as permits and regulations, interventions and monuments, grants and recognitions prizes. Many or all of us here would like the politics in the plural, in lower case and in between quotation marks (which may not be a bad idea) or policies of our various city administrations to give us a Richard Serra instead of a Sebastian, or even worse, five upright snakes spitting out water. 12 And so what? What are the political- in caps? Implications of the fact that some of us want this sort of thing in public space everybody's an nobody's space and that others do not? What policy in the singular? might induce art in public space to be precisely that: public?

FROM THE CITY TO THE CAMP BARE LIFE AN URBAN POST. POLITICS Bülent Diken

In a joke from the times of the German Democratic Republic a German worker gets a job in Siberia and knowing that his letters will be read by the police he makes a deal with his friends Lets establish a code if a letter you will get from me is written in ordinary blue ink. "Everything is wonderful

here stores are full, food is abundant, apartments are large and properly heated movie theater show films from the West, there are many beautiful girls ready for an affair the only thing unavailable is red ink" (Zizek 2002: 1).

Slavoj Zizek starts his recent book on September 11 with this joke and the "red ink" in the joke is of course a symbol of politics, of the missing link in today's "post Political" society. Like the term "trans politics" popularized by Baudrillard and Virilio years ago, post politics signals the lack of a hared language in which individual problems can be translated into a collective, social terminology. So to say, a post-political sociality is a sociality. That is the en of society, of the city and of politics. To discuss this idea I would like to open up with six short cases or examples

First, let us imagine the situation of a refugee, that is of a person who has lost all his political rights. The refugee is reduced to being a "human being as such" to a politically "naked body" an therefore he is the very subject of human rights Yet paradoxically as Giorgio Agamben, following Hannah Arendt, writes, this figure "that should have embodied human rights more than any other marke(s) instead the radical crisis of the concept" (Agamben 2000: 19).

What is of interest in this context is that the refugee is excluded (he has for instance no citizenship rights in the country n which he seeks asylum) but not really -outsidell (he is absolutely subjected to the power of the juridical political framework of the country in which he seeks asylum) In other words, in the figure of the refugee -Inclusion - an exclusion are mechanisms that operate simultaneously in a gray zone, making the distinction of inside outside obsolete.

Second example could e a symmetrical one: -gated communities 'public" space do not exist, the "gates" are controlled by private police, and the most basic citizenship rights