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這次演講裡，我或許太有野心了，因為我有六頁的筆記、72頁投影片與兩部影片。我不知道我能不能在時間內把它們全部都呈現，但這次演講給了我一個機會整理思緒。我希望今晚能與你們分享。或許，你們能夠幫我梳理這些想法，挑戰我，讓我的想法能更豐富。

我想你們大多數都知道我的作品。藝術界裡大多數人都視我為社會藝術家，進行社會界入行動與基進政治藝術。這些標籤就這樣跟著我。但社會藝術家也不是近來才有。我們可以追溯到迪亞哥•里維拉（Diego Rivera）、約瑟夫•波依斯（Joseph Beuys），最近則有Superflex與Yes Men等團體。台灣有陳界仁，中國有艾未未。這些人被當作是參與社會藝術的藝術家。

當我處理社會議題時，我們在藝術領域的象牙塔裡爭論。我的作品在這個範疇裡被討論，而不是公眾空間。但最近，我離開了那個場域。我做的事情再也不位於藝術的領域裡，不在藝術的競技場裡。政治人物、社會運動分子與政府機構在公共空間裡爭論我的作品。或許可以說，我離開藝術象牙塔的那些藝術紛爭，進入街上的政治戰場。我不再被藝術圈內的標準評量或認可，因為現在是政治人物與政府機構在評量我的成果。

過去，當我做藝術作品時，我讓它們遠離政治，即使其中的議題可能與社會相關。那時，藝術的過程純屬藝術。［一直以來我都喜愛美麗的藝術，不管是浮世繪、漢斯．霍夫曼（Hans Hoffman）或是馬提斯（Matisse）。事實上，七、八年前當我在這間藝術館演講時，我引用了馬提斯。我在這裡再度引用他：「我想要同時為商人與學者製作藝術作品。這件作品會像一張好的扶手椅一樣，讓人可以舒緩疲累。」］

這個演講將會分為三個部分。第一部分將會處理影響我作品的一些思想。我將會討論兩位跟這場演講有關的思想家。一位是教育家保羅．弗雷勒（Paulo Freire），另一位則是約瑟夫•波依斯。第二個部分將會介紹三個我的計畫。第一個計畫裡我是位藝術家，第二跟第三個計畫中我則是政治社群運動工作者，替政府機關做事，同時也在現場當某種「政治家」。第一個計畫是影片與攝影的案子，主角們是土耳其的羅馬吉普賽社群。第二個則是低價社區的都市更新案子。最後一個則是與當地政府合作，讓地區裡的社群能夠參與式預算分配。

**第一個部分：**

這裡有個我做的小圖表，中間是我的想法、作品與方法。當然，我受到許多不同的影響，但今天我想談兩位天差地遠的人物。他們不僅在地域上相差很多，弗雷勒來自於巴西，而波依斯來自於德國。文化上，前者是位教育家與親力親為的政治家，波依斯則是位藝術家和所謂的政治家。思想上，他們也差異很大。

我先從波依斯開始，因為他是位藝術家，而在座的聽眾應該知道他的作品，也知道他的社會藝術。當然，他被認為是位政治運動分子，有趣的是，他也是德國綠黨的創辦人之一。就我自己來說，我不是波依斯的粉絲，因為他的視野給人太難解、宏大、甚至過於宏觀的感覺。但一些他的個人看法還蠻有趣，我想讓大家知道這些思考是怎麼影響我的作品。再來，弗雷勒也對我影響很深。當我還是個在美國的年輕小夥時，我去上了他的工作坊。他的哲學與著作也對我影響很大。

我將從兩位一些影響我的關鍵詞彙開始。三個來自於波依斯，五個來自於弗雷勒。

受壓迫者成為壓迫者：弗雷勒作為「接受文盲」（adopted illiteracy）的教育家，他其中一個基本觀點是都市窮人、或是被剝奪公民權、被邊緣化的文盲社群是被壓迫的群眾。但不僅如此，他們不僅想要壓迫的枷鎖，同時也內化了壓迫者的態度與世界觀而變得沉默。他們在社群內重現了壓迫的狀態。

因為他們不識字，所以本就有著沉默的文化。文盲沒辦法讀寫，因此沒辦法說出自己的觀點。他們內化了壓迫。他們壓迫自身，讓自己變得沉默。

對話行動：因為文盲，人們無法溝通。他們說話，但無法溝通。對話行動想要讓人們以平等的關係向彼此交流與互動。有著行動的對話意味著反思與能動性。當我們說話時，我們反思。在反思的過程中，我們也做出行動。所以這是關於聆聽與消化的概念。我們如何把思想與對話轉換成行動。

當我們對話時，如同我們學會ABC、讀寫與這些過程一樣，我們開始認識並為這個世界找出詞彙。我們說那個人是壓迫者。我們說這是一間房子。我們說那是貧窮。這是「命名世界」的意思。在命名的過程中，世界對於命名者來說成了個問題。世界不僅僅有著名字而已。在賦予其新的意涵時，貧窮成了問題。貧窮需要被克服。人們才能接著行動，並進入下個階段獲得公德意識。當人們有了公德意識，他們才能夠有能動性，並開始轉化自己與世界。

當你有了公德意識，世界的神話特質也就隨之消失。

波依斯。我說過我不同意他的多數想法。像是他的Gesamtkunstwerk概念。Gesamtkunstwerk在德文裡的意思是整體藝術。他認為政治與社會行動需要被社會取代。這我不認同。

那我為什麼還引用他呢？我喜歡他，因為他的一些話語讓我思考，即使他的論述沒有被完整的發展。他做出一個又一個大膽的宣言。「每個人都是藝術家」、「社會有機體是一種藝術形式」、「社會關係與公眾行動是社會雕塑。」這些宣言都聽起像是老生常談、不證自明的事情。但我有興趣的是如何重新詮釋他的詞彙與發展他們可能的意涵。

在這三句宣言裡，他嘗試把所有的事情都轉變成藝術。第一句話裡，所有人都是藝術家。從我在社群裡的工作經驗來說，此話有幾分為真。我們與孩子和大人合作。透過溝通、密切的對話行動，人們能夠學會如何設計自己的遊樂場、壁畫。在某些機構或是援助單位裡，他們能夠學習為自己設計些東西。某種程度上來說，這些也是藝術。

再來，社會有機體作為藝術。社會有機體通常意指涉人們之間的社會關係。當我們想像蜜蜂或是螞蟻作為社群生物與有機體時，這些小東西創造出許多複雜且美麗的結構。蟻洞可以說是許多通道結合起來的美麗複合建築。或是蜂窩，結構多麼的精緻，美麗又大有用處。為什麼我們不能這樣思考人類呢？人類也是社會有機體。在我的實踐經驗裡，人們之間的關係可以既美麗又痛苦、既複雜而又纖細。

社會雕塑則是語意上最有趣的概念。我們知道「社會」是形容詞。雕塑則是名詞。社會常常被用來形容各式各樣的連結與人際關係，可能是社交媒體、研究社會關係社會科學、社會道德，意指特定社會結構的價值系統。

雕塑可以簡單地理解為立體的東西。任何形式、任何物體、任何概念。在環境與空間裡，我們所呼吸的空氣。所以你把兩個概念放在一起時，意思就是社會空間與環境裡的人類關係與連結。

**第二個部分：**

好，現在這是另一個圖表。主要有三個元素：社群、促進者與贊助者。促進者是計畫的實行人；他們可以是社工、學生運動分子、政府官員、藝術家、非政府組織等。沒有贊助人，也就沒有案子。贊助人可以是當地政府或機關、議會等。

我們合作的社群，可以說是某種人際關係組成的社會單位，許多人組織成一個共享價值、利益的網絡，更被地理、地點、家庭、親屬關係、宗教、種族、社會階層與身分所形構。當然，許多不同的分類都相互重疊。

這三個元素相輔相成，與彼此互有往來。社群、贊助者與促進者一起合作，用某個方法得出某個結果──產出和成果。今日的討論裡，所謂的產出也就是「居住」。

居住是基本權利。眾人都認為居住是三大人權：衣著、食物與居住。沒有食物，我無以為繼。自從起源，我們學習如何狩獵、進食，我們利用自然製作衣物，保護身體。我們使用樹葉、枝幹來打造棲息處與頭上的屋頂。這三個行為可說是人類作為社會中能夠生產的一份子不可或缺的事情。

我即將討論的三個案子都跟居住有關。第一個是在2007年土耳其伊斯坦堡的蘇魯庫雷（Sulukule）。蘇魯庫雷是法提省的一區，也是世界遺產的一部分。2006年，市議會決定更新整個區域。他們想像中的區域更新就是把整個地方夷平。2010年，整區都被夷平了。他們拆了355棟建築物。3400人被驅離，無家可歸。或是被遷居的遠在45公里外的地方。

塔滿美丹（Taman Medan）則是我從2010年發起的一個案子。整個工薪階級區域居住地都是都市窮人。社群的源起則可以追溯到1970年代來到城市定居的鄉村移民。2002年的馬來穆斯林與印度教印度人之間的衝突激起了種族暴動，導致六人身亡，超過40人送醫。

雙溪檳城則是檳城喬治鎮裡的工薪階級區。此區的公寓可以說是無法管理。這些是真正的城市窮人。2006年，幫派分子在此孳生，而自殺與謀殺事件震驚了州政府。

事實上，我稱這樣的三個地方為衝突場域。這些場域被政府忽略，而在我心中，我在那裏的職責就是進行某種治療。我把這些衝突的場域當成讓人們得以療傷的場域。

第一個案子是和羅馬社群一起製作的影片。羅馬吉普賽人，但他們不喜歡這個名稱。我為了土耳其雙年展來到這裡，但我發覺伊斯坦堡有很多在此處定居的吉普賽部落。我立刻就覺得這是個好點子。當然我這樣覺得原因是因為我總是想跟吉普賽人私奔。我幻想著馬戲團裡的吉普賽人弄了個火堆、整夜狂歡爛醉。所以當我聽到有吉普賽人的時候，我的反應是「好，我想要跟吉普賽人合作。」

所以這個案子的起源不是因為我想處理社會議題；我只是想在夏天裡花四個月跟吉普賽人鬼混而已。

我是怎麼被引介進這個社群的呢？三個NGO的工作人員在一場會議裡把我介紹給整個社群。會議的主題是蘇魯庫雷的拆遷與我們該怎麼辦。我們有清真寺的首領伊瑪目阿賽姆（Imam Asem），還有社群代表毎玫（Mehmet）。一方有NGO的工作人員，另一方面則有聯合國與當地政府的顧問。

我很直接。我跟NGO的朋友還有阿賽姆說我不是來這裡搞政治的，我也沒辦法處理蘇魯庫雷即將面對的拆遷。我只想跟吉普賽人鬼混而已。我去找伊瑪目，跟他說「我來這裡是想向你學習，拍支影片，但我還不知道會是怎樣的影片。我不知道我能做甚麼，但我想跟社群裡的人合作，特別是年輕人與小孩。你能幫我嗎？」他用很懷疑、帶有距離感的方式同意。但因為我有NGO的支持，他同意我能夠在社群裡自由移動。

你可以看到屋子上有許多通知。這些是市政府發出的通知，標定那些房子即將被拆毀。

羅馬社群非常貧窮。他們被剝奪了許多權利，許多年來都被遺棄在這裡。

在這張照片裡，你可以看到許多人開始居住在帳篷裡，因為他們的房子已經被拆掉了。這些照片是為了讓你們大略了解這個社群。

許多人屋子裡甚至沒有自來說。他們得去公共區域取水，然後提回家。

我找了一群孩子來。這是他們的照片。他們是非常特別的一群孩子，生活在一個我不熟悉的世界裡。我和孩子們合作過，但這些孩子像是另一個世界來的生物。他們早上六點睡，下午三點起來。

我問他們為什麼六點才睡，他們說他們整夜狂歡打鼓。

我像之前一樣，準備跟孩子合作，當個好藝術家、教育家和協調人員。本來有個計畫：第一週，我們要怎麼辦？幾個小時？我們有整個過程的文案。我們有個討論的部分還有不同的方法。甚麼都準備好了。三天內，我把這些都丟出窗外。

因為他們才不遵從這樣的工作方式。我們要做甚麼事情之前，一定要先踢一下足球、打一下鼓或是跳一下舞。我們可以做任何不是「工作」的事情。

所以我們決定跟他們一起玩。我花了三個月跟吉普賽孩子玩在一起。跳舞、遊戲還有踢足球。我們做了各式各樣的事情。我們玩樂，避開政治。

但我們在玩樂的同時，房子一間間被拆毀。每天都有建築物被夷為平地。

你可以看到他們帶我們去這些拆遷現場。我們打鼓、跳舞，在附近鬼混。

接著孩子們跟我進行了訪談。我們也訪談了伊瑪目，還有Syuki Punduk，他是居民協會的會長；我們避談馬上就要來臨的拆遷和居住問題。我用玩樂的方式讓它們卸下心防。

這就是我給的大略方法，而這是最後的結果。

我們有贊助者，也就是我們自己。促進者有NGO的工作人員，還有我自己在社群裡頭活動。目標族群則是羅馬孩童與青年。

我們還是保持著某種工作型態。對話行動。我們說了很多。孩子跟我們說了很多故事。他們想到的故事，透過故事來表達並找出自己的觀點。透過玩樂與說故事，我覺得他們覺得自己有了能力可以說些關於自己的事情。這非常有趣，因為我一開始碰到了很多問題。我看起來不像他們。NGO工作人員很能融入，因為他們看起來就像當地人。我看起來像成龍。那裡唯一知名的中國人就是成龍。

有人對我大喊、有人對我亮出刀子、也有人拿出槍來指著我。我有看過大人來把小孩子抓回家，朝我尖叫。先救了孩子，再朝我怒罵。

但我們還是待在那裡。我們最後待下來的原因也很有趣。有好幾個電視台來採訪我。我說要採訪我可以，四分之三的時間都得訪問孩子。然後我們協商了一下。他們採訪了孩子，然後訪談出現在全國性的電視頻道上。隔天我終於被羅馬社群所接受，因為孩子學會了如何表達自己的觀點。家長和部落領袖來找我，跟我說他們不知道孩子這麼有能力表達自己的觀點。

我們弄了一部關於幻想與快樂的影片，生活的快樂。影片有著他們的夢想及想要更好的生活的願景。

計畫快結束時，我跟整個社群變得很親近，所以離別時很不捨。這是一個完全不同的經驗，我從來沒有進行藝術計畫時獲得這樣的經驗。

當然，我知道我忽略了最重要的議題：過幾年，這些孩子將會流離失所。而我在那裏就是和他們玩而已。我每天都能看到毀滅一天天入侵。這些是最後拍下的影像。

這是我們工作的咖啡店。我們在這裡開會和玩遊戲。左邊的咖啡店有我們的畫作。我們在那跟三個女孩們喝了咖啡、做了訪談。現在只剩斷垣殘壁。

那是個很令人動容的經驗。特別是在那之後，這是現況。

整個社群都被抹滅、搬遷到別處。中產與上層階級移入這都市更新完的區域。

我從羅馬社群學到的其中一件事情是他們不想游牧、住在貨車裡、從一處移到另一處、被驅逐、被趕出家園。這再次證明了主流社會如何實現對吉普賽人的浪漫幻想。他們把吉普賽人踢了出去，讓他們流浪。等他們離開後，就說「哇，你看。吉普賽人又上路了。」

第二個案子回到了馬來西亞。跟羅馬小朋友的快樂時光告一段落。都市重建計畫在這個地方展開。塔滿美丹是個充滿種族衝突的地方。人們被殺害。也是開始治療的場所，重建這個區域。

這就是那個公寓社區。我起初不想處理這個問題。我當時很天真。我下定決心是因為我屬的反對黨拿下政府，成為執政黨。接著我向朋友們提議：「讓我們做看看這個案子，看看可不可行，看能不能把這個案子變成政策，施行於州裡其他地方。」

這就是那個地方，屋舍還有整個社群。我們經手過的每個案子都有這樣的社群。普遍來說，老人，三代住在一起。第一代是從鄉村地區移居城市的勞工。他們沒有地方可待，所以只好開闢森林，建造自己的房子。其後，開發商來到此處，給了他們小小的公寓待著，但以前他們的房子是在堅實的土地上。這就是跟我們合作的社群。

甚麼是都市更新？和我合作的議會在這方面非常無知。他們不懂都市更新。對他們來說，都市更新就是上一層新的油漆。但我跟他們說都市更新不是一層油漆而已。而是為窮人而發起的社會改革。

這個案子裡，情況不像是羅馬社群那樣，整個地區被賣給開發商。而是要幫人們提高生活品質、復甦當地經濟、為地區與社群創造社會與經濟空間。所以，目標不是讓整個地區中產階級化，把建築物與相鄰地區夷為平地，也不是要把這些人遷走。

都市更新需要政府來幫忙，成為社群的夥伴，參與其中，而非由政府或開發商成為單方面的決策者。這同時也關於讓社群感到自己有力量，讓他們成為社群的股份持有者，讓他們有責任感，並覺得自己能夠掌握現在與未來。

都市更新並不是要讓這些被剝奪權利的社群人口失去生計、教育、資源、生活品質。舉例來說，如果你把一個家庭遷到別處，但他們在此處已經住了三十年，孩子們去距離十分鐘的地方上學。新的地方在五到十哩外。那他們要怎麼去上學？當父母去做時，他們還得付車資油錢。這會讓他們處境更悲慘。我們想要倡導永續概念。我們不想要拆毀與蓋更多的水泥牆而製造更多的垃圾。

又來到另一個圖表，這裡我們有整個案子的方法。我們有贊助者出資，也就是市議會與一群建築師實踐他們的企業社會責任、居民協會。也有促進者，其中包括了建築師、社運人士（包含我自己）、顧問、藝術家與居民。

我自己想出這樣的方法。當然我腦中已經有了理論，而這個案子直接讓我想起波依斯的社會雕塑與有機體等概念。要是我們能夠在社區裡透過建築介入生活，我們可以說這是一種社會雕塑嗎？這是我問自己的問題。位於中央的是居住問題。我們的目標鎖定的是社群與環境更新。

我們有焦點小組。我們和居民座談。我們和議會、建築師和藝術家想出一個大方向，包括了重新粉刷、新的入口、中庭、窗戶的雨遮、平台與綠化環境。地面上則重新設計景觀與鋪路等。

起初，這對我來說是個很困難的計畫，因為我是新來的人。我得跟非常多不同的人與團體協商，像是地方上的居民、政客、顧問、顧問辦公室、建築師到藝術家。老實說，很多時候我都不知道在幹嘛。

接著我要一一介紹我們完成與沒完成的目標。

重新粉刷：從髒兮兮的灰牆變成了色彩繽紛的樣貌。人們可以選擇自己的建築物要漆上甚麼顏色。裏頭，人們可以選擇家門前的牆上要漆上甚麼顏色。

雨遮：因為平價建築瑕疵的設計，雨遮可以讓雨水不會從窗戶滲入。當雨下得很大的時候，雨會從沒有雨遮的公寓窗戶滲入。現在雨水會直接被導入排水管中。

中庭：現在成了機車停車場，同時也是居民的小小社交空間。在這個意義上，這成了社會雕塑。人們可以在立體的空間裡移動。

連接的通道：金屬製的平台讓人們可以自由移動。女生可以坐在上面做家事，把衣服曬出來。孩子們可以在這裡玩，讓大人可以在同一樓層看見他們玩耍。

新的入口：安全的入口讓人們可以知道誰進出整個區域，同時也可以讓大家有被庇護的感覺；讓人們回家的時候可以有被保護的感覺。

接著我們跟孩子們開了幾次會，然後跟把大人們分成不同的焦點小組討論它們的需要。孩子討論了如何設計一個新的遊樂場。大人表達了他們的想法，人們總是說要改變這個地方，說了二十五年。政客總是會來這裡開空頭支票，他們希望這次是真的。我確定大家都聽過這種故事，也對你們的政府有一樣的想法。所以，其實聽他們的故事、抱怨和碎碎念令人不好過。我們真的想要改變。

這是我們做到的事情。我們重新鋪了路、換了燈、裝了雨蓬。這是舊的建築物，這是新的建築物。

這還是簡單的部分。我們沒辦法動到建築結構。當我們開始處理結構的部分時，包括中庭、平台跟新的入口，我們才從居民那邊知道建築底下整個汙水系統都很有問題。整個系統堵塞，滿溢出來。在我們開始施工時，整個地方都開始發臭。我們需要做的事情是蓋一個新的汙水與排水系統，讓汙水可以從建築物排去別的地方。不過為了要抵達新的地方，我們得把中庭整個挖起來、支撐好建築物然後重新蓋一個汙水系統。

我們能怎麼辦？我們沒有錢。我們也沒辦法撐起建築物，把中庭整個挖起來。我們得一直跟別人協商。兩年之後，我們還在跟舊的開發商協商，畢竟是他們蓋了這棟爛建築給窮人。我們現在還在跟他協商，找辦法蓋個新的汙水系統。

這是我說真正的政治的意思。因為在跟前開發商的協調會議裡，他總是會冷酷無情又自信滿滿地說：你知道你們這些人真的很麻煩嗎。我沒辦法付你錢解決問題。換句話說，他沒辦法賄絡我們。過去，他能夠跟政府公務員打打高爾夫就能解決一切問題。「你為什麼這麼關心窮人呢？你給他們一寸，他們會進一尺。你給他們一尺，他們會進一哩。所以我不知道你幹嘛這麼擔心它們，他們只是想佔你便宜。」

第三個案子是推動參與式預算分配，並同時關注性別的問題。不同的人，不同的需求。我們著重在每個人都有自己的需求，我們需要理解不同的社群來找出他們到底需要甚麼。

這邊你可以感覺一下我的藝術手腕。我設計了這裡所有的旗幟。

兩個不同的社區：安盤南（Ampangan）公寓其實位在還不錯的地點，這裡是窮人的出租公寓。三房一廳的公寓一個月只要三十五塊美金。左邊這個沒啥問題，右邊這個才是發生自殺與謀殺案件的地點。這個社區也有許多不同的種族：六成的人是馬來人、兩成是中國移民、兩成則是印度移民。

參與式計畫到底是甚麼？其實這讓社群居民認識自己的需求，並參與討論與分配政府預算與基金。社群居民可以貢獻自己的想法，參與決策過程，把某幾項需求列為最重要的支出，而不是政府官員決定如何花錢。這讓政府能夠對人民負責，同時讓過程透明化。大眾可以開始監督政府。我們同時也著重在少數族裔與邊緣族群的權益上，像是窮困的孩子與婦女。這讓對話行動能夠發生，市民作為股東與政府的合夥關係能夠在建設社群的過程中被發揚光大。

我們有個大致上的方法，參與式預算在中間。目標則是讓社群的需要被滿足。

所以結果到底如何？我規劃了一年四期的案子。第一個部分是調查。我們進入社群，然後做所有不同群體的人口調查，基本上就是做了一次普查。接著，我們從不同的團體當中選出代表，這些團體包括了婦女、男性、孩童、年長者、行動不便者。我們有焦點小組。我們聽他們抱怨、抱怨再抱怨。

接著他們投出自己想要甚麼。我們聽了他們的抱怨，也聽了它們需要甚麼。接著，他們需要一些時間來投票，決定把錢花在甚麼事情上。

當我們跑完整個程序後，我們開始處理他們的需求。舉例來說，如果他們想要整理好整個環境，我們就把這議題帶進議會。議會會坐下聽我們說。我們會決定如何分配預算，改善社群的境況。

這是普查表格。我們有職業、性別、年紀，包山包海，所以我們知道他們到底是誰。

這也是不同的資訊，我們有不同的團體，包括了年輕人、青少年、孩童、成人與年長者。不同的年齡層。

我們從調查裡知道就業的情況。不工作的人佔了39%，其中包括了孩童、學生、青少年與年者者。40%的人失業。17.4%的人不工作。9.7%的人做著低薪的兼職。4.7%的人是家庭主婦。

這是另一個表格：64%的人是馬來人、18%的人是中國移民、10%的人是印度移民、10%是其他種族。

焦點小組，這是計畫的第二個階段。我們有小團體，每個團體不超過二十個人，通常是十到十五個人。我們坐下來閒聊、聽他們抱怨、把成人跟青少年分開、女人與男人分開。因為如果在同一個團體內，有時候他們不會告訴你他們在想甚麼。女人比較能跟女人談心。人們比較能向同性別的人表達自己。

就青少年來說，我們把他們分成小組，但我們有不同的方法與孩童應對。我們帶他們去參訪藝術與不同的地方。我們想讓他們有種自覺。到底大人或老人需要甚麼呢？我們用家庭的形象開始。你的父親、母親或祖母。他們需要甚麼？這個社群又需要甚麼呢？接著為了讓它們理解社群需要甚麼，我們帶他們去參觀那些好區與壞區。

在一個月的討論之後，這些是第一個區域找出來的主要問題。這個社群需要一個活動空間來辦活動。清潔。危險的路口需要紅綠燈。他們需要一個休閒公園，然後還想提升整區或是特定建築物的治安。他們也想要找出一些能讓婦女做生意的小空間。

這是另一個比較危險的區域。他們關心區域的安全、建築的維護、教育、還有社群的教育活動、當地人的停車場、遊樂園還有清潔。

第三個階段是投你想要做的事情。我們有調查得來的資訊，弄了一個投票名單。每個人都可以登記拿選票。十歲以上的人就可以投票。每個投票人都可以拿到五張兌換券，像是大富翁依樣。每張兌換卷值一百。年紀不同也會拿到不同顏色的兌換券。

你登記完之後，就把兌換券丟進票箱裡。你可以投一百塊給清潔、兩百塊給治安、兩百塊給社區維護。有很多不同的票箱，你可以讀完說明後再決定如何投票。我們有三天的投票時間；年輕與年長的選民都有。只要超過十歲，不管再老或是有行動不便等等問題的人都可投票。

每個投票日結束時，我們會公開地唱票。我們有人在看著我們，打開箱子，你可以看到不同的顏色。我們點了選票，並向大家公告結果。

這是結果，三天的投票情況。我想要聚焦在右手邊的第二個。總共有69.5%的人出來投票。能有這樣的結果讓我很開心，畢竟我本來擔心只有30%的人匯出樓投票，整個案子就會付諸一匱，因為不是多數人同意。

這是結果，對雙溪檳城公寓的居民來說，建築維護是最重要的議題。53%的女性投了這個選項，47%的男性投了這個選項。因為兌換券的規格，我們有編號可以找出這些選民的性別與年紀。

這裡是一段影片。這影片不是我拍的，中文翻譯也不是我做的。他們在計算結果。社群與促進者一起數票，然後大家在上面簽名。

之後，就是我們要怎麼實踐了。下一個階段最為複雜，計畫與實行。我們得讓議會與居民參與，接著他們又吵起來。我們需要跟居民合作來寫出計畫與提案。這是他們從沒做過的事情。這就是讓居民感到有力量、進行對話行動並培養公民意識的過程。當人們知道自己的需求被滿足、聲音有人聽，他們便會採取行動。

我們說服議會把預算提高三倍。這是他們在2012年有的錢，這則是我們有的錢。我們說服他們居民想要解決環境維護問題。清潔合約：把清潔合約交給當地人，而不是外面的合約商或雇傭。

重新粉刷建築、安裝防火設備（因為東西都被偷走或已經損壞）。重新為當地居民裝潢老舊或廢棄建築。同時在遊樂場安裝新的設施。

這些是大人物。這是整區的州議員。這則是州裡的居住事務首長。這是當地議會的機要秘書。

我們從第一項任務開始，其實也是最重要的任務。我很努力爭取提案，把合約要回來。正常來說，你如果把合約發包給外面的人，他們一點也不在意當地社群。他們只是想來這裡賺錢而已。我們的論點是要是當地居民自己照顧環境，品質會更好。因為他們在意自己的環境清潔。

居民協會的人也有派人監督清潔事務。我們找了六個清潔工。主管和清潔工都是有給職。所有的面試都公開公平。人們來申請，社群代表、議會和我則面試了他們。

這是清潔的預算，從2012年的馬幣66,000元上升到2013年的馬幣108,015元。這是清潔工們。穿著格子襯衫的那位是居民協會的理事長。戴著帽子的人則是主管。其中有個清潔工不在。

這是施行前後的照片。之前街上有很多垃圾，現在則很乾淨。

居民也可以選擇新油漆的顏色，當然我們也投票決定。人們可以去看一下顏色再來決定他們想要甚麼。這是新舊建築的照片，他們還在繼續上漆。

這是之前屋頂破損的廢棄建築。現在成了公寓裡社群組織的辦公室。有一個是佛教社，另一個則是伊斯蘭中心，還有婦女中心與居民協會。我們幫這些社團找到家。

一些反思。做到甚麼程度是藝術與藝術介入的終點，社會行動的起點呢？哪裡是社群與社會運動的終點，真實政治的起點呢？當我講完手上的講稿時，我希望我們能夠討論一下。這些事情跟藝術有關嗎？還是因為林宏璋的關係，所以我能把政治議題偷渡進藝術社群裡？

我是我的政黨的輔選與宣傳人員嗎？我是位嘗試新東西的藝術家嗎？我是在社會空間裡創作社會雕塑嗎？或這我其實就是位政治家，組織著群眾？博物館會出資支持這類的案子嗎（既沒東西可以展覽，也沒東西可賣）？

讓我們回到這個演講的標題上：憤怒、愛與希望。為什麼我選擇這些詞彙？因為我覺得憤怒很重要。我們都從心中的小小星火開始。星火需要被燃成大火。相同的憤怒也驅使著梵谷或高爾基，讓他們能夠創造出藝術的分水嶺，並為現代主義創造出代表作品。梵谷、高爾基或是剛剛過世的20世紀偉人曼德拉。他們心中都有對著不公不義的憤怒，讓他們成就了些甚麼。甘地也有相同的憤怒。因為他們兩人，世界變得更好。因為憤怒。

但單純的憤怒是不夠的。單純的憤怒可能具有毀滅性，沒甚麼用。我們需要把憤怒轉化為愛。愛人、愛美好的事物（像馬提斯）、愛正義、甚至是愛著遊戲或快樂。切格瓦拉說過真正的革命由強大的愛所引導。不管是藝術、社區工作甚至是政治，愛都是非常重要的。但這樣的愛一點都不感傷。這是渴求著某種自由，而非操縱。

你需要憤怒與愛才能有希望。為什麼是希望？因為你總在渴望著。你希望有個好日子、房子或是教育。你希望你的生活品質變得更好。希望就是認識到我們的生活、藝術與活動還不圓滿。我們希望我們可以讓他們完整。或許在未來吧，但我們需要那股希望。

我留著幾個問題沒回答。如果你覺得它們很重要，那我們可以進一步討論。謝謝你們聽我思考這個過程。我希望你們可以發言，就跟希望依樣。希望是為了圓滿。希望你們能夠幫我完成這個過程。

**Date:** December 6, 2013

**Moderator:** Hung-chang LIN / Associate Professor and Director, School of Fine Arts, Taipei National University of the Arts

**Speaker:** Hoy-cheong WONG / Artist

**[Below is transcript of the lecture]**

I have given myself an ambitious task in this talk. I have 6 pages of notes, 72 slides and 2 videos. I don’t know if I can manage to show all these to you, but this talk has given me the opportunity to put together some thoughts. And I hope tonight I can share them with you. Maybe you can help me think through these thoughts, provoke me to think more and challenge me.

I think most of you who know my work or most of the people in the art world ~~know~~ consider me as a socially engaged artist. Someone who does social interventions or political-activist art. These are the terminologies I have been associated with. But this is nothing new. We can go back as far as to Diego Rivera, who is known as a social artist. Joseph Beuys. And more recently, groups like Superflex and Yes Men. There is also Chen Jieren from Taiwan and Ai Weiwei from China. These are the people who have been categorized as artists who have been involved in socially involved arts.

While I engaged with social issues, they were debated within the white cube and within the art enterprise. The work is debated there, not in the public sphere. But of late, I have moved out of that sphere. What I do is no longer within the art enterprise, within the art arena. It is developed and argued within the public sphere among politicians, among social activists who work in the communities, and among government agencies. I have left the artistic battles in the white cube and in the art enterprise, and entered the political battles on the streets, so to speak. I’m no longer evaluated and legitimized by the art circles, but I’m evaluated by politicians and government agencies.

In the past when I was doing art, I kept it away from politics, even if issues might be socially relevant and socially engaged. The art process was the art process for me. (I always love beautiful art. Whether it is an Ukiyo-e print, Hans Hoffman or Matisse. And in fact, some seven or eight years ago, in this museum, when I gave a presentation. I quoted Matisse. I’ll re-quote him: I want to make art for businessmen as well as men of letters. Something like a good arm chair which provides relaxation for physical fatigue.)

This talk is in three parts. The first will cover some ideas that have influenced my work. I will touch on two people whom I think might be relevant to this discussion. One is an educator by the name of Paulo Freire. The other is Joseph Beuys. Second, I will talk about the three projects I did. The first, as an artist and the second and third, as a political-community activist-worker who works for government agencies and as a “politician” of sorts on the ground. Project one is a video-photography artwork with the Roman gypsy community in Turkey. Two, is an urban regeneration project in low-cost flats. The last is a participatory budgeting project in a social housing community with the local government.

**Part I**

Here we have a little model that I made about how the center would consist my ideas, my work and methodology. And of course there are all these influences, but today I’m going to talk about two people who are quite diametrically opposed. Not only geographically, Paulo Freire is from Brazil and Joseph Beuys from Germany. Culturally, Paulo Freire was both an educator and activist of the ground. Joseph Beuys was an artist and so-called politician. And intellectually they are quite different as well.

I’ll start with Joseph Beuys, because he’s an artist and most of you would know of his works and how he was doing socially engaged works. Of course, he was known as a political activist and interestingly enough he was the founder of the German Green Party. Personally I am not a great fan of Joseph Beuys because some of his ideas are a bit too esoteric, grandiose and totalistic in his vision. But some of his personal views are interesting and I think it’s worth looking at how they were influencing me. Second, Paulo Freire was a big influence on me. I took a workshop with him when I was a young kid in the US. His thoughts and his books were a big influence on me.

I’ll start by talking about Paulo Freire and some key terms that affects me. Three from Beuys and Five from Freire.

Oppressed become oppressor. In one of his basic arguments of Paulo Freire as an educator for adopted illiteracy is that the urban poor, or the disenfranchised marginalized communities who are illiterate, are oppressed. But more than that, the oppressed, they not only want the shackle of oppression, but have internalized the attitude and the worldview of the oppressor so that they become silent. They reproduce oppression among themselves.

There is a culture of silence because first they are illiterate. The illiterate cannot read or write and therefore they cannot articulate. They have internalized the oppression. They oppress themselves and make themselves silent.

Dialogic action. With illiteracy, people do not communicate. They talk, but they do not communicate. Dialogic action talks about communication and interaction amongst people as equals. And not only just dialogue as such. Dialogue with action meaning that it involves a sense of reflection and action. As we talk, we reflect. And in the reflection, we have acted. So it’s concept of hearing and process. How we transform thought and dialogue into action.

As we dialogue, as we learn the ABCs, as we learn how to read and write, as we learn these processes, we begin to recognize and name the world. We name this person as an oppressor. We name that as a house. We name that as poverty. This is what we call naming the world. And in naming the world in turn represents to the namers as a problem. It’s not just a name. And by giving that a new meaning, poverty becomes an issue. Poverty needs to be overcome. People then can act and we go to the next stage of conscientization. When people are conscientized, they can then have the agency and begin to transform themselves and the world.

Once you are conscientized, the world becomes demythologized.

Joseph Beuys. As I said, I don’t really agree with most of his ideas. Like his concept of Gesamtkunstwerk. Gesamtkunstwerk means total work of art in German and his idea that politics and social actions need to be replaced with art. That I don’t agree.

So why do I quote him? I like him because some of his words spur me on to think despite the fact that they’re not argued out. He proclaims and declares. “Everyone is an artist.” “A social organism is a form of art.” “Social relations and working in the public are social sculptures.” These are declarations so they all sound like truisms or axioms. I’m interested in the semantics and the reinterpretation of his terminologies.

In the three quotes or proclamations here, he tries to turn everything into art. In the first, everyone is an artist. There is some truth to that in my experience of working in the communities. We have worked with children and adults. Through communication and working closely in a dialogical process, people can learn to design their own play grounds, their own murals. They can learn to design something for themselves either in an organization or a support structure. And that, in a way, is art.

Secondly, social organism as art. Social organism usually refers to society or social relations amongst people. When we think of bees or ants as social creatures and organisms, they create complex and beautiful structures. Think of ant tunnels as a beautiful complex of tunnels. Or honeycombs - so structured, useful and beautiful. Why not humans? Humans are social organisms, in my experience of working on the ground, interrelationships amongst people can be as beautiful and agonizing, complex and intricate.

Social sculpture is the most semantically interesting concept here. Social, as we know, is an adjective. Sculpture is a noun. Social has been used to describe various kinds of interconnectedness and interpersonal relations, whether it is social media or social sciences that studies social relations or social conscience, which is a conscience regarding value systems of a given social order.

Sculpture can be easily understood as something three-dimensional. Any form, any object, a concept even. It’s within the environment and space, the air in which we breathe. So when you put the two together, it’s about human relationships and interconnectedness in a social space and environment.

**Part I I**

Ok now we move to the next diagram. There are three components: Community, Facilitators, and Sponsors. Facilitators are the people who work on the project; the can be social workers, student activists, government officials, artists, NGOs. Without sponsors, work cannot begin. Sponsors can be in the form of local government and agencies, local councils, etc.

Then the community we work with. It’s a social unit consisting of interpersonal relationships, a network of people who share values and self-interests, and can be characterized by geography, locations, families, kinships, religion, ethnicities, social classes and identities. These of course are overlapping categories.

These three components function together, interacting with each other. Community, Sponsors and Facilitators all work together with a method to deliver something – an output and result. In todays discussion the output is “housing”.

Housing is a basic right. It’s known as one of the three basic human rights and needs. Clothing, food and housing. Because without food, we cannot be. Since the beginning, we have learned to hunt and to eat, we have used nature to make clothes for ourselves to protect our bodies, we used leaves, branches to make shelters and roofs over our heads. So these three things are the most important ones for humans to exist as productive and social beings.

There are three projects related to housing I will discuss. The first one is done in 2007 in Sulukule, Istanbul, Turkey. Sulukule is part of the World Heritage zone and a district in Fatih. In 2006, the municipal council decided to regenerate this area. Their notion of regeneration was flattening the zone. By 2010, the district was flattened. 355 buildings were razed. 3400 people were evicted and became homeless. Or they were relocated to places as far as 45 kilometers away.

Taman Medan is a project I started in 2010 as a project initiator. This area is a working class area for the urban poor. It’s a community which emerged from urban settlers and rural migration in the 1970s. In 2002, six people were killed in a race riot and over forty were hospitalized because of the ethnic clashes between Muslims Malays and Hindu Indians.

Sungai Pinang is a working-class district in Georgetown, Penang. It is known as the most unmanageable flat. There are the hardcore urban poor. In 2006, there was gangsterism. A suicide and murder shocked the State government.

So, in fact, these three areas are what I call sites of conflict. They are sites neglected by governments, and my work there, in my own mind, was a form of healing. In a way I also see these sites of conflict as possible sites of healing.

The first project is a video collaboration with the Roma community. Roma gypsies, but they prefer not to be called as Roma gypsies. I was there for Istanbul Biennale, but I found out that Istanbul has a lot settled communities of gypsies. I jumped at the idea. I said this before but I always want to run away with gypsies. You have this fantasy about gypsies in a circus, having a fire, partying all night, getting drunk. So when I heard there were gypsies, I was like “yes, I’m going to work with the gypsies.”

So it wasn’t because I was socially conscious. I just wanted to hang out with gypsies for four months in summer.

How was I introduced in the community? I was introduced to the community in a meeting. Three NGO workers (Names). They took me to a meeting about the destruction of Sulukule and what we want to do about it. So we have Imam Asem here, head of the mosque, and Mehmet, who belongs to the community. We have NGO workers on one side and counsels from the United Nations and municipal government on the other.

I was quite forthright. I told the NGO friends and Asem that I’m not here to do politics and I’m not here to deal with the imminent destruction of Sulukule. I just want to hang out with gypsies. I went to the Imam and told him that “I’m actually here to learn from you. I just want to make a video. I don’t know what kind of video. I don’t know what I can do, but I would like to work with the communities, particularly the youth and children. Would you support me?” He said yes in a very skeptical and distant way. But because I was supported by the NGOs, he allowed me to move into the communities.

You can see all these slips of paper on the houses. They are the slips put by the municipal council, marking the houses for demolition.

The Roma community are very poor. They have been disfranchised and left there for many years.

Some of them have started to live in tents as you can see in one picture because their house has been destroyed. I just want to give you a sense of the community.

A lot of them don’t even have pipe water in the house. They have to collect pipe water in the common area and carry them home.

I asked for a group of children. Here they are. A wonderful group of kids who function in a totally different world than I’m used to. I worked with kids before, but these kids are out of this world. They sleep at 6 in the morning and wake up at 3 in the afternoon.

I asked them why you sleep at 6. They say they party and play drums all night.

I went there like a good artist, a good educator, a good facilitator working with children as I have done before. With a program: Week 1, what are we going to do? How many hours each? We have the description of the process. We have a discussion project and methodology. Everything all prepared. Within three days, I threw these all out.

Because they wouldn’t follow this way of working. Every time we have to do something, we have to play football first. We have to play drums or we have to dance. We have to do something that is not work.

We decided to play. I spent three months playing with gypsy kids. Dance, we play games and soccer. We play all kinds of things. We opted for play, and resisted politics.

And at the same time we even played at where the houses were destroyed. Buildings were destroyed every day.

You can see they took us to these sites of destruction. We played drums, dance, just clowning around.

The kids then did interviews. We interviewed Imam also as well as Syuki Punduk, the Head of Residents Association without deciding to talk about their imminent eviction and housing issues. I drew them out because we’re playing.

This is the rough methodology I’ve shown to you. And this is the way it turned out.

We have sponsors, us. We have facilitators, NGO workers and myself working with them. And the target group which is the Roman children and their youth.

We kept to a certain form of working. Dialogic action. We talked a lot. Children told us a lot of stories. Telling stories they thought and telling stories in which they expressed and articulated their views. Through play and storytelling, I felt at that point they were empowered to say something about themselves. This was very interesting because I faced a lot of problems at the beginning. I don’t look like them. NGO workers fitted in because they look like locals. I was Jackie Chan. The only well-known Chinese is Jackie Chan.

I was shouted at. I had knives pointed at me. I have guns pointed at me. I had adults coming to pull the children away, screaming at me. Save the children first and scream at me.

We stayed on. The way we survived is very interesting. A couple of TV stations came to interview me. I said I do not want to be interviewed unless three quarters of the interviews are with the children. And we negotiated. They interviewed the children. It came out on national TV. The next day I was finally accepted by the Roma community because the children learned to articulate their views. The parents and community leaders came to me and said we didn’t know our children could article such views.

We made a video about fantasy and joy, the joy of living. It was about their dreams and hopes for a better life.

I got very close to the community towards the end. It was very difficult for me to leave. Because it was a very different kind of experience. I never had an experience like that working in an art project.

To know that I have neglected such an important issue: these children, in a few years’ time, will have no homes. And All I did was to play with them. I could see the destruction from day to day to day. This is to give you the final images of what happened.

This is the space in which we worked, a café. We had our meetings, games. The café on the left had our drawings. There with three girls is where we drank coffees and did our interviews. Now, it’s all in pieces.

It was a very emotional experience. Especially after that, this is what happened.

The whole community was wiped out and relocated. The middle class and upper class moved in in the gentrified area.

One of the things I learned about the Roma is that they never wanted to be nomads, to live in the caravans, to move from place to place, to be evicted and forced out. This again shows how the dominant society fulfilled their own romanticized vision of gypsies. They kicked them out and turned them into nomads. And they go, “Wow, here we go. Gypsies on the move again.”

Next project, back to Malaysia. No more fun with the Roman kids. The urban regeneration project is done with this site, the site of ethnic clashes in Taman Medan. This is where people were killed. This was the site of healing, the site we worked for urban regeneration.

This is the flat. I didn’t want to tackle this. I was very naïve. I decided because I belong to the opposition and we took over the government as the ruling party. And I just proposed to friends that “lets start this project, lets see if it works, lets see if we can turn this into policy and do it everywhere in the state.”

This is the site, the house and the community. Every project we go through would have such a community. Generally, elderly folks, consisting of three generations there. The first generation is the urban settlers which means they came from the rural areas and they moved to the city. They didn’t have their place to stay so they cut down the forests and built their own houses. Later, the developers came, and they were give a tiny flat to live in. But in the past, they had a house on the ground. This is the community we work with.

What is urban regeneration? The council I was working with was very ignorant in a way. They did not understand urban regeneration. For them, urban regeneration is a new coat of paint. But I told them urban regeneration is not a new coat of paint. It is social reform for the poor.

It’s not about selling the neighborhoods to developers like what we saw in the Roma community.

It’s about revitalizing and improving the quality of life, local economy, and the creation of social and economic spaces for this neighborhood and community.

It is not about gentrification. It is not about demolishing buildings and neighborhoods. It’s not about relocating communities.

Urban regeneration requires the government to enable and to be a partner with the community as a participant, not as a unilateral decision-maker embodied by the government or developers.

It is about empowering communities, to make them stakeholders, to have responsibility, to have a sense of ownership of their present and future.

Urban regeneration is not about disenfranchising communities from their livelihood, education, access, quality of life. For example, if you relocate a family and they have been there for thirty years and the children go to school to a place ten minutes away. Now the place is 5 or 10 miles away. How are they going to go to school? When parents go to work, they to pay for buses and trips. That would disenfranchise them further.

We want to privilege the sustainability. We don’t want to more and more rubbish by breaking down concrete walls and rebuilding more of them.

Here we are again, we have the methodology of the project. We have the sponsors which are the council, a group of architects who in their corporate social responsibility provide some money, and the Residents Association. We have facilitators consisting of architects, activists including myself, councilors, some artists and residents.

I thought of the methodology. Of course I have theory in mind and this one is the one that really made think of Joseph Beuys’s social sculpture and organism. If we do architectural interventions in the building, can it be considered as a form of social sculpture? This is what I was asking myself.

You have the housing issue in the middle. The goal and output were the regeneration of the community and their environment in particular.

We have focus groups. We talk to the residents. We, with the council as well as the architects and artists, came up with a masterplan. It includes repainting, a new entrance, a courtyard, rain hoods for the windows, decks, and a planting apron. On the ground we redid the landscaping, paving, etc.

It was a very difficult project for me personally because I was new to it. I had to negotiate with so many different kinds of people and groups, from the community, politicians, councilors, council offices, architects, to artists. To be quite honest, some of the times I had no idea what I was doing.

I’m going to run through the things we did and what we accomplished and did not accomplish.

Repainting: from dirty greys to colors. People can choose the color for their building.

Inside, people can choose the color for the wall in front of their unit.

Window hoods to prevent rain from seeping in through badly designed windows because it was low-cost housing. Because when it rains heavily, the rain would seep through the windows that don’t have rain-guards a lot of apartments and units. Now it moves straight into the pipe.

A new courtyard: it is a motorcycle park now and courtyard that functions as a small social space. And it is in this sense it’s a social sculpture. People can move in three dimensions.

Connecting corridors: to have decks made of metal so people can walk through. Women can sit there, do their jobs and put their laundry out. Children can also play there so adults can see the children on the same floor where they play.

A new entrance: a secure entrance where people can monitor who goes in and out of the block. Also, it’s a little shelter. So people can have the feeling of being protected when they come home.

Then we did workshops with the kids and we have focus groups with adults. The kids talked about how to design a new playground.

Adults expresses their feelings because people have been saying for twenty-five years that we want a change. They hope this time it is for real because officials always come and make promises but never keep them. I’m sure you all have heard this and said this to your government. So, it was very difficult to hear their stories, their complaints and their naggings. We really wanted to do something.

This is what we accomplished. We resurfaced the roads, changed the lights, put in the new window hoods. This was the old building. This is the new building.

This was the easy part. We couldn’t do the structural part. As we were planning to do the structural part, the courtyard, the deck, and the new entrance, we realized from the residents that the whole sewage system underneath the building was screwed up. It was stuck and overflowing. The whole place started to stink when we started working. What we needed to do was to build a new sewage system and piping system to take the sewage out of the building into a new area. To bypass the new area, we have to dig up the whole courtyard and support the building and rework a new sewage system.

So what did we do? We didn’t have the money. We couldn’t support the building and dig up the whole courtyard. We have to constantly negotiate. After two years, we are still negotiating with the old developer who made such a bad building for poor people. And now we are still trying to negotiate with him to help reconstruct a new sewage system.

This is what I mean by real politics. Because in the meetings with the former developer, he would callously and confidently make this statement: You know you guys are so difficult to work with. I cannot pay you money anymore. In other words, he cannot bribe us. In the past, I would just play golf with a government civil servant and everything would work out fine.

“Why are you so concerned about poor people? You give them one inch, they would want one foot. You give them one foot, they would want a mile. So I don’t know why you are worried about these people. They just want to take advantage of you.”

The third project is the participatory budgeting with gender awareness, meaning the awareness of gender issues. Different people, different needs. The emphasis was on everybody has their own needs and we have to understand different communities so we can find out what they need.

Here you can see my artistic skills. All the banners here are designed by me.

Two areas of housing: Ampangan flats located in a generally speaking OK area. They are rental flats for urban poor. 35 USD per month for a three-bedroom flat.

The one on the left is not so bad. The one on the right is the one I told you about with murders and suicides.

This is a multiracial community, consisting of 60% Malays, 20% Chinese, 20% Indians.

What is this participatory project about? It’s about communities getting to identify their needs and participate in the deliberation and allocation of public funds and budgets.

Communities get to contribute to the decision-making processes and prioritizing on how to spend public money. Not just government officials deciding how to spend money.

It forces the government to be accountable and transparent. The public becomes check and balance.

We also privileges minorities and marginalized communities like poor children and women.

It promote a kind of dialogic action and partnership between citizens as stakeholders and government in building community.

We have this general methodology, and participatory budgeting is at the center. The target and goal were to implement the needs of the community.

How did the process go? I developed a four-phase plan in one year. The first part is survey. We went into the community and did the demographic survey that covered all groups. We basically did a census.

Secondly, we select people from different groups and the groups are women, men, children, senior citizens and disables. We have focus groups. We hear they complain and complain and complain.

Then we went to vote for what they wanted. We heard their complaints and we heard what they needed. Then they had some days when they can vote what they should spend money on.

Once we did that, we start implementing those issues. For example, if they want to build maintenance, we would bring the issue to the council. The council would sit with us. We would decide how to allocate the budget and improve the situation in the community.

This is the survey. We have information about occupation, sex, age, everything, so we understood who they are or who we are.

This is the information on me. We have different groups, including the youth, teenagers and children, adults and senior citizens. They are the age groups.

We found out from the survey, occupation-wise, the numbers and percentages. Those who do not work, including children, students, teenagers, and senior citizens. It’s about 39%. Almost 40% is out of work. 17.4% of adults do not work. 9.7% of people have underpaid part-time jobs. 4.7% of population are housewives.

This is another chart that I told you which has 64% Malays, 18% Chinese, 10% Indians and 10% others.

Focus groups, Phase 2 of the project. We have small groups, each of which is less than 20 people. Usually about 10 to 15 people. We sit and talk. We hear them complain. We broke them up, especially for adults and teenagers. We separate then into males and females. Because when they are in the same group, sometimes they don’t tell you exactly what you think. Women work with women. With the same gender, people would get to express themselves more freely.

For teenagers, we broke them into groups. But for children, we use a different methodology, which is through art and site visits. What we did is to create an awareness of our target group. What are the needs of adults or old people?

We use the image of a family. Your father, your mother or your grandmother. What are their needs and the needs of the community?

Then to understand what the community needs, we took them to sites which they call best areas and not best areas.

After about a month of discussions, these are the main issues coming out in the first area. This community wants an activity space, so they can do activities. Cleanliness. Dangerous junctions which should have traffic lights. They want a recreation park and more security for the whole area. More security for a particular building. They also want some small space where women can do small businesses.

This is the other flat, the more dangerous one. Their needs were the security of the area, building maintenance, education and awareness programs for the community, parking lots fo the locals, a playground and issues of cleanliness.

Phase Three was to vote for your needs. We have the information from the survey. We created a voting list. People can come register and collect ballots. Each person above ten years old are eligible to vote. Every voter is give 5 coupons, like Monopoly. Each coupon is worth 100. Depending on your age, you get different color coupons.

After you register, your drop your coupon into a ballot box. I can put 100 dollars for cleanliness and 200 dollars for security and 200 dollars for maintenance. There are all these boxes. You read the information and you decide how to vote.

We have voting for three days. We have young and old people coming out to vote. Young above 10 years old and old and disabled people.

The end of each voting day, we count the votes in a transparent way. We have people looking at us. We open the box and you can see there are all different colors. We count the votes and announce the result to the community.

These are the results. Three days of voting laid out. I’ll focus on the second one on the right hand side. 69.5% of the residents came out to vote. I was very happy about the result since I worried that only 30% of people would come out. The whole project would be a failure because it’s not majority.

These are the results. For the Sungai Pinang flats, building maintenance was the most important issue. 53% of females voted for it. 47% of males voted for it. Because of the way we did the coupons, we have serial numbers so we can identify how old they were or males or females who voted for the issue.

I would just show you part of a video. I didn’t do the video or the Chinese translation either. They’re tabulating the results. So communities and facilitators counted the vote and everyone needed to sign.

After that, the question is what we do. The next phase is the most complicated one, planning and implementation. We have to bring in the council and residents. They start fighting again. We need to work with them to develop papers and proposals, something is totally out of their range.

This is what I mean by empowerment, dialogic action and conscientization. When people realize their needs are being met, their voice heard, they take action.

We persuaded the council to increase the budget by 300%. In 2012, this was the amount of money allocated. And this is what we had. We persuaded them that there are the issues of maintenance that communities want to solve. Cleaning contract: Give cleaning contracts to the locals, not an outside vendor or contractor.

Repainting the building. New fire-fighting equipment because they were all stolen or broken. Refurbishing the old or abandoned building for the community. Also new equipment for the playground.

These are the big shots. This is the state assemblyman for that area. This is the Head of Housing in the state. This is the secretary for the local council.

We started with the first one, which is the most important one I felt. I really worked hard and came up with a working paper to get back the contract. Normally, when you get contracts to external contractors, they have no stakes in the community. They are there to take the project to make a profit.

The argument is that if the residents take care of their own environment, it would be much better. They have stakes in keeping the environment.

The structure also has the Residents Association advising. A cleaning supervisor. We also have 6 cleaners. The supervisor and cleaners are paid positions. All the interviews are open and transparent. People apply and representatives from the community, the council as well as myself would sit there in the interview.

This is the budget for cleaning. It increased from RM66,000 in 2012 to RM108,015 in 2013. This is the cleaning community. The guy with the checkered shirt is the head of the Residents Association. The man with the hat is the supervisor. One of the workers is not there. This is the cleaning group.

These are some before and after pictures. Before the rubbish, now how clean it is.

They also get to choose the new coat of paint. And again we did the voting exercise. People can go and look at the display and vote for what color they want.

The old building and the new one. They are still in the process of painting.

The dilapidated building which was abandoned with broken roofs and all. Now it has been turned into the offices for community organizations in the flat. One is for the Buddhist Association, one for the Islamic Center, one for Women’s Center and one for the Residents Association. We create homes for organizations.

Some reflections. Where does the Art and Artistic interventions end and Social Activism begin? Where does the Community and Social Activism end and Realpolitik begin? After I go through the notes, I hope we can all talk about this. Does this have anything to do with art? Just because of Sean Lin, I’m sneaking in political issues from the back door and bring them into the art community?

Am I a campaigner and propagandist for my party?

Can I be consider as an artist who’s trying new things?

Am I working in social space, doing social sculpture? Or am I just a politician and community organizer?

Will museums fund and support projects like this without nothing to sell and show?

Let’s return to the title of this talk: Rage, Love and Hope. Why did I choose these words? Because I think rage is very important. We all start with that little amber within ourselves. That little amber that needs to kindle into a fire. This is the same kind of rage that stirs Vincent van Gogh or Gorky, to stir them into making arts that became watershed and iconic works for the creation of modernism.

It can be van Gogh or Gorky or the greatest man in the past century who just passed away, Nielson Mandela. It was the same kind of rage for injustice that made him do what he did. This is the same kind of rage for Gandhi. Because of both them, the world has changed for better. It was because of rage.

But rage cannot just suffice as rage. Rage alone is destructive and useless. We have to be able to transform this into a sense for love. Love for people, love for beauty like Matisse or for justice, or even for play or for joy. Che Guevara said the true revolutionary is guided by the great feeling of love. Love is very important whether in art or in working in the community or, as I believe still, in politics.

This love is not sentimental. It is about desiring a kind of freedom. It is not about manipulation.

You need both rage and love to have a sense of hope. Why hope? Because in everything you hope. You hope to have a better day or house or education. You hope your quality of life would be better. Hope is the recognition that our life, our art and our activities are incomplete. We hope we can move them to a level of completion. Somewhere in the future perhaps, but we need that hope.

I’ll leave the last few questions up that so we can use them. If you think they are important, they something we can discuss. Thank you very much for hearing me think through this process. I hope you would speak like I said. Hope again. Hope is about completion. Hopefully, you’ll help me complete this process.