

Taking Moroccan Art to the Streets: Ephemeral Engagement and Sustained Community Practices

– Katarzna Piepzrak

Every summer, cultural festivals take place all over Morocco. From June through August of 2006 alone, there were more than fifteen festivals of art, music and cinema staged in large urban areas and beachside towns. With displays and performances that mix elements of folklore, technology, the “traditional” and the “modern,” the streets of Moroccan towns and cities become an animated scene for the articulation of Moroccan contemporary culture. So animated, heterogeneous, and pluralistic has this festival scene become that the semi-official newspaper for the Islamist PJD party called these street festivals “vectors of decadence” and, ironically, certain Moroccan artists unions requested legal protection from the state not to be marginalized. This attitude by both Islamists and marginalized artists to restrict the nature of festivals was critiqued in the cover-story of the January 5, 2007 edition of the Moroccan magazine *Telquel* in which the editors listed ninety things in Moroccan society that they are “sick of” (*y'en a marre*). Included in this list was the surprising entry on: “[...] des rabat-joie pendant la saison des festivals” (The Wet Rags of the Festival Season):

Anti-festivals have found a newspaper to support their cause: Attajdid, the semi-official daily newspaper of the PJD that, once the summer has come, never misses the opportunity to judge these artistic manifestations “vectors of decadence” for Morocco. This point of view denies the millions of happy festival goers the occasional musical free oasis in the grand cultural desert of Morocco.¹

The metaphor of the desert to describe the situation of the arts in Morocco is not a new one. Since the early independence period, artists and writers have decried the lack of general support, education, and infrastructures for the arts in the Morocco. In 2004, Hassan Darsi performed the metaphor by filling a gallery space with sand, plexiglassing the entrance so that visitors could see him, and spending several days in this desert space with two other artists and a cat.²

While Moroccan art festivals have long functioned as an antagonistic model for the Moroccan art museum, they demonstrates how a museum institution might interact with its public and the multilayered spaces of experience it could create. Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett has theorized that the traditional museum, in similar terms to Darsi’s 2004 installation, is a “form of internment—a tomb with a view.”³ In comparison, she argues that art festivals are “generally less didactic and less textual,” and function as “an environment of sensory riot.”⁴ Indeed whether listening to gnawa-fusion bands, observing painters at work, or witnessing someone pulling a bus with his teeth in a faith-inspired test of strength, the experiences that a festival offers both Moroccans and tourists are overwhelming in richness and diversity.

Moroccan arts festivals have worked within a general Western history of museum transformation over the past four decades to find new ways of staging and experiencing culture—from the modernist formalized aesthetic experiences of the 1960s, to the 1970s populist transformation of museum space into “anti-museums,” to the growth of the museum as part of a culture and entertainment industry in the 1980s and 90s. Rather than object-centered visual displays, today’s museums have the potential to engage all the senses, and most importantly, initiate multiple conversations among traditionally unequal groups. In other words, to borrow from James Clifford’s reading of Mary Louise Pratt, museums can function as “contact zones” that function less as centers

or destinations, but more as “zones traversed by things and people.”⁵ Arts festivals are of course destinations, but they are not restricted in the same way as events or exhibitions inside a closed building that is meant to withstand time. Rather they draw on the palimpsest of the street to engage with multiple histories and experiences of the environment. They are ephemeral by nature, and as Erin Manning tells us: “an engagement with the ephemeral represents all that is anathema to rationalist discourses that attempt to confine knowledge within prescribed disciplines and systems of understanding.”⁶

Festivals can make claims about the identities of heterogeneous Moroccan communities by going beyond reductive and exclusionary architectures of the nation and by accepting plural and pluralistic staging of culture.⁷ They also, and perhaps more importantly, encourage people to reflect upon more intimate and immediate relationships, such as those between the spectator, art, and the city itself. The wall-less nature of these spaces of cultural representation and the freedom with which people can move in and out of various performances, invite a transformation in the identity of art institutions from hierarchical architectures of knowledge to more democratic and dynamic forms of cultural exchange and process. In writing of the future of the museum, Tony Bennett argues that it is time for the museum to give way to “new forms of expertise that, in facilitating a less hierarchical exchange of perspectives, may allow a renovation of the museum’s earlier conception as a conversable civic space that [...] functions across the relations between different cultures. This it must do if it is to be of any value at all.”⁸ In a country where material museums are often seen as a failure, the arts festival is an important site to be explored for its staging of art and Moroccan culture as a potentially conversable civic space.

Arts festivals are one form of what I call the ephemeral outdoor museum. Flexible in its identity, the ephemeral outdoor museum can do many things judged impossible in the confines of a physical museum. As a mobile and temporary site, it has the promise of serendipitous interaction with heterogeneous publics, and dislodges the idea that culture is an object to be located in a central, static and symbolic temple. Gustavo Buntinx writes of the necessity to break from a neocolonial logic that asserts that there is one museum location and one model of museology.⁹ Likewise, in his work on South African national parks, David Bunn asks:

What might it mean to go outside the museum? In the first and most important sense, this would imply the recognition that museum space is never singular. Instead, it should be understood as one element of a series of real or imaginary articulated zones, and it is this very articulation that makes possible what Tony Bennett calls in this volume “the development of new forms of civic self-fashioning.”¹⁰

This civic self-fashioning is not just about becoming a better citizen of the abstract nation, but rather fundamentally rethinks the relationship between arts, museum practice and the local environment of the city. City streets, squares and parks become places of exchange and transformation in art. This museum model underlines the idea that both art and the museum are social processes in which “a power-charged set of exchanges, of push and pull” occur; for the museum this occurs in the collection itself between the visitor, the curator, and the history of relations that define the objects and its subjects.¹¹ Museums have the potential to turn their collections inside out and transform the environment around them.

This essay is not just proscriptive, however. Rather it asks the question: how have Moroccan artists engaged with the potential, promise, and problems of the outdoor museum when existing exhibition spaces and inexistent museums failed them? In describing various attempts by Moroccan artists to bring art to the streets over the past forty years, I hope to show how ephemeral outdoor museums have functioned in different contexts such as the Djemaa el-Fna in Marrakech and the

town of Asilah and to what extent they were able to reach the audiences they sought. In displaying modern art in public squares and spaces, cultural modernists of the 1960s and 1970s struggled with and against various European and Moroccan museum models of the time in order to interact with a new and diverse public. Their attempts to bring art to the streets presaged the arts festivals of the present and showed progressive artists and curators of the twenty-first century that the street should be the fundamental space for their work. La Source du Lion art collective is a compelling illustration of the powers of contemporary art to transform urban environments into dynamic and vibrant spaces of social exchange. In describing the collective's project to transform a colonial-era Casablanca park, I aim to illustrate how this group of artists uses museological practices of collecting, preserving, displaying and educating to turn public space in Casablanca into the type of artistic exchange that earlier generations of artists desired. Likewise, the tactical curation of Abdellah Karroum of L'appartement 22 seeks to redefine public space and public discourse by redrawing its boundaries. These efforts to think outside the physical museum while using its tactics point the way forward in thinking of the future of public spaces for art and culture in Morocco.

Taking Art to the Streets

In 1967, *L'Opinion* commentator "Ben" scolded both the state and Morocco's privileged classes for creating a public space devoid of art. In his column "Read This," Ben challenged his readers to:

Make the tour of all the public establishments (ministries, prefectures, provincial offices, theaters, post offices, banks, cinemas and airports) and show me with your finger one authentic painting by a Moroccan artist. Don't forget to pass by those villas that resemble palaces and whose construction cost 50 to 100 million francs. The state and its privileged servants, can't they purchase some paintings, decorate their rooms and show what our national artists produce?¹²

Why was the public sphere so devoid of Moroccan contemporary art? Why were new public spaces like airports, post offices, and government buildings that were supposed to project images of a new and technologically modern Morocco, so utterly vacant of both "traditional" and "modern" Moroccan artwork? While newspapers and cultural journals decried the absence of art in public space, artists associated with the Casablanca School of painting did perhaps the most radical thing possible during this period. They took their imaginary museum from the page to the street and created temporary outdoor museums of modern art that appeared to unsuspecting publics and reached larger and more diverse audiences.

The first initiative to take artwork out into the public occurred in 1969 when six painters from the Casablanca School decided to display their work in the Djemaa el-Fna in Marrakech.¹³ The choice of site was a provocative one. Djemaa el-Fna is one of the largest open squares in Morocco, fabled for its lively and heterogeneous public including both Moroccan and African traders from across the Sahara. A true contact zone of historical periods and cultures, men and women meet there to sell their wares and to exchange news and tell stories. To this day, it is home to lively oral traditions with pockets of small crowds gathering around storytellers. In an article that covered the exhibit, *Lamalif* described the scene: "Marrakech ... Housewives with their bags, old salesmen propped up on their canes, young people, strollers from all ages, approach and look at the paintings on the wall."¹⁴ This was the general public that the painters wanted to engage.

Lamalif presented the following three exchanges in their coverage of the event, and the choices were not without significance: in each, the painters are portrayed as facilitating educators that valorize public interpretation of their art. In the first dialog, the painter encourages the viewer

not to think about art as a set of elements that need to be understood in a specific frame of knowledge or through extensive education, that art can only be understood by those who know its rules:

What do you think of it?—I don't understand very well—there is nothing to understand. Simply ask yourself if it says anything to you.¹⁵

In seeming defiance of Bourdieu's conclusions—published that same year—that: “Considered as symbolic goods, works of art only exist for those who have the means of appropriating them, that is, of deciphering them,” the painter here attempts to extract art from the set of criteria that give it value, out of the social sphere that gives it value, and put it in the hands of a new public with new and subjective criteria.¹⁶ In the second exchange we see yet another attempt to open the world of aesthetic judgment to the everyday viewer and legitimize his/her vision:

What does this mean?—Whatever you want; it is for you to find a definition to give—Is that why you haven't put names on your paintings?—Yes—Then I am free to give the interpretation that I want—Yes, you are free.¹⁷

The artist calls his viewer free to decide on the meaning of his work. The repetition of the word “free” stands out when we remember that this period was one in which people were very careful about what they said in public for fear of imprisonment.¹⁸ The empowerment of the unschooled public in the first two exchanges is followed by an empowerment of the artists in the third:

I find that this one has something strange about it, there is no equilibrium. But it is you who must be in the real because the world we live in is totally inverted.¹⁹

Here a member of the Moroccan public at large legitimizes the vision of the artist. While the viewer doesn't quite understand the work, he or she claims that the imagined world of the artist must be reality, because Moroccan life seems so unreal. This recognition and legitimization is quite powerful considering how deficient and absent art institutions forced many artists to create imaginary institutions and publics in order to maintain meaningful environments for their work.

The narrative that framed these exchanges in *Lamalif* provided another commentary on the public interactions and applauded the initiative of the painters:

People stopped and reflected. They were forced to redirect their surprise by surpassing it. It must be said that the thing was surprising: for the first time in Morocco, painters have dared to go down into the streets and to expose themselves, naked, in front of a public that was not prepared, but that reacted beyond their expectations and hopes, and without a doubt with more spontaneity than a so called initiated public.²⁰

According to the journal, painters had stripped themselves from the protection of a Western and bourgeois culture industry and dared to go down into the uneducated and untrained masses to search for legitimacy and authenticity.

But if we re-examine the dialog between painters and spectators as reported by the cultural journal, we must ask if and how anything had really changed regarding the public's idea of art. First of all, we never hear the end of the conversations. What does the public say after they have been given the liberty to say anything they want? While *Lamalif* reports that the public reacted beyond the painters' expectations, the journal does not report any public interpretation of the works; intellectual interactions between painter and public remain silenced. The voices of the painters and reporters

frame the exchanges but ultimately censor the public. The public transcript as a hegemonic discourse remains in place with the dominant group, the cultural elite, narrating the voices.

On the level of display, the outdoor museum struggled with modernist exhibit dynamics from European and American museum models—models that themselves were being challenged and rethought in Paris and New York. In the 1970s, museums that alienated the audience by distancing them both physically and socially from art, were losing their authority to museums “of architectural diversity and multiple use, of expanded subjectivities and aesthetic traditions, of anti-elitist education and popular entertainment [...] of hybrid intensity and interaction with the street.”²¹ However, the act of merely moving art outside and not changing the ways it was displayed was not enough to bring upon the type of exchange that artists desired. In certain ways, their intervention into the *space* of the city was not radical enough.

If we examine photographs of the event, we can see that perhaps taking art to the streets was more a rhetorical representation than a reality, for the grammar of elite museum space remained in place and the heterogeneous pluralistic nature of the Djemaa el-Fna was erased from images of the event. First of all, the paintings are out of the audience's reach, and the exhibition space itself is cordoned off with metal dividers that evoke protest barricades more than gallery walls. Were painters afraid that the public would storm their art in an uncontrolled “sensory riot,” to recall Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett's expression? Not only are the paintings out of reach, they are so far out of reach that it would be difficult to see the texture of the paint on the canvas. The physical distancing of the untrained public from the works of art points to the structures of social distancing at work in the urban space itself. The public may not be contained in a controlled environment such as the Western museum or gallery where the physical institution controls behavior through a directed display path and a socially enforced set of rules. However, the construction of the exhibition took certain elements from this type of disciplinary museum space and projected them into the public square. While painters persuaded their audience of the public's liberty of interpretation and vision, celebrating their new perspective on art, an educational process reinforced categories of elite culture. The painters were not the only ones who were receiving an education, but rather the public at large was given a lesson in social manners and taste. They were being taught how to act in front of a painting, how to behave and how to access culture based on class models from the nineteenth-century museum.

In 1978, a group of eleven painters led by Melehi and Benaïssa took their work to the streets in the small coastal town of Asilah and founded an annual art *mousse*, an Arabic term more regularly used for religious festivals than those of the arts. Melehi and Benaïssa were both inhabitants of the town, and Benaïssa, in the first step of a political career that would eventually turn him into Morocco's Minister of Foreign Affairs, was its mayor. The group conducted restoration work on various parts of the town, but the spirit of the project lay firmly within the concept of establishing a site of exchange on modern art for heterogeneous publics. In writing about the project, Melehi and Benaïssa argued that,

There is no common ground where the Arab Muslim intellectual-artist, writer or poet of the Third World—can meet his counterparts from the “the other world.” This limits their communication through dialogue and an exchange of experiences that should be open, intimate and direct. There needs to be a common ground [...] for much needed communication within a human framework that includes students, teachers, workers, farmers, craftsmen, civil servants and housewives.²²

The Asilah festival was designed to provide an international venue for the arts and transform life in a city that was, in the words of Benaïssa, “a disgrace, lots of garbage, the sewage was a total

disaster, the walls had collapsed, no electricity.”²³ And thus, in true modernist fashion, modernity (through art) would cure the town of its insalubrities and reconfigure social relations.

It is arguable if the residents of Asilah were particularly happy when the artists came to paint the exterior walls of their homes with abstract geometric murals under the slogan “Culture and Art for Development.” However, as Benaïssa exclaimed in 2004, their work had the intended effect of restoring buildings, attracting attention for tourism and improving the quality of life:

We now have a generation of kids who where 8, 9 years old when the festival started, and who are now in their thirties. A generation who has opened its eyes and has been influenced by art, as a medium to enjoy life, and also to mobilize the resources of imagination and creativity—without imagination, without creativity, without a clear vision, no matter how many means you have, you don’t bring about sustainable, viable development. With art you cannot end poverty, but you can bring about the end of misery.²⁴

Asilah was a success in the eyes of its modernizing cultural agents and also according to those artists from abroad who participated in the festival. One cannot, and should not, deny the festival its success as a site where art transformed the city and created a new site of exchange. In fact, for its work at rehabilitation, the festival organizers won the 1989 Aga Khan prize, and that summer more than 150,000 people filled the streets of Asilah.²⁵

Despite its international recognition, informal conversations with Moroccan artists, writers and curators over the past eight years reveal a deep disillusion with the festival. Some see it as merely a step in Mohamed Benaïssa’s political career; others, seeing it as a purely touristic event, a beautiful spectacle for foreign visitors, question its relevance for local artists. For the festival is not the perfect picture of community building and interaction. Architectural historian, Eunice Lin questions the nature of local participation in the restoration process and subsequent development plans, writing that the majority of the town’s population was not involved in the decision-making process and participated only on the level of providing labor and supplies.²⁶ In her critique of the project, she writes that while Melehi and Benaïssa wanted to transform the city into a shared space between artists and residents, “the reality, however, is that the influx of large numbers of the cultural elite for two months every summer seems to have had the result of alienating the residents who feel they could not understand or participate in these cultural happenings.”²⁷ The renovation of the town provided a veneer of beauty without deeper restoration efforts, effectively creating a “stage set” for the *mousssem*.²⁸ The rehabilitation of Asilah into a town of the arts for more diverse publics ironically excluded local residents from its conception and thus created an aesthetic space at the price of a sustainable community.

Returning to the “Source”:

Art and the Local Environment

While the cultural modernist elite of the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s could not fully respond to an uninitiated audience, at the turn of the twenty-first century, Moroccan artists and curators have returned to the streets and its unexpected viewers in order to interact with an abandoned public and involve them more directly in the world of art and cultural memory. Today, using museological processes such as collection, preservation, display and education, and developing multisensory interactions that target sight, smell, hearing and touch, these actors create new contact zones. Their art and community projects function to underline the idea of a museum as a process that builds ideas, collections and communities from multilayered memory and histories, rather than an institution that didactically instructs and socially conditions. Two examples of these outdoor museums, based on the participation of local residents to define a relationship between immediate spaces, their histories

and the future, are the Casablanca art collective La Source du Lion's Hermitage Park project, and curator Abdellah Karroum's work with L'appartement 22.

The art collective La Source du Lion (The Lion's Spring) was started in Casablanca in 1995 by artists Hassan Darsi, Mohamed Fariji and Rachid L'Moudenne. In many ways, the collective deals with discovering the nation from the ground-up by focusing primarily on smaller units like the city, neighborhoods, parks, and families. In Casablanca, it started this process through a long-term project to restore and preserve the many layers of history in the Hermitage Park in Casablanca. This park, once a botanical garden during the French Protectorate, was in a state of utter abandon and neglect when the group decided to focus their artistic activities on the site in 2002. Faced with mountains of trash and homeless populations exiled from the modern city, the collective desired to intervene artistically and attract the public's attention to this promising space of urban beauty and human potential. The first step in the project was to construct a model of the site to be displayed with a detailed inventory of the contents of the park: plastic bags of various colors, but predominantly black; plaster; glass; various carton, plastic and aluminum containers from coffee, yogurt, and drinks; beer cans; glass from bottles; paper; animal waste; car parts; radios; various metals; marble; cigarette ends and human feces. In July 2002, the group exhibited an architectural plan of the space, a collection of photographs documenting the refuse, the condition of the trees, plants and gardens, and all the technical studies pertaining to the project at the Villa des Arts in Casablanca. The group wrote an open invitation to the city to participate in their project. In September, workshops began to construct an architectural model of the space with the participation of artists and non-artists alike. In April of 2003, the Villa des Arts hosted another exhibition for the project and an international meeting for artists called the Passerelle Artistique in order to discuss shared concerns about city environments. Two weeks later, refuse from half of the park was removed in about two thousand truck runs. In October 2003, the group started an open dialog about the park's future with the mayor of the city and restored a small building in the park to be used as an art activity and environmental-awareness space for children. The following summer, international artists returned to the park and worked further on the project together. Worked continued until 2005 when the Mohamed VI Foundation for the Environment offered to complete the restoration project. At first, artist and community projects were integrated into the final landscaping. However, in 2008, final plans by Atelier Vert, the agency contracted by the state to carry-out our renovations, revealed a completely different park that removed many of the human-scale projects designed by the collective in collaboration with neighborhood groups.

In creating and co-curating memory, the project was a success. The garden became the site of story-telling circles (Conte de l'Hermitage), art workshops, and a pleasant place for city-dwellers to come. When asked about the interaction between artists and the public, Hassan Darsi says that their project pushed the public to redefine what they saw as art and who they understand artists to be: "I think that first and foremost the public discovers [us as] citizens that take on initiatives in their city. At each encounter there is a debate between people. When they approach the nature of the actions and learn from artists who they are and what they do then the exchange becomes truly interesting. I think that the dialog goes really well."²⁹ What we can read in the work of this collective is not only the intense desire by its artists for communication with the public, but a recuperation of the city's past by its inhabitants, both artists as citizens and citizens interested in art.

La Source du Lion performs the potential of art to exhibit, to catalog, to engage and to transform space and memory. The project is not caught up in the national politics of memory that have turned *medinas* into preservation safaris and refuse to consider anything that post-dates the colonial period as patrimony. Rather, rejecting nostalgia for both the pre-colonial and the post-independence periods, the artist group focuses on the now. They collect memory from city sites and the people who live in them to deepen the signification and relevance of the city, and most importantly to

claim memory as a process that is multi-voiced and participatory. While capturing the energy and heterogeneous nature of interactions in Moroccan art festivals, they strive to engage memory and art through longer lasting museological interventions into the city space. In writing of the modern art museum void in Peru, Gustavo Buntinx describes the work of alternate “museums” to perform contemporary art in the face of inexistent state architectures. Much like La Source du Lion, these collectives across Latin America resort to what he terms tactical museologies: “Their innovative praxis defines a radical institutionality almost heroically gained by deliberately forsaking the established demands for the long-term, the firmly located, and the well-endowed, opting instead for the small-scale, the mobile, the nimble, even the whimsical and the opportunistic.”³⁰ While the state might be drawn to monumental institutions, tactical museology is the most exciting, relevant, and promising development for contemporary art and its publics in Morocco.

Through tactical curatorial practice, Abdellah Karroum created another dynamic art space in 2002 that engages the cityscape, blurs the boundaries between public and private space, and creates new space for discourse. Located across from the parliament building on the main avenue in Rabat, Avenue Mohamed V, the space is entitled L'appartement 22 after the number of the apartment. At first glance, the idea of an art space within an apartment might reflect the continued dynamic of shrinking public spaces for art in Morocco. But for Karroum, the space is “a project site,” “a site of diffusion” and “a space of encounter and discourse.”³¹ The space exists in multiple physical, virtual and sonic incarnations beyond the physical boundaries of an enclosed private apartment. By diffusing its activities and exhibits throughout Morocco—and the world—through traveling art projects, a website that serves as a site of documentation and research, and a web radio station that broadcasts interviews with artists in Moroccan Arabic and French, the apartment works to redefine the idea of public space and public discourse. It practices an “activism beyond frontiers”³² whether those frontiers are national, international, social or political. As Karroum likes to say, my apartment is “my permanent seat in front of the parliament.”³³

For Karroum the concept of exhibition fundamentally exists as an expedition, a movement outwards, a movement towards encounter, and a movement towards discovery:

The expedition mode is first of all an alternative strategy of an overture; it claims the possibility of existence of the “margin” as an active zone for encounters and the life of artwork. The movement from exhibition to expedition is in my mind the path to take to arrive at the function of art, at a possible autonomy, in societies of the Maghreb as well as elsewhere. [...] The expedition mode as an art practice inscribes the concept of “bricolage” as an alternative to its dependence vis-à-vis crushing local and international conventions.³⁴

The idea of the expedition is a fundamentally nomadic practice that resists the static and monumental edifices of the traditional museum for active strategies of expanding public contact with art, its ideas and its overtures to discussion.

Today’s artists and curators have moved away from large and monolithic starting points like the “nation” and its “people” to smaller and more engaging spaces such as the city, the village, the neighborhood and the park. When asked about the future of the Arab world, poet Abdellatif Laâbi wrote: “In the process of struggle, defeats, like victories, constitute a valuable patrimony of the experience of people and authentic movements of liberation.”³⁵ The ongoing struggle, the ongoing process, to create meaningful and sustainable art communities and institutions is in itself an important part of Moroccan patrimony.

- * This essay is a revised version of Chapter Five of my book *Imagined Museums: Art and Modernity in Postcolonial Morocco* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010). All translations are mine.
- 1 “Y en marre!,” *Telquel Online*, no. 253–4 (January 5, 2007), <http://www.telquel-online.com>.
 - 2 For more information, read the project description for L'invenu on Darsi's website: <http://www.lasourcedulion.org>.
 - 3 Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums, and Heritage* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 57–59.
 - 4 *Ibid.*, 57–59.
 - 5 James Clifford, *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), 8.
 - 6 Erin Manning, *Ephemeral Territories: Representing Nation, Home, and Identity in Canada* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010), 6.
 - 7 Of course, not all festivals function this way. In her work on national museums and youth festivals in Mali, Mary Jo Arnoldi shows how the Malian state used festivals in order to disseminate a certain regulated vision of the nation. Arnoldi, Mary Jo. “Youth Festivals and Museums: The Cultural Politics of Public Memory in Postcolonial Mali,” *Africa Today* 52, no. 4 (2006): 55–76.
 - 8 Tony Bennett, “Pedagogic Objects, Clean Eyes, and Popular Instruction: On Sensory Regimes and Museum Didactics,” *Configurations* 6, no. 3 (1998): 370–1.
 - 9 Gustavo Buntinx, “Communities of Sense/Communities of Sentiment: Globalization and the Museum Void in an Extreme Periphery” in *Museum Frictions: Public Cultures/Global Transformations* ed. Ivan Karp, et al. (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006), 238.
 - 10 David Bunn, “The Museum Outdoors: Heritage, Cattle, and Permeable Borders in the Southwestern Kruger National Park,” *Ibid.*, 358.
 - 11 Clifford, *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*, 192.
 - 12 Ben, “Lisez Ceci: De la peinture,” *L'Opinion* (April 10, 1967): 4.
 - 13 The group of painters consisted of Mohamed Ataallah, Farid Belkahia, Mohamed Chebaa, Mustapha Hafid, Mohamed Hamidi and Mohamed Melehi.
 - 14 “Il faut revaloriser et encourager l'art,” *Lamalif* 30 (May – June 1969): 48.
 - 15 *Ibid.*
 - 16 Pierre Bourdieu and Alain Darbel, *The Love of Art: European Museums and the Public*, trans. Caroline Beattie and Nick Merriman (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991), 39.
 - 17 “Il faut revaloriser et encourager l'art,” *Lamalif* 30 (May – June 1969): 48.
 - 18 For accounts of political censure and oppression in Morocco during the 1960s and 1970s see Susan Slyomovics, *The Performance of Human Rights in Morocco* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005); Gilles Perrault, *Notre ami le Roi* (Paris: Folio, 1990); Moumen Diouri, *A qui appartient le Maroc ?* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 1992).
 - 19 “Il faut revaloriser et encourager l'art,” *Lamalif* 30 (May–June 1969): 48.
 - 20 *Ibid.*
 - 21 John Roberts, “The Museum and the Crisis of Critical Postmodernism,” *Third Text* 41 (Winter 1997–98), 71.
 - 22 Cited in Danielle B. Hayes, “Asilah: Common Ground,” *Arnamco World* 45, no. 1 (January 1994), 12.
 - 23 Mohammed Benaïssa cited in “Mohammed Benaïssa on the Asilah Festival,” *Contemporary Art from the Islamic World* 7 (June 2004), <http://universes-in-universe.de/islam/eng/2004/03/benaïssa/index.html>.
 - 24 *Ibid.*
 - 25 “Rehabilitation of Asilah, Morocco,” *Mimar: Architecture in Development* 33 (December 1989), 28.
 - 26 Eunice M. Lin, “Asilah, Morocco: Rehabilitation and the Cultural Festival of Asilah,” <http://web.mit.edu/akpia/www/AKPsite/4.239/asilah/asilah.html>.
 - 27 *Ibid.*
 - 28 *Ibid.*
 - 29 Hassan Darsi, interview by the author, January 12, 2007.
 - 30 Gustavo Buntinx, “Communities of Sense/Communities of Sentiment,” 221–2.
 - 31 Abdellah Karroum, interview by author, Williamstown MA, May 24, 2008.
 - 32 Abdellah Karroum, “Allers/Retours: L'exposition comme déplacement vers les contextes,” *L'appartement* 22, May 14, 2007, <http://www.appartement22.com/spip.php?article9>.
 - 33 Abdellah Karroum, interview.
 - 34 Abdellah Karroum, “La coprésence fondement de la rencontre,” *L'appartement* 22, August 6, 2006, <http://www.appartement22.com/spip.php?article16>.
 - 35 Cited in Ghislain Ripault, *Pour Abdellatif Laâbi* (Paris: Nouvelles éditions rupture, 1982), 229.