longer fit 21st century conditions and circumstances. The notion of the institution as an autonomous entity is a dated one, and I'd argue that it will lead to a slow death, because in order to thrive, to be relevant, to tackle the complex issues we're facing, being autonomous doesn't make sense.

We live in a much more networked condition and that should apply to how we see our institutions as well.

On a practical level, in this era of globalisation that's unravelling right now, and that began in the 90s with, among other things, the rise of the internet and social media — people don't get their information, nor do they share information or get together in the same ways as they used to. That changes the role, purpose, and reason-for-being of many institutions — here I'm talking more about public cultural institutions and spaces. At the same time all the information that we have readily available means we have a state of, let's say, hyper production of ideas, initiatives, projects, speculations, and discourses to the point where everyone's trying to do their own thing and much of it isn't getting anywhere. Everyone's trying to invent their own wheel, when we're already sitting in a tire factory. So how do we move forward? I do still believe in this 20th century idea of progress, for better or worse. We need to collaborate and see where the gaps are, see what's needed, see what the next step is, instead of everyone doing the same thing over and over again. That is what's

— not my own which is an off-shoot, but the regular main pavilions. In the early days it was the old heroes including 100-year-old characters — Oscar Niemeyer, Zaha, Toyo Ito, Jean Nouvel etc. In recent years it's been people who were