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Foreword

Open Ends is the third and final of three cycles of exhibitions organized by The Museum of Modern Art under the banner MoMA2000 to mark the millennium. Selected entirely from the Museum's extensive collection and presented over a seventeen-month period, these cycles of exhibitions have been conceived to explore issues and themes in modern art through the filter of the Museum’s holdings. Modern Starts, which focused on the period 1880 to 1920, was followed by Making Choices, which dealt with the years 1920 to 1960. This concluding cycle, Open Ends, examines the art of 1960 to the present. All three cycles take a multidisciplinary approach and include works of art from all of the Museum's curatorial departments: Architecture and Design, Drawings, Film and Video, Painting and Sculpture, Photography, and Prints and Illustrated Books, presented in a series of synthetically organized exhibitions.

The chronological framework of the cycles is intended only as a convenient means of loosely organizing a considerable body of material into a coherent group of exhibitions. Over the last seventy years, The Museum of Modern Art has argued for an understanding of modern art through a carefully articulated history of this still-evolving tradition. By establishing a reading of modern art based on critical dates, styles, schools, and key artists, the Museum sought to make sense of the often competing and contradictory forces of this tradition. Modern Starts, Making Choices, and Open Ends build on this work but endeavor to provide a more interdisciplinary approach to the material. Each cycle explores relationships and shared themes as well as divergent movements and conflicting points of view by juxtaposing works of art in new and challenging ways. Individual exhibitions within each cycle concentrate on issues germane to the period under consideration, but the works of art chosen for these exhibitions often span the century in order to reveal how themes from one movement either respond to earlier questions or affect later decisions.

Taken together Modern Starts, Making Choices, and Open Ends are meant to provoke new responses and new ideas about modern art. They are not meant to be overarching or definitive statements about modern art or even about the nature of The Museum of Modern Art’s collection but, rather, interrogation ones that can help shape future issues and concerns to be dealt with as the new century unfolds. The ability of The Museum of Modern Art to embark on this initiative is the result of several generations of collecting that have allowed the Museum to acquire holdings of unparalleled richness and complexity. Indeed, many of the most important historical developments in modern art that have emerged over the last one hundred years are represented in the Museum's collection.

Alfred H. Barr, Jr., The Museum of Modern Art’s founding director, spoke of the Museum’s collection as being metabolic and self-renewing. While he meant this in terms of the Museum’s ability to constantly acquire new works of art through selective de-accessioning of its more historical holdings, the idea of an institution capable of considering and reconsidering itself in response to the ongoing and continuous inquiry about modern art is central to any understanding of the Museum. There is within the Museum a lively debate about which artists to collect, which works of art to display, and which exhibitions to mount. At the heart of these discussions is always the question of how to display our collection, what issues and themes to focus on, and what juxtapositions and relationships to highlight or emphasize. Given the cost and complexity of making significant architectural changes to the Museum’s galleries in order to create spaces that allow for different kinds of presentations of the collection, the changes effected by these debates can take years to be realized.
Modern Starts, Making Choices, and Open Ends are thus unique opportunities for the Museum to literally reconfigure many of its galleries and explore its collection in a way that is almost impossible to do on an ordinary basis. Each cycle should be seen as an experiment designed to offer a different reading or understanding of modern art while providing a more thorough investigation of the depth and breadth of the collection. In doing so we hope we will have turned the Museum into a laboratory where arguments and counter-arguments, issues, and ideas of modern art can meet and be explored in a way that allows for the emergence of new approaches to our history, and by extension, the history of modern art. This becomes especially important as the Museum prepares for a major architectural reconstruction, scheduled to begin when MoMA2000 closes.

The idea for this series of exhibitions began more than four years ago when a retreat was held with seven chief curators of the Museum to consider what might be done in recognition of the closing of the century that saw the birth of modern art as well as the founding of The Museum of Modern Art in 1929. After extensive discussion we felt that for an extended period of time we should concentrate on our own collection, devoting to it the attention we would normally give to the development of a major loan show. We were attracted to this idea because it afforded us the opportunity to reconsider the way we present our collection to the public as well as the chance to look back, from the vantage point of the end of the century, over one hundred years of modern art while posing questions that would guide our thinking about modern art into the next century. We quickly realized that despite the synthetic nature of The Museum of Modern Art's collection, no exhibition or series of exhibitions could ever hope to provide a genuinely comprehensive account of a tradition of that is still very much alive and evolving. This led to the recognition that the greatest contribution that we could make at this time would be to show as much of the collection as possible, including both familiar and unfamiliar works of art, in new and imaginative ways that open up possibilities for us, and our public, to examine the future.

Given the magnitude of this task, the entire curatorial staff embarked on an extended review of the collection and worked together to create a comprehensive overview of what the Museum had acquired over the last seventy years. Subsequently, smaller working groups were asked to study specific aspects of the collection and report back to the full staff on their findings. Other research departments of the Museum, including conservation, education, the library, and the archives, were also invited to participate in these discussions. Eventually we decided that to examine the collection to the extent we wished, we needed to use all of the Museum's galleries for this project and to divide the project into three separate cycles of exhibitions, each anchored around a chronological moment equal to roughly a third of the period covered by our holdings.

The organization of each cycle was entrusted to an interdepartmental team. Each of the teams was encouraged to pursue its own interests and ideas and to articulate them in unique and different voices. Taken together Modern Starts, Making Choices, and Open Ends are not meant to be read as a continuum, as if each were a part of a larger, seamless whole; rather, they are meant to provide three separate and distinct “takes” on modern art as represented by the collection.

As noted above, MoMA2000 evolved out of lengthy discussions with the Museum’s seven chief curators, all of whom—Mary Lea Bandy, John Elderfield, Peter Galassi, Terence Riley, Margit Rowell, Kirk Varnedoe, and Deborah Wye—made important contributions to the form it took. Its overall coordination was provided by John Elderfield (from 1996 to 1998) and Mary Lea Bandy (since 1999) in the capacity of Deputy Director for Curatorial Affairs, and by Beatrice Kernan, Assistant Deputy Director for Curatorial Affairs, assisted by Sharon Dec and Amy Romesburg, and working closely with Jennifer Russell, Deputy Director for Exhibitions and Collections Support, Michael Maegraith, Publisher, and Jerome Neuner, Director of Exhibition Design and Production. Open Ends has been skillfully and insightfully directed by Kirk Varnedoe, Chief Curator, Department of Painting and Sculpture; Paola Antonelli, Curator, Department of Architecture and Design; and Joshua Siegel, Associate Curator, Department of Film and Video, assisted by Judith Hecker and Amy Horshak.

Glenn D. Lowry
Director
The Museum of Modern Art
his volume presents a selection of artworks made after 1980, drawn from the collection of The Museum of Modern Art. The works, in diverse mediums, come from each of six curatorial departments in the Museum: Painting and Sculpture, Drawings, Prints and Illustrated Books, Architecture and Design, Photography, and Film and Video. The dominant purpose of the volume is visual information; but its eleven thematic essays suggest particular concerns that unite works of different dates, styles, or mediums.

The book was conceived during the planning of the exhibition Open Ends, the third and concluding cycle in the Museum’s series of MoMA2000 exhibitions. This series, held at The Museum of Modern Art from autumn 1999 through spring 2001, has been drawn entirely from the holdings of the Museum, and has been presented as a re-examination of the history of modern art and of the Museum’s collection. It has sought to integrate works from all curatorial departments and across traditional historical categories in ways that could provide a testing-lab for fresh consideration of what the Museum has done in the past—and might do in the future—with its incomparable collection.

Modern Contemporary was organized in a parallel spirit. From the outset, it was meant to accompany Open Ends, but not to serve as its catalogue. It was intended to be an independent publication, whose contents were selected separately from the exhibition lists and structures. Of course, the contents of book and exhibition often overlap: both draw from the same collection, and many of the same highlights are featured. Similarly, some of the essays address themes taken up by individual exhibitions within Open Ends, although the texts are not descriptions of those thematic displays.

Still, many of the works in the exhibition are not in the book, and vice versa. A principal difference involves the period covered. Open Ends focuses on works in the collection dating from 1960 to 2000, and initially this book was to have covered a similar scope. However, it soon became clear that it would be impossible, in one volume, to feature the better-known works of the 1960s and 1970s—including, for example, the masterworks of Pop and Minimalism—and also to showcase the richness of the Museum’s acquisitions of recent art of the 1980s and 1990s. Acutely aware of how little chance the public has had to see the scope and variety of the Museum’s contemporary acquisitions, we decided to focus in the publication exclusively on the period after 1980. The book thus allows maximum exposure for the least-known part of the Museum’s collection, and underlines the institution’s continuing engagement with contemporary art. Even with the expanded focus, however, it should be recognized that the illustrations gathered here represent only a relatively narrow selection of the far larger and more comprehensive acquisitions of post-1980 works. While preliminary lists were solicited from the various curatorial departments, the final selections were ultimately the responsibility of the book’s editors.

Modern and Contemporary Art at MoMA

The Museum of Modern Art was founded as, and has always been, an institution committed to contemporary art. From the inauguration in 1929, and for many years after, it was thought that the “permanent” collection would have relatively constant dimensions, but ever-changing elements. The
founding director, Alfred H. Barr, Jr., proposed the notion of a torpedo through time, conjuring the image of a forward-moving collection that would always have its “nose” in the present and immediate past, and a “tail” in the receding past about fifty years distant. The metaphor implied that, as a balance to its ongoing acquisitions of new art, the Museum would steadily divest itself of the older art in its possession, as that older art became more “classic” than “modern.” This practice was designed to keep the Museum forever fresh and free from the burdens of an extended history, and also indicated pragmatic concerns for limiting the size of the collection and for providing, by the occasional sale of the older artworks, a renewable source of funding for future purchases.¹

Had the notion of the torpedo been followed literally, the earliest works in the Museum’s collection would now be those of the early 1950s. Instead, the early 1950s were precisely the point at which the Museum began to accept—tentatively and piecemeal at first, then as a matter of general principle—that it would retain its collection of Post-Impressionist masterworks (such as Cézanne’s Bather and van Gogh’s The Starry Night) as the starting point of its painting and sculpture collection. (Other curatorial departments had different points of departure for their collecting: Photography and Film, for example, include the beginnings of their mediums, around 1840 and 1890, respectively). This change meant that the tail of Barr’s torpedo would become permanently pinned to around 1880, while the nose would continue to advance. The resultant tensions and stretches—between the ever-more-certified treasures of the historical collection and the seemingly ever-more-perilous adventures of collecting the art of the present—defined the character of The Museum of Modern Art in the last half of the twentieth century.

Those who have worked at the Museum in recent years, and those who have supported it, have felt that its built-in duality—the simultaneity of its commitments to what might be called classic modern art and to the creativity of the immediate present—not only makes sense, but creates the special quality of the institution. There is an argument to be made that the revolutions that originally produced modern art, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, have not been concluded or superseded—and thus that contemporary art today can be understood as the ongoing extension and revision of those founding innovations and debates. The collection of The Museum of Modern Art is, in a very real sense, that argument. Contemporary art is collected and presented at this Museum as a part of modern art—as belonging within, responding to, and expanding upon the framework of initiatives and challenges established by the earlier history of progressive art since the dawn of the twentieth century.

The historical collection provides a special implicit framework, illuminating and demanding, within which to present the art of today. And, conversely, a continued engagement with today’s art constantly challenges the curatorial staff to reexamine and reinterpret the history of innovations that preceded it. Without the dialogue between these twin aspects, The Museum of Modern Art would be a far less rewarding place for viewers to visit, for the staff to work, and for artists to show their work. The trick is, of course, to find the proper balance, in institutional time and resources, between the care and elucidation of the classic modern collection and the everyday-renewed need for growth and change. The works shown in this book are an important part of that process of growth—of the constant amendment, revision, and expansion of the collection that, in sum, constitutes an evolving definition of what the institution is.

**Past Bedrocks and Present Risks**

The German Expressionist painter Franz Marc once said, “Traditions are wonderful things—to create.” The presence of a great historical collection at The Museum of Modern Art is a source of pride and incentive to those who acquire new art for the Museum. But, contrary to the suspicions of some critics of MoMA, the historical collection does not provide a monolithic canon against which potential new acquisitions can be universally measured, nor any sharply defined template for the institution’s future. In this respect, Alfred Barr—the son of a preacher, and often described as a missionary—may have left his best legacy to subsequent curators, not in the form of a theological orthodoxy but in the form of an existential injunction to act and to take chances. He always insisted that
if, two decades later, even a tenth of the works acquired in a given year were deemed worthy of showing on a long-term basis, it would be a positive accomplishment. And he insisted that, in the eyes of history, sins of omission look worse than sins of commission: that is, the curator is more often damned for what he or she failed to acquire, than for the things brought in that, over time, do not pan out.

A corollary of Barr’s pragmatic outlook—humbling but encouraging at the same time—is that the quality of the collection is as much a matter of retrospective refinement as of on-the-spot discernment. It is easy to presume, given the many masterworks of early modern art in the collection, that the Museum had, early on, a “hot hand” for identifying and obtaining superior pieces of then-contemporary art. A closer look will show, however, that the institution began conservatively, and got more “progressive” as it aged. In the mid-1930s The Museum of Modern Art looked more like a museum of Kolbe, Maillol, and Pascin; it became the Museum of Picasso, Matisse, Malevich, and Duchamp only gradually—often by key purchases made with the benefit of considerable hindsight. The purchase of Picasso’s 1907 Les Demoiselles d’Avignon in 1937 is one example, the acquisition of key Abstract Expressionist works in the 1970s another; and several key works of the late 1950s and 1960s—by artists such as Rauschenberg, Warhol, and Judd—were only brought into the collection in the 1990s. In this respect as well as others, it would be mistaken to see the Museum’s view of earlier modern art as frozen, in opposition to its changing assessments of the present. Instead, these two aspects—the revision and refinement of a view of history, and an openness to the lessons of contemporary creators—are often closely connected, and evolve in dialogue.

However, one premise of the “torpedo,” involving the relationship between the older and newer parts of the collection, has become virtually inverted. It was originally thought that older modern art from the collection would be sold to buy more up-to-date works. In more recent years, while de-accessioning artworks has continued to be an important means of raising money for acquisitions, an unwritten policy has evolved with regard to works whose worth has been validated by history. The policy holds that such works should not be sold in order to fund the speculative field of contemporary art but only to acquire what are deemed better works of the same kind or, alternatively, to acquire works that have over the years become desirable additions to the historical collection.

A Changed Context

For many years after its founding, The Museum of Modern Art enjoyed a global pre-eminence owing at least in part to the uniqueness of its mission. But one measure of success is emulation, and, beginning in the 1960s, numerous institutions in the United States and abroad, either newly founded or reinvigorated, began to take up a parallel commitment to modern—and especially to contemporary—art. At the start of the twenty-first century, this competitive element has become ever more intense, as the status of contemporary art—among both private and state-supported institutions, and among the wealthiest private collectors—has ascended dramatically. The bar has been (and continues to be) raised, financially and in many other respects, for institutions like this one that aim for primacy on this hotly contested terrain.

The depth and variety of the Museum’s collection of early modern art, still unrivaled, only adds to its future challenges—to build its collection in a way that will both maintain the high levels of quality established by its past, and also redefine its singular character within a now crowded and intensely competitive field. One of the demands the altered situation places upon the Museum is that of carefully examining the mechanisms by which the institution has thus far acquired art, and of assessing their viability for the years to come. And in this regard, the impression this book presents—of a continuous, multimedia collection—actually belies the more complex and often fragmented procedures that brought these works to MoMA.

How Art Enters the Collection

While the works in this book are presented as a continuum of various mediums, they entered the collection by different routes, determined by the six different curatorial departments (divided
according to medium) within the Museum. Each department has its own budget and its separate acquisition committee, made up of Trustees and other invited patrons of the Museum. The basic mechanism of acquisition is everywhere the same: curators propose, and committees dispose. Works proposed for acquisition (including gifts offered) are presented at committee meetings by curators, who argue for the addition of the works to the collection. The committee (whose members contribute most of the funds that make up the acquisition budget) then votes to accept or reject the proposed work.

Beyond that, however, departmental philosophies of collection-building may differ widely. Some departments have specific exclusions built into the representation of their respective fields. While the Department of Film and Video might eagerly amass a collection of films related to war, for example, the Department of Architecture and Design has always refused to collect weapons. Yet while the design collection has been formed within a generally very broad, non-restrictive consideration of functional and commercial objects, the collection of film (while it includes such diverse fields as feature films, animation, documentary, and experimental works) has specifically avoided collecting within the area of commissioned work, which constitutes one of the largest areas of film production—thereby specifically excluding industrial, religious, and pornographic films. The collecting of photography, film, and design objects at the Museum, meanwhile, proceeds in certain areas without regard for original artistic intention (acquiring, for example, items such as propellers, ball bearings, documentary photographs, family snapshots, instructional film, or home movies), while the departments of painting and sculpture, drawings, and prints only collect works defined and intended as art by their creators. No department aspires to anything like a reportorial or archival inclusiveness in dealing with its respective field, though the Department of Prints and Illustrated Books has made arrangements for the acquisition of every work issued by certain publishers who have had particular significance for their area.

Perhaps most crucially, the collection is built by six separate staffs of curators, whose outlooks and strategies may vary widely. This produces a diverse range of approaches pursued simultaneously at any given moment in the Museum’s history. It also means that each department’s collection accumulates a particular set of idiosyncratic strengths and weaknesses—pockets of concentration and broad patterns of representation—that reflect different generations of leadership. Each new set of “builders” must in turn choose how to build further upon, or compensate for, the particular structures left by their predecessors. For example, when the photographer Edward Steichen was the head of the Department of Photography, his collecting reflected ideas of a universal language of photography (as embodied most evidently in his well-known 1955 exhibition The Family of Man); but his successor John Szarkowski focused his collecting and exhibitions program on the work of particular artists. From Barr’s early exhibitions on Cubism and Surrealism to more recent shows devoted to Cy Twombly or Japanese textiles, curatorial programs of loan exhibitions have also opened special opportunities for acquisition, and left their mark on the permanent holdings of the Museum. Particular artists and schools have come in and out of favor, and the collection records these fluctuations. Barr did not share, for example, James Thrall Soby’s early enthusiasm for Jackson Pollock, and it was not until William Rubin’s efforts in the late 1960s and 1970s that the Museum’s exceptional holdings of this artist were finally formed. Soby’s affection for the work of Pavel Tchelitchew in the late 1930s and early 1940s, on the other hand, now seems a closed chapter in collecting, without any subsequent reinforcement. Examples of similar shifts and stops and starts, corrections and revisions, mark every phase of the Museum’s holdings in virtually every medium.

In sum, while the collection of the Museum may seem to many outside observers to represent a monolithic structure, built according to some uniform consensus, those inside the institution are most acutely aware of how its holdings are actually a rich patchwork, formed—from the beginning and still today—within a shifting constellation of contingencies, including the changing practices of separate departments, the divergent tastes of particular donors, and the shifting concerns of individual curators.
The Particular Challenges of Recent Art

The collecting of contemporary art has, in the past few decades, challenged the Museum’s structures, both physical and organizational, in several ways. Most evidently, the scale of many important works in painting and sculpture has increased beyond the ability of the institution’s building to contain them, and the sprawling space requirements of other works—especially in the area of installation art, but also in photography, drawing, and printmaking—have imposed sharp limitations on what can be on view at any given time. We hope to address these challenges by the dramatic increase in open, high-ceilinged galleries for contemporary art within the new Museum building designed by Yoshio Taniguchi. There are no such direct, physical solutions, however, for other, parallel conundrums. A number of impulses within new art since the 1960s—including Happenings or Performance Art, Conceptual Art, and Earthworks—have been explicitly opposed to the idea of the collectible object, and hence to a fundamental premise of the traditional museum. And even within the domains traditionally covered by the Museum’s various departments, there has been an important upsurge of hybridization, intentionally and effectively transgressing the boundaries between, say, video and sculptural installation, or photography and painting. Many important artists since the 1960s have conceived of their art as one program expressed through diverse mediums, including not only painting, sculpture, drawing, and printmaking, but also often photography, film, and video. While it was Barr’s genius to propose that all the diverse modern mediums—painting, film, photography, design, etc.—belonged together under one roof, the idea of separate languages of expression, and separate historical traditions, still shaped the formation of the individual curatorial departments. Now, when artists frequently work simultaneously and interchangeably within several different mediums, and criss-cross the traditional lines between fine and applied arts as well, these curatorial divisions can frequently seem constraining and arbitrary.

This intellectual challenge is linked, paradoxically, with a shift in economic structures. Much of contemporary art has moved away from the basic model of the unique, handmade object, preferring instead mechanical means of production and moving more comfortably in the zone of photography, prints, film, and video where infinite replication is implied. But, at the same time, that art has, regardless of medium, often been pressed into conformity with models of marketing and sales associated with the traditional trade in paintings. Large-format, limited-edition works are now a staple of artists working in photography, film, and video, and the prices being asked are dramatically, by quantum leaps, larger than those observed within these mediums prior to the 1990s. In these circumstances, more collective planning and cooperation between the various departments of the institution seems a priority for any reasoned program of acquisitions. Accomplishing that coordination, while honoring and accommodating the pluralism and curatorial autonomy that has thus far enriched the Museum’s holdings, will be a key goal of the present and future staff.

Note

Note to the Plates

The following plates are arranged chronologically, beginning in 1980. All are works of art in the collection of The Museum of Modern Art and represent acquisitions of contemporary work in the Museum’s six curatorial departments: Painting and Sculpture, Drawings, Prints and Illustrated Books, Architecture and Design, Photography, and Film and Video.

• The year in which a work was made or completed is referenced at the bottom of the page next to the page number. The illustrations are accompanied by brief captions for purposes of identification; these give a plate number, the name of the artist, title and date of the work, and an abbreviated medium to indicate at a glance (and sometimes only in a general way) whether a work is a photograph or a film, a drawing or a painting, a print or a multiple, a sculpture or an installation, etc.

• The actual, complete medium of each work is given in the fuller caption in the Checklist of Illustrations on page 541, along with other information. The checklist is organized sequentially according to the disposition of the plates. There the reader will find for each illustrated work the plate number, the full title, series (if applicable), date, medium, and dimensions (in feet and inches, and in centimeters or meters; height before width before depth). For prints, dimensions are given both for plate or composition (comp.) size and sheet size, and the publisher, printer, and edition size are given where relevant. For architecture, inclusive dates represent the period from commission or design to completion; single dates may represent the point at which a drawing or model was made; and “project” indicates that a work is unbuilt. For film and video, a work is represented either by a still, or frame, from the work or a promotional image; and for these the country of origin, type of film, and running length are given. For design objects and multiples, the manufacturer may be given. For series in all mediums, a representative sample of the whole work may be shown; the size of the whole will be indicated in the checklist entry. The final part of most entries is the credit line, which indicates how the work entered the Museum’s collection.

• To locate works by particular artists, the reader may consult the Index of Illustrations, on page 555, which lists the works alphabetically by artist and keys them by plate number.
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5. Cindy Sherman. Untitled Film Still #56. 1980. Photograph


opposite: Vito Acconci. 20 Foot Ladder for Any Size Wall. 1979–80. Print
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Raging Bull. 1980. Film
opposite:
McCoy/Tyner/Sextet.
1980. Poster

Cain et Abel
Cinéma et Vidéo


15. Toshiyuki Kita.
Wink Lounge Chair. 1980.
Design
Untitled. 1980. Drawing

17. Philip Guston.
Untitled. 1980. Drawing

18. Philip Guston.
Untitled. 1980. Drawing

Untitled. 1980. Drawing
Cafe Deutschland (Style War).
1980. Painting

opposite:

Atlantic City.
1980. Film
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1980. Film
23. Yoji Yamamoto.
A River. 1980. Poster

Bye Bye Brazil. 1980. Film

25. Leon Hirszman.
They Don't Wear Black Tie. 1981. Film

Pixote. 1980. Film
27. Seiichi Furuya.
Graz. 1980. Photograph

28. Seiichi Furuya.
Photograph
29. Peter Hujar.
Photograph
30. Rainer Werner Fassbinder. 
*Lola*. 1981. Film

31. Rainer Werner Fassbinder. 
*Lili Marleen*. 1981. Film

32. James Welling. 
Untitled #46. 
May 20, 1981. Photograph
33. Bernard Tschumi.
The Manhattan Transcripts.
Episode 4: The Block.
Project, 1976-81.
Architectural drawings
34. Frank Gohlke.
35. Georg Baselitz. 
Woman on the Beach, 1981. Print 

Drinker, 1981. Print
37. Scott Burton.
Pair of Rock Chairs.
1980-81. Sculpture
38. Lee Friedlander.
**Untitled.** 1980. Photograph

**Untitled.** 1980. Photograph
40. Lee Friedlander.
Untitled. 1981. Photograph
41. Cindy Sherman.
Untitled #96, 1981.
Photograph

42. Willem de Kooning.
Pirate (Untitled II), 1981.
Painting
43. George Miller. 
Mad Max 2 (The Road Warrior). 1981. Film

44. A. R. Penck (Ralf Winkler). 
Nightvision. 1982. Print

45. Andrzej Pagowski. 
Wolf's Smile (Usmiech Wilka). 1982. Poster
46. Vija Celmins.
Alliance. 1982. Print

opposite:

47. Werner Herzog.
Fitzcarraldo. 1982. Film
You invest in the

divinity

of the masterpiece

Untitled (You Invest in the Divinity of the Masterpiece), 1982. Painting

49. Katharina Fritsch.
Madonna, 1982. Multiples
50. Krzysztof Kieslowski.
Blind Chance. 1982. Film
51. Ingmar Bergman.
Fanny and Alexander.
1982. Film
52. Tina Barney.
1982. Photograph

Chan Is Missing. 1982. Film
opposite:
56. Barry Levinson.
Diner. 1982. Film

57. Uwe Loesch.
Point (Punktum). 1982. Poster
Punktum.
58. William Wegman.
Blue Head. 1982.
Photographs

59. Paul Rand.
IBM. 1982. Poster
60. Ridley Scott.
Blade Runner. 1982. Film

opposite:
61. Joan Fontcuberta.
Guillumeta Polyphorma.
1982. Photograph
Mary and Babe. 1982. Photograph
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64. Stephen Armellino.
Bullet-Resistant Mask.
65. John Canemaker.
Bottom's Dream, 1983.
Animated Film
66. John Divola.
Untitled. 1983.
Photograph

opposite:
Untitled. 1983.
Sculpture

70. Terry Jones and Terry Gilliam.
Monty Python's The Meaning of Life.
1983. Film
71. Swatch. GB 001 Watch. 1983. Design

72. Swatch. GK 100 Jellyfish Watch. 1983. Design
74. Joel Sternfeld.
Houston, Texas. 1983.
Photograph

75. Joel Sternfeld.
Canyon Country, California. 1983. Photograph
76. Kathryn Bigelow and Monty Montgomery. *Breakdown (The Loveless)*. 1983. Film
HOLLYWOOD
IS A VERB

77. Edward Ruscha.
Hollywood Is a Verb.
1963. Drawing

78. Martin Scorsese.
The King of Comedy.
1983. Film
79. Federico Fellini. 
And the Ship Sails On. 
1983. Film
80. Nicholas Nixon.
C.C., Boston, 1983.
Photograph

opposite:
81. Anselm Kiefer.
Der Rhein. 1983.
Illustrated book
82. Jan Groover.
Untitled. 1983.
Photograph

opposite:
83. Francesco Clemente.
Conversion to Her. 1983.
Painting
84. Mike Leigh. 
Meantime. 1983. Film

85. Lizzie Borden. 
Born in Flames. 1983. Film
86. Jörg Immendorff.
Futurology. 1983. Print
88. Bill Viola.  
Anthem. 1983. Video

89. Mako Idemitsu.  
Great Mother Part II: Yuniko.  
1983. Video
90. Michael Spano.
Photograph—Michael Spano.
1983. Photograph

opposite:
Stick Man, 1983. Print
92. Frank Stella.
Graff, la luna, i ladri e le guardie.
1984. Painting

opposite:
93. Sigmar Polke.
Watchtower. 1984. Painting
94. Bruce Nauman.
Drawing

95. Claes Oldenburg.

Opposite:
96. Sergio Leone.
Once upon a Time in America. 1984. Film
The Company of Wolves.
1984. Film

100. Andy Warhol.
Painting

101. Anselm Kiefer.
Departure from Egypt.
1984. Drawing

103. David Goldblatt. Mother and child in their home after the destruction of its shelter by officials of the Western Cape Development Board, Crossroads, Cape Town, 11 October 1984. 1984. Photograph

The shelter was a framework of Port Jackson brushwood staked into loose sand of the Cape Flats and covered by plastic sheets—black plastic near the base for privacy, translucent plastic over the roof for light. Neatly, without touching the contents of the home or its occupants, a team of five overalled Black men, supervised by an armed White, lifted the entire structure of frame and plastic skin off the ground and placed it nearby. Then they pulled off the plastic, smashed the framework, and threw the pieces onto a waiting truck. Hardly a word was spoken. While they could legally destroy the wooden framework, they were forbidden, by the quirk of a court decision brought against the State seeking to prevent these demolitions, from confiscating or destroying the plastic. So it was left where it fell.

Then the convoy—a police Landrover, the truck with the demolition squad and broken wood, and a Casspir with policemen in camouflage lolling in its armoured back—moved towards the next group of shelters.

For a while the woman lay with the child. Then she got up and began to cut and strip branches of Port Jackson bush to make a new framework for her house.
Photograph
105. Aldo Rossi.
Cemetery of San Cataldo, Modena, Italy. 1971–84.
Architectural drawing

106. Aldo Rossi.
Cemetery of San Cataldo, Modena, Italy. 1971–84.
Architectural drawing
107. Su Friedrich.
The Ties That Bind. 1984. Film
108. Hou Hsiao-hsien.
Summer at Grandpa's.
1984. Film
110. Allan McCollum.
40 Plaster Surrogates.
1982–84. Installation
111. Paul Graham.
Crouched Man, DHSS
Waiting Room, Bristol.
1984. Photograph
should be judged as individuals.
114. Martin Puryear. 
Greed’s Trophy. 1984. 
Sculpture

opposite:
115. Robert Ryman. 
Pace. 1984. Painting
Stranger Than Paradise. 
1984. Film

117. Woody Allen. 
Broadway Danny Rose. 
1984. Film
Woman Twirling. 1985. Photograph
119. Robert Frank.
1985. Photographs

120. Bernard Tschumi.
Parc de la Villette, Paris, France.
1985. Architectural model
121. Anselm Kiefer.
The Red Sea, 1984-85.
Painting
122. Jasper Johns.
Summer, 1985. Painting
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123. Jean-Michel Basquiat.
Untitled. 1985. Drawing
126. David Salle.
Painting
125. Sir Norman Foster.
Hong Kong and Shanghai Bank,
Hong Kong, 1979-85.
Architectural drawing

126. James Herbert.
River, 1985. Film
la fin du voyage.
They've taken four Jews away for Pearl Harbor without love notes.

The ghetto in Furman. If you try to pry open, keep your story logical, I'll never get it straight... Tell me more about 1941 and type.

The Germans intend to make us a model of them.

The next day I managed over to Columbia Street and saw them.

They wanted those one full week.

A few months I did meet still me.

They gave me cloth with no coupons.

This wasn't yet a real ghetto. Still, you could shop in parts of town.

So long. We were at night-time, it wasn't matter.

I'm putting a drama to give to some children.

They gave me cloth with no coupons. It was no more the dead life, like we were before.

They've taken four Jews away for Pearl Harbor without love notes.

All of our neighborhood were given none to live in 2½ small rooms.

When we were in the ghetto, I was in 1943.

They give me cloth with no coupons.
WHEN SPELUNKING
SOMETIMES YOU HAVE TO STOOP...
SOMETIMES YOU HAVE TO GO ON ALL FOURS...

SOMETIMES EVEN CRAWL

CRAWL WORM !!!
132. Thomas Florschuetz.
Photographs
134. John Coplans.
Self-Portrait. 1985. Photograph
135. Lothar Baumgarten.
Untitled (Fish). 1985, Print
136. Terry Gilliam.
Brazil. 1985. Film

opposite:
137. Jeff Koons.
Three Ball 50/50 Tank.
1985. Sculpture
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138. James Casebere.
Photograph
130. Trinh T. Minh-ha.
Naked Spaces: Living Is Round.  
1985. Film
140. Susan Rothenberg.
Biker. 1985. Painting
141. Susan Rothenberg.

Boneman, 1986. Print
142. Bill Viola.
I Do Not Know What It Is I Am Like.
1986. Video
143. Shiro Kuramata.
How High the Moon Armchair.
1986. Design
144. Bernhard and Anna Blume. 
Kitchen Frenzy. 1986. Photographs

Untitled. 1986. Sculpture
Ellsworth Kelly.
Three Panels: Orange, Dark Gray, Green. 1986. Painting
147. Larry Fink.
Pearls. New York City.
1986. Photograph

148. Patrick Faigenbaum.
Massimo Family. Rome. 1986. Photograph
RAQUEL MENDOZA PUGA
(a) "La Regalona", Tender. A MATI RANNA CARDKMTL, (a) La Ne. Companera de la Raquel Lara, operan muchas detenciones por huren Valparaiso, Santiago y Los ríos suavizamiento del que no habló retorno. Senti, por qué sí misericordia de la hora me impulsó ver, que era obligada a permanecer al interior de una demolidora de bárbaros. Senti, como después en cada temblor en que he forma de tomar reminiscencia de tu absoluta soledad. Senti, además, una suerte de catastrófica emocionante, la sensación ferroa de que la locura está allí, del lado de la muerte, hasta que un ruido oldo 149. Eugenio Dittborn.

140. Eugenio Dittborn. 8 Survivors. 1986. Print
150. Bertrand Tavernier. 
Round Midnight. 1986. Film

opposite

151. Niklaus Troxler. 
A Tribute to the Music of Thelonious Monk. 1986. Poster
A TRIBUTE TO THE MUSIC OF THelonious Monk.

Friday, Sep 26
20.30 Uhr, München

Walter Davis jun.
Stefan Pollard
and Cliff Benjamin

Joshua Hendricks
Gene Adams
Bill Kellman
wounded English soldiers traveling with us and shore on feet — by order of the captain. Our captain is a fat lobster from the south of Italy, who, when in Taranto, dressed in the uniform of an ensign but, while steering the ship now, wears a pair of white trousers and a dark blue jacket and cap with shiny visor, the border of which is trimmed with chestnut silk. Our captain’s duties are exactly as follows: to be present at the distribution of rations and to give the order to put on our life jackets. Each time we leave port, at the first shock of the propellers, the captain bounces like a spring to the bridge, armed with a cyclopes megaphone under which, it seems to me, he could quite conveniently hide in case of danger. The captain blows a rolling toot on his nickel whistle, which has the effect of drawing to his modest person the one thousand two hundred six hundred soldiers on board, after which he nucleates the megaphone about like a brigantine trombone, first in the direction of the stern, then in the direction of the stern, and fires this command twice: “Present life jackets!” But the captain lacks the temper of a commander: it’s obvious to me and — I believe — obvious to him as well; this explains the difference with which he tries to make up for this lack, having recourse to subterfuge even. Before drawing anchor at Taranto, he informed us: “I’m your father and yours, my sons,” but more as well, he lacked that authority which distinguishes a responsible parent. The captain is a good man; it would be better to say: he does what is better, but lacking the most striking qualities, he has diligently set himself to the task of professing an intense humility. Beyond the boundaries of the putative family of six hundred chaps, sons, among them blackguards and rogues from every part of Italy, I imagine him with the true, clerical family and see him in the double role of pet-husband (being dragged on a leash by an ascetic Amazon of a wife) and pet-father, overpowered and washed out and resigned to the tyranny of a swarm of rosy-checked, stubby-headed urchins. Next I wonder what sort of control he can
possibly expect to hold over these six hundred “sons,” unlike him in every way —ables who will have to leave the trenches, not the cradle, broken in for the human hunt by three years of war!... After the song of the honuusculus has exhausted itself in the guns’ funnel, there follows a bit of commotion on deck and one sees the radiest agent and best senter of his “sons” in the sharp gestures of putting on their life jackets. But once the captain’s little should fall alight into the hatchway, all arms fall, backs straighten up and the life jackets return to their primary function as seats, pillows and card tables. I find this exasperating, but I decide to have an eye to everyone, with the captain and to make perfectly clear the psychological link to be followed in the performance of his duties. By now upon the matter, sir, of the life jackets issued to the six hundred soldiers committed to your care, the effectiveness of which is guaranteed, I’m sure. It could have been shown just how well they work by putting them to the test back in Tomahoe. If I were you, I’d have asked for a show of hands from all those men who can’t swim. From their number I’d have picked two trustworthy lads and ordered them to be on their life jackets and jump into the sea. They’d have floated like snowflakes. But nothing will alter the fact that this example wouldn’t be nearly persuasive enough when applied to them, but the ones assembled for the demonstration three Italians, I might further add — better after the passing of your commanding manner. “They say you can’t say life jackets!” and you’ll get the opposite result. I might even venture to say, the desired one.” But while boasting, of course, I realize that I’d better do a little psychological pre-conditioning first. Why disturb the captain’s serene spirits? And the one who has to order us to put on our life jackets and in doing absolves himself of all obligations, plans and sums. He hasn’t any other duties to take care of, and pronouncing the words for which the government pays him his salary, he’s freed of every further responsibility, and with peace of mind he can go down to the officer’s
153. James Ivory.
A Room with a View.
1986. Film

154. John Frankenheimer.
52 Pick-Up. 1986. Film
155. John Baldessari.
Untitled. 1986. Drawing

156. Bill Sherwood.
Parting Glances. 1986. Film
157. Louise Bourgeois.
Articulated Lair. 1986. Sculpture
158. Jeff Koons.
Rabbit, 1986. Sculpture
159. Edward Ruscha.

Jumbo. 1986. Painting
Bang! 1966. Animated film
162. Frank Gehry. 
Fishdance Restaurant, 
Kobe, Japan, c. 1986. 
Architectural drawing

163. Frank Gehry. 
Winton Guest House, 
Wayzata, Michigan. 
1983–86. 
Architectural model
164. Anish Kapoor.
A Flower, A Drama Like Death.
1986. Sculpture
165. Gaetano Pesce.
Feltri Chair, 1986. Design

166. Janice Findley.
Beyond Kabuki, 1986. Film
167. Andy Warhol.
The Last Supper, 1966. Painting
168. Clint Eastwood.
Heartbreak Ridge.
1986. Film

169. Oliver Stone.
Platoon. 1986. Film
170. Stanley Kubrick.
Full Metal Jacket. 1987. Film
171. David Wojnarowicz.
Fire. 1987. Painting
172. Bruce Nauman.
Video installation
*Tin Men*. 1987. Film

174. Jeffrey Scales.
175. Abigall Child.
Mayhem. 1987. Film

176. George Kuchar.
Creeping Crimson. 1987. Video
177. Nikita Mikhalkov.
Dark Eyes. 1987. Film

opposite:
178. Paolo Taviani and Vittorio Taviani.
Good Morning Babylon. 1987. Film
179. David Hammons.
  Free Nelson Mandela.
  1987. Print

180. Leon Golub.
  White Squad. 1987. Print

opposite:
181. Christopher Wilmarth.
  Self-Portrait with Sliding Light.
  1987. Sculpture
182. Alberto Meda.
Light Light Armchair.
1987. Design

183. Eric Fischl.
Portrait of a Dog.
1987. Painting
184. Tina Barney.
Photograph
185. Jac Leirner.
Lung. 1983. Sculpture
186. Tony Cragg.

Oersted Sapphire.

1987. Sculpture
187. Frank Gehry.
Bubbles Lounge Chair.
1987. Design
188. Andy Warhol.
Camouflage, 1987, Prints

The Dead. 1987. Film

195. Mario Merz.
Places with No Street.
1987. Sculpture
196. Office for Metropolitan Architecture. City Hall Competition, the Hague, the Netherlands. 1987. Architectural drawing

opposite:

Steven Holl.
American Memorial Library, Berlin, Germany.
Architectural model.
200. Jean-Luc Godard. Puissance de la parole. 1988. Film

opposite:
IT'S NOT ART
(THAT COUNTS NOW)

ARE YOU CRYING?

WHAT SHOULD I DO?

NOTHING

NOTHING

NOTHING

NOSTALGIA

24 HOURS A DAY

NO

I'VE GOT

SOMETHING

ONLY

IN MY EYE

PLEASE

ADULTS

WHO'S AFRAID

OF THE NEW

NOW?
204. David Wojnarowicz. 
The Weight of the Earth, Part I. 
1988. Photographs

opposite:
205. Ashley Bickerton. 
Tormented Self-Portrait (Susie 
at Arles). 1987-88. Painting
206. Zeke Berman.
Untitled. 1988. Photograph

207. Morphosis.
6th Street House Project.
Santa Monica, California.
1987–88. Architectural print
208. Richard Artschwager.
Double Sitting. 1968. Painting

209. Mike and Doug Starn.
Photographic collage
Five of fifteen paintings:
Funeral (Beerdigung)
overleaf:
Cell (Zelle); Hanged (Erhängte);
Youth Portrait (Jugendbildnis);
Record Player (Plattenspieler)
ROCKS UPON THE BEACH
SAND UPON THE ROCKS

211. Lawrence Charles Weiner.
Rocks upon the Beach/Sand upon the Rocks. 1988. Installation

212. Clint Eastwood.
Bird. 1988. Film
213. Bruce Nauman. Learned Helplessness in Rats (Rock and Roll Drummer). 1988, Video installation


opposite:

217. Gunter Förg,
Photograph

opposite:
218. Tony Oursler and
Constance DeJong.
Joyride. 1988. Video

Let's Play Prisoners.
1988. Video
220. Louise Lawler.

*Does Andy Warhol Make You Cry?* 1988. Photograph
221. Roy Lichtenstein.
Painting
223. Martin Kippenberger.  
Drawings

opposite:
224. Marc Newson.  
Wood Chair. 1988. Design
225. Gregory Crewdson.
*Untitled from the series Natural Wonder.* 1988. Photograph
Adam Fuss.
Untitled. 1988. Photograph
Nic Nicosia.
Real Pictures #11.
1988. Photograph

Paul Thek.
Drawing
The soul is the need for the spirit.
229. Pedro Almodóvar. Women on the Verge of a Nervous Breakdown. 1988, Film

opposite:

231. Marlon Riggs. 
Tongues Untied. 1989. Video

opposite:
232. Martin Scorsese. 
The Last Temptation of Christ. 1989. Film

opposite:

235. Edin Velez.
Dance of Darkness.
1989. Video
236. Carroll Dunham.
Shadows. 1989. Prints

opposite:
237. Tadanori Yokoo.
Fancydance. 1989. Poster

240. Bruce Nauman.
Model for Animal Pyramid II.
1989. Photographic collage
241. Gilbert and George.

Doom to Earth. 1989. Painting
242. Laurie Simmons.
Photograph

243. David Levinthal.
Untitled from the series
Photograph
244. Oliver Stone.
Born on the Fourth of July.
1989. Film

245. Spike Lee.
Do the Right Thing.
1989. Film

246. Chris Killip.
Untitled. 1989. Photograph

The Bastard Offspring of Art and Commerce murder their parents and go off on a Sunday Outing.


251. Ida Applebroog.
Chronic Hollow. 1989.
Painting
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252. Peggy Ahwesh.
Martine’s Playhouse.
1989. Film

opposite:

253. Shiro Kuramata.
Miss Blanche Chair. 1989.
Design

overleaf:

254. Edward Ruscha.
That Is Right and Other Similarities. 1989. Prints
255. José Leonilson.
To Make Your Soul Close to Me.
1989. Drawing

256. Sadie Benning.
Video
257. Marc Newson.
Orgone Chaise Longue.
1989. (Design)
258. Joan Jonas.
Volcano Saga, 1989. Video

opposite:

259. Giuseppe Penone.
Thirty-Three Herbs, 1989. Prints
260. Gundula Schulze.
Dresden, 1989. Photograph

261. Martin Parr.
Midsummer Madness,
Conservative Party Social
Event, 1986–89.
Photograph
262. Steina Vasulka.
In the Land of the Elevator Girls.
1989. Video
263. Robert Gober.
Cat Litter. 1989. Sculpture

264. Thomas Schütte.
Untitled. 1989. Drawings
269. Steven Holl.
Nexus World Kashii,
Fukuoka, Japan. 1989.
Architectural drawing

opposite:
270. James Turrell.
First Light, Series C.
1989–90. Prints
271. Joel Shapiro.
Untitled. 1989-90.
Sculpture

opposite:
272. Steven Holl.
"Edge of a City"
Parallax Towers,
New York. Project,
1990. Architectural
model
Formula 1 Racing Car 641/2.
1990. Design
276. Gary Hill.
Inasmuch As It Is
Always Already Taking
Place. 1990. Video
Installation

AIDS projects. 1988–90.
Prints
Opposite:
279. Akira Kurosawa.
DREAMS. 1990. Film

Right:
280. Brice Marden.
Cold Mountain Series,
Zen Study 1 (Early State).
1990. Print

281. Brice Marden.
Cold Mountain Series,
Zen Study 3 (Early State).
1990. Print
282. Thomas Struth.
Photograph
283. Thomas Struth.
South Lake Apartments 3,
Chicago. 1990. Photograph

284. Thomas Struth.
South Lake Apartments 4,
Chicago. 1990. Photograph
Architectural print

286. Arata Isozaki.
Architectural print
opposite:
287. David Hammons.
African-American Flag.
1990. Fabric object

right:
288. David Hammons.
High Fatutin'. 1990. Sculpture
292. Kiki Smith. 
A Man. 1990. Drawing

293. Kiki Smith. 
Untitled. 1987-90. 
Sculpture
Looks like day or breaking point. It looks like somebody's ready to go out. The world is waiting for somebody to defy something somewhere. They're drawing a cloud of dust, making a smokescreen. The red of my lust, the green of your sweater, the cool blue of night coming on. Any path will do.

Cluster in tongue drives me mad—after all, I say "Avenue du Clichy," I want to say Concorde. Stop here now.
Wild Edible Drawing No. 8.
1990. Drawing
298. Bruce Conner.

INKBLOT DRAWING. 1990.

Drawing
300. Felix Gonzalez-Torres.
"Untitled" (Death by Gun). 1990.
Prints.
301. Agnieszka Holland. 
*Europa Europa*. 1990. Film

*Ju Dou*. 1990. Film
303. Jim Nutt.
Drawing for Fret.
1990. Drawing

304. Stephen Frears.
The Grifters. 1990. Film

308. Martin Scorsese. Goodfellas. 1990. Film

opposite:
opposite:
310. Annette Messager.
Installation

right:
311. Peter Eisenman.

312. John O'Reilly.
War Series #34: PFC USMC
313. Boris Mihailov.
Untitled from the series
U Zemli (On the Ground).
1991. Photograph

314. Boris Mihailov.
Untitled from the series
U Zemli (On the Ground).
1991. Photograph

315. Boris Mihailov.
Untitled from the series
U Zemli (On the Ground).
1991. Photograph
316. Shimon Attie.
Almstadtstrasse 43,
1991. Photograph

317. Julie Dash.
Daughters of the Dust.
1991. Film
318. Toyo Ito.
319. Warren Sonbert.
Short Fuse. 1991. Film
Ernie Gehr.
Side/Walk/Shuttle.
1991. Film
321. Annette Lemieux.
Stolen Faces. 1991. Print

322. Oliver Stone.
JFK. 1991. Film
323. Tom Dixon.
S-Chair. 1991. Design

324. Dieter Appelt.
Photographs
opposite:
325. Jean-Michel Othoniel.

above:
326. Vito Acconci.
Adjustable Wall Bra. 1990-91. Sculpture
327. Felix Gonzalez-Torres.  
"Untitled" (Perfect Lovers). 1991. Sculpture

328. Felix Gonzalez-Torres.  
"Untitled" (Supreme Majority). 1991. Sculpture

opposite:

329. Felix Gonzalez-Torres.  
"Untitled" (Placebo). 1991. Installation
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330. Felix Gonzalez-Torres.
"Untitled." 1991. Installation

332. Enzo Mari.
Flowers Box. 1991.
Design

333. Abelardo Morell.
Photograph
334. Zaha M. Hadid.
Hong Kong Peak Competition,
Hong Kong, 1991.
Architectural drawing
HOW IT FEELS TO BE COLORED ME. HOW IT FEELS TO BE COLORED ME. HOW IT FEELS TO BE COLORED ME. HOW IT FEELS TO BE COLORED ME. HOW IT FEELS TO BE COLORED ME. HOW IT FEELS TO BE COLORED ME.

335. Glenn Ligon. Untitled (How it feels to be colored me... Doubled). 1991. Drawing
One day this kid will get larger. One day this kid will come to know something that causes a sensation equivalent to the separation of the earth from its axis. One day this kid will reach a point where he senses a division that isn't mathematical. One day this kid will feel something stir in his heart and throat and mouth. One day this kid will find something in his mind and body and soul that makes him hungry. One day this kid will do something that causes men who wear the uniforms of priests and rabbis, men who inhabit certain stone buildings, to call for his death. One day politicians will enact legislation against this kid. One day families will give false information to their children and each child will pass that information down generationally to their families and that information will be designed to make existence intolerable for this kid. One day this kid will begin to experience all this activity in his environment and that activity and information will compel him to commit suicide or submit to danger in hopes of being murdered or submit to silence and invisibility. Or one day this kid will talk. When he begins to talk, men who develop a fear of this kid will attempt to silence him with strangling, fists, prison, suffocation, rape, intimidation, drugging, ropes, guns, laws, menace, roving gangs, bottles, knives, religion, decapitation, and immolation by fire. Doctors will pronounce this kid curable as if his brain were a virus. This kid will lose his constitutional rights against the government's invasion of his privacy. This kid will be faced with electro-shock, drugs, and conditioning therapies in laboratories tended by psychologists and research scientists. He will be subject to loss of home, civil rights, jobs, and all conceivable freedoms. All this will begin to happen in one or two years when he discovers he desires to place his naked body on the naked body of another boy.
HAD IT BEEN FAIR TO MATCH MERE OUTLINE AGAINST A FINISHED COMPOSITION.

FILLING IN SO...

UNDER MY THUMB.

I CARRY THE BOTTOM NEWS.
opposite:
41. Frank Gehry.
Cross Check Armchair.
1991. Design

above:
342. Brice Marden.
Rain. 1991. Drawing
343. Robert Gober.
Untitled. 1992. Sculpture

344. Robert Gober.
Untitled. 1991. Sculpture
345. Robert Gober.
   Untitled. 1992. Photograph

   Newspaper. 1992. Multiple
Gnaw. 1992. Installation
Paul McCarthy.
Sketchbook "Heidi.
350. Paul McCarthy and Mike Kelley.

Heidi. 1992. Video
351. Roy Lichtenstein.
Painting

352. Christopher Connell.
Pepe Chair. 1992. Design
de haagse Zomer
26 t/m 30 Juni 1991
Opposite:

Right:
355. Guillermo Kuitca.
Untitled, 1992. Painting

Domestic I.D., IV, 1992. Print
357. Arata Isozaki.
Convention Hall, Nara, Japan.
1992. Architectural drawing
Sculpture

363. José Leonilson.
Drawing

364. Louise Bourgeois.
Ste Sebastienne. 1992. Print

opposite:

365. Rody Graumans.
85 Lamps Lighting Fixture. 1992. Design
366. Christopher Bucklow.
16,000 Solar Images; 1:23 P.M.,

367. Terence Davies.
Film
368. Sigmar Polke.
Painting
Marilyn; 28 years old. Las Vegas, Nevada; $30. 1990–92.
Photograph

opposite:
370. Juan Sánchez.
For don Pedro, 1992. Print

371. Raymond Pettibon.
No Title (The Sketch Is). 1992. Drawing

372. Rosemarie Trockel.
THE SKETCH IS AS COMPLETE AS IT IS RAPID, AND A HEARY WORLD OF EXTRITION AND OF STUFFED TOLERANCE IS UNVEILED WITH A SINGLE GESTURE.
373. Mark Steinmetz.
Knoxville. 1992. Photograph

374. Gabriel Orozco.
Maria, María, María. 1992.
Drawing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juan</td>
<td>555-1234</td>
<td>123 Main St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>555-4321</td>
<td>432 Oak Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>555-5678</td>
<td>567 Pine Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>555-8765</td>
<td>678 Maple Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena</td>
<td>555-9876</td>
<td>789 Cherry Ln.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego</td>
<td>555-6789</td>
<td>890 Elm St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar</td>
<td>555-9087</td>
<td>087 Oak St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvia</td>
<td>555-7865</td>
<td>654 Pine Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto</td>
<td>555-1321</td>
<td>213 Oak Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luisa</td>
<td>555-4312</td>
<td>321 Elm St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>555-5432</td>
<td>231 Oak Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>555-6321</td>
<td>123 Maple Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafael</td>
<td>555-7213</td>
<td>321 Oak Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia</td>
<td>555-8123</td>
<td>231 Oak Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>555-3214</td>
<td>123 Maple Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hector</td>
<td>555-1324</td>
<td>231 Oak Rd.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prototype Architecture School,
Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles,
Architectural drawing


opposite:

382. Helen Chadwick.
Number 11 from the series
Photograph

Photograph
383. Chris Marker.
The Last Bolshevik
(Le Tombeau d'Alexandre),
1993. Video

384. Zacharias Kunuk.
Saputi, 1993. Video
385. Anselm Kiefer.
Grane. 1980–93. Print

386. Glenn Ligon.
Runaways. 1993. Prints
RAN AWAY, Glenn, a black male, 5'8", very short hair cut, nearly completely shaved, stocky build, 155-165 lbs., medium complexion (not "light skinned," not "dark skinned," slightly orange). Wearing faded blue jeans, short sleeve button-down 50's style shirt, nice glasses (small, oval shaped), no socks. Very articulate, seemingly well-educated, does not look at you straight in the eye when talking to you. He's socially very adept, yet, paradoxically, he's somewhat of a loner.

RAN AWAY, Glenn. Medium height, 5'3", male. Closely-cut hair, almost shaved. Mild looking, with oval shaped, black-rimmed glasses that are somewhat conservative. Thinly-striped black-and-white short-sleeved T-shirt, blue jeans. Silver watch and African-looking bracelet on arm. His face is somewhat wider on bottom near the jaw. Full-lipped. He's black. Very warm and sincere, mild-mannered and laughs often.

RAN AWAY, a man named Glenn. He has almost no hair. He has cat-eye glasses, medium-dark skin, cute eyebrows. He's wearing black shorts, black shoes and a short sleeve plaid shirt. He has a really cool Timex silver watch with a silver band. He's sort of short, a little hunky, though you might not notice it with his shirt untucked. He talks sort of out of the side of his mouth and looks at you sideways. Sometimes he has a loud laugh, and lately I've noticed he refers to himself as "mother."

Ran away, Glenn Ligon. He's a shortish broad-shouldered black man, pretty dark-skinned, with glasses, kind of stocky, tends to look down and turn in when he walks. Real short hair, almost none. Clothes non-descript, something button-down and plaid, maybe, and shorts and sandals. Wide lower face and narrow upper face. Nice teeth.
307. Rosemarie Trockel.
What It Is Like to Be What You Are Not. 1993. Prints
388. Brice Marden.

Red-Orange Panel with Curve, 1993. Painting
392. Roni Horn.

How Dickinson Stayed Home. 1993. Installation
393. Robert Therrien.
No Title. 1993. Sculpture
394. Derek Jarman.
Blue. 1993. Film

opposite:
395. Fernando Campana
and Humberto Campana.
Vermelha Chair. 1993. Design
396. Antonio Citterio and Glen Oliver Low.
Mobil Container System.
1993. Design

397. Jean Nouvel.
Architectural drawing
398. Rachel Whiteread.
Sculpture.
Ian Hamilton Finlay.
Prints
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400. Martin Scorsese.
The Age of Innocence.
1993. Film

401. Ximena Cuevas.
Bleeding Heart. 1993.
Video
402. Charles Ray.
Family Romance. 1993.
Sculpture

404. Cheryl Donegan. Head. 1993, Video
405. Jos van der Meulen.
Paper Bags Waste baskets.
1993. Design
   Amateur, 1994. Film

406. Quentin Tarantino.
   Pulp Fiction, 1994. Film
409. Lorna Simpson.
Prints.
410. Renzo Piano.
Kansai International Airport, Osaka, Japan.
1988–94.
Architectural model

411. Takeshi Ishiguro.
Rice Salt-and-Pepper Shakers.
1994. Design
412. Kim Jones.
Untitled. 1991–94.
Drawing
413. Andreas Gursky.
Shatin. 1994. Photograph
opposite:
414. Mona Hatoum.
Silence. 1994. Sculpture

above:
415. Teiji Furuhashi.
Video Installation
ABUSE OF POWER COMES AS NO SURPRISE

RAISE BOYS AND GIRLS
THE SAME WAY

Truisms projects. 1980–94.
Multiples.
Robert Gober.

Untitled. 1993-94.
Sculpture
419. Ann Hamilton.
Seam. 1994. Video
Installation
420. Ross Bleckner.
Memorial II. 1994. Painting
Michael Schmidt.
Unity (Einheit).
1991–94. Photographs
422. Thomas Roma.
Untitled from the series
Photograph

423. Richard Artschwager.
Five untitled works. 1994.
Sculptures
424. Uta Barth.
Ground #34. 1994.
Photograph
425. Cy Twombly.
The Four Seasons: Autumn, Winter, Spring, and Summer.
1993-94. Paintings
Jim Nature Portable Television
1994, Design

427. Rineke Dijkstra.
Tia, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
1994. Photographs
428. Marlene Dumas.
Chlorosis. 1994; Drawings
429. Hella Jongerius.
Soft Vase. 1994. Design

opposite:

430. James Turrell.
A Frontal Passage. 1994.
Installation
431. Jeff Scher.
Garden of Regrets.
1994. Film

432. Barbara Kruger.
Public projects and illustrated book. 1986-94. Prints
433. Louise Bourgeois.
Fenelon. 1994. Drawing

Tan Delta Force Fin. 1994. Design
435. Roni Horn.
Island-Pooling Waters.
1994. Illustrated book

436. Jean Nouvel.
Less Table. 1994. Design

437. Alberto Meda.
Long Frame Chaise Longue.
1994. Design

opposite:
YOU BECAME A
SCIENTIFIC PROFILE
440. Louise Bourgeois.
Ode à ma mère. 1995.
Illustrated book
441. Marcel Wanders.
Knotted Chair. 1995. Design
442. Tom Friedman.
Unstitied. 1995. Sculpture

opposite:
443. Peter Halley.
Exploding Cell Wallpaper. 1995. Prints

overleaf:
444. Toba Khedoori.
untitled (Doors). 1995. Drawing

"A los ojos de la Historia"

(altura de 200 m)
opposite:
447. KCHO (Alexis Leyva Machado), "In the Eyes of History." 1992-95. Drawing

left:
449. Laurie Anderson.
Puppet Motel. 1995. CD-ROM

450. Joel Sanders.
Kyle Residence, Houston, Texas.
Project, 1991–95. Architectural model
452. Sigmar Polke.
Bulletproof Vacation magazine. 1995. Prints

opposite:
453. Chuck Close.
Dorothea. 1995. Painting
Juli–August 1995
(Foundation Bauhaus Dessau, Jul–Aug 1995)
1995, Poster
Sheron Rupp.

Untitled (Bayside, Ontario, Canada).

1995. Photograph
457. Stan Douglas.
Untitled. 1992-95. Painting
459. Inoue Pleats Co., Ltd.
Wrinkle P. 1995. Design

460. Luc Tuymans.
Drawing
461. Luc Tuymans.
The Heritage IV. 1996.
Painting
462. Joel Coen. Fargo. 1996. Film

463. John Sayles. Lone Star. 1996. Film
Ah ! Grain-de-Bceau. Je passe que tu beau. Il y a longtemps que je n'ai vu de John en notre chef. Maroun, le cook. Glafar, Barmakide, dans le troisième port. Ils sont aussi perspicaces que toi. Quant à Grain-de-Bceau, il continue à subir Zobfida. Il a après le festin et de multiples épisodes. Abbott-Novas, poète (enfin, je le considère ainsi). Puis, comme le soir tombait, il fit briller les flambeaux de la lallt à la réception posée à organiser le concert, comme toutes les autres, quand on frappa à la porte. Il fut peu surpris de voir les quatre derviches de la première musique. Il ajouta : « C'est le plus grand des idées que j'ai jamais eu. » Il jeta un coup d'œil à Grain-de-Bceau. Il appela : « Maître, je suis le Khalifat. » Je te donne le diwan et, déposant le coffret (sur lui la bénédiction et la piéce) accepté qui les lui offrissaient. Ton esclave, j'ai pris cette attention de cet adolescent et lui de ma générosité. »


« Mon digne, du moins, il a rendu son esclave à la grâce de ma fille ! Ah ! puisse Allah d'ailleurs. » Alors je lui répondis : « O ma maîtresse, accepte donc cette pièce de sole ! Et d'ailleurs elle ne sera pas la seule ! Mais, je t'en prie, accorde-moi cette faveur d'admirer un instant ton visage qui m'est caché. » Alors elle releva l'étincelle qui lui voilait le bas de la figure et qui ne laissait apercevoir que les yeux.

« Et je vis ce visage de bienfaisance, et ce seul coup d'œil suffit à me jeter dans un trouble extrême. Il a frappé l'amour en mon cœur et m'enleva la raison. Mais elle se mit à baisser son voile, prit l'étincelle et me dit : « Mon maître, que ton absence ne dure pas trop longtemps. »
465. Flex Development B.V.
Cable Turtle. 1996. Design.

466. Mona Hatoum.
Rubber Mat. 1996. Multiple
468. David Hammons.
Drawing

opposite:
469. KCHO (Alexis Leyva Machado). The Infinite Column I. 1996. Sculpture
opposite:

471. Gabriel Orozco.
Light Through Leaves.
1996. Print

472. Chris Ofili.
North Wales. 1996.
Prints

473. Jeanne Dunning.
Untitled. 1996. Photograph
474. Thomas Demand.
Room. 1996. Photograph
475. Andrea Zittel.

476. Werner Aisslinger.
Juli Armchair. 1996. Design

479. Toray Industries, Inc.
Encircling Fishing Net. 1996.
Design

482. Kiki Smith.
Constellations. 1996.
Print

1996 | 437
thinking her deed done she soundly settles into a deep meditation on the nature of her New World.


opposite:


overleaf:

488. Fred Tomaselli.
Bird Blast. 1997. Painting

489. Chuck Close.
Self-Portrait. 1997. Painting
495. Stan Brakhage.
Commingled Containers.
1997. Film

Opposite:
496. Reiko Sudo.
Origami Pleat Scarf.
1997. Design

opposite:

500. Kiki Smith.
Illustrated book

452 | 1997


Prints.
AND
504. Franz West. 
Hangaround, 1997. 
Drawing (two-sided)
505. Lewis Klahr.
Pony Glass. 1997. Animated Film
506. Sue Williams. 
Mom's Foot. Blue and Orange. 1997. Painting

opposite:

507. Yukinori Yanagi.
opposite:
508. Zhang Peili.
Video installation

right:
509. David Williams.
Thirteen, 1997. Film

510. Pipilotti Rist.
Video installation
GUY LEANING OVER HIS CAR, IT'S BRIGHT YELLOW. HE'S SPONGING DOWN THE WINDSCREEN. SOMEONE YELLS, "I'VE GOT IT MAN... I'VE GOT IT." THE GUY LOOKS UP BEMUSED OUTSIDE.

YOU SEE THEY'RE SHINING EVEN MORE. IT'S GONE STROBING BEHIND THE OTHERS, YOU SEE IT AGAIN IN GLIMPSES. THE OTHER CAR'S EVEN CLOSER AND THE DRIVER "SHUFFLES" BUDDY. "THEN HE'S GRABBING THE PETROL PUMP, POINTING IT AT THE GUY. SAYING, COAXING, "TRY IT MAN... JUST TRY IT..."

ALL THREE OF THE MEN ARE OUT PUSHING AROUND. "TO MISS THE MASKED FOR A MOMENT BY THE BIG TREE IN THE FOREGROUND, DRAGGING THE FIRE ALONG UNDERNEATH. THEN IT PULLS STILL AND THE WHOLE BODY JERKS ON THE CHASER.

"THE GUY TRENDS THEN REV'S EVEN HIGHER. YOU SEE ALL THE OTHER CARS. ALL DIFFERENT COLOURS BLINKING PAST, THEN THE RED CAR'S VISIBLE AGAIN - JUST THE SHINY SIDE IT'S HIM ONTO THE BONNET. SLAM. HE YELLS, "GET AWAY FROM THE CAR... MOVE IT... GET IN..."


SOMEONE FROM THE BACK SHOUTS, "I THINK WE'RE LOSING THEM!" SOUNDS BREATHLESS AND MUTE. THEIR EXPRESSIONS ARE STRANGE, SO TOTALLY FIXED, THE OH MIDDLE OF THE ROAD. THE BACK TIRES SLING ACROSS THE TARMAC FIRST AND A HUGE CLOUD OF EXHAUST SMOKE'S BELCHING OUT BEHIND.

THE FRONT NOW. THE RED CAR KEEPS BASHING INTO THE WHITE ONE, BUT IT'S AS IF THE CAR TRENDS THE RED ONE BASHES IN AND I THINK IT GETS LIFTED OFF THE ROAD. THEN SUDDENLY THE ROAD'S RIGHT THERE IN BETWEEN THEM.
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511. Fiona Banner.
Break Point. 1998. Print

1 9 98
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512. Konstantin Greic.
May Day Lamp. 1998. Design

513. Julia Loktev.
Moment of Impact. 1998. Video

opposite:
514. Paul Winkler.
Rotation. 1998. Film
515. Charles Long.
Internalized Page Project.
Richard Serra.
Sculpture

overleaf: interior view
518. Anish Kapoor. 
Wounds and Absent Objects. 
519. Terry Winters.
Prints

520. Gerhard Richter.
521. Gabriel Orozco.
Photograph

opposite:
Favorite Objects. 1998. Prints
524. Matthew Barney.  
Drawing

525. Kara Walker.  
African/American.  
1998. Print
526. Luc Tuymans. 
The Blue Oak. 1998. 
Drawing

527. John Madden. 
Shakespeare in Love. 1998. Film
528. Robert Rauschenberg.
Bookworms Harvest. 1998. Painting
529. Chris Ofili.
Untitled. 1998. Drawings

530. Enrique Chagoya.

Appendix:

531. Lisa Yuskavage.
Asspcker and Socialclimber. 1996–98. Prints

532. Elizabeth Peyton.
Bosie. 1998. Print
534. Ralph Schmerberg.
"Los Toros," a commercial for Nike footwear. 1998. Film

535. Mariko Mori.
Star Doll. 1998. Multiple

(What are you getting ready for?)
opposite:
538. William Kentridge.
Seated Couple (Back to Back).
1998. Drawing

539. William Kentridge.
Untitled (drawing for Stereoscope).

above:
540. Phil Solomon.
Twilight Psalm II: Walking
Distance. 1999. Film
542. Andreas Gursky.
Toys "R" Us, 1999.
Photograph
543. Barbara Bloom.  
A Birthday Party for Everything.  
1999. Multiple

544. Jean-Marie Straub  
and Danièle Huillet.  
Sicilia! 1999. Film

545. Carroll Dunham.  
Ship. 1979–99. Painting
Steak and Kidney *
Ethambutol Hydrochloride
Tablets
400mg
100 Tablets

Cornedbeef® 200
200 mg Amiodarone Hydrochloride Fr.P.
28 Tablets

Cornish 100mg/5ml
Pasty
Rifampicin B.P.
To be taken by mouth
Peas

Salad™ tablets
Lamivudine
Each coated tablet contains
lamivudine 150mg
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546. Damien Hirst.
The Last Supper.
1999. Prints
opposite:
347. E. V. Day.
Prints

right:
346. Chris Ofili.
Prince amongst Thieves. 1999. Painting
552. Jean-Luc Godard.
The Old Place. 2000. Video
Faith Hubley.
Matthew Barney.
The Cabinet of Bally Fay La Foe.
2000. Sculpture
Essays

504  Sets and Situations | M. Darsie Alexander

507  Mind over Matter in Contemporary Design | Paola Antonelli

510  Lest We Regret: Reflections in Film | Mary Lea Bandy

513  Home and Away | Fereshteh Daftari

516  One Thing After Another: Serial Print Projects | Judith B. Flecker

520  Aspects of Documentary Photography in Europe Since 1980 | Susan Kismaric

524  The Vanishing Monument and the Archive of Memory | Roxana Marcoci

527  Relentlessly Transparent | Terence Riley

530  We’re No Angels: Recent Violent Movies | Joshua Siegel

534  Size Specific | Lilian Tone

537  Wednesday’s Child | Kirk Varnedoe
A view through a window opens to an idyllic outdoor scene (plate 225). Butterflies are gently perched on budding flowers. Carnations, daffodils, and roses grow from the earth, bathed in the bright light of the sun. Intense colors abound—blues, yellows, reds, lavenders—offset by the soft gauzy fabric of a curtain. A second space is implied, a domestic world demarcated by glass, curtain, and latticework. Moving back and forth between the scene and the window, the eye detects a disturbing incongruity: the window is at ground level, restricting the field of vision to a worm’s-eye perspective. Once this peculiar orientation is registered, strange details previously overlooked become pronounced: a rotten piece of fruit over-taken by insects and a mammoth beetle crawling along a dead branch. Suddenly the whole scene becomes oversaturated: too many butterflies, too much color, too many flowers. Nature is all wrong.

At the same time, it is exactly right. The artist who made this photograph, Gregory Crewdson, carefully prepared every detail of this image, from the placement of the flowers to the strategically fallen tree, and assembled the entire scene on a platform in his studio. Crewdson belongs to a generation of artists who have forsaken the tradition of photographing the world of everyday events in order to fashion their own alternate realities, creating sets and situations exclusively for the camera. Using their skills as fabricators, sculptors, lighting technicians, and set designers, these artists build discrete self-contained environments, which range from the eerily familiar to the utterly fantastical, and sometimes encompass both.

Working in this state of “retreat” from the outside world has enabled them to exert a high level of control over all aspects of their endeavor, down to minute details. Whereas a photographer who takes pictures in the street traditionally depends on his or her instantaneous reaction to external stimuli, those who prefer a studio or staged outdoor environment engage in a fundamentally more studied and introspective process. Images do not present themselves through a rapid succession of encounters, but are born of a premeditated, elaborate, and imaginative process of execution.

A shift toward what has been termed “fabricated photography” or “the photography of invention” came about gradually, the result of a growing awareness of photography’s fictionalizing attributes. During the 1960s, artists and critics began to challenge many of the prevailing assumptions about photography’s objectivity, examining how the meaning of an image can be shaped by many factors, from the politics of its maker to the context of its presentation. As thinking about photography began to change, so too did the profiles of its practitioners. Artists with no conventional training in photography adapted the medium to their own ends, combining it with other practices such as painting, printmaking, and performance. Photography also served a practical purpose in the recording of impermanent installations and performances. Many artists began to devise their own Happenings for the camera, appearing as principal players in private dramas. These simultaneous developments—a growing critical awareness of photography’s complex relationship to truth and fiction, and its new role in documenting artist-generated performance theater and tableaux—established the essential groundwork for what would become a move toward staged photography in the 1970s and 1980s.
James Casebere began to create simple cardboard cutouts for the camera in the 1970s, piecing together modest architectural elements for black-and-white tableaux. Though inspired by familiar structures and environments, Casebere’s photographs present a deliberately alienating space in which themes of suppressed violence lurk just beneath the surface. One set may evoke a childhood classroom as remembered in a nightmare, another may suggest a scene from a forgotten movie. His 1985 image of an overturned covered wagon shot through with arrows (plate 138), for example, recalls a still from a Western in which Native Americans attack a migrating frontier family and leave the scene in ruins. The disturbing reference to recurring myths of Native American brutality that underlies this image is amplified by Casebere’s stark execution. Built of plaster and Styrofoam and haunted by a surreal light, his generic model is frightening and severe. Harsh contrasts of black and white accent and disguise form, and the closely cropped compositional field is shallow and suffocating.

For Laurie Simmons, the invention of artificial worlds is not merely an artistic activity but one that has its roots in childhood games and playthings. Dolls, dollhouses, and toy furniture are the mass-produced props of her still-life tableaux, and the nexus of a universe centered on femininity and domesticity. Fascinated by how dolls serve to reinforce sexual stereotypes and shape girls’ fantasies about their future lives as mothers, wives, and homemakers, Simmons orients her work on the plastic female figurine as the object of girlhood fixation. Her imagery is by turns bleak, nostalgic, and humorous. In the late 1980s she embarked on the Walking and Lying series, in which isolated accouterments—a handbag or perfume bottle, for example—function as the upper body for a (typically) female lower half (plate 242). These amalgamated figures are photographed head-on and in dramatic stage lighting, as if on display as a nightclub act.

Since the 1980s, staged photography has increasingly involved narrative situations in which human subjects engage in a form of role-playing, acting out particular attitudes and emotions according to the artist’s designs. But unlike the work of an artist such as Casebere, which proclaims its artifice on impact, the contrived nature of these images is often more difficult to detect. Pictures that appear to provide a transparent view into the real world may show only subtle signs of staging—perhaps lighting that is unnatural, or an action that seems posed. Such images constitute a kind of puzzle that the viewer is left to sort out, measuring those elements that seem plausible against those that are not exactly “right.” This game is further complicated when the photographer adopts a style or look—such as that of a snapshot, for example—that suggests the picture was made spontaneously.

To the extent that a staged photograph involves a human presence and storyline, it also requires acting. No artist has evinced talent in this realm more successfully than Cindy Sherman. In 1977, she began an experiment using costumes, props, and wigs as a means of casting herself in a variety of movie-inspired roles: femme fatale, runaway, sex kitten, working girl. The resulting series of sixty-nine photographs, the Untitled Film Stills, was ground-breaking in its interrogation of clichés of femininity, and established Sherman as a master of disguise who could imitate both the look of actual film stills and the heroine types they depicted (plates 2, 3, 4, 5, 6). In the Centerfolds series (1981) Sherman expanded her repertoire, this time playing teenage girls caught in a moment of extreme vulnerability—hanging by the telephone, daydreaming in bed, or simply waiting for someone unknown or for something unforeseen to happen. A girl lies dreamily on a linoleum floor in Untitled #96, grasping a newspaper clipping in her hand as if it holds the key to some future happiness (plate 41). Her faraway look belies a secret fantasy, perhaps of escape or romance. While the girl’s attitude is one of tranquillity and repose, the image itself is replete with visual tensions: the tight cropping of the frame (which serves to entrap the figure), the bright clash of orange hues, and the threatening position of the camera (and viewer) bearing down on the subject from above. As the object of the camera and the eye behind it, Sherman creates a deliberately unsettling composition that captures with equal force themes of vulnerability and aggression.

The pictures of Philip-Lorca diCorcia are a blend of fact and fiction. Created in everyday
settings—on the street or indoors—they are dramatized excerpts of daily life, touching on universal themes of human isolation, boredom, and uncertainty. Often there is nothing specific “happening” in diCorcia’s photographs; his subjects (who play themselves) are typically more reflective than active. Nevertheless the mood of the work is highly personal and psychological. In one picture, a woman looks up as her lover pulls at his pants in an ambiguous gesture of dressing or disrobing (plate 62). Is this an awkward moment of departure or the beginning of an afternoon tryst? In another, a heavily made-up transvestite clutches herself against the backdrop of the city street, as a young male prospect in high-top sneakers studies her from behind (plate 369). The emotional force of these pictures resides not only in the subjects’ expressions and interactions (or lack thereof) but in the theatrical effects the artist has exploited to intensify the scenes, particularly through strong contrasts of light and dark. Experienced in commercial photography and inspired by the movies, diCorcia inflects reality with the suggestion of fantasy, frequently bestowing his subjects with an otherworldly aura. His pictures evoke the veneer of Hollywood and glossy magazines, but they also reflect a deep consideration of private human struggles, which ultimately form the center of his narratives.

Whether staged interactions between people or fabricated setups in the studio, the process of producing a photograph has become an increasingly complicated undertaking. The photographer’s role—newly expanded to encompass that of visionary, director, and master of ceremonies—is no longer restricted to a position behind the camera, where an image is generated through a simple click of the shutter. On the contrary, the realization of a single idea may involve extensive measures and a team of professionals, a veritable movie crew of make-up artists, technicians, set designers, and prop masters. Yet the question remains: Why a photograph and not, say, a film or installation, as the culmination of these efforts? Perhaps one explanation is that the still photographic image continues to invite a suspension of disbelief, even when it is equally a product of fantasy and a reflection of reality. A photograph ultimately functions as a contained window through which an alternate world may be perceived, and in that way provides an opportunity, however momentary, for the viewer to glimpse something mysterious, unfamiliar, or out-of-the-ordinary. It is also a format that offers clues to an implied narrative; in this respect it functions as many paintings and film stills do.
The best contemporary objects express history and contemporaneity; manifest physically the material culture that generated them; speak globally; carry memory as well as an idea of the future; and spark, like great movies, a sense of belonging while also carrying us to places we have never visited. The best contemporary objects express consciousness by showing the reasons they were made and the process that led to their making. Contemporary design is vigorous with experimentation and creativity—optimistic, honest, and aware.

The multifaceted character of contemporary materials calls for an essentially rigorous and conscious approach to design. Designers are already responding, spontaneously, to this call, and are conceiving products for a sophisticated progeny that has learned to recognize patterns of beauty in pragmatic and economic ideas.

Our perspective on the material world has changed dramatically during the past twenty years. After the sensory and material overdrive of the 1980s, the design world now privileges simplicity and originality. This new attitude is exemplified by the Dutch collective Droog Design ("dry design") formed in 1993 by curators Renny Ramakers and Gijs Bakker, who had noticed a unique brand of ingenuity and economy that connected several Dutch designers despite their differences in age and background. Their coherent minimalist aesthetic provided a link with Dutch tradition, as well as elements for a manifesto. Droog Design made its first appearance at a time when the material world seemed unable to tolerate redundancy. In the fashion world, Miuccia Prada and Tom Ford were breaking new ground by taking garments one step beyond the previous threshold set by the Japanese avant-garde, with a sophisticated blend of high-tech simplicity and visual rigor that, despite its minimal appearance, called for very steep price tags.

Likewise, the apparent modesty of the objects by Droog Design, made of recycled parts and using visibly low technology, was crowned by unexpectedly high prices. Droog Design became the international symbol of a new less-is-more approach and of a political correctness in design, so dry and visually spare as to look impoverished—an illusion supported neither by the manufacturing process nor by the retail prices. Thus a deeply ingrained character of hypocrisy entered the functional arts in the early 1990s. Among the most renowned objects from this period in the Museum’s collection are Tejo Remy’s 1991 “You Can’t Lay Down Your Memory” Chest of Drawers (plate 331) and Rody Graumans’s 1992 work, 85 Lamps Lighting Fixture (plate 365), both accumulations of found objects that seemingly use the resources of the world without asking the world for any further effort; and Hella Jongerius’s Soft Vase of 1994 (plate 429), one of a series of straightforward, archetypal flower vases made of soft polyurethane.

Toward the mid-1990s, many signs confirmed this minimalist cultural shift toward subtraction. At a 1995 design conference, the third in a series of conferences known as Doors of Perception, organized in Amsterdam by the Netherlands Design Institute on the theme of “matter,” Dutch trend forecaster Lidewij Edelkoort gave a poignant audiovisual presentation of natural fibers, Donald Judd-like furniture, recyclable materials, and translucent soap bars. The world, one could assume from her talk, wanted fewer, better, clearer, sounder things, and at any cost. In the same passionate search for cleanliness, Japan was the
first country to market air by offering whiffs of pure canned oxygen for sale in street-vending machines. In May 1997, at a symposium at the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art devoted to the theme of “icons,” the art historian Alexander Nemerov spoke eloquently about a new American icon: bottled noncarbonated water. He had joined the chorus to point out an apparent need for a cleaner, purer lifestyle.

After the stylistic impositions of the 1980s, the succeeding years have been somewhat similar to the period that followed World War II, when a fresh injection of previously restricted technologies and new materials joined with an objective need for new dwellings and objects to build a triumphantly modern material culture. Just like the 1950s, these are optimistic times, marked by a renewed attention to domestic living and human mobility, guided by concerns about the environment and by a strong international political consciousness, and fueled by exuberant progress in technological research. In contemporary design, ethics are as important as aesthetics, and morality—even moralism—inspires many contemporary objects, fortifies their purpose, and motivates “users” to rid themselves of redundancies.

As a consequence, the design landscape has changed during the past twenty years. Furniture has become sleeker, and less formal and impertinent. Accessories have become smaller, more personalized, and easier to use. Technological advances, which allow for many more variations and degrees of freedom within the same manufacturing cycle, assist in this new phenomenon.

Today, high and low technology can coexist peacefully. Advanced materials, such as the aramid fibers of Marcel Wanders’s 1995 Knotted Chair (plate 441)—roughly knotted in a fishnet, then dipped in epoxy resin, and finally frozen in the shape of a low chair—can be customized and adapted by the designers themselves. Some advanced materials, like the carbon fiber of Alberto Meda’s Light Light Armchair of 1987 (plate 182), actually demand manual intervention. Indeed, experimentation at any technological level requires a hands-on approach to test new materials and techniques that do not yet have a fixed set of applications. In the process, thanks to the flexibility and novelty of the materials and manufacturing methods available, designers have managed to discover new formal and functional possibilities. Japanese textiles, such as Reiko Sudo’s work for Nuno (plates 381, 496, 497) provide a dramatic example of what technology based on materials can do for aesthetics.

New techniques are now used to customize, extend, and modify the physical properties of materials and to invent new ones. Materials can be transformed by engineers and by the designers themselves, and adapted in order to achieve their design goals. The 1995 exhibition Mutant Materials at The Museum of Modern Art introduced progress in material technology and culture through the innovative transformation of materials in product design and function. According to the exhibition, adherence to the truth of a material, a tenet of historical modern design, is no longer an absolute. Materials have become curiously malleable and sensitive to a designer’s intentions. Ceramics, for example, can now look and act like metal, just as plastics can feel and perform like ceramics or glass. A “monastic” wood stool can be surprisingly soft. A knotted rope can be as sturdy as metal.

The substances we used to know and recognize have become the basic ingredients for unexpected combinations, opening up a new world of possibilities for designers and manufacturers. No longer adjuncts in passive roles, materials have been transformed into active interpreters of design. Instead of being mere tools in the design process, they inform and guide it. The changed character of a material is not merely a function of the quantity and diversity of the objects it can produce: it is related to the diversity of its functional properties. Design is energized by an endless search for the perfect balance between means—available materials and techniques—and goals, such as a super-light chair, a mass-produced steel floor lamp, or low-cost foldable furniture to be sent to disaster areas. In this quest, contemporary materials have acquired a new importance in that they are often instrumental in the inspiration for, and achievement of, superior design and manufacturing goals.

Lightness, for example, is the theme of many celebrated contemporary designers, the obsession of many researchers in materials technology, and a feature of almost instant appeal for consumers.
It is also widely accepted as an important ecological goal for the future: "In a sustainable economy, the guiding principle is 'the lighter the better.'" One milestone of enlightened, precocious design in the Museum's collection is the already noted Light Light Armchair by Alberto Meda, a successful design that became a design paradox. When it was first introduced in 1987, the chair so literally pursued the idea of lightness that it sacrificed any chance of commercial success. The public did not accept the chair, which was made of carbon fiber, was perfectly sturdy and supportive, but weighed less than a kilo: its minimal mass made most customers feel uncomfortable and insecure, and production ended after a limited run of fifty samples. Many new materials are able to embody even more evanescent and emotional functions than lightness, for example, in Mary Ann Toots Zinsky's Bowl, a work of glass filaments (plate 99) and Tom Dixon's S-Chair of 1991 (plate 323). One of the most sublime objects in the Museum's collection is Shiro Kuramata's 1989 Miss Blanche Chair (plate 253). Kuramata's masterpiece, a chair only in name, is in fact a sculpture, a lyrical exercise in contemporary beauty. Its goal and its intended function, as can be perceived subjectively, is sheer emotion, evoked by red silk roses suspended in a throne of perfectly translucent acrylic resin. Kuramata indicated many new directions for design, employing the most up-to-date technologies to show how materials and objects can consciously and deliberately carry meaning, feeling, and memory. He contemplated the established rules of modernist design and filtered them through a Japanese sensibility. He chose a classic black-and-white cubic dresser and deformed it gently on its own axis. He took white bookshelves formed in a rigid grid and varied the rhythm of the grid within the piece. By attacking only one of the variables in the modernist equation instead of many at a time, he created surprise and enlightenment. He did this by looking deep into the well of his own material culture to apply its tenets to the most enhanced innovations of global technology. In the same fashion, the German lighting designer Ingo Maurer has taken advantage of the excellent technological tradition of his culture to perfect delicate and poetic lamps. The Lucellino Wall Lamp, 1992 (plate 354), a little angelic bulb with wings, can be gradually turned on and dimmed by touching with two fingers any metallic part of the lamp, thanks to a sophisticated and innovative wiring system. Local tradition is a powerful antidote to modernist mannerism. In recent decades, local cultures have proven to be, for design and architecture alike, the most meaningful way to move beyond modernist style without giving up the salutary qualities of modern design. Materials and techniques are the ambassadors, the most visible manifestations of local material cultures. Some countries, whose material tradition is based on craftsmanship and whose economy is based on necessity, like Brazil, are being looked at as new models for inspiration in architecture and design. Fernando and Humberto Campana, brothers from São Paulo, elaborate on the rigid tubular-steel frame that is the signature of traditional modernist chairs and add to it traditional colorful cotton ropes to form their very comfortable Vermelha Chair of 1993 (plate 395). The available materials are used in harmony with their capabilities, according to what Arthur Pulos calls "the principle of beauty as the natural by-product of functional refinement," a timeless principle that has often been used to define quality in design.

Notes
1. Dr. G. J. Wijers, [Preface], in A. Beukers and E. van Hinte, Lightness (Rotterdam: 010 publishers, 1998).
The evocation of memory is hardly new in art, but it can appear, especially in film, in unexpected ways. Contemporary independent filmmakers working in the narrative tradition have often imbued their stories with a reflectiveness as startling as it is seductive. Their thoughtful films—less ambitious technically than major studio productions, in terms of special visual effects and multitrack sound, yet no less so artistically—search the human spirit in intimate ways, pondering the preoccupations or obsessions of their writers and directors. An independent artist like John Cassavetes, struggling to understand emotional ties in *Love Streams*, 1984 (plate 112), or an eighty-year-old old-master, Akira Kurosawa, working on a small scale in *Dreams*, 1990 (plate 279), are filmmakers who follow no prescribed route, and adhere to no established school or studio. Their pursuits, instead, expand the notion of the “personal” cinema that has long characterized the individual vision, the poetry, and the astounding beauty put before us by truly independent filmmakers such as Stan Brakhage. His biomorphic abstractions in color, including the five-minute-long *Commingled Containers*, 1997 (plate 495), or the artistry of Ernie Gehr in his structuring of perspective and motion above city streets in *Side/Walk/Shuttle*, 1991 (plate 320), are riveting essays in cinematic experimentation.

From the 1960s onward, the concept of *auteur* cinema, which emerged in critical discourse, served as a guide for our recognition of a Cassavetes or a Kurosawa, a consistent voice, identifiable in style, approach, or content, regardless of the size and scope of the production. Whether or not this concept still governs our thinking today, it is interesting to consider contemporary works that engage—much as the *auteur* works have—our hearts and minds in profound ways, rather than merely our senses. This is particularly pertinent in revisiting the works of filmmakers who are obsessed with memory and loss. Though it may seem contradictory, it is these filmmakers—like artists in other mediums who probe the distant or immediate past—who often evoke the most absorbing, at times elegiac, homages to truth in perception.

The perception of actuality, with a moral edge, has long been deemed a worthy goal of filmmaking. In the same sense, creators of films acting as journalists, have aimed at presenting factual truths, even as their works often got those facts wrong. Film genres established early in the twentieth century internationally included historical adaptations, gangster movies, war epics, and biographies of famous, or infamous, people. More often than not, these films glorified the past in broad strokes, even as they attempted to critique it.

In the last two decades of the twentieth century, filmmakers and commentators saw the world change several times over, in quick succession and in complex ways. They, and we, lacked simple threads to tie new developments into neat cultural packages. In a period of unprecedented economic prosperity and worldwide communication, we witnessed deep poverty and illiteracy, diseases and plagues, terrorism and ethnic cleansing, and ecological devastation. As entranced as we were by penetration into a vastly more complex universe than we previously had understood, so too were we horrified, in our earthbound neighborhoods, to learn of the abuse and murder of innocent children. Called into question, as we attempted to interpret our new times, were the...
influential legacies of Marx, Lenin, Einstein, and Freud. Technological innovation threatened to substitute itself for ideology, but utopian visions of problem solving were countered by a growing sense of victimization. We were reminded that World War II was still of consequence.

Faced with so imposing an array of issues, numerous filmmakers pursued personal perceptions rather than attempt to mirror current events. Those who thought to step back from the complex present, to delve into memory and search understanding, opted to work within self-imposed boundaries: autobiographical musings, nostalgic recall, meditations on violence, and lamentations on illness and death. All of these came forth in formats that ranged from the miming of home movies to direct sociopolitical exposition. Genre and other traditional descriptive categories were of little use here; what were wondrous were the cinematic expressions of passions, fears, and delights in worlds closely observed and deeply felt. Some approaches are reticent, others instinctive, and still others cheeky. Some take a distinctly moral point of view, others are intentionally ambivalent.

The recycling of texts and tales is a constant source of inspiration, and the complete edition of Shakespeare’s plays and sonnets gathers no dust in the filmmaker’s study. In Looking for Richard, 1996 (plate 478), Al Pacino intuited a complex relationship between actor and text as he prepared the staging of the play Richard III, and he queried the relevance of Shakespeare for most everyone he encountered at the time, in neighborhood and workshop, including contemporary interpreters such as Kevin Kline and Kevin Spacey. The intensity of his search and his eagerness to grasp the essence of his theater through the particular rhythms of his daily investigative beat capture the passion that filmmakers bring to their obsessions.

Looking for meaning on the West Side of New York offers the restless artist an urban map for a personal odyssey. Woody Allen, that chronicler of Manhattan on both sides of town, created his homage to a passing West Side culture with Broadway Danny Rose, 1984 (plate 117), spicing its delicatessen hilarity with a melancholy touch, shot in the self-conscious black-and-white cinematography that he used to great effect in capturing the urban scene.

Music, as much as cinematographic tonalities, is key to mood and character. Jazz, for example, is inseparable from Clint Eastwood’s sensibility. In Bird, 1988 (plate 212), Eastwood concentrates with unusual intensity on the familiar theme of an artist’s self-destruction—in this case the downfall of the saxophonist Charlie Parker, a gifted performer who revolutionized jazz during the 1940s but whose drug addiction overruled his efforts to behave. Forest Whitaker, as Parker, captured the angst of the musician, blowing on his sax to the soundtrack of Parker’s recordings. The film itself entered territory thought to be off-limits for a mainstream filmmaker and amateur musician, but in taking us along on nights in the city in slow time, without giving us a pedantic history lesson, it tells us much about Eastwood’s abilities to trust in his instinct and his passions, and to sidestep easy moralizing.

Martin Scorsese daringly interwove text and music in his most passionately felt probe for spiritual truth, The Last Temptation of Christ, 1988, adapted from the novel by Nikos Kazantzakis (plate 232). As the film reveals the torments of a sensual self-doubting Jesus when he becomes the messenger of God, its sincerity and beauty are enhanced by the provocative music of Peter Gabriel.

The last film of an American master surprised all who had met him decades earlier as the brash young director of The Maltese Falcon, 1941. For John Huston’s The Dead, 1987 (plate 192), his son Tony adapted the short story from The Dubliners by James Joyce, and his daughter Angelica played the gracious wife who laments the lost true love of her youth. The finely calibrated atmosphere of melancholy, during a holiday dinner set in 1904, and the hushed elegance of the performances seemed a generous and extraordinary remembrance from a dying artist.

The sorrows and joys of childhood tugged at the memory of filmmakers who created some of their most expressive works about their own or others’ youths. A narrative structure of quiet, gentle rhythms belies the intense preparation undertaken by the actors who were the protagonists of Thirteen, 1997 (plate 509), a Virginia family led by a devoted mother and her daughter, Nina, whose first year as a teenager finds her restless and confused. Filmmaker David Williams
dug deep, through a unique process of rehearsal and improvisation, to expose the sense of isolation and yearning that Nina is unable to articulate. So troubling is her struggle with adolescence that she must run away from a loving family and friends, in order to come back home and accept that she is too young to legally drive, let alone own a car.

Similarly, Terence Davies crafted—through the rich, painterly colors of lush cinematography and nuanced blend of family chatter and music on the radio—a look back on his own childhood in *The Long Day Closes*, 1992 (plate 367), set in Liverpool during the mid-1950s. A sensitive eleven-year-old boy, loved and guarded by his mother and siblings, cherishes every chance to dream of Hollywood musicals, and we are transported with him into his world of magic and memory.

Such films take us through familiar territory in unexpected ways: Williams through his year-long association with his actors, and Davies through his exquisite selectivity of word and image. In neither film do we miss an explanation of a father's absence. A remarkably tough, seemingly almost brutal, rendering of a daughter and her father is *Moment of Impact*, 1998 (plate 513), by Julia Loktev. More stylized than *vérité*, the black-and-white cinematography coolly captures the daily miseries of Loktev's father, paralyzed from an accident, and her mother, who must take care of every task. Each suffers terribly, and although the mother can articulate her frustrations, she resents her daughter's intrusions, and those of the camera. The filmmaker's strength fosters our sense of her weakness, for we are left wondering what is exploitation, and what is a search for truth and understanding.

The memory film—especially the sort devoted to making us reflect on the most incomprehensible horrors of World War II—was forever changed by Claude Lanzmann's *Shoah*, 1985 (plate 129), which gradually reveals layers of truth through nine hours of interviews, comprising the recollections of those who endured the Holocaust, as victims or oppressors.

Jean-Luc Godard, an artist who ceaselessly layers truths and serves them forth, in films or videos, as essays, dramas, or meditations on the past, is among the most personal of all makers of moving imagery. For Godard a work is a collage of seconds of fictional films, newsreels, television programs, paintings, and photographs overlaid with carefully chosen words whose letters are rearranged to suggest multiple meanings, and enhanced by his own narrative voice and the music of Beethoven or Bob Dylan. Since 1974 Godard has created films, such as *Sauve qui peut (la vie)*, 1980 (plate 11), and videos that are intended to be discerned as a continuous discourse. This has been followed by essays of moving imagery spanning the twentieth century, including *The Old Place*, 2000 (plate 552), a meditation on art in collaboration with Anne-Marie Miéville.

Another creative partnership, is that of Jean-Marie Straub and Danièle Huillet, whose 1999 sixty-six-minute film *Sicilia!* closed the millennium on an uncompromising note (plate 544). Adapted from the 1939 novella *Conversations in Sicily* by Elio Vittorini, the narrative offers a dialogue between an exile returning to his country after many years and the people he meets on his voyage into the past. Each encounter, especially that with his mother, is understood as a passage for the man, yet seemingly buries more than it exposes in conversations as harsh as the intense sunlit landscape. Straub and Huillet shot the encounter of child and parent in black and white, as did Loktev, to give clarity to toughness and truth, and also focus to the quiet but unsettling perceptions of mothers who suffer and endure.

Reflection in film achieved no more astonishing impact than in *Blue*, 1993 (plate 394), directed by Derek Jarman. While dying of AIDS, Jarman recorded a monologue in which he talked of his treatment, set in part against the backdrop of a program of church music. All we see on the screen is a swath of color, a dense, bright, sky-blue that seems at times to quiver as we listen to the voices. It is not radio, it is not a painting, it does not appear to be cinema in any way in which we know it, but a more powerfully personal voice cannot be readily conceived, nor are we ever the same after experiencing this mighty film.
In the last two decades, the escalating interconnections throughout the world have made "globalization" a master concept and a key term. An expanding market economy and thickening net of communication have touched, and often altered, an exceptionally broad range of cultures, traditions, and practices. There is no agreement as to what this ongoing process may ultimately yield, for better or worse. Where some have damned it as a new form of colonization, a kind of transnational dominance based on an ideology of consumerism, others have hailed the way it weakens oppression by nation-states and liberates local cultures. Pessimists see globalization as suppressing differences, while optimists see it fostering their proliferation. We have seen arguments that the phenomenon is an old one and a new one, a question of Eurocentrism or American capitalism, antagonism or emancipation.

Contemporary artists often cross cultural boundaries, and have been implicated in and attentive to these changes and debates. Their traffic within the networks of globalization is multidirectional. Western artists, such as John Cage (plate 297), Francesco Clemente (plates 83, 152), Wolfgang Laib (plate 197), and Bill Viola (plates 142, 416), by immersing themselves in the cultures of the East, have reaffirmed a familiar linkage between modern art's dominant centers and formerly peripheral cultures. But other artists, of non-Western origin, have also created more complex and unprecedented hybrids in their physical and in their spiritual "residences." Transition has been the order of the day, shuttling between a variety of global terms and an equal mix of local identities. It should not be surprising, then, that vessels of transit, such as boats, recur in the imagery of artists from so many different points of the globe.

Cai Guo-Qiang is a telling example. Born in Quanzhou, in the Fujian province of China, he studied in Shanghai, has exhibited in Asia, Europe, America, Australia, and South Africa, and now resides in New York—where he first showed Borrowing Your Enemy's Arrows (plate 536), a sculpture that embodies a metaphor for cross-cultural exchange. The work is built on the skeleton of an old fishing boat, excavated near the port where the artist began his personal journey. Bristling with 3,000 arrows designed by the artist, and fabricated in his native city, the ship flies the flag of contemporary China, but refers to the nation's deeper history. Historical texts (known as sanguozhi) recount how General Zhuge Liang, lacking ammunition in the face of a heavily armed enemy, was ordered to procure 100,000 arrows in ten days. The legend recounts that, on a foggy night, the general sent a boat loaded with bales of straw across the river, toward his foes. When the enemy had fired volley after volley of arrows at this decoy, the general pulled it back, full of a captured store of fresh ammunition. One subject of the sculpture, then, is how a culture may appropriate and transform foreign intrusions into a defensive strategy.

The Infinite Column I (plate 469), made in Cuba by the artist KCHO (Alexis Leyva Machado), also takes up the theme of the boat, but navigates in different waters, and points to another aspect of globalization: migration. KCHO, unlike Cai Guo-Qiang, lives in a country whose ties to the world market have been severed by a United States embargo. Still, he has been featured in numerous international exhibitions, and his field of reference cuts across political boundaries. The Infinite Column I is in part a conscious homage—in its
title, its form, and its artisanal mode of production—to the early modern sculptor Constantin Brancusi, who himself drew constantly on the folk traditions of his native Romania while living in Paris. Brancusi's major outdoor monument, a 1938 war memorial, includes a stacked and modular Endless Column made of steel. KCHO's open-lattice structure, seemingly jury-rigged from building scrap and common hardware, has a very different character. As flimsy as a drawing outlining a dream, it is willfully precarious and provisory. Embodying the triumph of aspiring ambition over impoverished means, these multiplied boat forms, rising upward, irresistibly conjure the worldwide migratory phenomenon of "boat people," fleeing their homelands—even if the sculpture, and its creator, elude any simple political categorization. KCHO's boats may in fact be traveling to the Cuban mainland (and Havana) from his destitute native Isla de la Juventud.

Poetically ethereal yet monumental and looming, his ascending, gyrating boats open onto the broader meanings of voyage and transit, freighted with both hope and peril. Another KCHO work, the drawing In the Eyes of History (plate 447), may have a more pointed intent. By re-imagining one of early Communism's masterworks—Vladimir Tatlin's 1920 vision for a colossal Monument to the Third International—as a drip coffeemaker, KCHO seems to make a sardonic comment on the translation of distant Soviet ideals into local Cuban realities.

In such complex circumstances, where local inflections are informed by broad education in an international modern tradition, and where the artist's life experience may involve a variety of cultures, native and adopted, it is often far from obvious how one should identify any particular "ethnic element" in a given body of work. Perhaps it is more useful to think, as Edward Said has suggested, of the pervasiveness of a "contrapuntal" consciousness, inherent in the way exiles experience, by definition, more than one culture, one home. Mona Hatoum, for example, was born in Beirut to Christian Palestinian parents, but since 1975 she has been in effect an exile, based in England. The forms of her work reflect the West and her British art training, but the content is more personal and less easy to associate with any one culture. Often her expression involves the use of, or reference to, the body—a device that may reflect what she says is the absence, in her Palestinian inheritance, of a simplistic mind-body dichotomy, but one that is also intimately tied to the epoch of AIDS and its broader artistic renewals of an often macabre fascination with the corporeal and organic. Silence (plate 414), for instance, made of test tubes on which the movement of light gives the illusion of fluid traveling in transparent arteries, seems quietly to fight for its own life. More generally, elements of instability—a lack of anchoring, slippery ground, shifting maps, and dangerous terrain—define the experience of much of Hatoum's art, and its lingering sense of deracination. A mat, as entrails (plate 466) beneath one's feet sums it all: no welcome at any location. Similarly, the art of Toba Khedoordi (plate 444)—an artist living in Los Angeles, but born in Australia to Jewish Iraqi parents—has no particular ethnic inflection, but her ghostlike architectural sites may be taken to speak of an unspecified place left behind.

The work of Anish Kapoor, by contrast, involves a transnational vision that is deliberately, evidently bifocal. Half Jewish Iraqi, half Indian, Kapoor left Bombay for London in 1973, but has persistently maintained in his art traces of his Indian heritage. His 1986 sculpture A Flower, A Drama Like Death (plate 164) enacts a coming together of opposites—the male and the female, the erotic and the spiritual—in ways that evidently evoke such Western origins as Alberto Giacometti's Surrealist sculptures, Yves Klein's notions of color, and Carl Jung's typologies. But the work is just as evidently associated with the sexually charged Hindu combination of lingam and yoni, and the intense powdered pigments of Kapoor's Indian culture. The work is permanently bathed by the willful ebb and flow of two cultures.

Chris Ofili, especially, defies easy cultural categorization. Born in Europe—in Manchester, England—Ofili is the son of Nigerian immigrants. Living in London, he has been concerned less with any simple recovery of African roots than with contemporary stereotypes of his race. And the vehicles of his expression—intricately worked paintings that seem at once gaudy, pungent, and tender—are extravagant hybrid fictions. In Prince amongst Thieves (plate 548), the caricatured pro-
file of a black man, decked out in a necklace crowned by a rough ball of elephant dung, is embedded in an explosive web of elaborate pattern, iridescent color, and surrounded by countless small collaged heads of black men clipped from contemporary magazines. Derived from some exotic tale, the quintessential fiction of the Thousand and One Nights, he looms large in this nocturnal scene, like a dark, expanding, hallucinogenic vision.

As a sophisticated young member of a lively urban art community, Ofili is fully conversant with long-standing debates pitting abstraction against figuration, craft against ready-made appropriation, and so on. Hence the hybrids in his work bring together not only inflections of different cultures, but also elements of opposing approaches within modern Western art. The highly decorative, cake-icing surface, for example, seems right in step with certain trends of the 1990s, but its swarming fields of small resin dots actually stem from dot drawings the artist saw in Zimbabwe. The elephant dung offers a still more complex origin. An appropriated, "transgressive" ready-made material taken from the London zoo, it also conjures up African tribal art, where its presence is affirmative and even sacred. Its inclusion suggests an outsider translating European strategies, and, at the same time, an exile looking back with a new eye on indigenous practices. Ofili is neither and both. Playing on a complicated scale where respect and veneration match satire and degradation in a way that mingles an almost over-sweetened lyricism and lushness with an occasional obscenity, Ofili reinvents—one might say fabricates—the experience of his richly layered selfhood, tethered to several cultural traditions and outsiders' perceptions.

Hybridization is no absolute novelty, but until now only Western artists (Gauguin and Matisse to name two) have received attention, at the expense of Third World artists grappling with the mainstream. The brand new spotlight currently focused on the many individual "creole" languages of various artists may represent nothing more than a trendy thirst for exoticism. Globalization, as stated before, raises a host of unresolved questions, and a globalized field of art poses similar conundrums. Are the borrowings from and minglings of references from marginalized cultures only a savvy strategy of "niche marketing," bound eventually to exhaust the freshness of their appeal, or are they the signal of a growing wave of art that will render obsolete many of the frontiers, boundaries, and self-enclosed traditions that have been so determining? Is this a phenomenon of greater tolerance of expanded diversity, or only the cloak for an increasing homogenization? In all the cases touched on here, fluency in the language of Western art has been a requisite for access to the global sphere of exhibitions, museums, galleries, and journals. It may be fair, then, to wonder whether, in the process of featuring and enabling difference, the new art world is ultimately weakening the authority of any zone of resistance, such as those artists who choose not to speak in the current vernacular of the marketplace.
The making of art is, in many ways, predicated on the copy. The original, its likeness, and the successive presentation of related images have always been central to the development of artistic representation. But the arrival of Pop art and Minimalism in the 1960s, with their proliferation of reproductive and serial imagery, altered our understanding of these basic concepts. Andy Warhol’s pervasive repetition of images from the mass media, and Sol LeWitt’s infinitely repeatable geometric works, among many others, displaced the historical categories of the unique, original, and hand-made in art.

Printmaking played a crucial role in the development of these new art forms in the 1960s because it inherently involves mechanization, standardization, and serial production. The printmaker’s ability to reproduce images quickly and repeatedly, as well as to create developmental imagery through the progressive printing and reworking of proofs, made printed work a natural medium of experimentation and innovation. Through the print series or portfolio, artists could show multiple images together, emphasizing the relationship among parts rather than a singular presence.

The innovations of the 1960s established strategies that contemporary artists have adopted, but with notable shifts. Whereas serial projects were formerly dominated by the modular repetition of geometric shapes (LeWitt and Judd), or the depersonalized successions of everyday objects and images (Warhol and Lichtenstein), today’s projects emphasize content over formal experimentation, and engage more frequently with nontraditional mediums. Installation, performance, and video art, photography, and new-media technology (including digitization, virtual reality, and the internet) have expanded artistic vocabularies, and artists are increasingly drawn back to the printed series because it enables further exploration into the multiple, developmental, and spatial structures of these other mediums.

**Standardization**

The print series is perhaps most easily understood in terms of classic seriality, or the repetition and variation of a standardized part to build the larger structure of a work. Individual parts can sometimes be shown in isolation, but more often the artist’s intentions are only fully grasped in the presentation of the entire set. Numerous contemporary works build upon such systems of logic and push them in new directions. In fact, in Warhol’s last printed project, *Camouflage*, 1987 (plate 188), we can see a shift from the straightforward seriality of the 1960s (Campbell’s Soup Cans, Marilyns) to a more experimental approach.

While Warhol continued to take his subjects from popular culture until the end of his life, in later years, he often stressed their abstract qualities. This abstraction provided his serial imagery with new complexity. The relationship of camouflage fabric to the artist’s obsession with disguise, as well as its symbolic association with militarism, gives the project a satirical tone, but the portfolio is most compelling because of its complex visual structure. Warhol took the same section of camouflage fabric and subjected it to manipulation not only through color variation, but also through changes in scale and orientation, creating an enigmatic relationship among the prints. The group of eight prints in *Camouflage* actually comprises four...
distinct pairs, each one depicting a different level of detail.

For John Armleder, whose work explores the relationships of art, design, and ornamentation, the print portfolio is an ideal correlative to his work in other mediums. In Gog, 1996 (plate 467), Armleder draws upon Minimalist strategies by using a standard shape—the circle—and creating thirteen different variations. Armleder infuses each print with shocking colors, including fluorescents and metallics, that make the targets pulsate. By virtue of these eye-teasing Op-art colors, the work parodies the aloof stillness and standardization associated with serial Minimalism. While the individual composition harks back to the 1960s, particularly to Kenneth Noland’s concentric circle paintings and Bridget Riley’s pulsating forms, the hard-edge variation from print to print—coupled with targets that burst beyond the square of the paper—turns a simple geometric motif into an ongoing optical event.

Gerhard Richter, who has dealt with recycled imagery since the 1960s, expands upon classic seriality by infusing the standardized unit of the square with abstract markings in the portfolio 128 Details from a Picture (Halifax 1978), 1998 (plate 520). Yet, in a typical Richter twist, the seeming irregularity and arbitrariness of these units are actually governed by a series of parameters established by the artist. The portfolio is based on 128 photographs the artist took in Halifax in 1978 of one of his abstract paintings. He then classified the photographs into eight sets of sixteen, each representing a particular angle, distance, and lighting condition. They were then arranged in a large grid for a unique collage. Continuing his long-standing practice of making printed images after photographs, Richter then transformed this collage into the print portfolio. The eight sheets—their largest grids of sixteen similar units—yield 128 reconstituted parts that evoke images ranging from lunarscapes to oil spills.

Circles of subtle color create a serial structure of diaphanous forms in the portfolio Wounds and Absent Objects, 1998 (plate 518), by Anish Kapoor, whose work in sculpture explores the concepts of space and emptiness, using abstract forms and color. The portfolio is based on a project Kapoor did for BBC television in which an abstract void continuously changed colors, creating the perception of emerging and receding space. To make the prints, the artist isolated this movement in nine video stills that were then printed onto rectangular plastic sheets through a complex pigment-transfer process. The resulting images, when shown together, give the impression of changing light, color, and space, as shown in the original video.

Spontaneity

Contemporary serial structures often strategically employ serendipity and embrace chance, spontaneity, and impulse. In the 1960s, art based on materials, surroundings, and actions, was often explored in printed form, and today artists continue to evolve and reinterpret these strategies by incorporating new systems and technological advances.

Terry Winters’s portfolio of woodcuts, Graphic Primitives, 1998 (plate 519), comprises nine cellular networks that mutate from print to print, suggesting an organic metamorphosis rendered through drawing. This approach to imagery variation stands in stark contrast to the hard-edge, mechanical variance found in portfolios such as Warhol’s Camouflage or Armleder’s Gog. But like much of Winters’s work, Graphic Primitives appears to merge natural formations with synthetic systems, creating tension between gesture-based and technological designs. This complexity, in fact, is no coincidence. The images were first drawn and then scanned into the computer and manipulated digitally, which gave the set a mechanical quality. In addition, the woodcuts were made from blocks cut with a computer-programmed laser, adding another twist to the shifting boundaries between standardization and impulse, mechanization and manual arts.

The tension between standardization and spontaneity also emerges in the prints of Yukinori Yanagi. The five etchings in Wandering Position, 1997 (plate 507), appear—at a distance—to be simple variations on the shape of the rectangle. Up close, however, these free-floating forms are filled with a dense network of wiry lines, which become less penetrable toward the corners and outer edges. To create each print, the artist traced the path of a single ant confined to the surface
of an etching plate. Based on a performance piece in which the artist tracked an ant with crayon directly onto the floor of a gallery, the prints subvert the rhetoric of Minimalism—dictated by the rectangular size of the metal etching plate—to explore the concepts of movement and entrapment. The irregularities of the rectangles create uneven pathways for the ants, underscoring the unpredictable forces driving the serial structure.

Chris Ofili’s print project *North Wales*, 1996 (plate 472), is an expression of the artist’s varying state of mind during his travels through the country. At each stop along his way, in a chronological fashion, Ofili incised a different metal plate prepared with an etching ground. These spontaneous visual ruminations were later transferred into ten printed images. The resulting networks are highly intricate patterns, loosely related to the patterning found within the layers of Ofili’s large paintings, but more specifically based on the artist’s ruminations at each creative moment. The images differ widely, yet serial uniformity is maintained by the artist’s use of a consistent approach and format throughout his journey.

**Time**

Yanagi’s incorporation of an ant’s physical movement and Ofili’s own visual travelogue suggest yet another type of the serial project in the contemporary period: the two-dimensional representation of time, motion, or events. The film-animation artist William Kentridge develops a narrative in his portfolio *Ubu Tells the Truth*, 1996–97 (plate 501), employing the Surrealist poet Alfred Jarry’s fictional character Ubu—a symbol of the physically grotesque and politically brutal—as a metaphor for the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Ubu is depicted in two ways, using different etching techniques: as a white chalkboard drawing based on Jarry’s cartoonlike character (with a spiral belly and pointed head), and a more literal textured human counterpart (based on a photographic self-portrait of the artist). Ubu is shown acting out symbolically in ten different prints, for example, cleansing himself under the shower, scratching his back, lying on a table under an interrogation lamp, and looking at himself in the mirror. With this series, Kentridge illustrates the imaginary acts and scenes of a play (numbering each print), creating the basis for a subsequent film animation and a live theater production.

The progression of time within a singular dramatic moment is depicted in the prints of E. V. Day, known for her site-specific installations that capture stop-action explosions of socially-charged objects and materials, such as a blow-up sex doll or fashion gown. Seizing upon the sequencing capabilities of the print, Day illustrates the unfolding of an explosion from one stage to the next in *Anatomy of Hugh Hefner’s Private Jet (1–5)*, 1999 (plate 547). She created the series of five prints by tracing a blueprint of Hefner’s private jet, “Big Bunny,” and then gradually transforming the drawing into a mass that permutates, from print to print, into diffuse matter. Furthermore, by replicating the medium of the blueprint, the project parodies the seriousness of the airplane’s original design.

Movement and narrative are explored by Julian Opie with works that merge post-Pop imagery and the computer age to present scenes straight out of virtual reality. Using the flatness and color density of the screenprint, which is both friendly and alienating in his work, Opie takes us on a virtual trip through city and country: *Imagine You Are Driving: Cars?; Imagine You Are Walking: Cityscape?; Gary, Popstar; Landscape?*, 1998–99 (plate 541). The images are instantly recognizable for their generic simplicity, but also strangely unfamiliar because of their hyper-technological edge. The prints, in fact, are derived from the artist’s evolving library of computer-scanned images, which he then manipulates. And although the sequence within the series is interchangeable, when shown together the prints create a narrative about the way we inhabit and navigate the different spaces of our world.

Peter Halley’s Web project for *Exploding Cell* draws upon both classic seriality and the temporal structure of the printed series. In 1995 Halley created a series of nine black-and-white images, *Exploding Cell*, which depict a cartoonlike organic structure in the process of exploding. These technological abstractions, printed from a digital file onto sheets of paper, can be installed as wallpaper in a gallery (plate 443). Later Halley turned this
series into a Web project, which enables users to access and design their own exploding cells. Users are directed to choose one of the nine images and then to select from 256 colors available for shading the different parts of the cell. Once the design is complete, the image is printed. Taking its cue from the expansiveness of 1960s repetitive imagery, such as Warhol’s endless grids of S&H Green Stamps or colors of the Marilyn portfolio, Halley’s project provides unlimited replication of nine images, as well as over sixteen million possible color variations. The project is permanently installed on the Web and will never lose its quality—the first copy is as pristine as the millionth—marking a new chapter in the discourse on reproduction and seriality.

Although the serial project is strongly linked to the particulars of printmaking, its principles also extend beyond. Whether through formal experimentation, content-driven approaches, or the representation of action and time, the serial structure has assumed an increasingly important position in all mediums. Among examples in other mediums are the stark, gridded architectural photographs of Bernd and Hilla Becher (plate 198), and the stackable rectangular modules of Antonio Citterio’s and Glen Oliver Löw’s Mobil Container System (plate 396). The serial narrative of Gerhard Richter’s monumental fifteen-canvas *October 18, 1977* (plate 210) relays media fragments from a singular event, the murder of the German Baader-Meinhof group; while the extended narrative of Seiichi Furuya’s photographs (plates 27, 28), documents his wife in portraits over a four-year period. The pervasiveness of the serial project perhaps speaks to an overriding contemporary interest in process and continuity over the singular work or finite moment—a way of representing process itself as the reality of the world that surrounds and defines us.
In the last several decades, two countries have emerged as leading centers of contemporary documentary photography in Europe: Germany and Great Britain. Each has a distinct photographic tradition that extends back to the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; and a significant segment of contemporary work frequently bears a debt to these early beginnings. Germany and Great Britain are now the most important sites in a field that also includes Spain, the Netherlands, France, and Russia, among others.

In Germany, despite the devastation of World War II, an infrastructure for a serious artistic photographic community had emerged from many diverse sources and was in place by the late 1970s. Beginning in the late 1960s, the German painters Sigmar Polke, Gerhard Richter, and Anselm Kiefer, all of whom use or have used photography as a medium, or use photographs as a basis or starting point for their work, contributed to the presence and consideration of photography within the German art world. The work of these important postwar painters began to be shown internationally in the 1970s, lending credibility to the consideration of photography as a significant medium that could be employed in complex ways. By the mid-1980s photographers were beginning to compete successfully with painters for attention and space on the walls of galleries and museums.

In 1959 Dr. Otto Steinert, hired to teach photography at the Folkwang School in Essen, Germany, set up a collection of historical photography at the Museum Folkwang, and used the collection to teach and organize annual exhibitions of historical photographs. Upon his death in 1978, Steinert’s private collection and library were added to the museum’s holdings, and one of his students, Ute Eskildsen, became the curator of the combined collections. Eskildsen provided a venue for new work by younger photographers, and her exhibitions of lesser known figures from German photographic history have added to the evolving photographic infrastructure. She has also organized biannual exhibitions of the photographs of the recipients of grants for contemporary German photography, among them Michael Schmidt, Anna and Bernhard Blume, and Andreas Gursky.

In addition, two German schools were major influences on students of documentary photography: those who studied with Bernd and Hilla Becher at the Kunstakademie in Düsseldorf (where Nam June Paik and Joseph Beuys also taught) and those who attended the Werkstatt für Photographie in Berlin, founded by Michael Schmidt.

The work of Bernd and Hilla Becher derives from the French encyclopedic tradition of typologies, in which the gathering and sorting of individual things within a category contributes, through comparison, to an understanding of the whole. Typology’s photographic tradition is best exemplified by the work of the German photographer August Sander, who created a multi-volume atlas of German social and professional types. Sander’s project was halted in 1933 when the Nazis confiscated the printing plates, but much of it was published posthumously as *Citizens of the Twentieth Century*. Other notable German photographic typologists were Albert Renger Patzsch and Karl Blossfeldt, both of whom applied the method to the study of plant life.

Gas tanks, blast furnaces, industrial facades, water towers, and coal tipples—the archaeological remains of the industrial age—have been the subject matter for Bernd and Hilla Becher since 1957. The Bechers and their students, now into a third generation, have taken this “objective,” or neu-
nal, language of photographic description to create “proofs” of the historical symbology of the twentieth century. The Bechers’ work (plate 198) comprises grids of black-and-white photographs of the same kinds of structures, frontal views made from the same distance and vantage point. They look more like pictures commissioned by engineers or industrial architects than expressive, artistic work. Contemporary German photographers who studied with the Bechers, such as Thomas Struth, Thomas Ruff, and Andreas Gursky, have applied this methodology (minus the grids) to other subjects, in photographs that are reflective of their own generation.

In the work of Thomas Struth (plates 282, 283, 284), this methodology has been applied to landscapes, city streets around the world, the housing flats of Chicago, and the office buildings of Hong Kong, as well as to people in various countries, notably visitors to museums. In his landscapes there are no people, recalling nineteenth-century photographs made for topographical purposes. Struth exploits the camera’s capacity for seemingly uninflected vision. Rather than use photography to document the past, as in the case of the Frenchman Eugène Atget, however, he uses his neutral views of the present-day world to return the viewer to the self—in the present—in order to make us think about the future.

Thomas Ruff (plate 234) has photographed the expressionless faces of anonymous Germans, mostly students and friends, with a blandness that denies authorial intervention and invites a kind of microscopic inspection of his large-scale color portraits. Discouraging our interest in the individuals pictured, Ruff’s portraits precipitate questions about the relationship between photography’s descriptive capacity and the traditional implications of portraiture.

In the photographs of Andreas Gursky the typological methodology has been applied to subjects around the world, focusing on global commercialism as seen in stores, public institutions, and other sites. Through the use of advanced photographic technology Gursky has created a body of work that reflects the current world. He perfects his “neutral” color imagery through digital alteration of the work, erasing details that distract us from the intended impact of the picture. In the case of Toys “R” Us he removed birds, thus rendering the subject devoid of organic presence (plate 542). Or, as in another example, he uses the computer to replicate digitally half of a space to create a symmetrical whole. Gursky’s large-scale pictures create a world we feel we can walk into: they alert our sensual and intellectual consciousness to the overwhelming presence of consumerism at the end of the twentieth century. In his pictures, Gursky seems to be striving toward a kind of perfection, a photograph that represents all pictures.

The work of Gursky and Struth, like that of the Bechers, is made from what might be called a middle distance, where the horizon line runs more or less across the center of the picture, providing a somewhat distant and seemingly unmediated view. The individual work of these young Germans comprises a kind of archive. In the work of the Bechers, selections from the archive are brought together by the grid system. In the work of the younger generations it is the gathering of pictures, often very large-scale work, that brings aspects of the archive to one site (the exhibition space or book) for contemplation.

Drawing on the style of the German typologist Karl Blossfeldt, the Spanish photographer Joan Fontcuberta (plate 61) has utilized a serious contemporary critique of photography to convey cultural clichés and stereotypes with a droll sense of humor. In his studio, Fontcuberta has created a pseudoscientific photographic study of nonexistent flora and fauna. In an effort to undermine the scientific and factual aspects of photography, he created plants in his studio using various materials, labeled them with invented Latin names, and “documented” them with invented data in the style of Blossfeldt.

The work of the Dutch artist Rineke Dijkstra is, tangentially, an extension of the German school of the Bechers. Dijkstra always works in series, photographing people who are experiencing similar psychologically and sensually heightened states of mind: self-conscious, awkward teenagers in bathing suits, women who have just given birth, or matadors who have just left the bull ring. The common denominator among these groups is vulnerability and how the individual copes with it in front of the camera. In the diptych, Tia,
Amsterdam, 1992 (plate 427), we see two close frontal views of the subject’s expressionless face, one made the week she gave birth and the other six months later. The photographer complicates our notions of “before” and “after,” by reversing the chronology of the pictures on display; the last comes first.

Bernhard and Anna Blume are Cologne artists who have been collaborating since 1980 on conceiving, staging, and photographing themselves in what they call Photo Actions. In the 1960s they studied at the Düsseldorf Kunstakademie when Joseph Beuys was there. Their work derives from the Performance art of the late 1960s and 1970s, which was often documented by photographs. Kitchen Frenzy, 1986 (plate 144), records nightmarish encounters with inanimate objects such as potatoes and kitchen utensils, which assume a life of their own. These photographs undermine the seriousness of the daily rituals of traditional, German middle-class life.

Another major aspect of German photography was produced by the students of the Werkstatt für Fotografie in Kreuzberg, Berlin, beginning in 1976. Michael Schmidt, founder and director of the workshop, invited many American photographers to teach studio classes and to lecture, among them Robert Frank, William Eggleston, Ralph Gibson, Robert Adams, John Gossage, and Lewis Baltz. The work of these American documentary photographers, who were then largely unknown in Germany, was experienced through their widely published books and their visits to the workshop. Schmidt, reacting to the practice of German photographic trade schools designed to train photographers for applied photography, understood that the strong American infrastructure for photography was important to the future of German photography and that such an infrastructure could be created in Germany. Schmidt, born in 1945, confronted the wrenching and divisive effects of the war by making and nurturing work that would be expressive of the individuals of his generation.

Schmidt’s project, U-ni-ty (Ein-heit), 1991–94 (plate 421), is represented by an installation view of photographs made in Berlin, where he lives. The work was done after the Berlin Wall came down and is a meditation on Berlin’s condition as a newly united city, and one that is burdened with the weight of its historical past. As elliptical as the individual photographs may be, the sum is an overpowering montage evoking ineffable tensions and despair.

Thomas Florschuetz (plate 132) emigrated from East Germany in the late 1980s and lives in Berlin. Since he began photographing he has used himself as his subject, compiling diptychs and triptychs in which he rearranges close-up images of parts of his body into jarring juxtapositions evocative of neo-Expressionist art. The work is aggressive both through its monumentality and its intimacy. It also recalls European Performance art of the 1970s, especially the Vienna Actionists, whose extreme simulations of brutal self-mutilation were documented photographically.

In Great Britain the persistent division of classes created an insistent photographic anti-establishment that demanded a documentary tradition rooted in social change. As early as 1877–78, the photographs of John Thomson in his book, Street Life in London, documented the lives and work of the city’s under-class. The work of Bill Brandt, who photographed his countrymen of all classes and conditions beginning in the 1930s, was of major significance to postwar documentary photographers. Such photography experienced a new life during the years that the conservative Margaret Thatcher was Prime Minister. Chris Killip, Paul Graham, and Martin Parr photographed the various rungs of England’s social ladder. Killip’s works (plates 246, 306), are a kind of bitter poem in which Newcastle is a place of unrelenting despair, where an irrevocable, unidentifiable social force has undermined the individual lives pictured. The cumulative expression of the reality of life in post-industrial England in his deeply original pictures is a political and personal cry of rage.

Paul Graham’s work describes the boredom and frustration of people waiting in employment and social-service offices across Britain (plate 111). Often printed in large format and in color, his photographs are realistic depictions of demoralizing conditions. The use of color in social documentary photography is somewhat a case of “working against type.” Black-and-white photography has traditionally been regarded as more “real”
than color, where the harsh "facts" of a situation are not softened through the seductive powers of appealing colors. In Graham's picture the garish colors of these well-worn government sites encourage us to accept the scene before us as a contemporary reality, not a historic abstraction.

The humor of Martin Parr's photographs (plate 261) is in sympathy with the British literary tradition of satirical writers such as Jonathan Swift and Evelyn Waugh, whose caustic wit lampooned England's social hypocrisy, landed aristocracy, and political institutions. Historically, social-documentary photography rarely focused on anyone but the poor or very rich. Parr's send-ups of Britain's middle classes are especially suited to description in color. The color charges his work with an energy descriptive of his subjects' contemporary vitality.

The French photographer Patrick Faigenbaum has photographed the Italian aristocracy in their homes since 1984 (plate 148). The people in his pictures, whose world is closed to most of us, are described as simultaneously available and distant. They often appear as small figures entrapped by the grandeur of the past and by the burden of their individual familial lineage.

Outside Europe, with the fall of the Soviet Union, pictures by Russian photographers critical of current social conditions and the former Soviet government have come to the fore. In the work of the Ukrainian Boris Mihailov, through a series of panoramic views we see a fallen population (literally and spiritually), victims of unemployment and alcoholism in his hometown of Kharklov, right after the fall of Communism (plates 313, 314, 315). This spontaneous moment, descriptive of a general cultural condition, is evocative of the work of the great French photographer Henri Cartier-Bresson and that of the Czech photographer Josef Koudelka.

One of the surprising aspects of much current European documentary photography—especially in relation to that of the United States—is that the Europeans seem to have reactivated and revitalized the potential of photographic description of the real world. While the Americans maintained a belief in and appreciation of what is traditionally called "documentary" photography well into the 1970s, many turned away from it mid-decade, retreating to the studio to create their own worlds. Many European photographers, on the other hand, in returning to the origins of the medium, are confronting the world straight on and embracing it with updated tools (computers, color, and large-scale prints), despite its overpowering complexity and global scale.
The Vanishing Monument and the Archive of Memory

The question of memorialization has been salient in the thinking of the last half century. How do we remember the past? What role do public monuments play in mediating history and memory? In an era that resonates with the aftereffects of World War II, the Vietnam War, and the removal of the Berlin Wall, the need to recollect has intensified. Yet, paradoxically, the capacity of traditional monuments to preserve memories proves ever more precarious: considering that they either extol or absolve the deeds of history, monuments seal the process of remembering, thus reducing viewers to compliant observers. It is as if, James Young writes, once we ascribe "monumental form to memory we have to some degree divested ourselves of the obligation to remember."1

Post–World War II artists have systematically engaged in an aesthetic interrogation and implicit rejection of the monumental. Even as monuments continue to be commissioned, debates over how to probe the past from new critical perspectives have produced more active modes of memory-telling, fusing historical inquiry with an awareness of the ways history has been passed down to us.

The advent of “counter-monuments” (monuments conceived to undermine the premises of their own being) in the late 1960s constitutes an effective visual component to the period’s protests over war and civil-rights issues. An early instance is Barnett Newman’s Broken Obelisk, 1963–69, a twenty-six-foot-tall pillar forged on the unstable-looking tip-to-tip junction of an upright pyramid and an up-ended obelisk with a fractured shaft. Dedicated to Martin Luther King, Jr., following his assassination in 1968, the work at once represents a conventional heroic form and reverses public expectations of it. A subsequent example is Robert Morris’s War Memorials, 1970, a series of five lithographs conceived in direct response to the United States bombing of Cambodia in that year. Morris proposed a group of visionary monuments, each a colossal earthwork in the shape of a negative space: a crater, a trench, a star imprint, a nuclear-waste repository, and a void left behind by destruction.

Recent decades have seen the actualization of distinct negative-form memorials, particularly in Germany. Artists engaged in this practice, such as Horst Hoheisel or Jochen Gerz and Esther Shalev-Gerz, argue that no monument can better represent the conflicted motives of memory in contemporary Germany than a literally invisible or vanishing monument. In view of fascism’s misuse of monumentality, their argument is especially appropriate to the antifascist memorial, but also holds true for the commemoration of other victimized peoples.

In his Proposal for a Monument to the Survival of the University of El Salvador: Blasted Pencil (That Still Writes), 1984 (plate 95), an etching produced to protest Ronald Reagan’s interventionist policies in Central America, Claes Oldenburg imagined a huge pencil as a monument, but presented it shattered, under erasure. Its point, however, is intact: this is a pencil “that still writes,” and thus continues to tell its story. Memory survives uncensored.

Felix Gonzalez-Torres’s “Untitled” (Death by Gun), 1990 (plate 300), is a more particular analysis of violence, this time on the home front. Evoking the monolithic configuration of one of Donald Judd’s Minimalist modules, the work is in fact transient, consisting of a stack of paper sheets that are steadily replaced as viewers, by invitation, take them away. On each sheet are printed the names of 464 Americans killed by guns...
in a one-week period, along with their photographs and other personal data. Although commemorative, the piece is also unstable and exposed to a dissolution that lasts until the stack is created anew.

KCHO (Alexis Leyva Machado) makes sly references to historical monuments to address issues pertinent to the last quarter of the twentieth century, including problems of exile and cultural dislocation. In the Eyes of History, 1992–95 (plate 447), remakes one of the great propagandistic designs of Russian architecture, Vladimir Tatlin’s never-realized Monument to the Third International, into a pragmatic, mock-functional coffee machine. In light of the special resonance Tatlin’s model has in KCHO’s homeland of Cuba, the work reads as a tongue-in-cheek response to the achievements of Soviet socialism and to the utopian promise of monuments generally. In The Infinite Column I, 1996 (plate 469), KCHO takes a different modernist icon, Constantin Brancusi’s Endless Column, as the prototype of a thirteen-foot-high structure made of assembled bentwood frames which have in common the fact that they float: canoes, surfboards, kayaks, rowboats fully equipped with oars. Drawing on the imagery and construction methods of balsas, the homemade rafts that Cubans use to flee the island illegally, KCHO’s flotilla serves as a trope for escape and freedom, referencing the mentality of migration.

KCHO rehashes the notion of the monument to explore the fluid, unbounded space that describes the “global condition of late modernity,” while Rachel Whiteread turns to the notion of interiority, indeed, of the literal inversion of space, to dig into the pool of memory and collective history. Her casts in plaster, wax, rubber, resin, or concrete, which range from domestic objects to full-scale rooms (plate 398), convey a sense of history even as they signal human absence. Untitled (Paperbacks), 1997 (plate 503), is the negative cast of a walk-in library, where row upon row of paperbacks, shelved spine inward, double as a mnemonic field. The installation is related to Whiteread’s project for a Holocaust memorial in Vienna in the form of a book repository. Evincing the iconoclastic side of Jewish tradition, the library in this case is sealed, a solid cube sitting on a base inscribed with the names of all the concentration camps in which Austrian Jews perished. Its proportions are based on the rooms of buildings near the city’s old Judenplatz, where the memorial is to be sited. This square, like many others in Vienna, is pregnant with invisible memories, which recall the lives and culture lost to Nazi crimes.

Whiteread is not alone in formulating historical recollections on sites previously dominated by amnesia. Shimon Attie’s haunting photograph of 1991, titled Almstadtstrasse 43, Berlin, 1991 (1930) (plate 316), one of many works in which archival images from the 1920s and 1930s are projected onto the buildings of Berlin’s Scheunenviertel, the prewar Jewish ghetto, has the effect of disrupting the muteness of a conflicted neighborhood. Here, Jewish residents experience a return, but only as spectral beings to mark the site of destruction. While exuding a mood of Hollywood film noir, Attie’s undertaking is deeply invested in the act of memory and archival reconstitution. However, the recovery of the past is never fully achieved. Although the archive to which Attie returns functions as a data bank, a storage for historical documents, it still cannot reconfigure conditions that have been irretrievably lost.

Significantly, Michael Schmidt’s U-ni-ty (Einheit), a photo-project made between 1991 and 1994 (plate 421) in response to the fall of the Berlin Wall, mixes 163 black-and-white photographs, some taken by the artist in a factual style, others culled from newspapers, propaganda journals, and related sources. In an effort to articulate the difficulties of constructing images of historical recollection in Germany today, Schmidt interfaces contemporary images of anonymous and notorious people, mass scenes, places, emblems, and monuments with archival ones. History is presented not as a linear sequence of events but as a decentered, simultaneous narration of separate and contingent frameworks. Having to determine personally whether a given image is taken in East or West Germany, prior to or after World War II, during division or since reunification, viewers begin to question the limits of historical representation.

Among contemporary artists focusing on the archive, and in particular on the sublimation of artifacts in the Holocaust archive, Christian Boltanski is the most controversial. In his early
work Boltanski invented “true” memories about his past using images of unidentified children to document his own childhood. In later installations, such as *The Storehouse*, 1988 (plate 201), he took signifiers of the Holocaust—blurry photographs, elegiac lamps, and hundreds of rusted biscuit tins containing cloth fragments—to overtly manipulate the viewer’s emotions. The biscuit boxes are rusted to look old, the personal effects do not belong to Holocaust victims of concentration camps, and the Jewish adolescents in the prewar photographs may still be alive. His work succeeds to arouse emotions not because it relies on straight, documentary realism, but because it draws on the powers of suggestion and mediated memory.

Boltanski’s representation of the Holocaust is based on recycled material. He typically rephotographs and enlarges his images, so that facial features are close-up, blurry, and less recognizable. Stylistically, these images come close to Gerhard Richter’s murky, out-of-focus paintings of 1988 that comprise *October 18, 1977* (plate 210). Based on police snapshots of the incarceration and death of three young political radicals, members of the Baader-Meinhof group, the fifteen paintings replicate in minute detail, right down to their indistinct focus, the appearance of surveillance photographs. Both Richter and Boltanski turn the camera into a technology of incertitude. Richter confuses different orders of representation to undercut official history, while Boltanski suggests that postwar memory of the Holocaust is not firsthand but indirect, filtered through the altered lens of witness testimonies, films, photographs, and newsreel footage.

Similar views are expounded by Art Spiegelman, whose works convey the chilling memory of war and the Holocaust by fusing the facts of history with the reality of playthings in comic-book format. Spiegelman’s comic book *Maus: A Survivor’s Tale*, produced from 1980 to 1985 (plate 130), reconfigures the codes of war commemoration to create an intergenerational testimony. Composed of well over 1,500 drawings, *Maus* presents deportation and genocide as an allegorical saga between mice (Jews) and cats (Nazis). The narrative is constructed around two interlocking stories: one that recounts the artist’s father’s attempts to survive the concentration camp in Auschwitz, and another that focuses on the artist’s creative recording of his father’s story. This is at once a work of history and autobiography that includes both events from the past and the present conditions under which they are remembered. The constant shifting from one register of recollection and narrative to the next grants renewed status to historical relativism. Throughout its narratives, *Maus* advances a particular paradigm for memory premised on acts of resistance against forgetting and of confrontation with an irrecoverable past.

notes


The contemporary interest in transparency in architecture and design in work of the last two decades has a rich theoretical and artistic lineage.

In 1976 the architectural historians Colin Rowe and Robert Slutzky published “Transparency: Literal and Phenomenal,” an essay in which a critical distinction was made between what they called “phenomenal transparency” and “literal transparency.”¹ This dialogue favored the former, which was a theoretical transparency of forms, in the manner of a Purist composition, as opposed to actual material transparency, as in a glazed structure. The influence of their ideas on architectural theory was immediate and substantial, and it indicated the extent of the architectural community’s disenchantment with glass architecture. This was acknowledged two years after the publication of “Transparency” in the form of an ironic collage by the Chicago architect Stanley Tigerman that shows Ludwig Mies van der Rohe’s 1950–56 Crown Hall on the IIT campus in Chicago sinking, Titanic-like, into Lake Michigan.

Nearly half a century earlier, Mies’s colleague, the German functionalist Ludwig Hilbersheimer, noted that Joseph Paxton’s 1851 Crystal Palace in London, the first completely glazed structure, had “obliterated the old opposition of light and shadow, which had formed the proportions of past architecture. It made a space of evenly distributed brightness; it created a room of shadowless light.”² In contrast to the functional beauty he saw in Paxton’s masterpiece, Hilbersheimer decried its contemporary use: “Glass is all the fashion today. Thus it is used in ways that are frequently preposterous, having nothing to do with functional but only formal and decorative purposes, to call attention to itself.”²

By the time Rowe and Slutzky had published their essay, it would have been hard to say that glass, as a building material, enjoyed fashionable status. Whatever novelty might have been associated with it had long receded, as its use proliferated in the banal office towers built in the 1950s and 1960s throughout the world. By 1976, literal transparency had become a straw man in Rowe’s and Slutzky’s polemic, which became particularly potent in the architectural ferment of the post-1968 generation, whose rhetoric reviled glass boxes as the symbol of the architectural status quo.

Their arguments became the underpinnings of the formalist revival of the reputation of the radical modernist architect Le Corbusier in the work of the New York Five: Richard Meier, John Hedjuk, Peter Eisenman, Charles Gwathmey, and Michael Graves. Even as Rowe revived interest in Le Corbusier’s Neo-Plasticism, he repositioned this master’s work in a historicist manner in his essay “The Mathematics of the Ideal Villa,” validating the more frankly traditional work of Robert Venturi, Robert A. M. Stern, and Philip Johnson—soon to follow that of the New York Five.³

Ironically, the ensuing excursion into the postmodern debates of the 1970s and 1980s seems to have provided the basis for the rediscovery of literal transparency in contemporary architecture and design. The sudden and extended renewal of interest in materially transparent structures and objects is notable for several reasons, not least of which is the originality of the work that was produced. While Mies’s name is increasingly invoked, the current fascination with the glass box has successfully avoided the taint of revival.

Part of this renewed interest can be traced to the delight in new technologies that were only
recently available to designers and architects. Donald T. Chadwick's and William Stumpf's Aeron Office Chair, 1992 (plate 375), with its see-through "pellicle" seat and back and Bob Evans's Tan Delta Force Fin, 1994 (plate 434), cast in translucent and colored resins, both prominently utilize new processes and materials that seduce the eye with their ability to dissolve the boundaries between the solid and the transient. Shiro Kuramata's How High the Moon Armchair, 1986, constructed of perforated metal, appears to be the ghost of itself (plate 143).

The current fascination with transparency is also characterized by a rejection of absolutes and a greater sense of subtlety. Jean Nouvel's description of his Cartier Foundation for Contemporary Art in Paris, 1992–93, as haze and evanescence, describes a path beyond phenomenal or literal transparency (plate 397). Recognizing that glass is often as reflective as it is transparent, Nouvel speaks to the layering of images more familiar to the multiple exposures of the photographic eye or thin skeins of paint that lie one over the other.

Similarly, Rem Koolhaas's 1989 competition design for the National Library of France evinces little interest in the notion of absolute transparency (plate 247). Rather, the building seems to have a stronger conceptual relationship to the famous three-dimensional representation of the human body first exhibited at the German Hygiene Museum in 1930 than to a glass box. In both the museum's anatomical study and Koolhaas's design the "skin" is made of glass, allowing for a study of the internal organs. In the case of the former, the organs are the lungs, heart, liver, etc.; in the case of the latter, the revealed "organs" represent the principal interior functions suspended within an architectural body. The modernist metaphor of the relationship between architecture's "skin and bones" is here reworked: whereas Mies saw the glass skin as infill to the structural frame, Koolhaas's design follows a more anatomical model. In the National Library, the skin is a continuous membrane and the structure—the skeleton—is found within, as in a human body. Furthermore, the skin is inscribed with images of the exterior world, as images of clouds are "tattooed," if you will, on the structure's skin. The idea that the architectural skin might be a surface embedded with information, rather than simply a climatic barrier, can be further seen in Herzog & de Meuron's Ricola Europe Factory and Storage Building, 1993 (plates 389, 390). Here the architects applied reproductions of Karl Blossfeldt's nineteenth-century photographs of plants—representing the herbs used to make the pharmaceuticals—in a screenlike pattern that alternately allows and blocks vision and light.

Mies van der Rohe's 1946–51 glass-and-steel Farnsworth House in Plano, Illinois, was conceived as a platform for contemplation of the outside world, a place from which to view outward, in contrast to a directed "gaze," or vision, that establishes a relationship of desire between the viewer and the subject. The current revitalization of the glass box as a formal type displays significant evidence of the difference between the objective and subjective viewpoints. This is, no doubt, related to its potential for creating relationships between viewers and subjects. The contemporary glass box, therefore, is no longer simply a place from which to look out but a screen that allows an exchange of views, as in the Ricola factory, a constant engagement with the world.

The same attitude is evident in the world of contemporary design, where Antonio Citterio's and Glen Oliver Low's Mobil Container System, 1993 (plate 396), or Enzo Mari's Flores Box, 1991 (plate 332), contain, but do not remove from sight, the objects they hold. Architectural in their conception, both receptacles hold objects out of the way but not out of sight; the objects remain veiled presences, like the "organs" of Koolhaas's library, partially visible through their thermoplastic polymer walls. The appeal of this visual phenomenon may be discerned in the words of the literary critic Jean Starobinski: "The hidden fascinates. . . . Obstacle and interposed sign, [the] veil engenders a perfection that is immediately stolen away, and by its very flight demands to be recaptured by our desire."4

The "skin-and-bones" interpretation of the glass box favored not only a sense of absolute transparency but also—in Miesian architecture—an exposition of structural clarity. Toyo Ito's 1995 Mediatheque Project in Sendai, Japan, with its writhing trunklike supports, suggests that alternate structural readings are not only possible but also highly provocative (plate 446). Here, the classical repose of the trabeated pavilion gives way to
a dynamic expressivity that emerges from within, casting the building’s glazed membrane as a screen through which the viewer sees an interior landscape.

Starobinski’s sense of the subjective gaze lends itself to the idea of “mediated” vision. The idea that an interposed veil, or screen, conditions the viewer and subject alike cannot easily be separated from the world’s burgeoning media sensibility. Elizabeth Diller’s and Ricardo Scofidio’s Slow House, 1989, removes any distinction between the transparency of glass and the transparency of digital media (plate 238). Oriented to a bayside view, the “picture window” is combined with a monitor that captures the same panorama. Similarly, Joel Sanders’s 1991–95 project for the Kyle Residence in Houston interposes the small screen of the television with ersatz “vistas” of the American suburban landscape (plate 450). Both projects conflate the notion of a traditional landscape view and that of the global media landscape.

The connectedness of media culture is apparent in other design disciplines as well. In their overlapping layers of color, type, and images, the posters produced by the graphic design group cyan, such as Foundation Bauhaus Dessau, 1995, display a digital ecstasy that fuses the near and far and the now and then (plate 455). If the notion of literal transparency has been vastly expanded, so, too, has the notion of phenomenal transparency. Indeed, Rowe’s and Slutsky’s definition of solid forms as intellectually transparent has roots that predate Le Corbusier’s work of the 1920s. For example, the nineteenth-century Prussian architect Karl Friedrich Schinkel’s design for the Schauspielhaus in Berlin, 1821, encouraged the audience to think of the proscenium as a window on the city beyond, going so far as to paint a view of Berlin on the curtain itself. And in Paris Henri Labrouste’s Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, 1843–50, bears across its facade the names of famous authors, a device that resounds with new meaning when it is realized that the names appear precisely in front of the library’s bookshelves within—a marvelous example of a building’s transparency even if made of stone.

The contemporary architect Tadao Ando’s Church of the Light in Osaka, 1984–89, might also be seen in this manner (plates 265, 266, 267). Ando’s affinity for simple cubic forms gives the viewer a prefiguration of the interior space. Judiciously placed openings in smooth concrete walls, in this instance a window in the shape of a cross, further open the opaque volume to spatial comprehension by the mind if not, completely, by the eye.

Herzog & de Meuron’s Signal Box in Basel, 1988–95, further explores the notion of an intellectually transparent building (plate 451). Housing miles and miles of cable that regulate the complex movement of thousands of train cars and engines, the Signal Box is covered in ribbons of copper sheathing. The effect is compelling aesthetically but also gives visual expression to the structure’s use: the cables within are, in fact, also made of copper. A similar reading of form and material might be applied to Renzo Piano’s Kansai International Airport in Osaka, 1988–94 (plate 410). The shimmering, sensuous undulation of the roof and the complex trusses that support it need no justification beyond their beauty. Yet, it is all the more satisfying to know that the profile of the roof is meant to act as conduit for the blasts of cooled air that are projected into the space. In fact, the shape is derived from that of a gust of air, making visible an otherwise unknowable form.

Rody Graumans’s 1992 design for the 85 Lamps Lighting Fixture, features eighty-five standard household lightbulbs suspended from ordinary electrical cable and insists on the absence of embellishment (plate 365). Shiro Kuramata’s seductive Miss Blanche Chair, 1989 (plate 253), in which plastic roses are embedded in an acrylic seat back, might be seen in the same way. Named after the tragic Blanche Dubois in Tennessee Williams’s play A Streetcar Named Desire, the chair is a sensual send-up of the pretentiousness not only of its namesake but also of the omnipresent chintz in traditionally decorated houses.

The current fascination with transparency, in all its myriad forms, would suggest that Rowe’s and Slutsky’s attempts to parse out polarizing distinctions between the “literal” and the “phenomenal” may have missed a much larger point by failing to discuss the fact that, throughout the twentieth century, the relentless pursuit of the revelations afforded by transparency has been a constant theme that has defined the genesis, growth, and revitalization of modern architecture.

notes

At a time when high body counts, great volumes of spilled blood, and sensational special effects have earned movie violence the opprobrium of many viewers, it should be remembered that the cinema has always been violent—that it was born violent. *The Execution of Mary, Queen of Scots*, a kinetoscope made at the Edison Studio in 1895, used stop-motion to flaunt the queen’s severed head, and the first movie Western, Edwin S. Porter’s *The Great Train Robbery*, 1903, culminates in a bandit firing his six-shooter directly at the audience.

The suspicion of a causal connection between watching violent films and acting violently has also existed since the early days of cinema. In 1909, the Supreme Court of Illinois upheld a Chicago ordinance requiring movie exhibitors to get a permit from the police, ruling that Westerns such as *The James Boys* and *Night Riders* “portray exhibitions of mischief, arson, and murder [that] would necessarily be attended with evil effects on youthful spectators.”

Of course, today’s technologies have rendered movie violence far more convincing and visceral. Old masters of the war film like Lewis Milestone, the director of *All Quiet on the Western Front*, 1930, and G. W. Pabst, the director of *Westfront 1918*, 1930, did not have the Steadicams that enabled Stanley Kubrick in *Full Metal Jacket*, 1987, and Oliver Stone in his Vietnam war trilogy, 1986–93, to thrust the viewer into the chaos of a firefight. Nor were there digital sound effects that can evoke the cacophony of battle with such harrowing immediacy (earth-trembling napalm blasts, hollow-tipped bullets shattering bones, a dying soldier’s blood-sputtering gasps).

There is a seeming contradiction in our present relation to such violence. While war itself now seems to come to us through distanced images, packaged as tidily and as neatly as a Nintendo video game, we still go to the movies expecting, even craving, a full-fledged assault on our senses. This paradox has contributed to the fear that society has become even more prone to violence as it has become less sensitive to its consequences. Now, perhaps more than ever, the entertainment industry is accused of using violence irresponsibly. Lawsuits against the movie studios have proliferated, most notably cases in which victims’ families blamed Oliver Stone’s *Natural Born Killers* for a rash of killing sprees in the mid-1990s. Recently, President Clinton called on federal agencies to investigate the selling of violent media to children, film being only the oldest of its many siblings in the larger media culture. Under such pressures, and trying to stave off the loss of income from costly legal battles and national boycotts, the entertainment industry has agreed to music labels, a television ratings system, refinements in the movie ratings system, V-chips, and Internet regulation.

Still, despite hundreds of studies, the deleterious effects of film violence have not been proven. Moreover, discussions of film violence have been muddied by an assumption that all violence in cinema is the same, motivated by the same impulses and pursuing the same goals. Of course, there is a certain sameness to all film violence. With a keen eye on box-office receipts, Hollywood studios have continued to breed scripts for their familiarity, using codified narrative genres and favoring myths so clearly drawn that audiences can be sure to get what they paid for. Filmmakers have always known that crime pays handsomely, particularly if spiced with a lot of sex.
But a closer examination of recent films reveals that the contemporary use of violence has actually been a complex and varied matter—certainly more so than the public debate usually allows. Most violent films made since 1980 may be viewed in terms of three principal types: violence shaped by myth, which either fulfills or critiques the fantasies underlying political realities; violence that bears witness to some injustice in the hope of changing it; and an aestheticized violence that does not invite an audience’s sense of grief or pity so much as its fond recognition of familiar movie formulas.

**Violence Shaped by Myth**

The genres of cinema that has most successfully created or reinterpreted—gangster melodramas, Westerns, war epics, Biblical spectacles—use violence to illuminate character and to further narrative drive, usually culminating in a denouement that preserves or restores society’s moral codes. This tradition of cinematic violence continued in the 1980s and 1990s in such films as George Miller’s *Mad Max 2*, 1981, and Ridley Scott’s *Blade Runner*, 1982, dystopic fantasies that gave new currency to the old movie icon of the renegade antihero who must become an outlaw in order to defeat one (plates 43, 60).

The lopsided American invasion of the Caribbean island of Grenada in 1983 is the barely camouflaged subject of Clint Eastwood’s *Heartbreak Ridge*, 1986, another mythmaking film that seemed to capture the anxieties and longings in the contemporary political climate (plate 168). Eastwood plays a Marine sergeant once decorated for his bravery in Korea and Vietnam, now scorned as an anachronism. Because the modern army knows nothing of war, Eastwood alone is capable of turning a bunch of ragtag soldiers into an efficient platoon. After leading them in a heroic rescue of American medical students held hostage on a Latin American island, Eastwood picks a Cuban cigar off a dead enemy soldier and lights up, apparently satisfied that after one loss (Vietnam) and one tie (Korea), America has just evened the score.

Whether made in Hollywood or abroad, films of this period also extended the use of violence to fulfill a wish to symbolically vanquish “the others”—alien types who seemed to be corrupting the world on their way to taking it over. The British director Ridley Scott’s *Blade Runner* envisioned a future Los Angeles where crime and overcrowding have driven the wealthy elite to offshore colonies, leaving a non-English-speaking people to live like animals. Beneath the shadows of protofascist skyscrapers lies a labyrinth of neon-drenched streets teeming with the cacophony of a modern-day Tokyo. Harrison Ford, the reluctant hero, is summoned to hunt down and kill a group of genetically engineered artificial humans—including a particularly nasty one who has crushed his creator’s skull with his bare hands—before they find the key to immortality and render humanity obsolete.

The Australian director George Miller’s *Mad Max 2 (The Road Warrior)* is a postapocalyptic fantasy in which a psychotic band of savages lays siege to a group of settlers in a war over precious fuel. We know the enemy is unholy and deviant by their animal hides and motorcycles (like gay bikers) and from their Mohawks and war paint (like “Indians” or punks). One of their leaders calls himself the “Ayatollah of Rock-n-Rolla,” and they hoard oil. It befalls Mel Gibson as the Road Warrior, once a family man before his wife and child were murdered, now a gun-toting nomadic mercenary, to rescue the settlers and lead them across the desert to “Tomorrow-morrow” land, where they can build a utopia founded on democracy and a capitalist free-market system.

Yet Hollywood in the 1980s also had its share of movies that tried to counter the tide of jingoist, wish-fulfillment films by using violence to shatter myths. In counterpoint to fanciful visions of avenging angels and glorifications of American invincibility were Kubrick’s *Full Metal Jacket*, 1987, and Oliver Stone’s war trilogy, *Platoon*, 1986, *Born on the Fourth of July*, 1989, and *Heaven and Earth*, 1993, all of which reopened the wounds of Vietnam (plates 169, 170, 244). In the sadomasochistic boot camp scenes of *Full Metal Jacket*, Kubrick illustrates with pitiless fascination how the military makes killing machines out of young men. Ron Kovic, the real-life protagonist of Stone’s *Born on the Fourth of July*, went to Vietnam with dreams of glory but returned home at twenty-one paralyzed from the waist down. As a boy growing up in conservative suburbs, Kovic would pretend
he was John Wayne in *The Sands of Iwo Jima*, 1949. Now, confined to a wheelchair in a rat-infested Bronx Veterans' Hospital, he grows sick at the sight of *The Green Berets*, 1968, on television. The myth and the reality didn’t match.

**Violence as Witness**

Some recent directors, particularly those of the Third World, have followed the neorealist tradition of using film as an instrument of social change by exposing the brutal realities of ghetto life, racial violence, and class warfare, and by embedding their militancy in colorful storytelling. In *They Don’t Wear Black Tie*, 1981 (plate 25), the Brazilian director Leon Hirszman chose as his subject the violent industrial strikes of the late 1970s that were ground zero for the overthrow of the military dictatorship that had ruled since 1964. The harshest films of slum life—Vittorio DeSica’s *Shoeshine*, 1946, Luis Buñuel’s *Los Olvidados*, 1950, and Héctor Babenco’s *Pixote*, 1980 (plate 26), among them—are devoid of romance. Babenco discovered Fernando Ramos da Silva, the young boy who would play *Pixote*, among the three million children living on the streets of São Paulo, who are forced to steal, turn tricks, deal drugs, even kill for a scrap of food. Fiction is bred from fact: several years after the film became an international success, its star, da Silva, was murdered by the police. The slum devours its own children.

Social-realist filmmakers in developing nations contend that until true democracy has been achieved, their art belongs to a larger struggle for justice. One of these artist-activists, the Filipino director Lino Brocka, insisted that it was only by going into the streets with his camera that he could attend to society’s oppressed and counteract the obfuscations of government-controlled media. Because he made movies for what he fondly called “the Great Filipino Audience,” Brocka would coat his polemics with the dangerous eroticism of Hollywood noir and melodrama. The title character of *Bona*, 1980, is an eighteen-year-old girl who abandons her middle-class family to slavishly serve a bit movie actor in the slums (plate 13). When her lover threatens to leave for America with his new girlfriend, she scalds him with a pot of boiling water, knowing that his departure will leave her with nothing—almost an illustration of the Filipino saying, “A desperate man will hold on even to a double-edged knife.”

In the United States, Spike Lee ignited a storm of anger and concern with *Do the Right Thing*, 1989 (plate 245). Many critics argued that Universal Pictures was fomenting fears of a race riot by releasing the film on a hot summer weekend, not unlike the one Lee represented. Throughout the summer of 1989 audiences and critics debated whether the film was indeed incendiary, or whether it was an articulate, angry protest against racism in America. Much of the controversy centered on a climactic riot scene in which black teenagers burn down a pizzeria that has served the Bedford-Stuyvesant community for twenty-five years. Lee maintained that he drew inspiration from actual incidents of white-on-black violence, and he was distressed that most critics ignored this point.

**Aestheticized Violence**

Some contemporary directors have dispensed with questions of morality or character motivation in favor of hyperstylized self-referential violence that plays ironically with the language of filmmaking. The reference point of their violence is not so much the world of history as the history of cinema itself.

The violence in Stanley Kubrick’s *The Shining*, 1980 (plate 1), derives from countless other horror films. While acting as the winter caretaker of an isolated hotel, an author is driven to hunt down his wife and child with an axe. The roots of his violence are contemporary criminal defense arguments: whisky or writer’s block, cabin fever or a haunted past.

Quentin Tarantino brings Pop sophistication to genre filmmaking. His *Pulp Fiction*, 1994 (plate 408), became known as the film that launched a thousand imitations, all similarly modeled on a structure of interconnecting narratives featuring cartoonish gangsters and their molls. Tarantino laced his film with references to earlier movies such as Robert Aldrich’s *Kiss Me Deadly*, 1955, Gordon Parks’s *Shaft*, 1971, and John Badham’s *Saturday Night Fever*, 1977. *Pulp Fiction* may be rife with all manner of rape, torture, ritual execution, and gunplay, but since everything is
wrapped in quotation marks and Tarantino’s tongue is so firmly planted in his cheek, he gets away with it. One reviewer safely described the killings and breaking of fingers committed by the film’s main characters as “occupational banalities.” The hitmen disarm us with charm and wit. “Come on, let’s get into character,” Samuel L. Jackson says to John Travolta before they murder a couple of college students.

Fugitive love and the fetishism of violence are driving concerns in Kathryn Bigelow’s and Monty Montgomery’s Breakdown (The Loveless), 1983, a chrome-and-leather look at Beat bikers in the late 1950s and a story of incest that leads to patricide and suicide (plate 76). Drawing on the iconography and idolatry of Pop culture, they make references to Marlon Brando in The Wild One, 1953, and Kenneth Anger’s Scorpio Rising, 1963, among others.

Martin Scorsese’s Raging Bull, 1980 (plate 9), adopts the arc of classic Hollywood narrative to tell the story of Jake LaMotta, who rose out of the mean streets of the Bronx by pummeling his way to the world middleweight championship. Scorsese consciously emulates the gritty realism of George Bellows’s paintings and boxing movies like Robert Rossen’s Body and Soul, 1947. One critic described Raging Bull’s ring scenes as having “a cataclysmic beauty that deepens the terror”—the terror being the violence that begins in the home. In Scorsese’s darkest view of the Italian immigrant experience, family life cannot be purged of its violence any more than of its quotients of guilt and self-loathing.

The violence of Hong Kong action movies rests on surface spectacle, an athletic aestheticism. Action sequences are outrageously choreographed to resemble MGM musical numbers. Bullets fly and bombs detonate in crowded buses, restaurants, even churches and maternity wards. Everything is at the service of speed, in the manner of Road Runner cartoons and Douglas Fairbanks adventures, except when Sam Peckinpah’s slow-motion bullet ballets are evoked. Underlying the overwrought melodrama of John Woo’s The Killer, 1989 (plate 250), is the theme of fraternal loyalty: Chow Yun-Fat is a hitman who discovers that he lives by the same code of honor as the renegade cop who stalks him.

With box-office receipts higher than ever, film endures as our most important repository of archetypes, formulas, and signs that are so innate to our collective unconscious as to constitute a second language. It is not enough simply to ask whether the cinema has exceeded all bounds of morality by satisfying our lust for violence. We must also ask whether the cinema has fulfilled its original aesthetic and political purpose: to convince us that we are what we seem. “The cinema . . . aims at transforming the agitated witness into a conscious observer,” Siegfried Kracauer wrote in 1960. “Nothing could be more legitimate than its lack of inhibitions in picturing spectacles that upset the mind. Thus it keeps us from shutting our eyes to the ‘blind drive of things.’”

notes
The issue of scale, from the minuscule to the massive, has been of prime concern to many artists in the past decades, and it acquires renewed relevance as technological media assume greater importance in our daily lives. Increasingly, our access to works of art takes place through a world of reproductions—in books, posters, postcards, and electronic media—radically transforming the experience of art. André Malraux postulated the notion of a "museum without walls," a collection of artworks found not in the physical reality of the gallery but in the artificial space of the book page, subject to the laws of photography. Not surprisingly, this change in vehicle and format has dramatically altered our apprehension of artworks. Malraux wrote that "reproduction (like the art of fiction, which subdues reality to the imagination) has created what might be called 'fictitious' arts, by systematically falsifying the scale of objects; by presenting oriental seals the same size as the decorative reliefs on pillars, and amulets like statues." Perceptually, any expression of a work's three-dimensionality is mitigated in reproduction; the work is turned into a flat image that does not convey the quality of its texture, the intensity of its color, the extent of its depth, or the expressive potential of its scale. In this museum of images, miniatures may be perceived as colossal, and the viewer may notice details that the artist never intended to highlight. The reverse may happen as well: paintings intended to envelop the viewer as expansive fields of color when experienced in person might come across in books as mere color chips. Additionally, new visual hierarchies set up unprecedented relations: on the printed page, graphic components are rendered more evident, and the totality of the work also becomes more easily graspable. In any case, the original's relation to the viewer's body is negated.

In reaction to this, the growing prevalence of the disembodied artistic experience may have contributed to an increased interest in the ways in which only the real-life object can affect the viewer. Contemporary artists have manipulated scale and explored magnification and miniaturization—both widely employed in digital technologies—as a conscious means of expression. A paradigmatic precedent is René Magritte's *The Listening Room*, 1952. Following the devices of Surrealism, it induces unease by manipulating the relative size of a commonplace object within the confines of an otherwise ordinary room. A huge apple claustrophobically crowds the depicted space in a disturbing distortion of normal dimensional relations. But in the last few decades, instead of altering scale within the limits of the picture, artists have generated disruptive extremes of size, not in the fictive space of the canvas but in the actual space...
shared by objects and their viewers. In direct confrontation with the viewer’s body, the object proposes unexpected relationships, inducing a heightened state of spatial awareness, a sense of uneasy familiarity, or other potentially uncanny states of mind. If Abstract Expressionism, while signaling the movement toward a more public practice, resorted to expansiveness to generate a sense of envelopment, Pop art and Minimalism self-consciously engaged scale for very different purposes. Certain emblematic examples of Pop art, such as Claes Oldenburg’s playful and outsized soft versions of ice-cream cones, cakes, and commonplace objects, and James Rosenquist’s gigantic images, draw their resonance from the scale of mass-culture advertising, particularly as seen in outdoor billboards and window displays. For Minimalists, scale was also a prime concern, relying on the viewer’s experience of concrete physical objects as they relate to the viewer’s body, on the one hand, and the surrounding space, on the other. As Carl Andre remarked, “I have come to the conclusion that perhaps the only single thing that art has is scale—something which has nothing at all do with size.”

Several works of contemporary art in the Museum’s collection speak to the issue of scale in distinct ways, from manipulating expected dimensions to representing things in a one-to-one scale. At one extreme of scale disruption, for instance, is Robert Therrien’s *No Title*, 1993 (plate 393). It consists of an oversized wood table appearing to emerge from the corner of a room, with only one of its legs protruding from the wall. *No Title’s* gigantism belies its generic appearance. Over nine feet high, it has a quasi-architectural impact: the viewer can walk under it, look up at it, be sheltered by it. A crucial transitional work in Therrien’s career, *No Title* marks the use of several new practices. From this point on, Therrien’s work becomes larger, less abstract, and more assertively three-dimensional. While evoking a child’s vantage point, *No Title*, in fact, derives from Therrien’s use of photography to register usual objects from unusual points of view, unhinging our customary surroundings and de-stabilizing a once familiar world.

Like Therrien’s *No Title*, Vito Acconci’s *Adjustable Wall Bra*, 1990–91 (plate 326), is so outsized that it becomes, in the artist’s words, “part of the room’s architecture—it’s made like a wall and functions as part of a wall, like a wall on top of and bulging out from the existent wall.” An enormous brassiere made of metal lathe, *Adjustable Wall Bra* constitutes an entire environment, complete with a light and sound system. Its cups are covered with a rough coat of plaster and lined with canvas, and contain the sound of steady breathing emanating from built-in speakers. *Adjustable Wall Bra* can be flexibly adapted to a number of given architectural configurations: against the wall, turned away from it, pushed into a corner, against the wall and the floor, or against the wall and the ceiling; but in all its possible incarnations, it can function as both shelter and seat, providing a support system that accommodates the viewer’s body while leaving the mind unsettled. “I want to put the viewer on shaky ground, so he has to consider himself and his circumstances,” commented Acconci.

Certain contemporary artists have addressed the issue of scale in exacting, literal ways, creating works in a one-to-one relation with the object being represented. With varying degrees of similarity, these works pose as slightly twisted duplicates of the real. Often painstakingly manufactured, they undermine absolute notions of true and false, bridging the distance between the authentic and the artificial. From Andy Warhol’s *Brillo Box (Soap Pads)*, 1964, to Jeff Koons’s *Baccarat Crystal Set*, 1986, these are works whose identities and allegiances shift from props to doubles, stand-ins to facsimiles, and whose insistent theatricality often tricks the viewer’s perception. Although these works obviously share a keen affinity with Marcel Duchamp’s Readymades, they are not unmanipulated found objects, though they may look that way. Like Readymades, these works raise questions about where life ends and art begins, but their handcrafted aspect and artistic materials, following the footsteps of Jasper Johns’s ale cans, lightbulbs, and flashlights, seem to imply a desire to feed the paradox of appropriating something from the world while engaging the language of art. Ironically, they are handmade ready-mades.

Robert Gober’s humorous yet often macabre incursions into domesticity have included sinks,
beds, plywood sheets, bundles of newspaper, bags of kitty litter, and body parts rendered in actual size. In *Cat Litter*, 1989, the artist celebrates the informal nature of daily life by personally making a prosaic reminder of its everyday chores (plate 263). The work may pass for the real thing from a distance, though nothing is done to disguise the unmistakable signs of human manufacture. The lettering and other graphic elements are all quirkily hand-painted on plaster, counteracting any expectation of slick, industrial packaging. Adding a certain ambiguity to its already uncertain artistic status, *Cat Litter* sits directly on the floor, leaning against the wall nonchalantly, much as a bag of litter might be placed in a house. Gober has said, "For me the kitty litter was to a large degree a metaphor for a couple’s intimacy."

More illusionistic in appearance, Tom Friedman’s *Untitled*, 1995, shares with *Cat Litter* the ability to disconcert viewers while challenging preconceived definitions of art (plate 442). *Untitled* is composed of two elements: a house fly meticulously constructed out of plastic, hair, fuzz, Play-doh, and wire, and a white cube made of painted wood, built like an ordinary pedestal. Owing to its realistic size and intricate craftsmanship, the fly occupies a space that vastly exceeds its size. Perched on the edge of the white cube, it speaks of the absence of conventional sculpture. Is this a pedestal under a sculpture of a fly, or a minimalist sculpture on which a fly happened to land? Reiterating Friedman’s recurrent interest in scale, process, and perception, *Untitled* is ultimately an exercise in looking that rewards intense observation.

If perceptual double-takes are a likely response to works like Gober’s *Cat Litter* or Friedman’s *Untitled*, both of which produce a kind of three-dimensional trompe l’œil in their realistic scale, a work like Charles Ray’s *Family Romance*, 1993, through an equally simple scale operation, produces a delayed reaction of a different kind (plate 402). As described by the artist, this work is “a nuclear family, the dad is forty, the mother is thirty, the son is like eight, and the daughter is four. They are all naked, holding hands, but I am taking them all to the same scale, four feet three inches. So the children have come up and the parents have come down. . . . The politics are dead through scale, all leveled out at the same height.” The title, *Family Romance*, is a Freudian concept related to the Oedipus complex that refers to the fictional story that a boy tells himself to reinvent his family origin, his real family replaced by an imagined one. The family that Ray reinvented is not only bluntly sexualized (given the four mannequins’ frontal nudity), but levels traditional hierarchical structures, based on age and gender, within the family unit. And it does so by equating each member’s stature, thereby not only disrupting our conventional assumptions of balance and parental power, but also our tendency to correlate size with significance. *Family Romance* points to something that all the works mentioned above suggest, namely that scale matters, and that it would be a blunder of considerable size to mistake Malraux’s “fictitious arts” for actual works of art.

notes
2. Ibid.
Contemporary art is rife with images of childhood and adolescence, often of an unsettling flavor. Jeff Koons’s armored toys (plates 137, 158), Laurie Simmons’s dollhouse photographs (plate 242), Kristin Lucas’s video self-dissections (plate 486), and Mona Hatoum’s pipette crib (plate 414) each contribute to what seems a darkling phase of modern culture’s ongoing obsession with the world we all leave behind us.

Faith in the superiority of childhood, as a time of uncorrupted perception and unimpeded creativity, was a foundation stone of progressive aesthetics in the early twentieth century. But modern artists often talk about absolutes while trafficking in ambiguities, and their rhetoric about infantile purity was shadowed from the outset by their fascination with the impure state of adolescence, whose power to discomfit derives as much from its proximity to adult life as from its still “uncivilized” distance. A prominent French historian, Phillipe Ariès, has argued, in fact, that the seventeenth century’s concern with youth, transmuted into the nineteenth century’s idealization of childhood, was supplanted in the twentieth century by the “invention” of adolescence as a separate age. Freud’s speculations on children’s sexuality played a central role in that new body of thought, blurring the line between early and adult experience, and powerfully desanctifying the idylls of life’s beginnings that had descended from the age of Wordsworth and the Romantics. On the broader level of popular culture, this focus on the special significance of the “in-between” stage of passage from child to adult—and with it a wary concern—has continued through the worlds of juvenile delinquents and mall rats to the slackers and hackers of the recent century’s turn; and in the twentieth century’s final decades, a vast body of film, from Rebel Without a Cause to The 400 Blows, with Satyajit Ray’s Apu trilogy before and countless others after, has dealt with coming-of-age stories.

A watershed was passed, though, in the 1960s, with its youth culture in general, and with Pop art in particular. This was the decade of “Puff the Magic Dragon” and the cult of Tolkien’s Lord of the Rings, when it was advised not to trust anyone over thirty, and when rejection of adult values had a serious political edge. Looking back at the imagery of Pop—at Lichtenstein’s comic-book canvases and Oldenburg’s giant soft ice-cream cones—one is struck by its glorification of adolescent appetites, and by its special kind of subversive utopianism. The dream of the blown-up teen romance comic, and of the Good Humor bar reimagined as a monument, was that unabashed amusement and clever irony (dumb and smart, innocent and knowing) could join hands to turn the grown-up life of high art and civic symbolism on its head, and yield something more democratic and more fun. The apparatus of the establishment—in advertising, consumer marketing, and mass entertainment—was to be hijacked for a joy-ride, and turned to anti-establishment ends.

Such Pop art was first made by artists in their thirties, give or take, and its insistently upbeat childishness rebuked the boozy, smoky sophistication of a 1950s world dominated by veterans of a war these artists had been too young to fight. But by the 1980s, a new generation—this time born too late to have sweated out Vietnam—in turn redrew the terms it had inherited. In the years of Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher, when Pop itself had been eagerly co-opted as another selling device for a packaged youth culture, much of what
had passed for sharp, corrosive smartness in the 1960s seemed foolishly naive. Artists of the late 1980s and 1990s began producing an altered imagery of childhood, laced with a distancing cynicism and fixed on the perversion of innocence.

Jeff Koons’s Rabbit of 1986 (plate 158) is perhaps the paradigmatic example of the shift. Produced by an artist then in his twenties, in the year the baby-boom generation just began turning forty, it has a double backward reference, both to the polished reflectivity of Constantin Brancusi’s early-modern metal sculptures and to the “soft-and-hard” transformations Oldenburg had performed on commonplace objects in his sculptures of the 1960s. The nose-thumbing impertinence against Brancusi’s spiritual ambitions is obvious, but the chill imposed on Oldenburg’s floppy, garulous bumptiousness may be even more devastating. This object—no signature mass mascot like Mickey or Bugs, but an off-the-shelf generic inflatable—has been transformed by its casting into an uncanny, preternaturally swollen and hieratically rigid icon of gleamingly sterilized kitsch. Wildly ludicrous and icily inert all at once, this frozen silvered phantom of a toy subsumes the chromed curves that were the machine age’s expression of sleek optimism, and parodies them, deadpan, as a hollow plastic triviality, glamorized by the hard glint of cupidity. Innocence and the Pop valuation of raucous young appetites seem far, far away.

A later, soft corollary to Koons’s totem-toy might be seen in the array of dolls Mike Kelley lays out on his crocheted afghan (plate 296) of 1990. Every cue of the material and format invokes the reassuring world of baby blankets and maternal care. Yet, when the piece splays out before us on the floor, the floppy, disjointed anonymity of the sewn-down dolls has the insidious overtones of a crime scene, and the little “bodies” on the huge field speak discomfitingly of exposure and vulnerability. The darker undercurrent fits, too, with other work by Kelley (see, for example, plates 131, 350) and his cohort of contemporaries in Los Angeles in the late 1980s and 1990s, where a range of “bad-boy” art embraced imagery and styles from pulp comics, and put a more funky, surrealistic spin on what had been the cheerily philistine cartoon jokes of mainstream Pop.

In other areas, too, younger art at the end of the twentieth century became a twisted doll’s house. Where Pop had loved the device of enlargement—making the common little thing into a mural, a billboard, or a monument—artists now often dwelled on miniaturization, as if inverting the former sense of emergent public power into one of a more closeted sublimation. Yet the intent was serious. Transposing the hard world of history into the pliable domain of surrogate play, whether in comic strips or in tin soldiers, provided fresh ways to sneak up on things as hard to confront and as stale with convention as World War II and the Holocaust (see Art Spiegelman’s Maus: A Survivor’s Tale, plate 130). And women artists, such as Laurie Simmons and Mariko Mori, concerned with the way femininity gets constructed and constrained, found in the fabrication of toy environments an appealing way to critique simultaneously the myths of ideal womanhood and the mechanisms by which those myths invade a little girl’s awareness (plates 242, 535). In these ways the languages of lightness were co-opted to do heavy lifting, small worlds encapsulated large issues, and the former domains of carefree fantasy were re-presented as sites of indoctrination.

A chilling ambiguity can be found in the spindly upright crib of Mona Hatoum’s Silence (plate 414). There, the glass tubing simultaneously evokes and cancels early modern notions of precision and clarity (as did Koons’s shiny metal), mutating cuddly security into brittle vulnerability, with a quietly breath-stopping sense of imminent violence. The title seems double-edged, implying a lifelessness utterly at odds with normal expectations of an infant, and inviting into the fragile void an imagined cacophony of shattering and shards.

A more literal spelling-out of the perils that impinge on defenseless childhood appears in David Wojnarowicz’s forced collision between the tow-headed image of appealing boyhood and the bitter disillusioned text of a fate foreseen (plate 336). As a kind of pre-imposed tombstone, the work evokes promise only to snuff it, and insists, in relentless pessimism, on the crushing inevitability of the countless traps and pitfalls involved in coming to maturity within contemporary society. Set out in the format of a warped grade-school album—pencil-necked, grinning mug-shot sur-
rounded by “personal notes” or “achievements,” Wojnarowicz’s piece plays in a somber key the same cynicism about the disjunctions of innocence and experience that prompted a classroom of tykes in Woody Allen’s Annie Hall to stand up one by one and announce their incongruous adult identities (“I’m into leather,” pipes one little ingénue).

Childhood is always threatened, of course, not only from without but from within, by the drive of physiological change that will inexorably replace its smooth perfections with lumpy, hairy adulthood. Especially in an epoch when AIDS has refocused an awareness of the body and its mortality, and touched sexuality with new associations of morbidity and danger, an altered attention to the changeling body seemed almost ordained. In a curious echo, the unsettled obsession with adolescence and the onset of sexual knowledge that pervaded art at the previous turn of the century (in the work of Paul Gauguin, Georges Minne, Auguste Rodin, Egon Schiele, and many others) returned in several corners of art during the most recent fin de siècle. But it was Robert Gober who gave us one of the pithiest and most disturbing tokens of this new sensibility, in his monstrous little werewolf of a child’s shoe, which sprouts hair in its creepily waxen sole (plate 343). If Koons and Hatoum had twisted childhood’s allure by rendering its objects in cold and alien harshness, this little souvenir suggests a world where even inorganic accoutrements are not safe from hormonal predation.

The early 1990s were a period where issues of repressed memory and childhood abuse surged up in every social venue from the courtroom to confessional television, a new currency developed for Freud’s earlier concern with the interaction between adults and their offspring, and for the overlaps and collisions between unformed and grown-up desires. Mass advertising, by selling youth and infantilizing their elders, did its part to confuse the dividing lines; and the recurrent horrors of murderous suburban preteens and high-schoolers with guns added to the anxieties in a way that made the “delinquency” of mid-century seem cut-and-dried by comparison. One of the most telling images to emerge from this climate of disequilibrium is Charles Ray’s unforgettable Family Romance (plate 402), a potent one-liner of a sculpture that lingers under the skin. Here enlargement and miniaturization get confounded, as mutant monster toddlers are leveled with their dwarfed parents, all rendered in anatomical correctness. Ray’s unsettlingly specific daisy chain makes the beatific and the horrific, treacly blandness and obscene grotesquerie, all join hands in a dance of precocity and diminishment that provokes a fused laugh and shudder as it destabilizes the viewer’s awareness of his or her own body, no matter what age.

Even beyond the disheartening contexts of the tabloid headlines and social dilemmas of what used to be called “the youth of our time,” can we wonder that the idea of childhood—its appeal as a separate, uncorrupt land of promise, forever renewing its revolutionary potential for each generation—should take such a beating in contemporary art? In intellectual life, it has been one of the conceits of our age to pride ourselves on our loss of illusions, and to count ourselves superior by virtue of a more thorough-going cynicism. Much of the writing about art in recent decades has, in this spirit, trumpeted the force of new art and new thought as that of debunking and discarding the ideals and mythologies—of autonomy, of teleology, of universality, of purity—that permeate the rhetoric of earlier modern art. It has become a ritual act, for advocates of this line of criticism, to recurrently wring dead whatever residual life might be seen to remain in ideals of originality, or of escape from cultural determination. In such a climate, the ideals of childhood in earlier modern art—as blissfully pristine or subversively potent—were bound to age poorly.
31. Rainer Werner Fassbinder

1. Stanley Kubrick

35mm film, color, 120 minutes.
Acquired from the Rainer Werner
Fassbinder Foundation

The Shining. 1980. Great Britain/USA.
35mm film, color, 146 minutes

2. CindySherman
Untitled Film Still #59. 1980. Gelatin
silver print, 6% x 91i in. (17.1 x
24.1 cm). Purchase

3. CindySherman
Untitled Film Still #58. 1980.
Gelatin silver print, 6 x 9 in.
(16 x 24.2 cm). Purchase

/5is
7
i$

4. CindySherman
Untitled Film Still #57. 1980.
Gelatin silver print, 6%$x 9%$in.
(16.6 x 24.2 cm). Purchase

5. Cindy Sherman
Untitled Film Still #56. 1980.
Gelatin silver print, 6 x 9%$in.
(16.2 x 24.2 cm). Purchase

/s
3

6. CindySherman
,3
/ie

Checklist of
Illustrations

/i$
3
/$
13

,5
/i6

This listing follows the
arrangement of the plate
section and provides full
citations for the works illus
trated. Followingthe plate
number and artist, the title
and date of the work are
given; then the medium
and dimensions in feet and
inches, and centimeters (or
meters); the entry concludes
in most cases with a credit
line. All works are in the
collection of The Museum
of Modern Art, NewYork.
The data vary for films and
videotapes, and additional
information about publica
tion and manufacture is
included for prints, archi
tecture, and design. For
multiple works by a single
artist, see the Index of
Illustrations.

17. Philip Guston
Untitled. 1980. Synthetic polymer
paint and ink on paper, 23 x 29 in.
(58.9 x 76.2 cm). Gift of Musa
Guston

18. Philip Guston
Untitled. 1980. Synthetic polymer
paint and ink on board, 20 x 30 in.
(50.7 x 76.2 cm). Gift of Musa
Guston

19. Philip Guston
Untitled. 1980. Synthetic polymer
paint and ink on paper, 20 x 30 in.
(50.9 x 76.2 cm). Gift of Musa
Guston

7. Vito Acconci

20. Jorg Immendorff

Instant Ftouse #2, Drawing. 1980.
Color inks and pencil on paper, 18 x
26 in. (46 x 66 cm). Fractional gift of
Joyce Pomeroy Schwartz

Cafe Deutschland (Style War). 1980.
Oil on canvas, 9 ft. 2%in. x 11 ft. 6 in.
(280 x 350.7 cm). Gift of Emily and
Jerry Spiegel

32. James Welling
Untitled #46. May 20, 1981.
Gelatin silver print, 9% x 7% in.
(19.5 x 24.3 cm). Gift of Carole
Littlefield

33. Bernard Tschumi
The Manhattan Transcripts. Episode
4: The Block. Project, 1976-81. Ink
and photographs on vellum, four of
fourteen sheets, each 19 x 31 in.
(48.2 x 78.7 cm). Purchase and par
tial gift of the architect in honor of
Lily Auchincloss

34. Frank Gohlke
Aerial View, Downed Forest near
Elk Rock, Approximately Ten Miles
Northwest of Mount St. Helens,
print, 17%x 21% in. (45.7 x 55.8 cm).
Purchased as the gift of Shirley C.
Burden

35. Georg Baselitz

8. Vito Acconci

21. Louis Malle

20 Foot Ladder for Any Size Wall.
1979-80. Photoetching on eight
sheets, overall: 19 ft. 4 in. x 41 in.
(589.3 x 104.2 cm). Publisher and
printer: Crown Point Press,
Oakland, Calif. Edition: 15. Frances
Keech Fund

Atlantic City. 1980.
Canada/France/USA.35mm film,
color, 104 minutes. Acquired from
Paramount Pictures

Woman on the Beach. 1981.
Woodcut and linoleum cut, comp.
and sheet: 31%$x 24%$in. (79.8 x
61.1 cm). Publisher: Maximilian
Verlag/Sabine Knust, Munich.
Printer: Elke Baselitz, Derneburg,
Germany. Edition: proof, before edi
tion of 50. Gift of Nelson Blitz, Jr.

22. Shohei Imamura

36. Georg Baselitz

9. Martin Scorsese
Raging Bull. 1980. 35mm film, black
and white and color, 119 minutes.
Acquired from United Artists

10. Niklaus Troxler
McCoy/Tyner/Sextet. 1980. Poster:
offset lithograph, 50% x 35% in.
(128 x 90.5 cm). Leonard and
Evelyn Lauder Fund

11. Jean-Luc Godard
France/Switzerland. 35mm film,
color, 88 minutes. Gift of Dan Talbot

12. Rainer WernerFassbinder
West Germany. 16mm film, color,
378 minutes

13. Lino Brocka
Bona. 1980. Philippines. 35mm film,
color, 83 minutes. Acquired from
Pierre Rissient
A. E. Bye Plouse. Ridgefield,
Axonometric projection, color pencil
and sepia print, 36% x 21% in.
(92.1 x 53.9 cm). D. S. and R. H.
Gottesman Foundation

15. Toshiyuki Kita
,5
/i$

Untitled. 1980. Synthetic polymer
paint and ink on board, 19%x 30 in.
(50.5 x 76 cm). Gift of Musa Guston

Untitled Film Still #54. 1980.
Gelatin silver print, 6
x 9%$in.
(17.3 x 24.2 cm). Purchase

14. John Hejduk
,5
/i$

16. Philip Guston

Wink Lounge Chair. 1980.
Polyurethane foam, welded steel,
and Dacron fiber-fill, upright: 40% x
33 x 31% in. (103.2 x 83.9 x 80.3
cm); reclining: 24% in. x 33 in. x 6 ft.
3% in. (62 x 83.9 x 192.5 cm); seat
height: 14%in. (37.5 cm). Manufac
turer: Cassina S.p.A., Italy. Gift of
Atelier International, Ltd.

35mm film, color, 128 minutes. Gift
of Janus Films
A River. 1980. Poster: offset litho
graph, 40%ex 28% in. (103.1 x
72.8 cm). Gift of the artist and
Japan Graphic Idea Exhibition

Drinker. 1981. Linoleum cut,
comp. and sheet: 31' x 23
in.
(80.8 x 60.5 cm). Publisher:
Maximilian Verlag/Sabine Knust,
Munich. Printer: Elke Baselitz,
Derneburg. Edition: proof, before
edition of 50. Gift of Mr. and
Mrs. Philip A. Straus

24. CarlosDiegues

37. Scott Burton

23. YojiYamamoto

They Don't Wear Black Tie. 1981.
Brazil. 35mm film, color, 120 min
utes. Acquired from Dan Talbot

Pair of Rock Chairs. 1980-81 .
Gneiss, in two parts: 49% x 43% x
40 in. (125.1 x 110.5 x 101.6 cm),
44x66x42% in. (111.6 x 167.7 x
108 cm). Acquired through the
Philip Johnson, Mr. and Mrs.
Joseph Pulitzer, Jr., and Robert
Rosenblum funds

26. Hector Babenco

38. Lee Friedlander

35mm film, color, 110 minutes.
Acquired from Dan Talbot

25. Leon Hirszman

Pixote. 1980. Brazil. 35mm film,
color, 127 minutes. Acquired from
Dan Talbot

27. Seiichi Furuya
Graz. 1980. Gelatin silver print,
14%x 9
in. (37.5 x 25.3 cm).
Gift of the Edward and Marjorie
Goldberger Foundation

43. George Miller
Mad Max 2 (The Road Warrior).
1981. Australia. 35mm film, color,
94 minutes

44. A. R. Penck (Ralf Winkler)
Nightvision from the portfolio First
Concentration I. 1982. Woodcut,
comp.: 35% x 27% in. (89.8 x
69.3 cm), sheet: 39% x 30% in.
(100 x 78.1 cm). Publisher.
Maximilian Verlag/Sabine Knust,
Munich. Printer: Atelier von Karl
Imhof, Munich. Edition: 50. Gift of
Nelson Blitz, Jr.

45. Andrzej Pagowski
Wolf's Smile (Usmiech Wilka).
1982. Poster: offset lithograph,
26% x 37 in. (67 x 94 cm). Purchase

46. Vija Celmins
Alliance. 1982. Drypoint, mezzotint,
and aquatint, plate.: 10%$x 7'/i$ in.
(25.5 x 18.9 cm) (irreg.), sheet: 24 x
19% in. (61 x 49.2 cm). Publisher
and printer: Gemini G.E.L., Los
Rockefeller 3rd Fund

47. Werner Herzog
Fitzcarraldo. 1982. West Germany.
35mm film, color, 157 minutes

48. BarbaraKruger
Untitled (You Invest in the Divinity
of the Masterpiece). 1982. Unique
photostat, 71% x 45% in. (182.2 x
115.8 cm), with frame 6 ft. % in. x
46% in. (185.6 x 118.7 cm). Acquired
through an anonymous fund

49. Katharina Fritsch
Madonna. 1982. Two multiples of
plaster with pigment, each 11'%$x
3'%x 2% in. (30 x 8 x 6 cm).
Publisher and fabricator: the artist.
Edition: unlimited. Purchased with
funds given by Linda Barth
Goldstein

50. Krzysztof Kieslowski
Blind Chance. 1982. Poland. 35mm
film, color, 122 minutes. Acquired
from Film Polski

51. Ingmar Bergman

Untitled. 1980. Gelatin silver print,
18%x 12%$(47.1 x 31.5). Purchase

Fanny and Alexander. 1982.
Sweden/France/West Germany.
35mm film, color, 188 minutes

39. Lee Friedlander

52. Tina Barney

Untitled. 1980. Gelatin silver print,
18%$x 12% in. (47.2 x 31.4 cm). The
Fellows of Photography Fund

Chromogenic color print (Ektacolor),
47% x 60% in. (120.7 x 154.8 cm).
Given anonymously

40. Lee Friedlander

Schattendorf. 1981. Gelatin silver
print, 14%x 10 in. (37.4 x 25.4 cm).
Gift of the photographer

Untitled. 1981. Gelatin silver print,
7
x 12 in. (20.1 x 30.5 cm). Gift
in honor of John Szarkowski from
the curatorial interns who worked
for him

29. Peter Hujar

41. CindySherman

54. Judith Joy Ross

Portrait of David Wojnarowicz.
1981. Gelatin silver print, 14 x 14 in.
(35.6 x 35.6 cm). The Fellows of
Photography Fund

Untitled #96. 1981. Chromogenic
color print (Ektacolor), 23
x 48'/$
in. (61.1 x 122.1 cm). Gift of Carl D.
Lobell

30. Rainer Werner Fassbinder

42. Willem de Kooning

Untitled from Eurana Park,
Gelatin silver printing-out-paper
print, 9%x 7% in. (24.8 x 19.7 cm).
Joseph G. Mayer Fund

Lola. 1981. West Germany. 35mm
film, color, 113 minutes. Acquired
from the Rainer Werner Fassbinder
Foundation

Pirate (Untitled II). 1981. Oil on can
vas, 7 ft. 4 in. x 6 ft. 4% in. (223.4 x
194.4 cm). Sidney and Flarriet Janis
Collection Fund

28. Seiichi Furuya

53. Nicholas Nixon
Chestnut Street, Louisville,
Kentucky. 1982. Gelatin silver print,
7"/i$ x 9'%6in. (19.5 x 24.5 cm). The
Family of Man Fund

55. WayneWang
Chan Is Missing. 1982. USA. 35mm
film, black and white, 80 minutes.
Acquired from Dan Talbot

541


70. Terry Jones and Terry Gilliam

71. Swatch

72. Swatch
OK 100 Jellyfish Watch. 1983. Plastic and metal, 6 x 16 5/8 in. (16.5 x 42.3 cm). Manufacturer: Swatch AG, Switzerland. Gift of the manufacturer.

73. Bruce Nauman
Human/Made/Dasine. 1983. Naomi genuine, transformed, and wires, overall: 7 ft. 10 in. x 70 in. x 25 1/4 in. (238.8 x 178.7 x 65.4 cm). Gift of Emily and Jerry Soppe.

74. Joel Sternfeld
Houston, Texas. 1983. Chromogenic color print, 13 1/16 x 17 in. (33.2 x 43.2 cm). Purchased as the gift of the Joel W. Solomon Estate.

75. Joel Sternfeld
Canyon Country, California. 1983. Chromogenic color print, 15 1/2 x 11 1/2 in. (39.4 x 29.7 cm). Gift of the photographer.

76. Kathryn Bigelow and Mento Montgomery
Breakdown (The Loveless). 1983. USA, 35mm film, color, 92 minutes. Gift of Kathryn Bigelow.

77. Edward Ruscha
Hollywood is a Verb. 1983. Dry pigment on paper, 25 x 23 in. (63.5 x 58.4 cm). Purchased with funds given by Agnes Gund, Mr. and Mrs. James Hedges IV, Ronald S. Lauder, and the General Drawings Fund.

78. Martin Scorsese
The King of Comedy. 1983. 35mm film, color, 101 minutes.

79. Federico Fellini
And the Ship Sails On. 1983. USA/West Germany. 35mm film, color, 107 minutes. Acquired from the artist.

80. Nicholas Nixon

81. Anselm Kiefer
Der Wohnen. 1983. Illustrated book with twenty-one woodcuts including front and back covers, pages: 225 x 101 in. (571.8 x 256.5 cm). Gift of the trustee.

82. Frank Stella
Glück, ein Leben (or 'Glück' im Garten). 1984. Synthetic polymer print, dry pigment, and oil stick on various fabrics, 9 ft. 10 in. x 7 ft. 4 in. x 12 in. (297.9 x 224.9 x 30.5 cm). Fractional gift of Ronald S. Lauder.

83. Sigmar Polke

84. Bruce Nauman
Crossed Stadiums. 1984. Synthetic polymer print, watercolor, charcoal, and pastel on paper, 59 x 72 in. (149.8 x 182.9 cm). Gift of the Lauder Foundation.

85. Claes Oldenburg
Proposal for a Monument to the Survivor of the University of Bologna. 1984. Polished aluminum; 60 in. (152.4 cm). Gift of the donor and gift of Ronald S. Lauder.

86. Sergio Leone

87. Gary Hill

88. Mary Ann Toots Zynsky

89. Andy Warhol
Rosacean. 1984. Synthetic polymer paint on canvas, 13 ft. 6 1/8 in. x 9 ft. 7 in. (417.2 x 292.1 cm). Purchase.

90. Anselm Kiefer
Separation from Egypt. 1984. Synthetic polymer paint, charcoal, and string on cut-and-pasted photograph and cardboard, 43 1/2 x 33 3/4 in. (110.9 x 85.7 cm). Gift of the Danilo and Andrew Saul Fund.

91. Sherrie Levine

92. David Goldblatt
Mother and child in their home after the destruction of its shelter by officials of the Western Cape Development Board, Crossroads, Cape Town, 11 October 1984. 1984. Gelatin silver print, 10 x 13 1/3 in. (25.7 x 34.5 cm). Gift of Vito Russo.

93. Judith Joy Ross

94. Aldo Rossi with Gianni Botsford

95. Jean-Michel Basquiat

96. Sergio Leone

308. Iou Hsiao-hsien
Summer at Clandestine. 1984. Taiwan, 35mm film, color, 102 minutes.

97. Neil Jordan
Once upon a Time in America. 1984. USA, 35mm film, color, 227 minutes.

98. Bill Viola
 Departure from Egypt. 1984. Synthetic polymer paint, charcoal, and string on cut-and-pasted photograph and cardboard, 43 1/2 x 33 3/4 in. (110.9 x 85.7 cm). Gift of the Danilo and Andrew Saul Fund.

100. Richard Prince
Animation eel from 35mm film, color, 90 minutes. Acquired from the artist.

99. Mary Ann Toots Zynsky

101. Paul Graham
And the Ship Sails On. 1983. USA, Gelatin silver, color, sound, 8 minutes. Purchase.

102. John B. Turner Fund
Once upon a Time in America. 1984. USA, 35mm film, color, 227 minutes.

103. Robert Ryman
Show Girl. 1984. ABS plastic casing, 13 1/2 x 9 1/2 x 4 in. (34.3 x 24.1 x 10.2 cm). Gift of the artist.

104. Sergio Leone

105. Aldo Rossi with Gianni Botsford
City of Casale Monferrato. 1984. ABS plastic casing, 13 1/2 x 9 1/2 x 4 in. (34.3 x 24.1 x 10.2 cm). Gift of the artist.

106. Jean-Jacques Burnel
Woman Twirling. 1985. Silver dye transfer print, 11 5/8 x 15 9/16 in. (29.5 x 40.1 cm). Gift of anonymous donor and gift of Ronald S. Lauder.

107. Dan Flavin
Five White Lights. 1986. USA, 35mm film, black and white and color, 69 minutes. Gift of Vivo Russo.

108. Tom Burden

109. Mako Idemitsu
Fluegel. 1984. Synthetic polymer paint, charcoal, and string on cut-and-pasted photograph and cardboard, 43 1/2 x 33 3/4 in. (110.9 x 85.7 cm). Gift of the Danilo and Andrew Saul Fund.

110. John Cassavetes
Love Streams. 1984. USA, 35mm film, color, 141 minutes. Gift of the artist and Cannon Films, Inc.

111. Aldo Rossi with Gianni Botsford

112. John Cassavetes
Love Streams. 1984. USA, 35mm film, color, 141 minutes. Gift of the artist and Cannon Films, Inc.

113. Aldo Rossi with Gianni Botsford
351. **Boy Lichtenstein**
Interior with Akibah. 1992. Oil and synthetic polymer paint (Magna) on canvas, 10 ft. 10 in. x 14 ft. 3 in. (3.15 x 4.44 m). End A. Haupt Fund, gift of Agnès Gund, Ronald S. Lauder, Michael and Judy Ovitz in honor of Roy and Dorothy Lichtenstein, and Anna Marie and Robert F. Shapiro.

352. **Christopher Connell**
Pepe Chair. 1992. Travertine, cast aluminum, and fabric. 51.1 x 20.4 x 24 in. (130.5 x 51.8 x 61.0 cm). Manufacturer: MAP (Marchants of Australian Products Pty., Ltd., Australia). Gift of the designer through the Netherlands Design Institute.

353. **Ben FayaUberbe**

354. **Ingo Maurer**

355. **Guillermo Kuitca**
Untitled. 1992. Mixed mediums on canvas, 8 ft. 4 in. x 6 ft. 7 in. (2.56 x 1.98 m). Gift of Patricia Phillips de Cenoz in memory of Thomas Ammann.

356. **Willy Cole**

357. **Azra Isfahani**

358. **Richard Serra**
Inense 11. 1992. Co-Ten steel, four plate, each 15 ft. 3 in. x 1 ft. 5 in. (4.6 m x 0.45 m). Gift of Richard S. Lauder.

359. **Peter Campus**
Burning. 1992. Chromogenic color print, 30 x 40 in. (76.2 x 101.6 cm). Gift of Paul F. Walter in memory of Mark Kaminski.

360. **Rudolf Budolle**

361. **Santiago Calatrava**
Alamillo Bridge and Cartagena Viaduct, Seville, Spain. 1987-92. Model, acrylic and mirror glass, 24 in. x 8 ft. 10 in. x 8 ft. 2 in. (61 x 2.7 x 2.45 m). Gift of the architect.

362. **Santiago Calatrava**
Alamillo Bridge and Cartagena Viaduct, Seville, Spain. 1987-92. Elevator, model on tracing paper, approx. 17 x 23 in. (43.2 x 58.4 cm). Gift of the architect.
404. Cheryl Donegan
Head 1993. USA. Videotape, color, sound, 2 minutes 40 seconds. Gift of Susan Jacoby

405. Jos van der Meulen
Paper Bag Notebook. 1993. Paper, woven cardboard, dimensions, 35 x 27 in. (90 x 70 cm); 20.5 x 13 in. (52 x 33 cm); and 15 x 10 in. (25 cm). Manufacturer: Foods, the Netherlands. Gift of the Manufacturer

406. Nam June Paik
Untitled. 1993. Player piano, fifteen televisions, two cameras, two laser discs and two players, one electric light and light bulb, and wires, overall: approx. 8 ft. 4 in. x 8 ft. 9 in. x 4 ft. 12 in. (2.54 x 2.67 x 1.22 m). Binnaill Fund, Gerald S. Elliot Fund, gift of Margot Paul Ernst, and purchase

407. Hal Hartley
Amateur 1994. USA/Mexico/Brazil/France, 35mm film, color, 165 minutes. Gift of the artist

408. Quentin Tarantino
405. Jos van der Meulen

409. Lorna Simpson

410. Renzo Piano
Kansai International Airport, Osaka, Japan. 1988-94. Passenger terminal, main building: painted brass, 61% x 51% x 6% in. (152 x 12.7 x 15 cm). Gift of the architect in honor of Philip Johnson.

411. Takeshi Ishiguro
Plate Salt-and-Pepers Shakers. 1994. Engraved, slip-cast, and molded in rice flour, dimensions variable, from 4 in. x 4 in. to 2 x 1 in. (1.3 x 1.6 cm to 10.2 x 2.6 cm). Gift of the designer

412. Kim Jones
Untitled. 1994-95. Pencil and erasures on paper, 24% x 37 in. (61.5 x 94 cm). Gift of Sarah Ann and Warren H. Kramarsky

413. Andreas Gursky
Shain. 1994. Chromogenic color print, 70% x 7% in. (180 x 235 cm). Anonymous Purchase Fund

414. Mona Hatoum
Silence. 1994. Glass, 49% x 36% in. (120 x 92 cm). Robert B. and Emily W. Betts Foundation Fund

415. Telju Furushashi
Lovers. 1994. Japan. Video installation with five laser discs and players, five projectors, two sound systems, two slide projectors, and two computers, overall: 11 ft. 8 in. x 32 ft. 10 in. (3.5 x 10 x 8.1 m). Gift of Cantor, Inc.

416. Bill Viola
Stations. 1994. USA. Video installation with five laser discs and players, five projectors, five cloth screens, five granite slabs, and sound system in a 70 x 30 ft. (23 x 9.1 m) room. Gift of the Birchen Foundation in honor of Richard E. Oldenburg.

417. Jenny Holzer

418. Robert Gober
Untitled. 1993-94. Bronze, wood, brass, aluminum, beaver skin, human hair, chrome, paint, and water; 32 x 37% x 34 in. (142.3 x 92.9 x 85.7 cm). Gift of the artist

419. Ann Hamilton
Scream. 1994. Room installation with two entrances on front wall, laser disc and player, projector, rag, wood, plastic, and three pans of glass, room dimensions: 11 ft. 5 in. x 24 ft. 15 in. x 18 ft. 47.9 in. x 744.2 in. x 467.8 in. Louise and Bessie Adler Foundation, Inc., Fund, and Peepal and David McCall Fund

420. Ross Bleckner
Island-Pooling Waters. Vol. IV from the series Islands. 1994-95. Two-chromogenic print, each 15% x 11% in. (40 x 29 cm). Gift of Agnes Gund

421. Marlene Dumas
Ostovia. 1994. Ink, gouache, and synthetic polymer print on paper, twenty-four sheets, 26 x 19% in. (66.2 x 49.5 cm) each. The Herbert and Narineh Rothschild Memorial Fund in honor of Judith Rothchild

422. Reena Jhinguer
Soft Voice. 1994. Polyurathana, 104% in. (265.5 cm) high x 6 in. (15 cm) diameter. Manufacturer: 3M, the Netherlands, for Droog Design. Frederieke Taylor Purchase Fund

423. Richard Artschwager
Five printed works. 1994. Wood and metal. From left to right: 26% in. x 7 ft. 8 in. x 22% in. (84.7 x 223.7 x 57.2 cm); 21% in. x 32% in. x 42% in. (53.7 x 82.6 x 106.6 cm); 13% in. x 10% in. x 30% in. (30.1 x 127.1 x 91.5 cm); 46% in. x 136% in. (117 x 34 x 41.3 cm); ft. 8 in. x 9 in. x 12 in. (20.3 x 7.3 x 31.8 cm). Gift of Agnes Gund and Anna Marie and Robert F. Shapiro Fund

424. Uta Barth
Ground #35. 1994. Chromogenic color print (Exhibition), 17% x 20% in. (44.3 x 53.3 cm). E. T. Herrmann Foundation Fund

425. Ey Twombly
The Four Seasons: Autumn, Winter, Spring, and Summer. 1993-94. Synthetic polymer print, oil, pencil, and spray on canvas: Autumn, 10 ft. 3 in. x 8 ft. 2% in. (316.7 x 269 cm); Winter, 10% ft. x 3% in. x 6 ft. 2% in. (310 x 180.1 cm); Spring, 10% ft. x 3% in. x 6 ft. 2% in. (310 x 180.1 cm); and Summer (1994), 10% ft. x 3% in. x 6 ft. 1% in. (314 x 180.1 cm). Gift of the artist

426. Philippe Starck
Jim Nature Portable Television. 1994. High-density wood and plastics, 15% x 4% in. x 14% in. (38.5 x 37 x 35.7 cm). Manufacturer: Thomson Consumer Electronics, France. Gift of the manufacturer

427. Rineke Dijkstra
To Amsterdam, the Netherlands. 11 November 1994. Photograph from the series Trusting Parents. Back: Amsterdam, the Netherlands, 23 June 1994. Two chromogenic prints, each 15% x 11% in. (40 x 29 cm). Gift of Agnes Gund

428. Marlene Dumas
Ostovia. 1994. Ink, gouache, and synthetic polymer print on paper, twenty-four sheets, 26 x 19% in. (66.2 x 49.5 cm) each. The Herbert and Narineh Rothschild Memorial Fund in honor of Judith Rothchild

429. Bella Jhinguer
Soft Voice. 1994. Polyurathana, 104% in. (265.5 cm) high x 6 in. (15 cm) diameter. Manufacturer: 3M, the Netherlands, for Droog Design. Frederieke Taylor Purchase Fund

430. James Turrell
A Frontal Passage. 1994. Fluorescent light installation, dimensions variable, museum installation, 12 ft. 10 in. x 22 ft. 6 in. x 34 ft. (3.91 x 68.5 x 103.6 cm). Louis and Bessie Adler Foundation, Inc., Fund, and Peepal and David McCall Fund

431. Jeff Scher
Rear of Gardens. 1994. USA. 16mm film, color, 8 minutes. Gift of the artist

432. Barbara Kruger
Public projects and illustrated book. 1986-94. Covers for Esquire, MS, and Newweek magazines. 1992. Three photolithographs, each 11% x 14% in. (27.3 x 22.8 cm). Editions: unlimited. Purchase, Un-
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Huillet, Daniele (French, born 1936): Sicilia!, 544.

II
Idemitsu, Mako (Japanese, born 1945): Great Mother Part II; Yamiko, 89.
Imamura, Shohei (Japanese, born 1926): Vinylite, 22.
Immendorff, Jörg (German, born 1945): Cafe Deutschland (Style War), 86.
Inoue Pleats Co., Ltd. Wrinkle (Style War), 357.

K
Kabakov, Ilya (Russian, born 1933): The Man Who Flew into His Picture from the Ten Characters series, 214.
Kapoor, Anish (British, born India 1954): A Flower, A Drama Like Death, 146; Untitled (Red Leaf), 191; Wounds and Absent Objects, 518.
Kčio (Alexis Leyva Machado) (Cuban, born 1970): In the Eyes of History, 447; The Infinite Column I, 469.
Keller, Götz (German, born 1958): See Office for Metropolitan Architecture.
Kelley, Mike (American, born 1960): Exploring (from "Plato’s Cave, Rothko’s Chapel Lincoln’s Profile") (Project), 131; Untitled, 296; Heidi, 350.
Kelly, Ellsworth (American, born 1923): Three Panels: Orange, Dark Gray, Green, 146; Red-Orange Panel with Curve, 391.
Kentridge, William (South African, born 1955): Dubu Tells the Truth, 501; Seated Couple (Back to Back), 538; Untitled (drawing for Stereoscope), 539.
Khedoori, Toba (Australian, born 1964): Untitled (Doors), 444.
Kiefer, Anselm (German, born 1945): Der Rhein, 81; Departure from Egypt, 101; The Red Sea, 121; Grane, 385.
Kippenberger, Martin (German, 1953–1997): The World of the Canary, 232; Martin, Stand in the Corner and Be Ashamed of Yourself, 274.
Kita, Toshiyuki (Japanese, born 1942): Wink Lounge Chair, 15; The Multilingual Studio, 309.
Kochta, Brigitte (German, born 1958): See Office for Metropolitan Architecture.
Kohn, Martin (Canadian, born 1953): See Office for Metropolitan Architecture.
Koohaa, Rem (Dutch, born 1944): See Office for Metropolitan Architecture.
Koons, Jeff (American, born 1955): Three Ball 50/50 Tank, 137; Rabbit, 158; Pink Panther, 216.
Kounellis, Jannis (Greek, born 1933): Untitled, 67.
Ligon, Glenn (American, born 1960): Untitled (How it feels to be colored me... Doubled), 335; Runaways, 386; White #19, 438.
Loesch, Uwe (German, born 1943): Point (Punktum), 57.
Löw, Glen Oliver (German, born 1959): Mobil Container System, 396.
Lucier, Mary (American, born 1945): Ohio at Giverny: Memory of Light, 190.
Lynch, Peter: See Steven Holl.

M
Maas, Wimy (Dutch, born 1944): See Office for Metropolitan Architecture.
Madden, John (British, born 1949): Shakespeare in Love, 527.
Maggiore, Ray (Dutch, born 1944): See Office for Metropolitan Architecture.
Marden, Brice (American, born 1938): Cold Mountain Series, Zen Study 1 (Early State), 280; Cold Mountain Series, Zen Study 3 (Early State), 281; Rain, 342; Vine, 388.
Mamo, Enzo (Italian, born 1952): Flores Box, 332.
Markert, Chris (French, born 1921): The Last Bolshevik (Le Tombeau d’Alexandre), 383.
Maurer, Ingo (German, born 1932): Lucellino Wall Lamp, 354.
Mazda Motor Corporation (Japanese): MX5 Miata Automobile Taillights, 87.
McCollum, Allan (American, born 1944): 40 Plaster Surrogates, 110.
Menzies, Kario (Italian, born 1925): Places with No Street, 195.
Messager, Annette (French, born 1943): My Paws, 310.
Mihailov, Boris (Ukrainian, born 1938): Untitled from the series U Zemli (On the Ground), 313; 314; 315.
Mikhalikov, Nikita (Russian, born 1945): Dark Eyes, 177.
Miller, George (Australian, born 1945): Mad Max 2 (The Road Warrior), 43.
Montgomery, Monty (American) Breakdown (The Loveless), 76.
Morphosis: 6th Street House Project, Santa Monica, California, 207.
Moukhin, Igor (Russian, born 1961): Moscow, May 9, 1966, 481.
Muniz, Vik (Brazilian, born 1961): Mass from the series Pictures of Chocolate, 487.
Murray, Elizabeth (American, born 1940): Her Story by Anne Waldman, 294; Dia Fair, 295.

Nauman, Bruce (American, born 1941): Humor/Need/Desire, 73; Donned Stadiums, 94; Dirty Story, 172; Learned Helplessness in Rats (Rock and Roll Drummer), 213; Model for Animal Pyramid II, 240.
Neutelings, Willems-Jan (Dutch, born 1959): see Office for Metropolitan Architecture
Newson, Marc (Australian, born 1963); Wood Chair, 224; Orgone Chaise Longue, 257.
Nixon, Nicholas (American, born 1947); Chestnut Street, Louisville, Kentucky, 53; C.C., Boston, 80.
Novel, Jean (French, born 1945); Cartier Foundation for Contemporary Art, 397; Less Table, 436.

Office for Metropolitan Architecture: City Hall Competition, the Hague, the Netherlands, 196; National Library of France (Tres Grande Bibliothèque), Paris, 247; Palm Bay Seafront Hotel and Convention Center, Florida, 299.
Ofili, Chris (British, born 1968): North Wales, 472; Untitled, 529; Prince amongst Thieves, 548.
Omar, Arthur (Brazilian, born 1948): The Last Mermaid, 485.
Orozco, Gabriel (Mexican, born 1929): Proposal for a Monument to the Survival of the University of El Salvador: Blasted Pencil (That Still Writes), 95.
Pace, Judith Joy (American, born 1944): Preview, 289.
Patterson, Simon (British, born 1942): see Room with a View, 548.
Penck, A.R. (Ralph Winkler) (German, born 1939): Blasted Pencil (That Still Writes), 485.
Penone, Giuseppe (Italian, born 1948): The Last Mermaid, 485.
Richter, Gerhard (German, born 1932): October 18, 1977, 210; Details from a Picture (Halifax 1978), 520.
Rigby, Lucian (Belgian, born 1955): see Office for Metropolitan Architecture
Richer, Gerhard (German, born 1932): October 18, 1977, 210; Details from a Picture (Halifax 1978), 520.
Rist, Pipilotti (Swiss, born 1962): Ever Is Over All, 510.
Rothenberg, Susan (American, born 1945): Biker, 160; Beneven, 141.
Ruff, Thomas (German, born 1958): Portrait, 234.
Rup, Sheron (American, born 1943): Untitled (Bayside, Ontario, Canada), 456.
Sacco, Brian (American, born 1955): One's Defrosting, 421.
Sala, Doris (Colombian, born 1958): Untitled, 448.
Sánchez, Juan (American, born 1954): For don Pedro, 370.
Sanders, Joel (American, born 1954): Untitled, 421; Untitled #197, 230; Untitled #250, 347.
Schorsese, Martin (American, born 1942): Raging Bull, 9; The King of Comedy, 78; The Last Temptation of Christ, 232; Goodfellas, 308; The Age of Innocence, 400.
Scott, Ridley (British, born 1937); Blade Runner, 60.
Shapiro, Joel (American, born 1941): Untitled, 271.
Sherman, Cindy (American, born 1954): Untitled Film Still #59, 2; Untitled Film Still #58, 3; Untitled Film Still #57, 4; Untitled Film Still #56, 5; Untitled Film Still #54, 6; Untitled Film Still #41, 41; Untitled #197, 230; Untitled #250, 347.
Sicilia, José María (Spanish, born 1954): Two volumes of Le Livre des mille nuits et une nuit, 464.
Simmons, Gary (American, born 1964): boom, 470.
Smith, Kiki (American, born 1954); A Man, 292; Untitled, 293; Constellations, 482; Endocrinology, 500.
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