Nasher Sculpture Center

360 Speaker Series
Artist Kathryn Andrews

Presented August 25, 2012 at Nasher Sculpture Center

Anna Smith: I'm Curator of Education, Anna Smith, and today I'm happy to introduce artist Kathryn Andrews. Kathryn Andrews' work thrives on and generates startling juxtapositions. Employing materials that range from ephemeral party balloons to movie props to borrowed works by well-known artists. Her visual contradictions challenge viewers' preconceived ideas about the value of disposable, pleasurable objects and of so-called high art. Examining issues of authorship, permanence, and the role of the viewer in static, immutable works, Andrews fuses serious art historical dialogue with a keen sense of humor.

Kathryn Andrews received her BFA from *Duke University* and her MFA from *Art Center College of Design*. Her work has recently been seen at the *Institute of Contemporary Art* at the University of Pennsylvania, at *United Artists, Ltd.* in Marfa, at the *Rubell Collection* in Miami, and at *MOCA Los Angeles*. In 2012 Andrews will present a solo exhibition at *David Kordansky Gallery* in Los Angeles.

Kathryn has asked me to advise you that there will be some graphic images in the presentation, so please use your discretion as you're viewing this.

And now we are very pleased to be hosting her today. Please join me in welcoming Kathryn Andrews.

Kathryn Andrews: So I thought I would start by instead of talking about my work in the way that I normally do, which is to give a historical overview in terms of earlier works, my thinking around them and then, sort of how my thinking developed. Instead, to do something much more mixed up, sort of a hodge-podge, and let's see where we can go with that.

So hopefully you can bear with me. I'll try to make it make some kind of sense.

I wanted to start by asking a question which is a question that... I'm not even using this thing. Is it coming from here? Oh yeah. Can you guys hear me? Okay great. I wanted to start with a question which is one that I think about a lot, and it's a question that drives most of what I'm making. And that question would be, "Where is the work?"

I'm interested in thinking about how we locate the artwork when we see it; how we language it; how we describe it; how we define it.

And in relation to that, I would ask a second question which is, "Where is the artist?" And I think that these two questions are very closely linked and perhaps one can't be answered without answering the other one.

So I wanted to start with an image that is a screen grab from Art Basel's website. I was invited to be on a panel discussion there in June in Switzerland. They host a lot

2001 Flora Street
Dallas, TX 75201

+1 214.242.5100

of talks between artists, curators, whatnot, in relation to works being shown at the fair, and if you look here. It's probably hard for you guys to read it, so I'll tell you what you're looking at. This is from Art Basel's website and then "talks and events" and then it goes on to show like, "Oh this talk happened with these people." And if you click on the website there's a little button you can press and you can see the talk online. So one day I was like, "Well I wonder if my talk is up there. Oh God I hope not. I'm so embarrassed." But, anyway, there's more details about that... I had a wild night the night before so...

I looked online and to my relief, here is this video that's posted here and it says that the panelists were Abraham Cruzvillegas, who's from Mexico City. He was on my right. Myself, artist from Los Angeles, and a moderator, Jens Hoffmann, who's a curator at CCA Wattis in San Francisco.

And then I look up and above is a video about Cy Twombly. So, if you press this button on the website for an hour you can hear a very interesting discussion about Cy Twombly. And I thought, "Oh, that's fascinating. What happens in this kind of situation? Will anyone actually watch these talks?" Probably not, because we all have a lot to do but for those people really bored who want to, I wondered what kind of sense they're going to make out of this kind of information, and then this kind of information. And so, a lot of times this sort of thing seems to happen to me but I don't think I'm alone in that. I think it's just a lot of people transmitting information around and mistakes happen. So probably the person who set up the site incorrectly linked to this video. So I thought, "Well, what happens in that case? Do I contact them and ask them to correctly link it? Does my gallery do that? Does some random person watching this send Art Basel a note?" So I haven't done anything about it and we'll see what happens. So I'm curious to see how that develops.

These are the kind of things I'm interested in thinking about. What happens when an artwork exists, it gets attached to an artist's name, and when that artist's name get sort of bandied about in the systems that are out there, creating slippages between the representation-- slippages between the work and the way that the work gets represented. Let's say that.

So, to go more specifically into my work, let me start by showing you an image from 2007. For a while, I was making works that had a lot to do with some of the formal questions explored by Russian Constructivism and that was through 2002 to 2007. And as I was making these pieces, people were coming to them and saying, "Oh it reminds me so much of early Modernism." And I said, "Great! I love early Modernism." And they said, "Yeah, great." And they would walk away and we wouldn't talk about it further. And what I realized, what kept happening was that works I was making in that time people were easily placing them into a visual category that felt very familiar to their knowledge of art history. And so if it seemed quite familiar to them, instead of really looking at it and thinking about how it might be different from what they've seen before, they would, pretty much, just say, "Oh, I sort of already know that. I'm busy I've got a lot other stuff to look at." And they'd walk away.

So I thought, "Well that's kind of a bummer," because I'd rather people have a more engaged interaction with my work.

[pre-recorded laughter]

So what I decided was that I wasn't going to make work like that. That I would do something different that would require people have a different kind of response. So it took me quite some time to figure out what that was.

In 2007 I made this piece. This is an artwork here. I curated a show in Los Angeles with a bunch of young LA artists called *Modern Lovers*. And this show had a component where I interviewed the different artists, and I was trying to understand how they made sense of their own relationship to Modernism or to a sort of historic vernacular. And if they thought that was okay or was that weird? What kinds of responses they were getting when people were looking at their works?

So this is actually an artwork by an artist who lives in Los Angeles named Jill Spector, and as I hung this show I decided as I was going along that the show was lacking in some ways visually. So I decided to just insert some decorative elements that appeared to be artworks, or maybe they were artworks, that would help the show have a more sort of powerful formal appearance. So this is one of those things that I inserted, and I decided that with these works that I wouldn't give them titles and I wouldn't put my name to them. So as you walked around the exhibition, you would come to three objects within it in addition to the works in the show. But there was no information about them. And I thought, "Well this is really interesting because it creates a problem for the viewer." What does the viewer do when they come to an artwork and they can't understand exactly what the materials are? There's no description. They don't understand even what the size of the work is because its dimensions aren't described anywhere. They don't know what is this work. "Is it really this and this or is this part of the work or is this part of the work?"

[pre-recorded laughter]

Wrong button.

So, this, I actually chose these forms because they reminded me very much of these light fixtures. And I thought, "Oh, well that's funny to put a work too close to the light fixtures." Usually you'd never do this. You're trying to get space, you know, and make it look pristine. And I also liked how this, visually, when you came to this artist's work, this sort of framed the eye and it pointed down and helped you see hers better.

So what happened when I did this was that a lot of people came to the exhibition and they got really pissed off. And some of the gestures I made, actually, were really close to the other artists' works. Though, I had asked each of these artists permission and the artists were fine with it, but the viewers didn't know that so they were like, "Ugh, that's so uncool what you did." And I was, like, really happy because I thought, "Oh that's awesome. People are, like, mad when they're seeing my work versus bored, and I'd much rather have mad than bored." So I was like, "Okay, I'm on to something here."

2001 Flora Street
Dallas, TX 75201

+1 214.242.5100

So this is another sort of shot of that exhibition that I curated. And I had built this wall which was framing this person's painting. Another painting was on it and I was trying to make certain formal relationships between the works where, like for example,

here's this horse on a rider--this is a sculpture made by the artist Ruby Neri. This is a painting by Brian Fahlstrom--where I was looking at how you make connections between things. And I want to make a point here, and I'll revisit this point later on in the talk, but one of the things I was looking at that amused me, and maybe I had... I hadn't consciously constructed this because Ruby said, "Oh I'm going to show up with a crazy pink and purple sculpture, blah, blah." Okay, great. And then she showed up with this instead like the day we were installing and that's sort of the way artists work: you never know what you're getting. But it serendipitously created this nice connection here. But, beyond that which was sort of a chance result, I was trying to make formal connections between the different pieces. So, one of the things I liked about this, and I saw it later after I saw the imagery, was that not only was there a nice color relationship between these two but you could actually imagine this is a sort of landscape and this is sort of a rider on a horse going through the landscape.

So I was thinking about, "Oh what are the ways we make connections?" Well one of the ways we connect things that are disparate is through formal resonance--like in this case the resonance of certain colors--but there's also symbolic resonances like we view this as a man on a horse and we might view this as a landscape, and it's not a far stretch to think a man on a horse might be in a landscape. So these are sort of basic perceptual things I'm describing but they do affect how we make sense of things. So I'll come back to that point in a bit.

After I did that show, I proceeded to attempt to make works using other artists' works, but where I did so very explicitly: making something in relation to another artist's work, but not doing it surreptitiously, where my name wasn't visible or it was, like, hidden or not accessible. I tried to make works where I borrow another artist's work and make something in response to theirs. So I put together another show with that in mind and I invited several artists to participate, and then they all like were flakey for different reasons, which were funny at the time except for not so funny for me because I was trying to make work in relation to their work.

So, I decided, "Oh these artists are too hard to deal with. You know. I don't know. What else could I use in the world that would have a sort of dynamic like that?" And so I started looking--I was looking at neon signs then for a different reason--and I came upon this neon prop shop in Hollywood that rented neon signage out to TV and films. And I was in there one day and I saw this--this actually has, like, a blue element and this one has a purple one--but I saw this and I thought, "Oh, that's a really kooky sign. What is that?" And they said, "Oh, that's from our 80s collection. The secretary in the office here designed it. It reminded her of the 80s and we rent it out for shows that want to evoke the 80s." And I thought, "That's hilarious." Like, how did she decide that this is the 80s and that, or like, could this have been over here a few more inches or whatever. But now she's decided that, that now comes to represent the 80s whenever we watch Hollywood TV shows that need to quickly reference that.

So I then produced this in response to that, and it's the same, it's just inverted and this is purple and that's blue. In person it looks... it's kind of hard to see it here. So, and I hung the two together and the work is called *The 80s* and the materials are rented neon sign and fabricated neon sign. So, and it's shown as one work. And it

was in a painting exhibition at a gallery that I thought of as frequently showing expressionistic painting. So it was sort of a joke I was making with myself about how that gallery is, like, I think kind of cheesy in what they show. So I thought I'd put something more cheesy there and let's see what that would do.

So anyway... So before I go--here let me go back here a sec. One of the things I'm looking at quite a lot is what happens when you locate the artist in a part of the work that's not where the artist would typically be located. What I mean by that is: if you have an artwork and you're a viewer and you're coming to it and you're trying to make sense out of it, one of the questions you might ask is, "Oh, who made this? When was it made? What other kinds of works did they make? How does this work signify in relation to the other works of this artist?" Whatever. And usually when you know an artist's body of work, it often changes the way you experience that individual piece. So I began thinking about, "Well, what happens if--when people want to start asking those questions and make sense of my object in relation to their idea of who I am--what would happen if I were to start moving myself? And so, the viewer could not locate the object in relation to me because I was constantly moving." And this is sort of an attempt at that, because I think normally you might come to a work and just from the outset assume the artist had made the whole thing until you learn more about it. But actually what happens is: here's me, sort of my gesture, I'm maybe Kathryn Andrews is framed by this part and this part is something coming from the world. So Kathryn Andrews begins to become a frame that's framing something that precedes my interest.

Here's another work that was sort of made with this thinking in maybe 2009. 2008 or 2009 I can't remember. I was invited to be in a group show in Berlin, and some friends of mine organized it and they said, "Will you put a sculpture in?" And I said, "Well, that sounds really complicated. I'm in LA and you guys don't have a budget for that." And I said, but--and I like the kinds of circumstantial things because I think they can help you have a reason to make a work that you wouldn't normally make--so I said, "Why don't you guys just make a work and just put it in the show, and just sign my name to the work." And they said, "Well, what would the work be?" And I said, "Well, I have no idea, just, you know, have fun with it." So this is what they made. And they decided that this represented me, and, like, very literally they were like, "Well, if we put her name on it, it really does represent her." And they put these little butterfly stickers on it. There's one there and there. And I just thought, "Oh, that's the sweetest thing in the world. Like, I would never make that and that's fantastic." So, I'm actually very conscious about being a woman artist and I try to not make things that are overtly feminine because I feel like that would cause people to put me in the "woman artist" camp, which is a tricky camp to be in in the art world because it's quite sexist in my opinion. So I really would never give myself permission to make this work and I love that this very feminine work had come out of this gesture that had nothing to do with me.

This is another work I made maybe around the same time, and it came from a similar thinking. I began making a series of works that took the birthday as its subject matter, or as subject matter. I was thinking about, "Oh, the person's birthday is this place where you can locate them from. They're born here; they're born in this place at this

time. So we can begin to construct this narrative about who they are." So I began sort of looking at that subject matter as something that I'd work with, and you'll see more of that as I go forward.

In any event, here, this was a diptych. This was some found wrapping paper I made, I think this piece is called *Birthday*. And this is a print that I made and the way that I made it--it's a silkscreen, it's unique--was that I went to this printmaker that I've worked with quite a lot. For years he's been involved with all kinds of, like, LA artists that are heavily involved in printmaking. And as we were there, a lot of times I would go to his shop and he'd look at me and be like, "What are we making?" And I'd look at him and I'd be like, "I don't know. Got any ideas?" And we would stand there and we'd just sort of look at each other. And I'd say, "Well why don't we pull these colors out. I like these colors. I know that." And so we'd put them on the table. And I'd say, "Well you know, what are the things that we could do with these colors?" And he'd start to give me suggestions, and we'd look at all these prints in his flat files. And I'd say, "Well what are things that people do with this medium?"

And so I made quite a few works with him and his assistant where I asked them to basically make the decisions as far as how the prints would be made. So this is one of the prints that was produced with their help. So, they chose the colors and the way that the colors would be placed and they laid them down and they pulled the print. And one of things that I liked about that is that in the pairing of this with this, there was this sort of interesting relationship created, and when you see it in person it's more obvious, again we're sort of having difficulty with the quality of...

[pre-recorded laughter]

So what happens is that, there's like a little bit of play down here, and here there's something funny about how it's ripped and you can't quite tell if this was made in response to this or if this was made, you know, that this was selected in response to that. So the order of how it happens gets mixed up. And there's something about that that to me was very interesting because it has a lot to do with like how you locate a thing. And one of the ways that you locate something is that you, when you're looking at work, is you try to figure out the order in which it's made or the process. And once you can sort of begin to understand that then you can start drawing all these conclusions about it. So, I might come back to that idea.

Here's a work I made last year. It was made as part of an installation at Art Basel for a sort of solo exhibition I did in that fair's section for, like, emerging artists. And this piece is called *John Hancock* and it's a big piece of vinyl. It's a vinyl sticker on a wall and a chair. It's an aluminum chair with a bat that goes upright. And this was sort of in this birthday theme I was describing earlier.

In order to make this work--and I'll show you a picture of the installation in a minute--again it emerged out of this kind of decision-making process where I was heavily engaged in a conversation, in particular with my art dealer. And I was saying, "Oh, I think this installation isn't working. It needs something more. We need to flesh it out." I had this idea to do this one thing. And he's like, "I don't know if that's going to be good." One of my art dealers has a very strong opinion, generally, about almost

everything. And, for me, this is quite interesting because I'm very open to influence and I like that as a problem, like, what happens, how does the artist make decisions? And what happens when the artist is passive and refuses to take a position? How can the artist create an identity that allows many subjectivities to come into play and that keep that artist from being pinned down or easily identified? And so, we were having a discussion about what this work would be, and it got to a place where we were in agreement that this would be a component and this would be a component. And part of why I'm even talking about this like this is I work quite differently than a lot of other artists, because a lot of the things I make are very produced, and as a result they can be quite expensive, and as a result there is a kind of influence that comes into play when you have that going on because there's something at stake for many different people. So that becomes part of my process, but I try not to be singular in that in terms of affecting all the decisions. I try to open it up and it drives people insane, but for me it makes me laugh.

So, in any event, this piece came out of this art dealer going, "Oh, I think you should put this bat upright on the chair." And I was like, "Well why would you do that? I wouldn't want to do that. It's against my sculptural interests." In sculpture I like when there's a problem of gravity and dependency and the forms have to deal with this on their own. For me this feels incredibly theatrical. And he said, "Oh but it's much more phallic and aggressive and I think that's interesting." And I said, "Well, that doesn't really interest me so much." And I said, "But, you know, since that's not something I would do, I'm going to do that and let's see what that's about." So I made this piece and people seemed to really like that. So you can make sense of that how you like. But what's really interesting about it is that I decided to call it *John Hancock* because that's, you know, the pseudonym for "signature" in American slang. And since I, in particular, had not made a lot of the decisions about it. Here's another shot. Interestingly, T*he New York Times* featured this work when they did coverage of what was going on in Miami that year. That piece is owned by Rosa and Carlos de la Cruz, and there they are standing in front of it. And then *The New York Times* says--here, I've got a close up of this--"Above the courtyard of Wynwood Walls, which is adding murals and graffiti from national and international artists this year for Art Basel Miami Beach." Oh sorry we don't need to know that part. Ok next. "Carlos and Rosa del a Cruz, top right, in front of John Hancock's work. A new addition to their collection for the fair." And I thought, "Oh well that's hilarious." So again I thought, "Well what happens in this case? Like do we bother to make this correction? Do we not?" And as opposed to that example of the Art Basel website, if I call up Art Basel, they're going to make the correction and then it's done. The link has been made. Here at *The New York Times* if you call and make the correction, it's additive. It's layered. They will make the correction. It will get printed later. But this thing won't be erased. Maybe on their website it will, but there's a historic record of these differences. So I thought, "Oh well that's interesting. We can make the correction but we still have the original. So it's like we get all the different ways." So I called and I said, "Guys can you please make this correction," and so here they did and I'll show you the close up of that. "A picture caption on Wednesday with an article about the Art Basel Miami Beach Art Fair misidentified the creator of a work shown behind the collectors Carlos and Rosa

de la Cruz. She is Kathryn Anderson not John Hancock. *John Hancock* is the title of the work".

Great. Thanks guys. Cool. You're really doing your jobs there.

So I was like, "Well what do we do with that?" So I was like, "Well, we've got to just keep going. You know?" So then again, "a picture caption on November 30th," yada, yada, yada, "and because of an editing error a correction in this space on December 3rd misstated her surname. *John Hancock* is the title of the work, not the name of its creator. It was made by Kathryn Andrews, not Anderson. "

Finally! Thank you! I am so glad that we had this worked out.

So, in any event, you can see here we have...

[pre-recorded laughter]

This is the installation I was describing that this work was made from. The sticker was over here behind the wall. One of the things I was looking at also is: what happens when you make certain kinds of forms in works and you repeat those forms elsewhere? How can that be a way of emptying out meaning? You begin to see--these were a series of sort of like baby crib-like forms that were sort of expanding and becoming almost more like prisons. And so I was looking at when you take this form and you put it here, what does that do to the reading of the chair? How do we begin to think about a chair as a kind of prison or the different associations that it suggests? I won't go too much further into that.

Here's another work that I made, and I'm sorry this is not the best reproduction. This is from Dave Kordansky's website. That's one of the gallerists that I work with. And it was made in 2010--Kathryn Andrews, *Rod--t*hat's what it was called. Kind of a dumb title. Chromed steel, rented props, blah blah blah. The way this work was made was, I produced this steel pole, I had it chrome plated and I rented these props to support it. And my idea about that was, I was thinking about: how can we take the artwork and the way that we come to it and experience it as a kind of unified event, and how could I create another kind of experience of that so that you would come to it and maybe experience it in parts, or start to imagine that one part of it is important and maybe not another part. And so, in this case, I was talking before about how could my gestures be sort of the frame for found objects or other things in the world that precede me. In this case, that component might be this. And I have again--I'll just put this idea out there now and we'll begin to see this more in the works--I've begun to repeatedly use the same material, which is sort of the shiny silver chrome or stainless steel or polished aluminum thing to begin to create an identity for Kathryn Andrews. If I use this material again, and again, and again, and again, how will people create an association around me, and what happens when that association becomes, like, very tight. Like Kathryn Andrews with this type of material. And I've purposefully done this. When I started making works I was resisting that people would come to works and they'd be like, "Oh, you're that artist that does this thing." And I'd be like, "Oh no, that's the death of the artist. Once they can identify you as doing this thing, they're done with you because they've figured out your game.

And so, I was trying to make all different kinds of works that, people are always trying to sort of place the artist in a categorical camp so they can, like, understand it and then move on to consuming the next thing. And so, instead of resisting that, I decided one day, like, why don't I just go through that? So I would try and become hyper-identified with this thing and then see what kind of space can be created once that identification was in place. So that's something I've been working with for quite a while, and I'll begin to talk about that more. But I like this idea that Kathryn Andrews could maybe be represented by this, and then these are maybe these temporary things that, because they're rented objects you know they're there on loan, they have a short life, and that implies that they would return to their point of origin later. I have made several works with rented props, quite a few now, and it took me a while to understand, for me, what my relationship was to that in the way that that would signify.

This is the same work and it's also on Dave's website--I don't think he realizes these two versions are there; please don't tell him--and it's called *Pushing Daisies*, 2007, which is a different title. 2010, blah, blah, blah.

This is lifted from one of the TV shows where these appeared. This was rented from a Hollywood prop shop, and I took that title from it. What happened in this work, and again this is sort of one of the ways that I work. I often make gestures but they're collaborative. And, I would say this work became a sort of collaboration with the collectors that purchased it. I was in the midst of a very intense debate about, with the rented objects, would the relic of what had come into contact with the rented object, and in this case it would be that, would that just go on and have a life of its own, and now the rented component, would that go back to its place of origin or would the rented things be consumed? And now, basically, the sense of the work, it would be transformed.

I wasn't sure what to do about that and it was part of... The decision had something to do with the market for me. That's how I saw it, in terms of what people would consume. Why would people want to buy something when they just get this and they don't get this? And the person they're buying it from they don't know. I don't know, that's a good question. Either they're, like, so convinced it's such a brilliant idea that they just want to go for it, or, you know, I'm not really sure about that. So, in the beginning, I didn't know how to go with this and so I was sort of looking to my dealers to see what strategies they would adopt, because they were on the front lines dealing with people that would sort of either accept this idea or not. And they came up with different strategies. And at this point I've tried them all, and I can see what works and what doesn't work. But some things work in the place of the market and then other things work, from my perspective, more in the interest of the object. And sometimes those are in alignment and sometimes they're not. And it depends on the specific object. In this case, the people that ended up purchasing this said, "Oh we love that work. We think it's so interesting, but we really want to buy these rented objects too." And at that time I wasn't decided about it and I thought, "Well, if that goes with it maybe that's interesting and the whole thing becomes a relic of this sort of active thing that it was and now it's a dead thing." So by its being consumed in its entirety it becomes this sort of corpse of itself.

So I sold it, but I decided then that its original title did not make sense, because with these rented and this not rented there was a great sort of division articulated there, and so the title, *Rod*, really pointed to that. Now that the whole thing was being consumed I felt that that wasn't the case, so I changed the title. Later, I decided I didn't think that that decision was so interesting. And so I don't do that anymore in that way. But what I did like is that now this work is out there in the world and there's different representations for it. And it's been reproduced under different titles in different magazines as well.

This is--and there you can just see the back of it, but I'm really here to, I'm really going to tell you now about this piece-- this is a work I made a little bit later using a painting of John Baldessari. So, you can see how he's invited to make an exhibition in a collection that owned this particular painting. This painting is--well, that's the image of it reversed--from Baldessari's *Goya Series*. And it's called *The Same Elsewhere*. And so my piece was to make a mirror that was the exact same size as the Baldessari painting and to hang it across the room from it. And in particular I liked that, I chose that painting because of its text. Obviously, that's creating a relationship with its reflection elsewhere. But this other very interesting thing happened which was this image was here and this ladder sort of getting cut off by the image. And if you're a viewer and you come to view this work, your body stands in front of the mirror and your legs get cut off in the same way that the ladder gets chopped off. And I didn't in advance know that that would happen. It was sort of this serendipitous thing. Some of the other things about this work that I liked a lot was that the title was called *Baldessari,* and usually the title information is here so you see it. It says "Baldessari," and then if you want to go in and really experience it, you stand here. But as you stand here you can't see the Baldessari painting. You're blocking it. So you see this thing that's suggesting something beyond itself, but then you see your own reflection. So your own desire to sort of consume the experience of this work and the way that it points outside ends up pointing back to yourself to the viewer.

This is another one of those funny games for me where the representation of this work sort of always ends up having objects in it. Whether in this case it was a sculpture in the room that was hard to move but it could be just the photographer's tripod. The way you want to shoot it, it's quite difficult to get it without the tripod there. So I had this retouched and this work exists in the world reproduced sometimes like this, which in my mind is not the work, what the hell does that have to do with it? Or it exists like this and that was another one of those funny moments where I as the artist was taking the agency to say this is the work, you know, and this becomes this negotiation between all the powers that be.

But in any event, it sort of amused me that people seemed to think that was fine as a representation of the work. This is a work I made more recently, this past year, and I'll give you a little bit more information about that. This is a print that I purchased by the artist Allen Ruppersberg who works in California. He's in his 60s. He's worked with Pop imagery and, like, printed reproductions for a long time. This was his attempt--in the 80s he made a lot of works using obituaries from newspapers--and this work was sort of his attempt to make a spoof on a movie poster. And maybe the film would be called "Screamed from Life." He's sort of the director in this, in this idea. And these

are clippings of different sort of gruesome killings that happened around this time. And he went in to put in some little handwritten sayings. "I love you." "I love you too." And I saw this print and I thought, "Oh, that's a really fascinating object." The way that these are made, he would take the newspaper clippings and hand trace them, and then he would photograph them and then he would silkscreen them. So there's this process of like many kinds of removal happening. There's this primary information that's, like, incredibly gruesome about this event that's transpired, but it's sort of been anesthetized by its reproduction in the newspaper. Then he recharges by it redrawing it. Then he re-anesthetizes it by photographing it. It's so many layers. And that's one of the things Ruppersberg's interested in. And then he creates a sort of opposition by bringing back the presence of handwriting, but then it's silkscreened and so it's yet again removed. So he's very involved in those games. Well I like those games too. And so I thought, "That's cool, I'm going to buy this work and I'm going to make a frame for it."

And so I was invited to be in this exhibition that was about artists working with other artists works, making collaborations but in a really broad sense of that term. And I don't really think of this as a collaboration because I didn't ask Al Ruppersberg's permission. Maybe it's a collaboration between me and the art market because the art market, by buying artist's works, now takes over that ownership and can do with them what they like. In essence taking the right to, you know, destroy this work if they like. So I worked with the same silkscreen maker that Ruppersberg had worked with 30 years prior and produced these two side panels. And I researched lots of gruesome killings from around the same time. Not speaking with Al I didn't know where he had sourced his material so I had to source my own through other methods. I hired someone to retrace these newspaper clippings to look like Al Ruppersberg's hand and then we copied Al's handwriting and using the same processes attempted to make a seamless sort of frame.

And this piece is called *Massacre*--

[pre-recorded laughter]

It's called *Massacre Expansion*. So I was looking at, for me, I was like, "Well why did Al choose these particular killings? Like, why these versus any other? That's a subjective choice". That in the end becomes about Al Ruppersberg in my mind. So I was like, "well, if this work is about this kind of gruesome... this kind of culture of that, like, you know, he could have just as easily chosen this or that or whatever." So I was like, "Let's just expand that and begin to look at what the subjective influences are in Al Ruppersberg making this work." So this piece is called *Massacre Expansion* with the idea of sort of exploring that. And if you read it--when I first heard it I was sort of mortified and then I ended up reading it like a million times and now I find them all hilarious, which is quite disturbing--but this one's maybe one of the best: "Artist died handcuffed to tree." This artist decides to commit suicide. He chains himself to a tree. He changes his mind but he's tossed the keys away and he can't get to the keys and he scrambles to get it but he died. These are real. These are stories of things that happened in the world. "Victim of cannibal agreed to be eaten." That's a really interesting one. But, anyway.

So in this same... When I conclude I want to take this back to a question about sculpture, because ultimately the questions--and we're in the Nasher museum which is looking at sculpture--ultimately the questions I'm asking have very much to do with what happens when you're in a situation where the presence of representation is so intense that it influences the way that you perceive other aspects of the object. And in particular, maybe, its formal qualities, its material nature, things like that. So sort of what I'm asking, if you think about it in that regard, is a question about really sort of the dichotomy or the difference between Pop and Minimalism. Pop Art is sort of putting images at its pinnacle. Minimalism putting an experience of the materials of things at its core.

So I'll keep developing that thought as we go.

[pre-recorded laughter]

This work was part of that same exhibition where--it was at the ICA Philadelphia--where artists were asked to make work collaboratively but in an expanded definition of that term. And so I decided to make a work for that exhibition. It was called *Serial Killer*. And it consisted of this fence, and this fence was on wheels. There were many works throughout the exhibition. The fence would move throughout the exhibition over its five months of being on view. And the way the fence would move is that a performer would come in and perform next to the fence for two hours. The performer was always a human statue. It would pose in a still position and then it would depart. The next performer would come in, move the fence to a new position, perform for two hours and then depart. And so on and so forth. The instruction given to the performer was to wheel the fence so that it was blocking another artist's work. So the artwork in essence sort of went on... it had an attack mission. And its mission was to complicate, sort of, the way that we understand artworks in relation to context, and it very heavy-handedly created aggressive context for these works, sort of calling their purity, or the way that we perceive them outside of their relationship to everything else. Calling that into question.

So here--just I'll quickly go through these--these are some images of the different performers. And I selected performers and coupled them with works frequently based on their appearance. This artist had maybe borrowed works from 20 different artists and made this installation using all these artists works with their permission. In my case, I just wheeled mine next to his without his permission. But he was happy about that. But not everyone was always happy about it. The curators said to me, "Oh Kathryn, what should we do?" Oh this guy's a tree actually. It's hard to see but... The curators were like, "Should we ask everyone's permission? What are we supposed to do in this case?" And I said, "I don't know. You agreed to this work. And we never talked about it. And now we're down the rope. What do you think you should do?" And they said, "Well, we think it might be good to ask, but I don't know." And I said, "Well, that's... you'll figure that out. That's your business." And I said, "You know, in the worst case though, if we put it next to an artist's work and they don't like it, they can say they don't like it. And then we can move it again." And interestingly, as the exhibition went on, they got more lazy about it and I think they stopped asking people. But I think they did sort of pre-warn all the other artists. That was *The Thinker* and this

is next to some philosophical text by some other artist group. So, anyway, so I figured we could go from this guy into Brancusi.

This is the *Kiss Column* from 1935. And then I wanted to show you this work, which is *Adam and Eve* from 1921. What I wanted to talk about here is what happens formally in Brancusi's work and, sort of, how some of the things he's doing relate to some of the things I'm doing. And this goes back to the bat and the chair comment I was making earlier, which is that Brancusi's very interested in stacking, and he's interested in the problems of gravity and how dependencies can be created simply by putting one form onto another form. The way continuities get created through this simple stacking gesture. That's something that interests me a lot. One of the ways we make connections by things is by looking at literally, like, how they physically rest upon each other, or are they separate? So that's a, that's a sort of formal device that I use when making works a lot.

This is a work I made in 2010 called *Ashton* and it's a coat hanger rack. I cast that. It's made out of stainless steel and a coat hanger. I also cast that. And on it sits a ring that Aston Kutcher wore in the move *The Killer*s. And the material--this piece is just called *Ashton*-and the materials are stainless steel and certified film prop. I actually don't know what that is made out of. It looks like stainless steel, but I doubt it. It's probably something cheaper.

What interested me about this work was to take something that was materially all sort of unified and gravitationally, you have this ring that sort of depended upon this object and it hooks into that, so it just rests there, but then that hooks onto that and then that goes to this. So, it's very much sort of like this same kind of idea of Brancusi putting one thing on to of another and each is dependent upon another. But one of the things that works a little bit differently here is that you have here a lot of work that has something to do with the hand of the artist, in my mind. You know, it's been produced. If you look at it carefully you can sort of tell that it's cast. So in my mind, I was thinking a lot about, like, how this thing has to do with the hand of the artist, in this case I'm Kathryn Andrews and could I marry Ashton Kutcher by putting his ring on my gesture? And this was his wedding band also from that movie that I mentioned that he was in. But, yet at the same time, I do think this work has a kind of dichotomy because you have this object which has a very erratic presence in terms of, like, aura, like its significance or its sort of value, because this piece of material has come into contact with this individual who's very popularly valued within the culture. And there's some kind of question being asked about, well what is the value of this thing that's the tiniest thing, that's maybe a very cheap material and has been traded in these economies, these filmic economies, and what does that have to do with the art object and all of the effort put into this? And now the cost of that object and how that functions as a signifier that suggests its value culturally.

This is another work I made maybe a year later. Jeffrey Deitch called me up and said, "Oh I saw you did that piece with Baldessari. I've got a show at George Herms coming. I thought you might do something like that for us." And I thought, "Okay. That's weird. I don't know George Herms and now I'm that artist that does that thing with other artists but that's cool." So he's like, "Why don't you call up George Herms and you guys work

it out." And I just thought, "Oh this is bizarre." I was like, "Well, what can I do to George Herms." And I thought, "Well maybe he and I could get married." And then I sort of checked into his dating history and thought, "Well, no, that's too complicated. So, but we could show the certificate of our marriage and maybe we could divorce each other a few days later." Instead, George had this idea that he would lend to me a bunch of documents from his archive of collage material that he had and he was like, "I'll just drop it over to your studio, Kathryn." And I thought, "Well, that's..." He said, "But I've got a ton of these too, you know, if you don't like them." Then I said, "Well why don't I just come over to your place and just go through all your stuff?" And he said, "Okay, come on by." So I did. And while I was there, I came across boxes and boxes of envelopes. Well, the Getty Museum had gone to George Herms, and if you don't know who he is, he's an artist like almost in his seventies. He lives in Los Angeles. He's very involved with the Beat Generation, Beat Poetry movement, blah, blah, blah, in basically the mid-twentieth-century in California. And so, he's sort of an important person historically because he's a link between many of the different poets that are working at that time and a connector between poetry and art. The Getty Museum went to his archive or asked him could they basically take many of his correspondences for preservation. He agreed. They went through everything. They'd gotten there some weeks before I did. And they left, they left the envelopes, however, from these correspondences. They only took the contents. And I thought, "Well that's so bizarre because the envelopes give all the information about who it's from, who it's to, the date it was sent back and forth..." And that's another one of those funny places where the institution decides how something's going to be represented, which may or may not correspond with other representations that are commonly understood. So as I was going through his artifacts, I thought, "Well maybe I can make a work with this." And I was looking at all of these envelopes and I realized George had moved many times over the years. So here's one from the 70s, he lived on South Figueroa. One in the 80s, he lived--he had this PO box in Orange, California. One in the 90s, he's on East First St. And so I asked him if I could borrow these documents and he said yes. And we never agreed when I would return them. I still have them on loan, so... So I made this work with them and I rented this bench from a prop house and I like this idea that you're coming to a work by Kathryn Andrews but you're seeing these documents by George Herms. So already there's a question about well what's the relationship of Kathryn Andrews to George Herms? But then George is like moving through space essentially. This object is moving through space as well because it's only rented for the duration of the exhibition. And then symbolically there's some kind of suggestion of things moving through space, these being envelopes, which is what they do, and these being chairs where you might sit. But there's this option of where you'd like to sit. You could sit here or here or here, which becomes sort of mimetic of what George is doing in space here. Funny part about this work is that I returned this bench to the prop house. Someone contacted me to purchase it. I thought ok well, then I have to go to the prop house and get a very long term borrow, borrow agreement. So I negotiated this with the prop house. Cool. All set. The person was taking a long time to pay, like months, and months and months. So I was like, "Well are they really interested in this work or did they just want to hold it or what happened?" And so finally they were like, "Okay, the deal is done. We're ready to move forward." I was like, "Cool. Okay. I'm going to go back to the prop house now and we'll get this object for you. Done. Goodbye. George Herms I

2001 Flora Street
Dallas, TX 75201

+1 214.242.5100

love you, you exist. You're in the world now in this work." And I went back to the prop house and they said, "Oh we've sold that. We didn't hear from you for a while. We've liquidated a lot of our goods. So that's gone now." So this work does not exist anymore. It only existed temporarily. So that object's off somewhere else. And I love that. I think that's just the perfect end for this piece.

[pre-recorded laughter]

That sort of takes us to...

[pre-recorded laughter]

This is a work I made in...

[pre-recorded laughter]

...this summer in Switzerland, and I'll sort of go through this a little bit quickly. But as you can see the theme that's emerging here is what happens when what we take for granted as the static object in space. What happens when its components get activated or being to shift or take on different kinds of roles in terms of the way that they can be used. Here I made a performance this summer in Basel, Switzerland as part of the art fair. They commissioned me to make a performance event for the opening night of this section of the fair. And I was given a particular site for it. So I decided to construct a series of walls along this river bank, which the site was here. And you could enter these structures from this end and from this end but you couldn't go out the sides because the buildings were here or here or because you'd be in the river. So you could only go back and forth this way. The curator had asked me if I would work with vaudevillian-type entertainment for the event and he asked me that because I had done another performance earlier in the year where I had done something along those lines. So I decided okay, well the idea of vaudeville is sort of interesting because it's the type of spectacle that maybe would be fun to see at an art fair. So how could I work with that but try to complicate that? And so I decided to use this wordplay: "vaudeville" in French it's very close to *voix de ville*: voice of the city. And there's a sort of historic relationship to those terms maybe etymologically. So I decided I'd call this piece *Voix de Ville* and to make, to use imagery that was exploring, let's see... I'll just go through these sort of quickly so you can see some of what happened to get to some of the imagery.

Here you can see there's an image of Florence with a viewfinder in front of it. So what I was trying to do and here--you can't really see this--but here's a picture of the Alps with a drunk man in front who's sort of clinging onto his beer glass. I was trying to take these sort of idyllic landscapes that were similar to the landscape behind these sets and look at our interest in consuming them and what happens in this kind of situation when we want to go and have this particular experience in relation to an art fair. We don't know what it is but we know we're going there to consume something that's to be consumed. Something enjoyable.

2001 Flora Street
Dallas, TX 75201

+1 214.242.5100

So I took the site itself and attempted to double it and to try and make a kind of criticism of our coming to that expecting something from that. And then I overlaid that using this *voix de ville*/vaudeville relationship to the viewers' relationship to the

performers. They were coming to these performers, participating in this spectacle and the viewers were expecting to get something from them. So their, sort of, consumption of the performative gesture was very similar to the consumption of the touristic landscape.

So the acts, what happened was that there were many acts throughout these structures throughout the night. There were eight of them. Performers from all over Europe came in and they were highly specialized in what they did. I didn't choreograph their acts. They did the acts that they normally do, though I did choreograph the event, and the music and how it all played out in terms of an order. And I constructed it so that--let's go back real fast--one performance would, say, begin here; all the viewers would flood into the structures to see this, then another performance would begin here. The viewers would become trapped between the different performances going on. This one went in, another one would start here. There was a sort of relief, the viewers could move around but then another one would start again right here. So viewers were constantly being shuffled around in this dance where really they became the ones sort of, like, hemmed in by what was going on, and there was a sort of inversion where typically the viewers would consume what's in front of them. What's in front of them would be what would be consumed. Maybe the subject of the work. There was this switch where the viewers were actually being sort of consumed by what was going on around them. So it was like taking a frame and making a frame the center of the work and taking the center of the work and pushing it outside.

[pre-recorded laughter]

This is another piece I made a couple years ago. And so I'm really jumping around a lot chronologically, but I'm trying to draw out a set of ideas, so I hope this is making some sense to you. Where I try to do something quite similar--and I won't go too in depth here because I feel like we're running long now--but this was an exhibition where there were a lot of artists involved and this piece, again, emerged in that very conversational way that I work with people. Where, in fact, much of its physical... many of its physical properties were sort of dictated, permitted, encouraged, invited by the other people who were involved: everything from curators to gallerists to other artists around. Where I had this idea to make a work that would really radically affect how people could move through the space and see other artists' works, and I was like but I want to be respectful and da, da, da, and all the other artists were like, "No, go bigger, go more aggressive. Go this. Go that." And I was like,"Okay." So that's kind of funny but then later, as the artist who made it... people were very excited about this. There was a lot of press, but one critic was very negative about that, and I thought, "Oh, that's interesting because the person's work that I came in conflict with had actually invited me and asked me to do that." But again, that's one of those places where the representation of what happens gets confused with what happened, and that's quite common.

These were two walls. These images were replicas of some graffiti down the street. I just basically appropriated them and copied them. And then what happened in viewing this, people came to this work to look at these sort of faces painted in the

center of this object, but these faces were sort of empty and expressionless and the viewers themselves ended up sort of becoming the subject of the work. They were looking at these things that were sort of contained by this fence or framed in. But in the end, the viewers themselves were framed by the piece and restricted. They couldn't move through the space freely. So the viewers ended up being all around the perimeter, the outside, sort of gawking to see this thing on the inside but then realizing that they themselves were the ones sort of being consumed by the piece.

This is a more traditional... well this is a painting by Hans Hofmann, but I pulled these because I wanted to look at a more traditional sculpture I made recently, and I wanted to--it has a lot of sort of Hans Hofmann-esque painterly qualities--and I wanted to look at or just point to when you see an artwork, particularly a painting, well, particularly this painting there's a frame around it, and it's very common in the world that you'll come to works and they're framed by the room they're in, the other artworks they're with, whatever maybe very literally a frame if it's a painting, and for me that's so bizarre because, as the artist, you almost never have control over this, yet your name is attached to that object as if you like that way that your work is being presented or being perceived. So this is a Hans Hofmann painting that's been framed. This is a work that I made last year. It's called *Gift Cart* and it's a stainless steel cart with rented presents from a prop shop. Here's another Hans Hofmann painting in a frame. I was looking at this quite literally as a frame, almost, for, like, a painting. Another one. And here you can see they're sort of used. That's from going off on set to be in different films.

One of the things that was nice about this work that I hadn't intended was that--I thought it might happen but I wasn't quite sure how--the viewer would come and stand next to this cart and be reflected here, and then there were these presents. So it was almost like their reflection was being framed by the work and perhaps contained within the presents, if you can go along those lines of thinking.

This is another work I made that's sort of similar to that that was a wall sculpture where balloons--it has a birth date. So this one was January 23rd, and I put these balloons on it on that day. They deflate over time and the owner of the work receives a set of instructions that the owner can activate this work in a particular way. And the work sort of arrives with this material problem inherent to it which is that you have this gate, which is a very permanent structure with this other material that's deteriorating, and so it creates this problem from the outset. The instructions the owner receives are: "The owner may add new balloons," (and this is on its birth date in consecutive years), "the owner may replace the original balloons. New balloons may or may not resemble the originals. The owner may not acknowledge the work... the owner *may* acknowledge the work differently in different years. The owner may allow a third party to acknowledge the work. Acknowledgement may take a form not mentioned here." Essentially the collector is given the role of the artist. The collector is allowed to be the agent in the work, and now the collector becomes Kathryn Andrews in a very literal way. The collector will make whatever interventions to this piece and this piece will be exhibited under my name. And there are four of these in the world. Sort of one for each season, if you will. And they each have, except for the first one, they have the dates of the owners' birth dates.

I think I'll just skip past this because we're...

This work is a work called *End of Vaudeville* and it's a photograph that sits on a mirrored armoire. And this is a piece of stainless steel that has a very strange reflective quality. And, for me, it's a quite a funny piece. I like it. It's a very, like, sort of casual, almost lazy piece in a way. You come to it and you see yourself reflected here fully. The top of your body here. The bottom of your body here. But the way that you're reflected is different because stainless steel creates this very strange, almost like, funny-mirror-type reflection and this is a normal reflection here. And then when you come to the photo you see almost a double of the human body except for it's in this very gaudy garb. And that's actually an image of Mae West from a film in the 1930s. And I liked that, in seeing your reflection, it's almost like you're being dressed by the dresser. And then you see this other person in a dress and so there's a funny doubling that's going on there.

This is another work I made called *Charlie's Angel*. This is a helmet that Cameron Diaz wore in one of the Charlie's Angel films. And this is just sort of a formal gesture that, materially, this material is being extended into the form of the sculpture, but here there's sort of the absence of Cameron Diaz, and then maybe that absence it creates is suggested also by this maybe being a kind of very industrialized body that's sort of been ridded of the human.

[pre-recorded laughter]

And here there's just the absence of the human presence in a way. So I think all of these works are sort of getting to this question about how we locate the subject when we're experiencing an artwork, and what happens when you start to dislocate the ways by which that's traditionally located.

This is a work I made earlier in the year called *Ascension Island* and it was with a found statue of Jesus and an aluminum mirror in an oval shape. And I like this piece a lot, actually, because I think it's a strange piece. I think some people don't know how to deal with it. I like it a lot because I think it's very unclear what my relationship is to the iconography of Jesus in it. And if Kathryn Andrews as a maker has somehow come or is coming to be identified with this material, it's almost like: here's the presence of Jesus; here's the presence of Kathryn Andrews, but what that relationship is is not qualified. And I think there's something curious about that.

[pre-recorded laughter]

This is another work I made around the same time. I'm almost done, so, there are a couple... These works are a little bit different. There's this sculpture and one last one and I'll stop.

Some works I've made are sort of taking that question of frame and framed, but exploring it in spaces that are already from the outset more unified. So here, if everything here is sort of black. This is in one kind of space and then this is coming off the wall and being separated from it. I was also looking at this as a very phallic form and thinking about how that might read in relation to that. But almost as if you've

taken this sort of sexual iconography and translated it into some kind of kitschy cultural realm. And these are bowling balls with some aluminum inserts.

And this is a piece I made recently called *Full Set* which is a sculpture of a weight bench but these forms can't be removed from their frame. They're built in.

That's it.

I don't know if anyone has any questions or...

Audience Question: I think I know the answer. I think I know how you'll answer. But you had two images - one was *Rod,* the other one you changed the name and there were four jockeys, I guess, that you had rented and they had a bar on it. What's interesting to me is further on that I guess it was, you went back to purchase, or borrow from or loan or whatever, the seats and now they're gone, and that was a problem. Well, that's interesting. So, let's say you, the artist, are being asked by your dealer a question by a prospective buyer. What do you mean you're going to take those jockeys away? How am I going to hold up that rod, or whatever? Is your thought to that shift an interesting problem or do you find it more interesting or less interesting that the rod would have to be placed on the floor in a collector's home or, you know...? What is your thinking behind that?

KA: Personally I liked, really, any of the ways because I think they all have value and they are all about the ways that we construct context for objects, and those contexts influence the value of the thing that it's relating to. So that rod, depending on how you answer that, will have a different value each time. That's great in a theoretical realm. In a practical realm that doesn't play out so easily because you have to deal with all these systems by which these objects get traded. And further, what I realize was that, for the viewer, it's really excellent if the object that's creating the context can come along, because then subsequent viewers who maybe didn't see it in its first iteration have access to this game. Otherwise they're looking at a rod and then you have to tell them a story about it, which is ok. Some artists work like that, and you can work like that, but then you need a lot of ancillary documentation. Someone has to stand next to it and do the dance, and that's fine, but sometimes that can really work and then sometimes it's just too much work and no one's going to deal with it. So I found that, in my case, people weren't doing the adequate work to suggest what the original context had been. So that maybe it was my job, as the artist, to bring the context along with it but to bring it with, bring it under a rubric of temporality, which in this case was: you as the buyer can possess this object, but through a rented contract of 99 years which suggests temporality. If that makes sense. Does that? I don't know if that answers your questions.

AQ: Were you monitoring our reactions to the laughter while you were talking, and did you come to a conclusion?

KA: Not too closely, but I was happy you were having a reaction. I gave a talk in February to about 200 people, and I realized that when you, when I speak to small crowds I get certain responses, but when I speak to a big crowd the dynamics are different. And maybe I was just giving a really boring talk that day. It happens. But I

found that the audience was not responding to the parts that I think of as funny, or where I was waiting for a laugh. Like no one was laughing. And so I started freaking out and second-guessing myself. And so, I was speaking, and then the audience wouldn't respond, and then I would monitor that, and then I would think about what I was saying, "Well was it funny or was it not funny? How is it failing?" And then I was trying to continue the talk forward. So I was processing these four or five things while I was giving a talk, and I ended up slowing down. And we were all sort of like trapped in this, like, torturous talk.

So then I thought, "Oh god!" Well the solution there was I could just preemptively provide the response so I could just generate the laugh. So whenever the laughs aren't coming as I need I can just like bring the laughs out. So you guys are sort of my guinea pigs for that. So I hope that worked out.

AQ: You're exposing your insecurities...

KA: Oh yeah, totally. I do that a lot. So...

Anyone else? In the back.

AQ: [inaudible] As an installation artist you don't expect your work to be [inaudible] So when somebody does the thinker or some works that are preemptive. I'm sure [inaudible] You seem to be so much more willing to having someone [inaudible] And engagement with the viewer [inaudible] [I think we should maybe just say the whole thing is inaudible?]

KA: Yeah, that's a really nice point, and maybe it goes back to this question about sculpture and photography that I had wanted to end with because I started in photography, actually, and came to making sculpture through making photography, and one of the things that has interested me more and more over time is the degree to which we confuse our image of things, our representation of things, with our experience of those things and the degree to which we substitute those quite easily. And I am always looking for places to sort of create a presentness in the work, and for me I think, well, I think all of the mediums do that, you know--sculpture, photography, painting--and they all engage representation as well in different ways, but I think in the medium of photography it's much easier to confuse the image of the thing with the photograph, whereas in sculpture I think it's trickier. You can see a representation of something but you're generally more aware of the material of what you're looking at. So I would probably argue that sculpture has more of a presentness about it, but one of the things that's happened, I think, is that because we've seen so many images in the age of the Internet, they've become ubiquitous in the culture, that we stopped looking at sculpture in the same way that maybe we would have prior because it doesn't quite perform at the same rate that images perform, and I think our perception has changed. So I do look for ways to create action within sculpture, or to make sculpture an active space so we can remind ourselves of the presentness of materiality in all mediums really. If that makes sense. Yup.

Great. Maybe we're done. Thank you very much.