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Conceptions and ideas, as well as movements with a definite spiritual foundation, regardless whether the latter is false or true, can, after a certain point in their development, only be broken with the technical instruments of power if these physical weapons are at the same time the support of a new kindling thought, idea, or philosophy.

-Adolf Hitler

In the grocery store I felt as if I were in an art museum. In the breakfast cereal aisle I found Cheerios, Lucky Charms and Frankenberry. In the candy aisle I found Chuckles, Snikers and Kit-Kat. Viewing art in the museum I felt as if I were in a grocery store. In the abstract expressionism section I found artwork by Pollock, DeKooning and Kline. In the pop art section I found artwork by Warhol, Lichtenstein and Indiana.

Panaestheticism

We cannot experience objects the way they experience themselves. Objects are conceived rather than experienced. Because the world outside of ourselves comes through the secondary source of our perception and due to the limits of our perceptual field, our relationship to an object always occurs from a specific view. As we move around the object its form is revealed to us, but we cannot view the object from every point simultaneously, our distance from the object affects our perception of its size and as time elapses our memory of an earlier view will diminish. We recognize an object with six equal square sides and can identify it as a cube. However, we do not see all six sides at once and when one side is revealed to us as a square we do not see any of the other sides. As we piece objects together in our mind, we gain a temporally and spatially distorted incomplete view.

Our identification of an object through our perception is secondary to the object's control. We can identify an object as a cube because the object has six equal square sides. Though we construct objects through our perception, it is the object itself which determines its construction. Superseding any interpretation, an object's identity is determined by the thing itself.

It would cease to exist as a thing at the very moment when we thought to possess it. What makes the reality of the thing is therefore precisely what snatches it from our grasp. The aseity of the thing, its unchallengeable presence and the perpetual absence into which it withdraws are two inseparable aspects of transcendence.

-Maurice Merleau-Ponty²

With its discovery all sorts of incidental details began appearing in photographs, quite outside the operator's consciousness:

Sometimes inscriptions and dates are found upon the building, or printed placards most irrelevant, are discovered upon their walls: sometimes a distant dialplate is seen, and upon it - unconsciously recorded - the hour of the day at which the view was taken.

-William Henery Fox Talbot³

The camera records disinterestedly:

The instrument chronicles whatever it sees, and certainly would delineate a chimney-pot or a chimney-sweeper with the same impartiality as it would the Apollo of Belvedere.

-William Henery Fox Talbot⁴

An object will not appear in a drawing or painting unless it is consciously rendered by the artist. However, not just what the operator intends but whatever is in the camera's field of view at the time of exposure is recorded.

Due to the automated nature of the process, the photograph is structured according to the physical characteristics of the object depicted. The subject of the photograph takes part in creating its own image.

Photography demonstrates that objects exist independent from our will. As the camera records indiscriminately, objects assert their autonomous existence. It is certainly not through the perception of the photographer that these objects exist, nor do they exist through the perception of the viewer. Describing its form, the subject of the photograph affirms that its existence originates from itself.

⁴Ibid, v. 1, pl. 2.
Readymade

(manufactured objects promoted to the dignity of objects of art through the choice of the artist)

-André Breton\(^5\)

Photographs are readymade. Through framing and focusing the viewer's attention is directed on a subject which is allowed to describe its properties.

EVERYONE AN ARTIST

-Joseph Beuys

Fox Talbot pursued his process in order to introduce an egalitarian art form. As his drawing skills were lacking, he desired an automatic method to transfer images from his camera lucida onto paper to record vacation snapshots. His goal was realized with the introduction of the Kodak which allowed many people to participate in picture making without formal training.

Untrained to pay attention to everything within the frame, amateur photographers unconsciously recorded extraneous objects. The range of subject matter was accidentally expanded and everyday things like a chimney-pot joined the Apollo of Belvedere.

Painters, intimidated into dismissing the complex issues photography's automation describes and realizing their profession was threatened, claimed the operator's lack of control signaled that photography was not an art. Photographers, intent to defend their newborn medium and establish its status as an art, copied painterly styles. The history of photography (what became known as art photography) was reported as a miniature history of

\(^5\)André Breton, "Lighthouse of the Bride," *View*, 5 (March 1945), p. 7 (Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1969). Using Breton's definition, the photograph is the manufactured object. Recognition of the readymade was aided by acceptance of the photograph. Through the photograph the artworld became accustomed to seeing commonplace things presented as art.
painting, its photographic qualities denounced in favor of its adherence to current aesthetic norms.

As most viewers object to the readymade because it employs an egalitarian mode of production, what upset artists about the photographic process was its accessibility. Art is seen as a specialized activity, one which most people should not be able to participate in. Though posing as a democratic practice, the production, distribution and reception of art are contained within an elite circle.

The isolating tendency of the aesthetic function is made visible in every aesthetic decision. Choice of clothing, interior decoration, speech and gesture pose ourselves in a hierarchy through which we define our status. Aesthetics stratify society.

Though aesthetic decisions are being made at all levels of society, art is seen as a rarefied experience. Rather than being seen as something everyone creates, the art object is enshrined. As high priced goods, art is seen to separate its owners from the lower classes.

Multiples

(simple, inexpensive, usually quotian objects - often ready-mades or modified ready-mades - produced in bulk for large distribution)

-Gregory L. Ulmer

To modify Breton's definition, the readymade is selected from the world of mass produced objects (Fox Talbot's negative/positive process is seen as the beginning of modern photography as it allows for mass production).

Mass production allowed more people to own high quality goods.

---

What's great about this country is that America started the tradition where the richest consumers buy essentially the same things as the poorest. You can be watching TV and see Coca-Cola, and you can know that the President drinks Coke, Liz Taylor drinks Coke, and just think, you can drink Coke, too. A Coke is a Coke and no amount of money can get you a better Coke than the one the bum on the corner is drinking. All the Cokes are the same and all the Cokes are good. Liz Taylor knows it, the President knows it, the bum knows it, and you know it.

-Andy Warhol

Mass produced objects are transparent: they can be seen through to other examples of their type.

Though impermanent individually, mass produced objects are collectively permanent. As one is destroyed (often as a condition for its use), another unit is available to easily take its place. Even if all examples of a type are destroyed, following its model, more examples can be manufactured. The power of the mass produced object is that its presence can transcend the token and our control.

Viewing one mass produced object others of its type are evoked. The individual identity replicates the collective identity. Though we are not witnessing their presence, these other objects can be delineated. The mass produced object affirms aseity by repetition through contiguity.

---

5 GRAMS OF SUGAR

Philip Jakubowski
May 2, 1986
12:30 pm
RIT photo gallery
Nothing has been created as ultima materia - in its final state. Everything is at first created in its prima materia, its original stuff; whereupon Vulcan comes, and by the art of alchemy develops it into its final substance.... For alchemy means: to carry to its end something that has not yet been completed.

-Paracelsus
Philip Jakubowski: Are there any questions?

Judy Levy: Are there any statements?

PJ: There's one right there.

Gunther Cartwright: What's your thesis proposal? I don't see any of that stuff. What's, what's this about?

PJ: What's this about?

GC: Yeah. I'm the new kid on the block here so...

PJ: O.K. This is an installation of five grams of sugar, in the center of a room, 5x7 proportions.

GC: What's your thesis proposal?

PJ: Do you mean what's the written proposal that I handed in?

GC: Right. What, what, what's your research? What's your thesis? I know, I see what you've done, but what was your proposal?

PJ: My proposal is to work with ideas stated in the quote by Paracelsus.

Michael Gessinger: What's the evidence of that work?

PJ: Pardon?

MG: What's the evidence of that work?

PJ: You're sitting in it.

MG: This is the work of someone else. The people who painted the room, the people who installed the tile, the people who installed the ceiling, lights. It's not your work.

PJ: I'm the person who put that there. I'm the person who arranged these walls, you know? I'm the person...

MG: You didn't make the cube.

PJ: I placed it there.

MG: [Laughs.]
PJ: Do you make the...

MG: I put my shoes on this morning.

PJ: Do you make the emulsion on the film that you shoot?

MG: I don't have to.

PJ: Why?

MG: Because it's done by a factory for me.

PJ: It's done by a factory for me. Thank goodness. Thank goodness, I don't have to do that pain-in-the-ass work. When I could buy it, when I can buy them, for a buck, for a whole bunch of them, why the hell should I do that?

MG: RIT ought to thank you for your contribution of tuition.

[Laughter.]

PJ: They probably won't.

Mark Haven: I have, I have a, a comment. When I first saw the piece, I think it's very successful. I, I, I'm not sure what your intent was, or your motivation and I'm not sure I really want to get into it, but it struck me as an act of defiance, on some level and I think, witnessing the group of people here, I think that it was successful as lots of people are intrigued by this act of defiance. Now, the reason why I wouldn't want to get into your motivation, as it could be any number of things, many of which have nothing to do with school or RIT or anything else, I wouldn't even hesitate to, but it is an act of defiance on some level against what this MFA program is about, and, um, and that's why I do think it's very successful, that's why I would, I would tell you why I would give you an F for it, because it is successful. If your intention was some act of civil disobedience then there has to be some punishment for that act. In this case we're dealing with the photographic medium. Whatever that source of anger is it seems to me would be appropriate material to document in a, in a, with photographic materials. If it's the incompetence of the program, if it's the personalities involved in it, there are lots of appropriate media and approaches that one could have taken, but you've chose to use this cube of sugar as a symbol, now this is conjecture I admit, as opposition to whatever that program might offer you and on that level I really do believe it was successful. Since it is an act of civil disobedience, since there would be no civil disobedience if there weren't any punishment, I give you an F for the effort, and call it very successful.

[Laughter.]
PJ: Could you see it as a symbol for anything else?

MH: Yes, it might involve some childhood trauma.

[Laughter.]

MH: I don't know. I really don't know you well enough, you know. You might be angry at any number of things. But I, I couldn't possibly speculate as to what the, what the core source of that hostility or anger is, but clearly some of it has to do with whatever the program, as you perceive it, offered you. So I would call it a successful show. I really do. But I think that it, for your own benefit, I think you should really get an F for it. Otherwise it would have no meaning.

Deb Bork: So, would you grant an MFA degree in photography for this?

MH: No I wouldn't. No I wouldn't. But, but I think that's the success of it. I think he's dealing with issues other than what that program is about.

Tim Callahan: I walked in late, did you, did you?

DB: No.

PJ: We just started.

TC: I'm interested in, in, in hearing about, aah, why you think that this is, should be interesting. I mean I have a feeling I'm being manipulated basically. That this is more about this happening, this experience, than it is about what you've done. I think, I think this is more about people coming and, and being jerked on a string a little bit, more than it is about the piece that you did. So, I'm interested in hearing about that.

PJ: About what you just said?

TC: No, about what your, what your interest was and what your base motivation was.

PJ: Um, I could tell you some of the influences on me, books I've read, books that, while I was doing this, things that influenced my thought. There is a book called The Asiatic Mode of Production by Hausbaum, I read Hitler's book Mein Kampf, I read a book by Hannah Arnett called The Origins of Totalitarianism, is that what you want to know?
TC: Well, no. I mean basically, I'm probably being simplistic, I'm basically asking you to explain what the bearing is and why do you think this relates to a graduate thesis in photography?

PJ: I came here to study photography...

TC: Um huh.

PJ: ...after reading Ivin's book, you know? And I was interested in reproduction. I saw these people taking cameras, pointing them, shooting them and it was kind of funny, because they got what they shot, they pretty much look the same. A big stack of prints, a big stack of photographs, what the hell do they need all them all for, you know? And they're just producing them, tons of them, and I wanted to study that. I wanted to study why people did it. I didn't want to do it.

DB: Well, then you're in the wrong degree.

TC: But...

DB: Why don't you, you know, get a philosophy degree or something?

PJ: You mean I could not come here and study photography? This would be the wrong place to do that?

DB: Yeah, well this a studio fine art photography that is differentiated from some history where you look at pictures and study the history.

?: What you just described wasn't photography. It was photographers. You were studying photographers, not photography. From what you just described.

PJ: I was studying photography.

TC: Well...

MH: Well, you were describing the process. These people making these stacks of meaningless images.

PJ: Whatever, or whatever.

MH: Well, that's the person.

PJ: It's not. Why do you think it's meaningless?

MH: That's the person. That's the person, not the, not the, not the medium.
PJ: It's the medium. It's the mode of production. It's the, it's the manufacturing of these objects.

TC: Well, the other thing that I'm interested in is how you, is how you digressed from your proposal, which I mean I, I've noticed that you haven't offered your proposal which I, I also think is a little bit of a way out and sort of an end around and I'm interested in what your proposal said and why you decided to digress from that, if you think you did digress from that.

PJ: Do you want me to get it?

TC: Pardon?

PJ: Do you want to see my proposal?

TC: Well, no. I'm just interested. What did you propose to do and, and...

PJ: You saw the photographs I was making, the paper?

TC: Right.

PJ: Did you see the ruler...

TC: Yeah.

PJ: ...the wooden ruler and the wood?

TC: Yup. Uh huh.

PJ: And it went to this, you see? I mean, there was a progression...

TC: Right.

PJ: ...and this is where I got.

TC: But didn't your proposal, wasn't your proposal along the line of making a series of photographs?

PJ: Yes. However, in the course of work, in the process...

TC: Right.

PJ: ...of producing artwork...

TC: Right.
PJ: ...I came to this.

TC: So the fact that you produced all this artwork is supposed to be inferred by the fact that we're all sitting here, staring at this cube of sugar. I mean how are we supposed to know?

PJ: Oh, no, no. You're not supposed to know that. I mean to say...

TC: Well then it's a private process is my point.

PJ: Making art is a private process?

TC: Well, no. I mean this, this the process that you've gone through in getting to this piece of sugar is something that you have accomplished fundamentally in the absence of, of I think, the people that are here, I'm not really sure about that, but it seems to me that we would have to be privy to that to understand this. Do you see my point?

PJ: No, I don't. I understand what you're saying, but I don't think I agree with that.

TC: Well, I mean, see, in other words, we weren't, we aren't privy to that process or, or that transition that you went through and you're not, you're not necessarily volunteering how this, how this evolved, so as a result we're sort of left in the um, um, in the lurch, so to speak.

PJ: So to appreciate, say a photograph by Agtet, we have to know his childhood?

TC: No, but it helps.

PJ: Why?

TC: Well, because it offers contextual information about the photographer and his life and what his influences were and how he worked.

DB: Any knowledge helps.

PJ: So, I would start with the day I was born and go to...

TC: No, no. I think you're carrying that to an extreme. I think that you can address any, any creative process and tell how you went through it and why particularly you, um, ended up in a certain place and I think to, um, not do that is, is I don't know, disengenuine somehow.
PJ: I don't agree with that.

TC: Well, I mean obviously, you don't agree with that.

PJ: If I go to a museum and I see a work of art. I look at a sculpture by Donald Judd, whatever, any piece, I don't know this person, I don't know where he was born, I don't know what he eats for dinner, I don't know whom he sleeps with, I don't care.

DB: But you probably know that he does other sculpture and that he's probably been doing sculpture for a long time. We could look at this and say you never took a picture! I don't know that you ever took a picture!

PJ: That bothers you?

DB: Yeah!

PJ: Why?

DB: I'm not going to accept this!

PJ: Oh?

DB: I'm getting the same degree as you and I feel like my degree has diminished in value and you know it's a hard enough struggle being here and thinking that as it is without having something like this.

Roy Sowers: Something like what?

TC: That's a good question.

DB: Something that I cannot accept as a photographic, um, work of art, which is what I expect from people who go through this.

Martha Leinroth: Phil, what are the boundaries of this, um of this art piece?

PJ: The boundaries?

ML: Yes.

PJ: Um. It ends like right there and right there and over there.

ML: How about time?

PJ: Pardon?
ML: How about time? Is there an event associated with this?

PJ: This event right here.

?: Pardon?

PJ: Certainly, this event right here. Certainly, from the time I put this here until the time it comes down.

TC: It's already come down.

DB: And who's participating?

PJ: You are, and you are, and you certainly are.

RS: Of course they participated something like... Who am I thinking of here? Duchamp. It's an audience's, the other part of it is to react to a work and continue speaking about it as much as the artist. Placing a sugarcube, a urinal, or a hat rack. Readymades.

TC: Yeah, but I'm, I'm...

Wynn Ragland: One of the issues, one of the issues coming through here is to learn how to establish a dialogue.

PJ: Yeah.

WR: Whether it's through photography or whatever medium. Some of the complaints that I seem to be hearing is that there has not been a dialogue established in which we can understand this piece. You come up here and put this piece here and there's no dialogue, so it's a slap in the face.

TC: It's happening right now.

PJ: Yeah, this is a dialogue.

MH: Well, this is a dialogue.

WR: But, but, it, as to the content and as to your...as to...

PJ: The content?

Carlos Guzman: Are you saying it's his responsibility to inform before he puts the piece up? That there has to be a history that he has to explain, that there has to be a, a conceptual ideology that he has to manifest in order for this to be understood, before he puts it up?
TC: No.

MG: In an institution of higher learning, I would say yes.

PJ: I have to teach? That's my role?

?: No, he's saying that he wants you to understand something from that, that's what you're saying.

MG: You're a student.

PJ: Exactly. You just said I was a teacher a second ago and now you're telling me I am a student.

MG: I said you were a teacher?

PJ: You said I have to explain to these people, what: the history of art? I have to tell you 26 years ago...

MG: I didn't say that at all.

PJ: ...there was something called Minimal art?

[Laughter.]

MG: Not me. Uh uh, I never said that.

PJ: What did you say? I mean, you said I had to inform the people.

TC: I just asked. I didn't demand anything.

Edward Kinney: Phil, what I wonder about is why did you do it and I think that the answer I'm hearing is not really the reason why you did it. I think you're giving answers that I think you feel will placate some very hostile questions and yet I think there are other reasons, really more personal reasons why you did this and I would really like you to share them with us and the hell with the safe answers that's gonna get you the degree, because you have not chosen a safe course anyway.

PJ: Yeah. So do you want me to talk about...

EK: I would like to know why you did this and I think these people might become more comfortable if they had a really honest answer as to why you did this or do you know?
PJ: I am very interested in the readymade.

MH: In the what?

PJ: The readymade.

MH: O.K.

PJ: You know what that is?

MH: Yeah.

PJ: I'm interested in the way art is produced, the mode of production, the way it is created, the actual process that the person goes through to create a work of art.

MH: I think that's a cop-out to his question.

JL: Philip, I don't know if this is what Edward was implying or anything. My feeling, I was really looking forward in a way because I figured something real minimal was going to happen, I didn't know it would be this minimal. But, I think that, I, I agree that the dialogue that's been engendered has been incredibly useful. I think it's wonderful to shake it up. I agree it's been done millions, it's been done before, you know that and I know that.

PJ: Oh, yeah.

JL: What strikes me as missing here is because I know enough, a little bit about you to know that you like art, I mean it excites you. Things which are literally made and finished excite you and you'd like to own some if you were, you know, could. O.K. You like them that much and what I feel is happening, what I felt disappointed in is that this whole thing was staked out on aesthetic grounds, rather than including political grounds, because I feel if you had been at another institution you might very well have pursued a course which involved some of the same aesthetic issues, but would not have engendered this particular statement and it feels to me, what disappointed me was that there was nothing up there on the wall, however minimal, that indicated that this might have happened, this particular course, because of a political or academic situation that engendered it. For me that's the disappointment because I feel you might not have done this, no matter how interested you are in aesthetic issues, if you were somewhere else.

PJ: Certainly, the appropriate action, at the appropriate time, at the appropriate place, is important, or else meaningless, you know? You take that and you put it at the Wegman's and they'd sweep it off the aisle. Right?
JL: Right. But there's no acknowledgement in terms of the statement that you put that there's anything expect aesthetic issues here and I don't think that...

TC: It's a private joke.

JL: I don't, I don't think it is just aesthetic issues and unless some way the extra-aesthetic issues are acknowledged somehow by you, either in terms of this discussion, not just what comes from other people, but from yourself, then it seems incomplete to me.

Charles Werberig: But the expression of resentment is an element of the political element. It's going on here all the time.

MH: But it's dishonest. This is a dishonest expression of that and that's really what bothered me about it.

PJ: Why?

CW: Well, if you, if that's, if you, if you include, I don't want to interrupt his...

MH: It's indirect.

CW: I don't want to interrupt his...

MH: You're intellectualizing anger or frustration.

CW: But the point is you're categorizing and in the process of categorizing you're isolating an element and separating it from the many, multiple things we're talking about, or rather that he's talking about, that's the basis for this.

MH: If this...

CW: You're narrowing it down too precisely. You're narrowing it down too precisely and as a consequence you can come to the conclusion that this deserves an F because you perceive it as, as worthless in relation to something else.

MH: No, I don't perceive this as worthless. I perceive this as having serious worth. But not in this particular program.

CW: But it's an extension of this program, that's where it's worth...

TC: But everything is an extension of the program.
MH: Charles, my problem with this...

CW: ...that's where its worth is.

MH: It's, Charles, my problem with this, my...

TC: Life is an extension of this program.

MH: My problem...

CW: You're getting absurd.

MG: Absurdity...

MH: Excuse me for one second. My problem with this is that it's an intellectual temper tantrum.

CW: This is not absurd. That's the point.

MG: Oh, Charles, come on!

MH: I see this as an intellectual temper tantrum.

?: Yeah.

TC: Me too.

CW: O.K. Just a second...

MG: Adolescent.

GC: A statement by, by a child.

MH: O.K. It's not that it's created by a child. The thought is intelligent thought. That's not what I'm bothered by. But that it's indirect. The child who has a temper tantrum in the, in the supermarket, you know, wants something and his mother doesn't give it to him. He doesn't deal with it directly, because he can't. This evolved out of a direct frustration or hostility with a particular program. I understand that. But it's dishonest to present it this way. You could have dealt with that hostility or the inadequacy of the program if that's what it was, we haven't had that said yet, this is all conjecture, in a more direct way and within the medium of photography.

CW: That's the point, I think you made it, is that you're...
MH: So, so, it's indirect. I think art should be honest and it's indirect and it's dishonest for that reason. I think it should, art should be about honest feelings and this is intellectualizing feelings, which to me is bullshit.

CW: But you're isolating, that's what I'm talking about. It has much more significance than, than what you're attributing to it, much more and just to attribute the political statement to the program, as a resentment to the program, may or may not be valid.

MH: Of course, I don't know whether it's true. He's not giving me that information. This is conjecture.

CW: What you're saying is that you're not getting enough information from him in order to clarify this issue?

MH: I'm saying that this as an act of defiance. I think everyone would agree with that. We don't know the source of that act of defiance.

CW: It can be, but that's not all it stands for.

TC: Well, how are we, how are we supposed to know? I mean, I, I think people have asked very direct questions and I don't think that the answers have been direct.

DB: Phil, you explained it...

CW: I have heard, I've heard his response to some of your questions that has added the dimension that you're telling me is not present.

TC: Well sure. But, I mean I still don't understand how this, how this grew out of this body of work that we don't have access to. I still don't understand.

Susan Myers: It didn't.

CW: You don't have access to it...

TC: No, I know. I just said that you don't have to have access to it.

CW: ...you don't have access to it in the physical sense that you're talking about.

TC: No, I know. I know. But I think, I think that I would, I, I asked what the process was, what the creative process was, how did this come about, what's the through line, you know?
CW: What's absent from the responses that he has already provided you in response to that question, to those questions that you proposed?

TC: He said, "I took a series of photographs, they were like this and then I got here."

PJ: What's absent?

TC: What's the process? I mean you described the physical set of events that happened. I didn't, I didn't understand, I didn't hear anything about, about why this happened or, or what the idea was behind it or what the creative process was about. You told me about physical steps you took to got, to get here. You told me a chronology. You didn't really offer me any explanation.

Ken White: There, there was a point Phil where you talked of your interest in the process of photography and particularly in the production of photographs by other people.

PJ: Or by myself.

KW: Why would you not take that as a source of subject matter and literally take photographs that other people have taken and make your commentary directly upon that process or those products.

PJ: I could, but that would be different. Then you can say...

KW: Granted it would be different.

PJ: ...then you could say, "How come you didn't do this?" And I'd go, "Well, I couldn't..."

DB: No.

TC: Well, then how come you didn't do it?

PJ: What if, what if... Imagine if you will, close your eyes...

SM: But then explain why?

?: This is a thesis defense today.

PJ: It's a sharing.

?: Oh, it's a sharing. O.K. I'm sorry.

PJ: We're sharing.
TC: That, that word has, has bounced, modulated over the years. They used to, they used to be defenses.

RS: A kangaroo court.

DB: They should be.

SM: They should be a defense.

JL: Philip.

PJ: Yes.

JL: Maybe part of the thing that I was trying to ask you is if, if in the course of your evolution, you were turned off, personally, from making pictures by the course of your thinking and your reading, is that, if that's what has happened, this might be a representative point. I had a fantasy of your coming here with a sheath of pictures under your arm, which you wouldn't have shown, in order to make a statement and then present it here. I would have loved that, but O.K. I don't actually believe that you're turned off from making images. Are you?

PJ: Oh no. This is an image.

JL: O.K. So then that means to me that this is definitely not just an aesthetic statement and, and I wouldn't have wanted it, you know? Like a series of photo documentary...

MH: He can deal with it in any medium he wants to. If, if, if the source of his inspiration is hostility about something or disillusionment about some part of this program, um, we don't know that, then I think we could have found some appropriate means within the medium to demonstrate that.

CG: Phil?

PJ: Yes.

CG: I've heard you, I've heard you talk like with Martha explaining a little bit more about this and at the same time, I've heard a lot of people saying what this is about, and what they're explaining this, and usually what they're explaining is in regards to [words obscured], "Well, what he's doing is, he's making a statement, a hostile statement, about the program."

TC: Well, we don't know that.
MH: We don't know that. It's all conjecture.

SM: He says that we don't know that.

CG: It is all conjecture. But, you know, that's what I keep on hearing.

SM: He says we don't know that.

CG: What I'm, what I would like to hear is more about is what the process was. What the readings were, what the issues of the readings were, the people, what were they dealing with, which is the game that you're dealing with.

PJ: Should I pull out the stuff that I showed you yesterday?

CW: It's up to you.

PJ: Yeah, why not?

CG: Go for it.

PJ: O.K. Here's some stuff that's been of interest to me for a very long time.

CW: I'd sort of like to make a qualification and I'm only making this qualification because we agreed to it in the process of, of what we expected we would encounter when we got involved in the sharing. I don't think what he's about to do now is necessary. I think what you want to know can be worked out and if we stay here long enough we can resolve that and we can justify everything that, with which you're concerned, both on an aesthetic and a political level and I really don't find the two inseparable which is the way I think they're also being discussed. Anymore than I feel that you can isolate the kind of element that, that you're, you tend, at least in your explanation, to be preoccupied with. There's much more breath to it than that, and I would prefer much more to have you exclude that from your thinking in order to be able to get to where he's at, in order to comprehend the process that we are in fact involved in. There's a process here. The process is, the process is terribly important.

?: Is this MFA degree a collaboration?

CW: It's terribly important.

?: Is this a collaboration?

CW: Is this a collaboration? Of course it is. I'm his, I'm his, the chairman of his thesis board...
SM: Did you know this was gonna happen?

CW: ...and I've been working with him since, since he arrived here...

?: No, but I mean you're, you're...

CW: ...so there's a history...

?: ...you've used "we" on several occasions in terms of a defense of what's here.

CW: All I can say is if it's necessary, if you feel you need me, I can provide you with some of the data that you feel you need in order to describe the process that not only led up to this, but of which this is a part.

?: So for the learning coming out of the thesis...

CW: But that's not why I'm here. That's not what...

?: No, no. I don't think so.

CW: I'm here for... This is his thing.

?: Yeah, right.

CW: That's why I prefer not to interrupt.

?: Yeah, yeah, right.

MG: The learning coming out of this thesis, is that important, the reaction of the audience to the piece? Is that it? Is that what you're saying? I mean telling Mark on the one hand that he's gotta get a different idea.

CW: I think that, no, no.

MG: He's gotta get away from the hostile idea...

CW: No.

MG: ...that he is expressing.

CW: I said that he has to expand upon that, because the reasoning...

MG: But you can't tell an audience that.
CW: Let me finish. The reasoning is being restricted to a very narrow, a very limited point of view, of what the objective of this can be.

MG: That's his prerogative.

MH: That's because the information is restricted.

MG: That's his prerogative.

CW: Yeah.

MG: That's everyone's prerogative in this room.

CW: But he's, he's asking for something that relative to what's going on here is so insignificant, I would prefer to have other things discussed, because there are other things that have to be discussed, they're important to, they're important to this process, they're important to this process and they're important to its relevance to...

DB: But maybe it's not lacking in us...

CW: Wait a minute! It's important...

DB: ...maybe, maybe it's lacking in the piece!

CW: ...it's important in terms of its relevance to the making of images and that's one of the things that you are all involved in and it just happens to be that this is an extension of the making of photographic images, but it is not a photographic image, but it is an image, and is part of the process.

DB: I wouldn't know that unless...

?: As an educational experience, why wasn't more of that information put out?

DB: Yeah!

CW: We're talking about it now. This is not a didactic exercise. This is not a didactic exercise. You're, you're trying to get information with which you are not familiar and in that sense...

MG: You're right. That's why I'm asking.

CW: ...we're trying to provide it. But this is not a didactic situation. It's not, I'm not...we're, we're not here as teachers.
TC: But Charles, how does it come forth? I mean...

MG: But we're here as...

DB: How do we know...

CW: You're asking questions.

TC: ...what's the conduit?

CW: By asking questions.

TC: But we've asked questions.

CW: Continue to ask questions.

MH: I don't feel we're getting honest answers.

MG: Really.

CW: Continue to ask questions. If you feel that, that, that he's not providing with you, providing you with enough, and I do agree that he stops at a certain point where he should continue to go further.

TC: Yeah.

CW: If you feel that maybe you should be asking me instead of him, I'll ask him whether I can do that or not, if that will help any, but...

TC: But it's his piece.

CW: That's right and that's why I...

TC: That's why I'm asking him and it stops...

CW: Then...

TC: This is too cute.

CW: ...provide him with the right question and he'll give you the answer to it.

TC: I haven't had that experience twice. I haven't had that experience twice. I've asked the same question twice, I haven't gotten anywhere.

CW: What do you want to know?
CG: I think that's what I was asking Phil just now. Please go ahead with the explanation.

PJ: Oh, the explanation about the mode of production...

CG: Yeah.

PJ: ...that we were just talking about before? Oh, that's important. I'll tell you a little story. When I was a kid they took us to this automobile plant to watch them make cars. They had this big sheet of metal. It was hot. They were going to make a car out of it and this thing was, this thing was orange and it illuminated this room and I was up on a catwalk above it. I looked down and that thing was beautiful. I just wanted to dive into it. I would die, but, um, it was gorgeous. I thought about the way things were made, the way they're manufactured, about the way art was manufactured, the mode of production... I'd like to give you the information that you want, but you have to help me to get there... I'm more than willing to share with you. I mean, in fact I'd like you to know why I did this and you would, I'm positive, if...

MH: Edward asked a question earlier and it seems to me it was an honest question, and he knows you a lot better than I know you, and you really failed to respond to that question and it just strikes me as, if you're pissed off at something, excuse me Charles for concentrating on that, then you ought to have the balls to say what it is.

PJ: Oh, I think that the...

MH: And this strikes me as art without balls. It's indirect.

PJ: Well, my balls, we could talk about my balls, but maybe we should concentrate on that instead. That might be more important.

MH: Well, I'm trying to understand your motivation for creating this piece and you seem reluctant to share that with us. Edward's question was a very straightforward question and I think that you, to deal with the surrounding issues to this installation or this performance.

PJ: The surrounding issues are being narrowed to one issue. Supposedly...

TC: It may not be one. I haven't gotten one. So maybe if I get one, I'll ask for a second one. But I haven't heard one.

PJ: You said one.
MH: Well you haven't, that was conjecture.

TC: He guessed one.

MH: I guessed one you know? That was a conjecture.

PJ: Yes it is. But, everybody seems to...

MH: Well, I'm more interested in what you think, not what everybody else thinks and you seem reluctant to share that with us and I think it's gutless. I really do. If you have the balls to do a piece like this, it's taking risks, then defend it.

PJ: Oh, I don't know if it's balls, it's just you know, where my work goes. This is where it is right now. This is part of a process.

TC: Oh, geez.

PJ: And I was somewhere else, now I'm here, I'm gonna be somewhere else in a year.

CG: Phil, is this a protest to the situation here, political in...

SM: No. He's really not into it, because he's never gone to any meetings about complaints about the system and stuff and people are reading...

MH: I have no idea.

SM: ...that into it and that's another conjecture.

PJ: Because I never went to meetings...

SM: No, you haven't verbalized it much. I think people are reading that into it.

RS: Would it be that he has not verbalized it to you?

?: Why don't you let him answer?

SM: Let him answer.

?: Let him answer. You just asked a question, let the man answer.

PJ: This guy cares about my balls, and I mean she's concerned about what?

TC: It's a figurative statement, don't pick on stuff like that.
SM: What I'm concerned...

MH: I may even be interested in them. What does that have to do, relevance...

SM: What I'm concerned about everybody's reading a lot of different things into this cube and people are asking you as to what you think and what you have to say and you start out with a little story about something and you then stop and you don't continue and people are here because they're concerned...

CG: Susan.

SM: ...they want to learn, they want to know and want...

CG: Susan, in all fairness...

SM: ...you could explain it.

CG: ...in all fairness, I just asked him a question and you just interrupted before he finished answering it.

PJ: Could you repeat the question?

CG: Is this a statement in regards to political and aesthetic situations of the program?

PJ: I think that it would be impossible for it not to be, because in a situation you act. I mean everything is, the way you act, the way you dress, the way you talk...

CG: I think it has more to do than that.

PJ: Yes. It has more to do than that.

CG: Such as?

PJ: That's one aspect. Another aspect would be, again getting back to the idea of modes of production, the way art is created.

DB: And you think we should be able to know that by coming in here and, and experiencing your installation?

PJ: You don't understand how this was created? That's a sugar cube. Out of an endless number...
DB: No. I don't understand how it's, how I'm supposed to know how it's related to the issues of how art is created.

?: Did anybody read the statement that's on the wall?

DB: Yeah.

SM: Yeah.

?: Well, would it make any difference if the statement was there without the cube?

TC: It would make a lot of difference.

PJ: Do you understand how that statement relates to this piece?

EK: No. I have a little trouble with that. I want some help.

WR: Explain to us how Vulcan's reaching in there and alchemy...

PJ: O.K. Vulcan is, in the context of this, the artist, and alchemy is the making of art.

WR: Vulcan is also the fire god.

PJ: Yeah.

WR: And alchemy is a mystical process.

PJ: Yes, as is making art.

DB: Well, making cars isn't a mystical process. That's a big leap of logic that leaves me breathless.

PJ: Making cars?

DB: It's hardly mystical.

PJ: Making a car is not an art? Not a process of art?

DB: It's not mystical.

PJ: Really?

DB: No.
PJ: O.K.

MG: It's physical.

PJ: So is making art.

CG: Does it carry some mythological implications to it? You know, working his forge?

TC: Now we're at warp speed. This is what...

CW: Phil?

JL: What...

PJ: Yes.

JL: ...what would you say about the relationship? I mean...

PJ: That relates to the readymade, that relates to Duchamp's ideas about the readymade: the choosing of an object, giving an object significance that it didn't have formally and, um, setting up the context, the environment, the situation where that object has the specific meaning that you've given it, that work of art.

?: What significance did you give the cube of sugar...

PJ: Art.

?): ...and what meaning does it have?

PJ: Art, art, it's a work of art.

?): What significance did you give the sugar and what meaning does it have?

PJ: I picked that five grams of sugar from many others that are out there. I went to the Wegman's...

TC: So why is that significant and not random?

PJ: It's, it's significant because it's what I chose.

TC: Is it significantly different from other cubes of sugar?

PJ: It's that shape. It's the one that's right there.
TC: Do other cubes of sugar look like that cube of sugar?

PJ: Pretty similar.

TC: In what ways do they look different?

PJ: They're not that one.

TC: In what ways do they look different?

PJ: They are not that one.

TC: I know that, I know that.

DB: If I took that one and mixed it with other ones, you wouldn't be able to pick it out, would you?

PJ: Probably not.

TC: So there's, there's, there's nothing physical about it that made it look different.

PJ: The shape...

TC: But other cubes of sugar would look like that cube of sugar.

PJ: There's a lot of them, a whole ton of them that look just like that one, there's a whole bunch...

TC: So why is this one significant?

PJ: Because it is in the middle of a room and there's a spotlight on it. Because we're all standing here and staring at it.

?: I wasn't staring.

PJ: You are...

MH: And that choice is important to this piece?

PJ: That choice is absolutely important to this piece.

MH: That, that, I fail to see that, try to explain that...

PJ: You, you fail to see...
MH: ...to see why that, why it's important, that your choice, the intellect of your choice, going into Wegman's or wherever, the picking of that particular cube of sugar is relevant to anything other than completing this installation...

PJ: Holy shit, the size, the way it relate to the size of the room, if it was...

MH: ...and if I had a cube of sugar that were, uh, uh, a sixteenth of an inch longer that would change the experience...

PJ: The room, yeah, the room would...

MH: ...and that, that minutia of choice in this case is important to the statement that you're making?

PJ: Yes, yes it is.

MH: Could you explain that?

TC: So you're replacing the cube of sugar during the middle of the week, was that a traumatic experience for you, when you had to replace the cube of sugar? So it doesn't really matter, really, if it's one cube of sugar or the other? Yeah, so well, it either, it either has to be a specific cube of sugar or it doesn't have to be a specific cube of sugar. You can't argue both sides of the argument.

PJ: Are you familiar with the editions Duchamp did in 1965 in Milan?

TC: No.

PJ: The editions form the readymades?

TC: No.

PJ: He did a bunch of editions...

EK: Phil, rather than talk about the physicality of that object...

PJ: Why don't you let me finish?

EK: ...what does it have metaphorically, for you, that cube of sugar. You talked about people stacking up photography endlessly which, um, you wonder why, and then you talk about the, um, mass production of this very similar object, almost one indistinguishable from another, is there any metaphor, is that piece, for your feelings about photography, in the state it exists in right now, especially at this place, because I don't think we can escape
that this is not Rhode Island School of Design, it is not Chicago Art Institute. The fact that it's RIT, I agree with Judy, produced this particular performance. I also agree when she says this performance would not have occurred had you been anywhere else in the world, in any different circumstance, something we all know that.

PJ: Right.

EK: So what is the metaphor that, at which we are looking?

PJ: You want me to explain why sugar...

EK: How does, yeah, why is it a metaphor, this whole thing, for something else, it's the something else I'm after and I'm having trouble getting it.

PJ: You mean that sugar could be seen say as energy?

EK: No, I'm asking what you say. I want to know if this is a metaphor, this whole installation, for your feelings about photography at this place and this time and if so I, I would like you to be as engaging as you were when you were, I understand you have a hostile audience, and I know I become very humble with a hostile audience, and yet I have heard you lapse almost poetic about this, and I, I would encourage you to do so, but I think one of the things that may be more poetic is you were being more honest and did not feel so threatened when talking to a smaller group and I think these people sincerely would like to buy into this, but I think it is very difficult.

PJ: Yeah, yeah...

EK: And they're really counting on you. I hate to put a, put a heavy...

MH: That's really what I'm asking. I think it's gut... I'm waiting for that honesty or whatever it is...

PJ: I need to be directed a little bit by you toward what you want because...

MH: What's so hard about being honest Phil?

JL: No, no, maybe Phil, maybe Philip, what he, maybe, maybe, I don't know what your discussion was earlier with Edward, but you could have put any number of small objects that were readymade there. You could have put a matchbox, you could have put a shoelace, anything. O.K? So, what maybe in terms of whatever your previous discussion was there is a meaning for having chosen that particular object, in this setting, at this time and if there is, say something.
PJ: Sugar...

JL: Yeah. The, the pressed sugar cube. Like, why that instead of another small readymade object, here?

PJ: Um, to me it relates to the individual in a bigger situation. There's a bunch of sugarcubes, but I picked one...

JL: That could have been true of any number of objects, right?

PJ: ...of any number of objects. But, I think that shape suggests it. I think the idea of sugar, um, see we're getting into something...

?: Hopefully.

PJ: Sugar to me is a metaphor...

JL: For?

PJ: ...power, drugs, it's manufactured, refined...um...

?: I don't know.

PJ: Yeah.

JL: I mean one of the things that occurred to me, when I was here and I was kind of hunting in my head, why did you pick the sugar? I mean, I, I had to ask myself that. I thought if I had a cup of water and poured it over that sugar it would disappear.

PJ: It sure would.

JL: I mean that was one of the things, you're not saying it, that was what I thought. O.K? A piece of palatable sweetness that if I poured water over it, it would entirely disappear. I mean maybe, I don't know if that's anything that came up in your discussion with Edward or not, but it certainly seems to me that that would be, you know, if your going to get into metaphor, that's something that might be there, but I don't know. I don't, I didn't, I don't want to put words in your mouth either, if there's a significance to it.

PJ: The ants could come and take it away. It has a different function. It has the aesthetic function. Do you remember that term?

JL: Yeah. I do.
PJ: And it has another one too, I mean you can eat it. That appeals to me. The fact that it's disposable, that it's cheap, that everyone can make it. You can go home, you can take a lump of sugar, you can put it on the floor, you got it. It's free. It's free to everyone.

MH: What does that have to do with a MFA program in photography?

PJ: Oh, wow. We're back to that again.

MH: Well.

DB: Phil, that's kind of important.

?: Phil, how could you, I mean you know?

TC: Why, why don't you answer the question? Answer the question.

MH: What, I understand the intellectual exploration that you've taken to get this lump of sugar, but what does that have to do, in a specific sense, with getting a MFA program in photography? Help me! I'm really troubled with your...

PJ: Oh, sure. We talked about Ivins when we first came here, the graduates. And then we talked about reproducibility. Um, multiples...

?: Multiples?

PJ: Does that have anything to do with this...

MH: Well, it's true you can make multiples of cubes of sugar and you can make multiple prints, so far I can see, you can make multiple Fiats, and um, Harley-Davidsons, and um, you know? So I see that connection, that's not hard to understand, what does that have to do with, seriously, with making, with getting a MFA degree in photography?

PJ: I came here to study photography. I came here as a student of the medium. That interested me because I saw a bunch of people making photographs, for different reasons, not all of them made it for [word obscured], you take a picture of this to get some money and sell it to a cosmetic company.

MH: That's one aspect of it.

PJ: And there's others, there's other aspects too.
MH: Photography doesn't have to be a multiple medium. You can make an image and destroy the negative and then it's not a multiple medium anymore.

PJ: Sure, sure.

MH: So, I don't understand, you know...

PJ: The actual act of making a photograph: taking a camera, setting it up, pointing it at something, taking a picture, and it comes out looking like what you took a picture of, basically.

MH: Right.

PJ: You know...

MH: Right, right. O.K.

RS: Along with that, in our MFA program, I was wondering is this somewhat a commentary, again, that it's possible within the myth of RIT, that one follows a series of steps, rules, norms, and one can create art?

PJ: Yes.

DB: Well, you know that decision isn't necessarily made at the time of production.

PJ: Pardon?

DB: The, the decision about an attempt at a piece of art isn't made at the time of production. I mean a car can get made and you can say this is a car. But a photograph gets made and you can't say this is art necessarily. There's a lot of other aspects to determine whether something is really art...

PJ: Um...

DB: ... fine art. You know? Something that's going to live down through the ages and be appreciated by a lot of people, consider it...

RS: But if you do it in the right way at RIT you get a MFA.

DB: Well, I'm not...

MH: Roy, say, say, run that by me again.

?: I think Roy said, "If you do it the right way at RIT you get a MFA."
TC: What happens if you do it the wrong way?

?: Then you get lots of people coming into a room and...

?: Has there ever been a MFA thesis that's been denied?

TC: I think one.

?: Has there, has there been ever a MFA thesis, thesis like this?

?: No, no...

TC: Yeah there has. What's the point?

MH: I don't know what's going to happen with you, that's not my responsibility. Has there ever been a MFA thesis that's been denied?

SM: Yes, there has.

Owen Butler: There have been thesis that have been delayed.

MH: Ah, not denied, delayed.

OB: That I know of.

TC: It's like gravity.

OB: Wait, wait, wait. I don't know what I would [words obscured]... I don't think a thesis really ever defines a program. That's, I think, sort of a waste of time, talking about a program based upon that.

MH: No, no. You're talking about this, based on our program. This, this may, this may have evolved from the program.

?: Well, let's split hairs. I don't think you can...

SM: Phil?

OB: I, I truly think that cube obviously could be any place including [word obscured] and um, it's regardless of what the program is or is not about, it's, it's unfair to funnel anything about that through that cube. Because that may have really evolved and it may not define anything about the program right or wrong. Um, I'm curious. I don't know if you've stated it, what, what would you like to be the outcome of this day?
PJ: I'd like to learn a little bit about what I do and why I do it. Personally...

WR: Let's turn, let's turn to your, um, your statement up there. It says: "Nothing has been made in its final state." Does that apply to this room?

PJ: Yeah.

WR: How?

PJ: Um, when I'm done with it, it will change, it will be taken down, the walls will be changed, the size of the wall...

SM: It's changed right now, everybody in this room, so...

WR: I'm not, I'm just asking. I'm trying to understand. It says: "everything is at first created in its final materials," final material, how do that relate...

PJ: "raw materials"

WR: O.K. "whereupon Vulcan comes, by, comes and by the art of alchemy develops it into its final substance."

PJ: The final substance is the, um, relationship the walls have to the place and the lighting in the room.

?: I mean does it have to be a one to one sort of correlation between the statement and the sugarcube, you know?

TC: Well, there is an implied inference there.

PJ: He wanted it. That's as good as I can do. Yes, Ed.

EK: Phil, I think for a, for a second you may have let down your barrier a bit and expressed one of your concerns, because somebody mentioned aesthetics and you said, "Oh yeah, aesthetics, remember that?" I know they're very important to you and I know the way you deal with them is not necessarily with the forms you choose, but the ideas that perhaps engender those forms, and that the forms in turn stimulate these ideas and it is the wondering...

PJ: Yes.

EK: I would hope and I, could you develop that a bit?

PJ: Um...
EK: May, may I ask you another question? What has happened to your aesthetic sensibilities while here? Do you feel they've been hurt or affronted?

PJ: Oh no. Not hurt. Certainly I've done reading that's changed my ideas about aesthetics and I've talked to people and I put myself in a situation like this one to learn about aesthetic norms. You know? And how that relates to value. You could say, um, I broke an aesthetic norm and that is a reflection of human value, my values, her's, whomever's values, whoever felt that norm shouldn't have been broken.

OB: You don't really think that's unique?

PJ: No, not at all. Twenty-some...

TC: So what's...

PJ: ... years ago, Minimal art, come on.

TC: So what's the aesthetic norm that was broken?

PJ: Forty prints, some of which are better than others, hanging on the wall.

TC: I thought that was, um, how's that an aesthetic norm?

PJ: That's a MFA norm...

JL: That is different...

TC: That's not an aesthetic norm then, is it?

PJ: Pardon?

TC: That's not an aesthetic norm then, is it?

PJ: Aesthetic norms fit a certain situation always.

TC: So how is that an aesthetic norm?

PJ: Pardon me?

TC: How is it an aesthetic norm?

PJ: How is what?

TC: How is what you did compared to what you just said, your forty prints, how is that, how is that breaking an aesthetic norm?
PJ: Well, people that come in here and express anger and when, when they do that, the reason they do it is because you broke a norm. Right?

TC: What's the norm that was broken?

DB: You can do this. Can I do this? Go ahead and do it. I don't think it's any of my business. It's [word obscured] that's what angered me. I, I think that your Minimalist little show and your points are just fine. It's just...

OB: I think he should get the degree. I'd like to be the public defender. I'm sorry...

[Laughter. Applause.]

OB: Wait, wait, let me. He should get the degree, because if it got this far and it was executed, the implicit approval, as far as I'm concerned, is all about some prior compensation and/or neglect which I don't give a damn about either way, if it got this far in the center of this room with a spotlight on it, you have earned the degree somehow or another. Now, I am not...

DB: I spent my money on Cibachrome...

OB: Hey listen, he spent the money. I could care less about how he spends his money. Um, if this is, I don't know if anybody talked about this being a political piece...

Everybody: Yeah, yeah...

[Laughter.]

OB: I think along with it, I think from the time that we're putting in we should share your degree...

TC: I don't need one.

[Laughter.]

OB: ...because giving you the degree that we are so involved in, I want a piece of it, I don't know what it is I want, but I...

[Laughter.]

OB: I, regardless, you, you somehow got your degree. Is this another [word obscured]...
[Laughter.]

?: Is there, is there anything in your, anything...

OB: Too long.

?: Is there any thesis that you would consider that wouldn't or shouldn't...

OB: It is not that it's such a would/should not. When it gets to a certain point that a board, a program, an education is not, um, influenced or [word obscured] by its own choice of being active and gets this far, I would not approve of this if I were on the board, but frankly I might, because what really goes on prior to this, I assume, is two years, three years, a year and a half of time doing something. I don't know about that, nor do I what to guess about it, nor do I think that forty prints is, is, is any bigger deal then that. I think the wall covering, the numbers and all of that nonsense, um, can be just as much nonsense as you might feel this is. Now this is strange coming from me, but the, the fact of the matter is that is equal in value at this point. Now...

DB: So you're, you're just assuming that there's some, some...

OB: Well...

DB: ...something behind it...

OB: Well, I, I...

DB: ...believe...

OB: Well, I assume that I could go to another school where I know zero about the program, see a cube of sugar there and you know hear the cages rattle and all the nonsense and I might believe it's a great program or not. That doesn't matter to me at this point.

DB: Well, I mean, that, he, assuming there's value to the piece. There's some background...

OB: Well, I'll give you some of the, the value I, I find, I, I find there's a lot of value in this. Even if it be entertainment. Entertainment is worth a MFA degree sometimes.

DB: Yeah.

OB: It's hard to come by, good entertainment.

TC: That's why I think we're getting jerked on a string.
OB: But, um, if there is any, and I don't know what the tape sounds like, if there is any prolonged, um, discussion about a number of things that I hear, um, that may be worth it. I don't know what the final concluding thesis report is going to be. Now my assumption is...

?: It's gonna be written, um...

OB: ...it's gonna be taped.

?: This tape, he's gonna offer that to us...

OB: Well, I'd tend to buy it, but then again all of our names should be on that effort. You see, I think you're very selfish about this, everybody's here tweedling and dwiddling with you. You're sort of enjoying it, to a point, um, the weakness is in what you're not giving and you may not know it.

?: That's right.

OB: You may not know. I think you may have stumbled into something a hell of a lot more than you know about. And on that basis, if I were on the board, then I would say I don't know that you've earned the degree. Not on the piece, not on the piece. I'm just not hearing enough to say that you've earned the degree.

CG: [Words obscured] I think the piece is successful as a performance thing. There's a lot lacking, that's lacking. For example, I heard when you were talking to Martha and the other people about what I asked you before and it's like you start to a point and then you stop, and you don't offer anymore and that's where, I think, the piece is lacking. Because that's what the piece is about.

PJ: I'd like to give you more, however, I, it seems like we all start talking about, uh, stepping on people's feet whenever we get to a point where we're talking about something relevant.

JL: I, I think that you do some of that Philip, honestly, cause I, I really do feel the meaning of this piece is our gathering...

PJ: Yeah...

JL: I absolutely do.

PJ: Yes...
JL: And in as much as you participate in it as fully as people are willing to participate with you, that is the depth or the shallowness of the effectiveness of this piece for me, my way of seeing it. O.K? And I think that you also have self stoppers. It isn't just people's anger or people's confusion, because I think that people have genuinely experienced the meaning of coming here. I think most people here are pretty appreciative of the fact that this dialogue was started. So, I think some of the stopping is happening from you, not just from the outside.

PJ: O.K. Could you help me to go further then and, um, when do I stop?

JL: I don't know why, I mean it's like you know, O.K., like Mark, Mark asked you a question and he said something that, I, I think he's genuinely concerned, O.K? He's giving you credit for something, for having started a dialogue that might not otherwise have been started. He says to you his feeling is that unless you come through with more you're doing something without balls. Now your way of stopping that is to say this isn't a discussion about balls, it's not. That was a genuine statement and it was one that was empathic with your, your, um, start of this dialogue. I think that you allowed yourself to get pulled off to the side and use that as a stopper for yourself instead of addressing what really was an empathic invitation for you to say more because discourse is all here, that's what we've got is discourse.

ML: Maybe to that end you could explain some of the traditions that this fits into...

PJ: Traditions?

ML: ...or the, um, sources. Explain the earlier Japanese artists, Jamie Lee Byars. That might help people understand.

PJ: O.K. The idea of "Ma," a Japanese word that means, um, the closest I could come to describing Ma would be Josef Albers teaching of figure-ground, are you familiar with that? There's a drawing on the cover of a book called The Drawings of Josef Albers. It's a drawing of an owl. Get your ruler out and if you measure it, there's more white than there is black on the page, but, um, it looks O.K. You know, you know you don't need anymore black even though, even though, um, if you measure it there's more white, it seems like it's O.K. There's enough. O.K. Albers would say that's a successful figure-ground relationship. Um, there's a French word called "métier" which means, um, deception in a playful sense, Alber's work has that. Um, the idea of Ma, I think, is the same idea Albers talks about with figure-ground. That's the important idea. Just enough. There's this guy. He was born in 1932 in Detroit, also. His name is Jamie Lee Byars. I don't know if anyone here is familiar with his work but, um, he did these performances and they last about two seconds long. Um, he did a performance in France, it was called Faster
Than the Speed of Sound. He closed the gallery and from down the street this guy jumped out and yelled, "Faster than the speed of sound," and he jumped back. O.K. Now, that’s Byars. The reason is, it’s important to the statement, if he jumped out again and said it again and jumped back, it would suck. O.K. It wouldn’t be the same. It wouldn’t be any good. If he went and jumped out and he walked up to the people and said, "Hi, how do you like that guys," you know and opened up the gallery and did a dance, it would stink. It’s important to the statement that it’s that brief. It wouldn’t be the same statement. It would mean something different. It wouldn’t be any good. It wouldn’t be the idea that Jamie Lee Byars is after. It wouldn’t be the same thing. You understand that?

MH: I do understand that when we’re dealing with performance art or when we’re dealing with Minimalist art, but not, or sculpture, but not, uh, not in this program.

PJ: Can I come, can I come here and pay $14,000 to study photography. To study it, as a student and I have these teachers and they teach me stuff, O.K., and then when I [words obscured]...

MH: Of course.

PJ: ...my artwork looks like what I want it to look like...

MH: Of course.

PJ: ...not what you want it to look like.

MH: Of course, absolutely.

PJ: Maybe this is not artwork...

MH: It is.

PJ: ...maybe it’s...

MH: It is and I have to judge it based on, on the environment that it was created in and based on that assessment I’d have to flunk you.

CW: What you’re saying though, what you’re saying is that you’re rejecting an alternative to your point of view. Is that what you’re saying?

MH: No! No, I think that...

CW: That’s what it sounds like.
MH: No, no I'm not. I'm saying that I think that if, if you, I think that not given his, the motivation for the creation to his, his piece here. We're starting to get a little bit of it, but not having the benefit of that, we can conjecture any motivation since he's not forthright in giving us what really motivated him towards this piece. Now based on, on that, um, fair, fair assessment, I can say, um, well this is about the easiest, the simplest form, this is the easiest MFA, quote MFA thesis I've ever seen. That's alright, that's...

CW: I disagree. I think that, that um, what we're dealing with here now and, and in the first five minutes it was quite clear and quite obvious that there is out here a predominant aesthetic premise, premise. Over here there is an alternative point of view.

MH: I understand that. I understand it. I understand what he's doing. I understand that it is an alternative point of view.

CW: But you're telling me that you don't understand what he's doing...

MH: No.

CW: ...and you're telling me now...

MH: I'm saying...

CW: Wait a minute.

MH: ...that it's still dishonest.

CW: Now what you're saying is that he is not conforming to your aesthetic and therefore he does not deserve the recognition that goes along with being awarded a MFA degree. This is what you, this is what you're saying.

MH: My aesthetic is, is to, to deal with the subject matter in a honest way, not dishonest. I think that...

CW: You're making a moral judgement now. Is that, is that valid in this context?

MH: Could you let me finish? Not dealing with the motivation for the creation of this piece is dishonest. It's intellectual dishonesty. I think and I think...

CW: Must you only see...

MH: ...serious art should flow from honesty...
CW: This is serious art.

MH: ...observation. Ignoring it, I think ignoring it, ignoring his motivation is dishonest. Whether it's true...

CW: All the aspects, all the aspects of the process that were involved in doing this, everything that we're doing here now has its relevance to the way in which you pursue your aspect, you, your aesthetic. It's the same, the process is identical, but we're moving out into a different dimension than you are, than you are familiar with. We're dealing with a different aesthetic out here than we're dealing with, with up here. And you, uh, this is what he's trying to tell you. He's trying to lead you into a different dimension...

MH: I understand that...

CW: ...and you're rejecting it on moral...

MH: ...he's...

CW: ...wait, you're rejecting it on moral grounds now. That's, that, that's a...

PJ: That's normal.

CW: ...mess.

PJ: That's normal though. Can I read this?

CW: Go ahead.

JL: Read it.

PJ: This is about, um, Champlin. He wrote it: "In working out my themes I employed only a proper awareness of what was required... It was merely an attempt to discover whether that genre which has been condemned by our most famous writers was really dead, or whether the theory of the genre, which I knew quite well, could enable me in practice to demonstrate to my friends that without a great spiritual soaring it is possible to use it successfully." This is a different guy talking now, Jan Mukarovsky who wrote this book in 1936: "Translated into our terminology," (the terminology of Czech semeiotics), "this statement expresses the belief that correct application of a norm is itself sufficient to create artistic value," (like Roy said). "Concerning Symbolism, it is sufficient to recall the desire to create an "absolute work" which has prevailed regardless of period and which appeared so intensively in, for example, Mallarmé. We can introduce, as additional evidence of the tendency of the aesthetic norm to become absolutely binding, the mutual intolerance of competing aesthetic norms
which is often brought to light in polemical situations. The aesthetic norm is replaced by another, more authoritative norm, e.g., a moral norm - and one's opponent is called a deceiver, or else by an intellectual norm, in which case the opponent is called ignorant or stupid. Even when the right of the individual to make aesthetic judgements is emphasized, one hears in the same breath the request for responsibility for them: individual taste is a component of the human value of the person who exercises it."

MH: I'm not concerned about taste, I'm concerned about the process.

PJ: We just had that discussion two minutes ago, remember, remember, remember that?

MH: I'm, I'm not concerned about the taste, I'm concerned about the process.

PJ: I just told you. Your concern...

MH: I was not concerned about the taste, I was concerned about the process. What I perceive as your dishonesty...

PJ: It's impossible to talk to you. I mean, you know what I mean? You haven't said, "I believe this..." I mean, let's follow a logical progression of thought, then maybe we'll get somewhere...

DB: Right. Accept, accept everything...

PJ: ...but you say one thing and then you say another, so we're going to have trouble...

DB: ...accept everything. You do it, it's O.K.

CW: Now what you're saying by saying that is that, what you're saying by saying that is that you have the standard that we have to conform to.

DB: Right!

CW: You see?

DB: Well, we're both talking the same thing, only with different words. I mean he's always right or I'm always right.

PJ: No, no, not at all.

CW: It's not a matter of right or wrong.

PJ: It's not at all. It's not at all.
CW: So, so you're changing, you're converting it into a moral issue. It's not a matter of right or wrong. That's not the issue.

RS: Is it impossible to see the sublime and beautiful qualities in a long extended piece of writing and chrome that you put up and in Phil's sugarcube, lighted and set in a grey room?

DB: Sure, I can see...

RS: Why defy the elements?

DB: ... I can see aesthetic value in this.

OB: Well, listen, I think there's a technical problem and, um, it's very technical to the eye. There's no way around this down to the bones of what you do. Is the floor too dirty or too clean?

PJ: The floor is terrible.

OB: Alright, that aspect of this piece doesn't work.

PJ: I agree with that.

SM: Yeah.

OB: And I don't care if it's spots on the print or some other way of dogging to what the hell you've been doing, um, what doesn't work in that piece is that the floor's too dirty. I don't know what else is wrong with it...

?: I do.

OB: ...there, as far as I'm concerned, is the place for criticism.

PJ: Yes, I agree with you. I agree...

OB: And, um, I don't know if you've offered that, because you're engaging much too much in what you're actually trying to [word obscured] and I don't think there is an interesting game as to whether or not this belongs in the MFA program.

CW: Yes, at the same time you're describing...

EK: I think...

CW: ...at the same time...
EK: ...[words obscured] answer that...

CW: ... you're describing the limits of the gallery as well.

OB: Right. I, I...

EK: No, you're, you're talking about, again, a product then instead of a process. The minute you say, "Oh, we've got to spotone these prints, you've got to dry mount it, or else it's unacceptable," then we're going back to the same old thing which I think he is trying to transcend. It is the process, not the product, I would hope, that is engaging us here. And I don't think the engagement would have been any more intense had the thing been highly buffed.

OB: I don't know about that.

PJ: The engagement would have been more intense if there wasn't a floor here. Yes. It would have been better. It would be better. If there was a better floor, this would be better. I agree.

KW: Why did you not make a better floor? Why did you not put a covering down?

PJ: Um, because that would be a different piece. Then it would be the sugar cube with the covering.

KW: Granted Phil. That's a cop-out. If there's an element of this that disappoints you, why would you not take the initiative to provide a better floor for your piece to get to the idea?

PJ: I would not redo the gallery floor because number one, it's not my job...

KW: No one's asking you to do that, no one says it's your job or not. It is your space.

DB: It's all part of this.

PJ: If I, if I altered the floor, the altering of the floor would be part of the piece. Do you understand? It's really simple.

KW: That is, that is not...

PJ: It's not part of the piece, it's not. I don't... if I, O.K., if I covered...

DB: So you don't want it to be better. You want it to be this.
PJ: I want the floor to be better, but I, I mean this floor should be better period.

SM: But you don't want to make the effort to do it.

PJ: It sucks, I mean look at it. It looks terrible.

OB: Phil if you stated that the floor is not working, which I think you stated, you have also stated that you did not want to put enough effort into finishing this floor...

SM: Yes.

OB: ...but you are thinking about it, and as far as I'm concerned that is where I get to talk about the criticism of this and your activity, regardless of the damn program.

PJ: Yeah...

OB: So, um, part of what we do when we sit around, I know, when there are forty prints on the wall, as I remember hearing it, "Did you really intend this, did you want the frame here, did you shoot more, did you look at..?" There are some very specific things, I don't care how cerebral this game is. In this whole game there are specific things to do.

PJ: Yes. Now if I...

OB: Now I, you know I would say I don't like the floor.

PJ: If I had prints on the wall I'd say the same thing. I'd still think the floor stunk. Even if, even if I didn't have a sugarcube there.

OB: Well, if you...

PJ: Remember the last show? I think the floor stunk there too.

OB: Yeah, but the floor...

SM: The floor is relevant to this piece.

OB: The floor is this piece.

PJ: No. The floor is not this piece.

OB: Why not?
PJ: The floor, the walls, the cube of sugar, the lighting is this piece.

OB: You damage yourself with this.

PJ: Um, to change the floor would be to change the piece.

OB: No, no.

PJ: Yes, the floor should look better, but to change the floor, would be a different piece. It would not...

OB: The arguments...

PJ: ...it would not...

OB: ...the arguments you're making now damage the piece.

PJ: You're saying that I should change the piece. You're saying another piece, imagine if you will, close your eyes, imagine...

OB: No, no I'm not. I'm saying what you said and what you said, you said, "It would have looked better if the floor were, um, something or another." That's all I said, because you said it.

PJ: Do you think it would look better if we didn't have drop ceilings?

OB: Fine, that's all. I think it is your obligation as an artist to do that, consider it. I think that it is a point of evaluation and criticism.

PJ: O.K. So...

OB: I don't think it's any point of evaluation or criticism to talk about the program.

PJ: So I should change the floor, I should redo the ceiling...

OB: I don't know, I don't...

PJ: See what I mean?

OB: I'm not, I, I'm not interested, I am not that interested in the floor and the ceiling.

TC: It's not impossible.
OB: I have to accept what you did and part of it is what goes on here and I find that very acceptable.

PJ: Do you understand why I can't change the floor because the piece would be different? I mean, it'd be great if the people who own this place put in a really nice floor. That'd be great.

OB: I think, I mentioned you could have put something underneath. I think, I think, that, um, given my acceptance of the [word obscured] exceptional. I only think you did not work hard enough on it. That's all.

DB: But there's a...

CW: I think that you're...

OB: I don't want...

RS: Would it be prettier by having...

CW: What you're also...

JL: No, it wasn't his idea though. It wasn't his idea.

OB: O.K. What wasn't his idea?

JL: That the floor should be better or I don't...

OB: But he said something else...

DB: He just said, "No, the floor is fine. The floor is exactly what I wanted." He didn't say that.

PJ: Drop ceiling is not perfect either, I just don't like drop ceiling, but I'm not going to reinstall a ceiling...

DB: Eric Mosher moved the whole place around. He painted the walls black. He blew, you know, carcinogenic objects in the air. He, you can do whatever you want to.

PJ: I know and I did what I wanted to do.

DB: O.K., well then you should say the floor is fine.

PJ: Well, it's not.
DB: I mean, we can't, we can't say anything about anything in here, except your, you know this is exactly the way you wanted and we have to accept that.

Berj Kantarjian: You're, you're making the same criticism as you would if the photograph was in a frame, spotted and printed to nice ten zone...

DB: Well...

BK: ...that, that, that, that doesn't make the photograph, that doesn't make the photograph, that doesn't make the message...

OB: That is a part of whatever you call...

DB: Yeah...

OB: ...the aesthetic, the craft, or the technique...

DB: ...and you think that...

OB: ...and at a certain point, at a certain point that is part of it.

DB: Part of everything.

PJ: I agree with you.

BK: Not, not, not, it, it, it, it...

OB: It's not part of this. But he has other parts to worry about here.

?: Well, I think there's a real resentment though that, that the execution of the piece is so simple and so sublime...

OB: I don't resent it.

?: ...well, I...

OB: I'm trying to help Phil out here, but he keeps putting his foot in his mouth...

?: ...I think the problem...

OB: ...by putting it out to meet his foot.

PJ: I agree with what you said. I agree with the Arts & Crafts philosophy and all that stuff. O.K? Blah, blah, blah. But, um, changing the floor would be a
different piece and I told you that, then I would say, "O.K., the sugarcube with
the floor that's been painted." That would be a different piece. Alright?

JL: I think the problem came Phil that you, that you agreed. I would have
been fooled here and I think maybe Deb would have too, if you said, "No,
this is the way I wanted it." Right? I mean, if the meaning of the piece was in
this exact setting, with this lousy floor and the, and the not drop ceiling, or
whatever. Right? That would have been the nature of your piece and I think
that the problem came when somewhere in your mind you envisioned a
different floor and thought that that would be a better piece. But then
betterness gets, you know, what is better? It's different, but you didn't say that
at the time.

PJ: This piece has been shown in a different environment. It was just a nicer
place. It was a nicer place to show it, that's all.

Michael Phillips: First of all Judy, I don't think Deb would have been happy
with anything concerning this piece. That's one thing you said. And I think
that also a lot of people here wouldn't be happy no matter what, because this
is so simple, this is a sugarcube on the floor, so I can see what you're saying a
little, but, um, and what Owen said about putting his foot in his mouth, I just
think those are little, little technical, well I guess they're not really technical
things, but they're these little things that everyone just wants to keep
nitpicking on...

CW: I think what...

MP: There's no acceptance...

CW: Yes.

MP: ...and...

CW: I think what's also present in some of the criticism and not, I'm not, I'm
not inferring that, that [laughs] this is characteristic of your criticism is that,
what a lot of people are saying, "Now if I did it, this is the way I would do it."

SM: No.

CW: Then it would become their piece rather than his.

OB: No, I don't...

SM: No.
OB: ...think that. I don't think that. I have no "if" for what I would do with this piece. I mean I could give a list of fantasies, you know? I, I might even present them...

CW: Well, one of the...

OB: I only asked a question about the floor...

CW: Yeah, but...

OB: ...because I'm looking at it.

CW: He, he made a, he made a rhetorical mistake, I mean, he, as Judy just said, and he made an opening that everybody is dashing into right now and I think we're, we're, we're, we're um, going off on that track. I, I think that the characteristics of the room and I, I prefer not to use, to use the term qualities of the room, because qualitatively this is a very poor environment and it has always has been so, for anything that was, was displayed in this space and this is where you start when you, when you set up a show in this space.

OB: The whole approach to...

CW: These are the problems that you have to contend with.

OB: This, this piece is very dependent on the space.

CW: He should not have said what he said. If he had not said what he said then we could say that now this, this total environment that is participating in the objective that he has in mind.

OB: But it was an honest...

PJ: Yeah, I was trying to be honest, but I...

OB: It was an honest [word obscured]. Maybe it's for the privacy of the board.

CW: It was a mistake.

JL: I have a question Phil, which is less to do with this, than, than where you go from here. O.K? Because in terms of the little bit I, let's say we've, seen of, of work that you've done, the, the evolution that, that at least based on the little bit, is that you've been absorbed in various kinds of possibilities, uh, that would be translated in photographic means. O.K? That you would use photographs as your means, or photographs and painting, or some combination of stuff as your means. This is, this is very definitely a performance piece, that is to say, as far as I can tell, the meaning of it is our
dialogue as much as anything else. What does this mean in terms of your own direction? I mean, when I asked you before, "Do you want to make objects or images after this?" alright, that's, that's part of the question and in some ways, uh, I'm opening this up for doubt, like meaning it as a moral statement. It could be that the integrity of this work has to do with the meaningfulness of it as part of your evolution...

PJ: Uh huh.

JL: ...or if it's just a one-shot statement.

PJ: Oh, no, no, certainly part of an evolutionary, part of an evolutionary process. The work is...

?: Can you describe it?

PJ: The work is in a state of change, constant...

?: Can you elaborate on that?

JL: O.K.

PJ: On the process?

?: On what?

JL: No [word obscured]...

?: Expand on what it is you're talking about.

JL: Like, like would, like...

?: In response to Judy...

JL: ... the future work that you do, be having to do with eliciting dialogue in some way as opposed to making objects.

PJ: Um, eliciting dialogue would be good. Um, I would learn a lot from it, the interchange of the people, when we start talking about aesthetics and when we talk about work, about what it should look like and what it does look like is part of the work, that does help me.

JL: But I mean like, can you, I see this as a very different way of entering into an art dialogue then what you, let's say, did before...

PJ: There's...
JL: ...and what I'm asking you is, is your direction going to be one that excludes artifacts and...

PJ: No.

JL: ...or uses artifacts minimally in order to engender a dialogue?

PJ: I, I'm not sure exactly what direction I'll take, because you know how that changes. Um, the production of objects is, um, a central idea to this work and to my work in general, the manufacturing of stuff. If we could talk more about that than...

JL: Do it.

PJ: We talked about the readymade, about choosing as an act of creating, um, placement in a specific situation, um, is the work itself.

JL: In this case.

PJ: Yeah, yeah...yeah.

RS: Along with, you've talked about your, your comments about the making artifacts or, or whatever. You know, if, if you drop dead right now, we'd carry you out of the room, the janitors would come in and they'd sweep up the sugarcube, and we'd be left with the memory of a show, the artist Phil Jakubowski and it was one sugarcube. We wouldn't have, we wouldn't be able to go to the museum and see platinums or paintings or sculpture or, or whatever. How do you feel about that?

PJ: You used to be a dancer Roy...

RS: Yeah. Well dancers in their medium have to know that you deal with temporally. All you've got's a show...

PJ: Yeah.

RS: ...all you can live with is that vivid memory in your mind, maybe your audience carrying away something.

PJ: The temporal...

RS: But we have talked about it.
PJ: The temporal nature is part of the statement. Remember I was talking about Byars, a little while ago, with the show he did in France, Faster Than the Speed of Sound? The temporal nature is part of the statement.

RS: Well...

PJ: It wouldn't be as good...

RS: ...in art...

JL: I don't...

RS: ...with artifacts. What are you, are you leaving anything out? Is there anything else that...

JL: I'm not bias towards artifacts. You understand that?

PJ: Yeah Judy.

JL: I mean, like it doesn't matter to me. But, it strikes me that, you know, the, the ultimate integrity of this show would be that if in the evolution of your thought, that your works for the next while would have to do with this kind of, of using, ah, a situation to elicit a dialogue or some kind of consciousness making event, rather than having any artifact, rather than making any photograph whatsoever, unless in the context that you placed it, it performs similarly to something like this.

PJ: That's really good.

JL: You know?

PJ: Yeah.

JL: But, I mean we don't know this about you.

PJ: You, you just said it.

JL: I mean, I'm putting words in your mouth.

PJ: You just said it. You know?

JL: I'm just guessing. You know?

PJ: That's really good though. Yeah, yeah. Um, some things that appeal to me about this are the fact that it can be used for something else, I mean I like that, the fact that it's so cheap I like, the fact that everybody can create it I
enjoy too and that everyone can have one or a hundred if they want, they could take a million of them if they want. O.K?

JL: Well, I, you know, like if I pretended that I was on your board. [Laughs.] And I haven't even gotten to that place yet backwards, um, I, I would, I would want you to brainstorm that. I would really want you to project into an imaginary picture, whether you did anything or not, how, what the implications of having done this might be on other things that are important to the consciousness, to consciousness in the artistic dialogue.

PJ: Yeah.

JL: I would want to push for that.

PJ: Yeah, me too. This is a good situation to be in, for me. Now I don't know how I'm going to get myself in a situation like this again, where I can do this. Do you understand?

JL: But, I mean, you have relationships in the world. You have lots of feelings about art. You see a lot of art. I think it would be important for you to project a dialogue, because that's what you're dealing with is dialogue. You have to project it into other potential situations and, and see it, you know, make it a, a continuing evolution. Because just to have come this far and do this once I think, to me would be questionable.

PJ: As I said, as...

JL: Useful for us, but questionable.

PJ: As I said, when you asked your question before...

JL: Yeah.

PJ: Yes. It is part of an evolutionary process, remember when you asked that before?

JL: Yeah, right.

PJ: You remember?

JL: Yeah. O.K.

PJ: Yeah, it is part of an evolutionary process.

MP: That's what's interesting to me, mostly, I think, is that our work a lot of times is dialogue from artist to the viewer and in this sense it seems like the
major thing is dialogue between viewers, much more than artist to viewer, and, and that is part of it too and that's what's triggering most of it, but, I mean, that's what I gotten out of it sitting here now, I, you know, I first walked in here and, you know, what the hell is this thing? You know, this is bullshit. But now, I see what it did and I think it's wonderful personally, because I've never seen people sit in a thesis sharing for an hour and a half and rap and, and get angry and other people start to defend it and then get angry and, um...

?: Where you gonna get a...

PJ: Would this have happened if I didn't do the work?

MP: Probably n... I don't think so. How could it ever happen without that little sugarcube sitting there? If we sat [word obscured] walls that would be impossible.

CW: Phil, I have a class to teach. [Charles exits.]

?: Where, where are you gonna get another audience?

PJ: Oh, that's rough.

?: I mean, here you have an audience that's all ready to see it. You got, you got to have something in this gallery, You go somewhere else I, I think it's gonna be, you know, you could put it on the street and people would step on it...

PJ: Step on it.

?: ...or walk by it, you know?

?: They might talk about it though.

JL: Well, then that would be a whole different kind, I mean, if, if he was gonna continue, the nature of the event would have to be completely different for the street.

?: That's true.

JL: It couldn't be like this.

PJ: No it couldn't. No it couldn't.

?: Yeah.
JL: You couldn't transplant this particular event to the street. It would have no, no value.

PJ: That's a good thing to talk about. We talked about that a little bit before, about taking this and putting it somewhere else, on a table at a restaurant, somebody could dip it in their coffee, it would mean something else, in the...

?: But, who would catch it, I mean, if there's no audience in a restaurant they would drop it in the coffee...

PJ: Exactly, exactly. But here, in this context, it changes. The meaning of the piece changes due to the context. See?

MP: Put this in another gallery, people might, might not, that's a projection, they might sit around and talk about it and say, "What is wrong with this artist?"

JL: But it seems to me...

SM: [Laughs.]

JL: ...in order to make it a really good event, it shouldn't be repeated because it seems to me if you...

MP: I agree with that.

JL: ...continued this way, that they, that another gallery, in a context, in another town, in another place, whatever the artistic dialogue already existing in that community it would have to be a different piece. To repeat this seems to me bad news...

MP: I don't think..

JL: ...to me.

MP: I don't think he could.

PJ: Unless there was a reason to repeat it that made sense and it was a good reason. You know what I mean?

JL: Maybe.

PJ: Maybe there would... I don't know.

JL: Yeah.
PJ: I can't think of a situation like that.

EK: No.

JL: But it...

EK: I think if it gets a history, it'll be diluted. I really do.

PJ: Oh, I'm not gonna put sugarcubes down on the floor for the rest of my life.

EK: I already saw, I already saw...

[Laughter.]

Duane Hanson: This piece needs RIT as much as RIT needs this piece.

PJ: We talked about the appropriate action at the appropriate time in the appropriate place and then it means something. Otherwise it doesn't, it doesn't mean anything, or it means something else...

JL: It seems to me though...

PJ: ...or it means something else.

JL: ...that if you were really tuned to a, to another situation, it would come out differently.

PJ: Yes. It would be a different...

JL: I really can't imagine that literally you would need to do the same thing again.

PJ: It would, it would be a different situation and probably my action, hopefully, would be appropriate for that situation. I, maybe it would be the same action. I couldn't think of a situation where it would be. You know? I can't say it never would be, maybe. I don't know. O.K. Anything else?

DB: Time to take the show...

SM: No!

[Laughter. Clapping.]

[Crowd disperses.]
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